UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
SHERMAN DIVISION

Case No. 4:21-cv-00033-ALM

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -X
TIMOTHY JACKSON, :
Plaintiff :
:
VS :
:
LAURA WRIGHT, et al., :
Defendants :
- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -X

Videotaped deposition of DR. PHILIP ADRIAN EWELL taken at the offices of Regus, 157 Church Street, 18th Floor, New Haven, Connecticut, before Clifford Edwards, Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public, in and for the State of Connecticut on September 19, 2024, at 10:09 a.m. EDT.

A P P E A R A N C E S:

ON BEHALF OF THE PLAINTIFF:

Michael Thad Allen, Esq.
ALLEN LAW, LLC
PO Box 404
Quaker Hill, Connecticut 06375
m.allen@allen-lawfirm.com

ON BEHALF OF THE DEFENDANTS:

Benjamin S. Walton, AAG (via Zoom)
Mary Quimby, AAG (via Zoom)
Office of the Attorney General
General Litigation Division
State of Texas
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, Texas 78711-2548
512.463.0447
Benjamin.Walton@oag.texas.gov

ON BEHALF OF THE WITNESS:

Richard Painter, Esq.
c/o UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA
318 Mondale Hall
229 19th Ave. South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455
rwpusa18@gmail.com

ALSO PRESENT:

Alejandro Gomez, videographer

Timothy Jackson (via Zoom)

Cari Jacoby (via Zoom)

Renoldo Stowers (via Zoom)

EXAMINATION

	PAGE
DIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ALLEN	7
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. WALTON	244
REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. ALLEN	254
CROSS-EXAMINATION BY MR. PAINTER	256

EXHIBITS

PLAINTIFF'S	PAGE
Exhibit 1, Re-Notice of Deposition for Philip Ewell	7
Exhibit 2, Theoria Volume 26, 2020	117
Exhibit 3, Article Entitled "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame" Written by Philip Ewell, Published in Music Theory Online	130
Exhibit 4, Printout from Society of Music Theory Website	158
Exhibit 5, Article Titled "A UNT Professor Challenged Claims of Racism in Music Theory and Now He's Facing the Music" by Lucinda Breeding Dated August 2, 2020	164

EXHIBITS

(continued)

PLAINTIFF'S	PAGE
Exhibit 6, Collection of Documents Submitted by Timothy Jackson to Ad Hoc Panel Convened at University of North Texas	179
Exhibit 7, Facebook Exchange, One-Page Document Dated July 25, 2020	191
Exhibit 8, Facebook Post by Levi Walls	205
Exhibit 9, Document Presented to Ad Hoc Review Panel	226
Exhibit 10, E-mail Exchange Between Philip Ewell and Rachel Gain	237

(Reporter's Note: Exhibits retained by the court reporter and forwarded to Huseby for production.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: This is the beginning of media number one in the deposition of Philip Ewell in the matter of Timothy Jackson v. Laura Wright et al., case number 4:21-cv-00033.

Today's date is September 19, 2024. The time on the monitor is 10:09 a.m.

My name is Alejandro Gomez and I'm the videographer. The court reporter is Cliff Edwards. We are here with Huseby Global Litigation.

Counsel, please introduce yourself, after which the court reporter will swear in the witness.

MR. ALLEN: My name is Michael Thad Allen, attorney for Timothy Jackson, the plaintiff.

MR. PAINTER: My name is Richard Painter and I am attorney for Philip Ewell, the deponent.

MR. WALTON: My name is Ben Walton. I'm an attorney for the defendants in the lawsuit.

MS. QUIMBY: My name is Mary Quimby. I'm also an attorney for the defendants

in the lawsuit.

MS. JACOBY: My name is Cari Jacoby. I'm an attorney for the University of North Texas System.

MR. STOWERS: My name is Renaldo Stowers. I'm an attorney for the University of North Texas System.

PHILIP ADRIAN EWELL

residing at 324 77th Street, Apartment 1C, Brooklyn, New York 11209, having first been duly sworn, deposed and testified as follows:

MR. ALLEN: Professor Ewell, the first thing we are going to do is I'm going to introduce an exhibit.

This will happen from time to time during the deposition. There will be documents I'll ask you to examine and I'll ask you questions about them.

So I've marked as Exhibit Number 1, which should be in front of you.

Do we have the marked Exhibit Number 1?

COURT REPORTER: One moment, please.

(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 1, Re-Notice of Deposition for Philip Ewell, was marked for identification.)

MR. ALLEN: And I'm sorry, Richard, I brought another copy. This is just the notice of deposition, but the court reporter has written on it.

MR. PAINTER: I --

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q This is the document -- I'm going to represent to you that this is the re-notice of deposition.

Could I ask you to examine the --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- document?

A Get -- get my glasses on here --

Q And of course we want you to have your glasses on, too.

And this is a good time to bring this up. If at any time you need more time to examine an exhibit --

A Uh-huh.
Q -- just say so.
A Okay.
Q Of course, no one in the room wants you to be answering questions that you haven't examined the exhibit to answer and so forth.
A So all the pages here?
Q If you could just look it over. I don't have many questions about this one.
A Uh-huh.
This is a copy of the subpoena that I received; right?
Q Well, that was going to be my question: Do you recognize this document as the subpoena and re-notice of your deposition?
A I think so, yeah. Yeah.
Q And is it accurate to say you've appeared to give testimony today in response to these subpoena -- this subpoena and this re-notice?
A Yes.
Q And that's the only question I have about that document. You can put it to --
A Okay.
Q -- the side.
At the end of the deposition the court

reporter will take all of the exhibits and will be essentially the keeper of the record.

A Got it.

Q So I wanted to ask you if you have been deposed before?

A No.

Q And before the deposition started, your attorney and I were discussing the nature of depositions in your presence.

But, again, this is the making of a formal record for the court, so there are several rules of the road we have to abide by precisely because it is a very formal conversation.

So in normal conversation, things like you just did to nod or say "uh-huh" or "uh-huh" are perfectly normal and understandable.

But for the purposes of creating the record today, I'm going to ask you to answer audibly "yes" or "no," not with partial words or nods of the head to every question; is that clear?

A It's clear.

And I would like to ask a question of you; may I?

Q Absolutely. You may ask me a question at any time.

Although, I'm not here to testify obviously, but --

A Of course. Of course.

If a question that you might want a yes or no is asked and it requires some equivocation, that's okay on my part to give such equivocation.

Is that an accurate statement?

Q I will leave that to the advice of your counsel.

For the purpose of this "deposation" -- deposition, I would say you must answer a question "yes" or "no" if there's a yes or no answer.

A Yeah.

Q If you can't answer it "yes" or "no," you should just simply state that and that would give me an opportunity to ask you why.

A Perfect.

Q Is there anything that would interfere with your ability to answer questions truthfully today?

A No.

Q You are not on any drugs?

A No.

Q You are not suffering from any illness that would affect your memory?

A Nope.
Q Okay. You also understand the meaning of taking an oath; correct?
A Yup.
Q And that you are obligated to tell the truth?
A Yup.
Q As you just did, please ask me if you do not understand a question or you have a question about the question, so to speak.
No one has an interest in answering -- getting an answer to a question you didn't understand; is that clear?
A Yes.
Q Likewise, if you don't ask a question for clarification, I'm going to assume that you have understood the question as asked.
Is that also clear?
A Yup.
Q Thank you.
Can you explain for the record what you did to prepare for your depos- -- excuse me -- deposition today?
A I went through personal e-mails from a Gmail account from an old defunct account that I

used to use for professional Gmail, contact@PhilipEwell.com.

I went through Facebook direct messages, all pertaining to the subpoena and the questions asked -- may I look here --

Q Please.

A -- at this document?

MR. ALLEN: And I just -- let the record reflect the witness is consulting Exhibit 1.

A -- with respect to the documents requested --

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Okay.

A -- and listed at the end of the subpoena.

So I looked for relevant items listed in the documents requested. I, on advice of counsel, put them into a PDF.

Q And let me interrupt you.

I'm not going to ask you for anything you've discussed with your counsel.

A Uh-huh.

Q That would be privileged.

A Uh-huh.

Q The fact that you discussed something with your counsel, that is not necessarily privileged --

A Oh.

Q -- but the substance, any legal advice, just -- just so it's clear to you --

A Understood.

Q -- and for the record, I am not going to try to ask questions about that.

A Understood.

Q And you may hear your attorney object from time to time but --

A Understood.

Q -- I'm just asking what you did to prepare?

If you met with him, that's fine. Obviously --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- most witnesses do --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- if they have attorneys.

A Uh-huh.

Q But -- but please continue. Sorry.

A So I put those into a PDF --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- submitted them to my counsel.

Let's see. In preparation, anything else?

That would be it.

Q And the documents you consulted, were those produced in response to the subpoena?

A The PDF document, you are -- you are asking about?

Q Uh-huh.

A Yes.

Q Okay. Were there any documents you consulted which you have not produced in this -- in response to the subpoena?

A Not to my knowledge.

Q Okay. Did you discuss your upcoming deposition with anyone besides your attorney?

A With my wife.

Q Which is also privileged, incidentally. So I'm just going to move on.

Anyone else besides your wife?

A When I first got the subpoena, I discussed it -- I discussed it with the chair of the Department of Music at Hunter College, Mark Spicer, to simply tell him that this had happened. And we had a phone conversation and that is the extent of

that conversation.

Q Simply the existence of the subpoena that the deposition would take place?

A Exactly.

Q Did he give you any advice?

A He did not.

Q What did he say?

A "Thanks for letting me know."

Q Okay. That was a little bit of the preliminary necessit- -- necessaries for a deposition.

I'm going to move on to ask you some questions about the basic background to your career.

So could you briefly describe your educational career starting with your undergraduate degree on up through the present?

A Yeah, of course. I went to Stanford University undergrad, graduated in 1989 with a degree in music. I'm a cellist.

So after that I was accepted to a masters program at Queens College, City University of New York. Moved to New York. That was a two-year program.

And I then went to Russia to study cello in St. Petersburg, St. Petersburg Conservatory of

Music. And at that time I was applying to Ph.D. programs and DMA programs as a cellist, so I had a bit of a fork in the road: Will I become a professional cellist; will I become a music academician?

I had offers for both DMA programs and Ph.D. programs --

Q Can I interrupt you only briefly?

Can you state for the record what a DMA is?

A Uh-huh. Doctor of Musical Arts.

Q Okay.

A And that's generally for per- -- classical performance people mostly in the United States. It's -- it's a degree that's not really offered in countries other than ours.

Q And was there a degree you received from the Conservatory of St. Petersburg?

A A certificate.

Q How long did it take you to earn the certificate?

A I was there for two -- over two years and it was something of the order of a -- of a special certificate for foreign students who'd come to do graduate work but it was really

performance-oriented.

Q Uh-huh.

A So there wasn't a whole lot of classroom time as part of that certificate.

And then I decided ultimately to enroll at Yale University.

Q Uh-huh.

A That was 1994. And I finished with a Ph.D. in music theory there in 2001.

Q Okay. And so when did you return from St. Petersburg?

A To start, in 1994.

Q Okay. So you were starting in St. Petersburg in 1992?

A Not quite. I first went in the summer of '91 --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- to study language in Leningrad USSR.

Q Uh-huh.

A I had a program to do language -- to continue language study that fall, but it was not a good program. This was CIEE, if I'm not mistaken, Council on International Educational Exchange.

And I ended upcoming back to DeKalb, Illinois, which is -- was my hometown.

And for the fall of '91, I was in DeKalb and I studied cello and I did some stuff at Northern Illinois University, studied cello with Marc Johnson. He was the cellist of the Vermeer Quartet. And then it was January of '92.

That whole fall of '91 I was trying to get back to Russia because I knew I wanted to study cello in Russia. And I was able to -- it wasn't easy because you needed to get visas and it was still kind of a Soviet transitioning -- right -- to post-Soviet.

Q Uh-huh.

A But I did get a visa and I went back in January of '92 to study at the conservatory in St. Petersburg.

Q So you lived along with the Russian people the collapse of the Soviet Union, it sounds like?

A Yes, kind of. I -- I was not there in the fall of '91, which is when Leningrad became St. Petersburg. That --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- was October --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- when Gor- -- Gorbachev basically went

on air and said, Okay, peace out. I'm done.

That was December. That was Christmas Eve --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- actually of '91 and I was in the States for that.

But right after that in January -- first, second week of January, I was back in St. Petersburg.

Q Okay. And -- and thank you for that.

And I think you said you were from Illinois originally?

A Yes.

Q DeKalb, Illinois?

A Uh-huh.

Q Now, after you graduated from Yale with a Ph.D. in music theory, was it?

A Uh-huh.

Q Can you from that point on briefly describe your professional career?

A Yeah. I got a job ultimately at the University of Tennessee, Knoxville.

Q Uh-huh?

A And from 2002 to 2007, I was an assistant professor of music theory there. Did not go up for

tenure. I left before I did that.

I got a job in Naperville, Illinois, North Central College. I was a professor there for two years and wasn't so happy with the professional professorship there.

And that's when I went back on the job market. I found a job at Hunter College, City University of New York. And fall of 2009 is when I began that position. And that's the position I still have.

Q And did you achieve tenure at Hunter College?

A I did.

Q What year?

A 2016.

Q And are you a -- did -- were you promoted after that?

A Well, tenure usually happens with promotion from assistant to associate professor, so I was -- I was both promoted and tenured --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- in 2016.

Are you asking if I was promoted from associate to full professor?

Q Yes.

A And that did happen, yes, in 2021.
Q Okay. And that brings us up to the present; correct?
A In terms of my rank --
Q Yes.
A -- and professorship, yes.
Q And I'm not interested in what you earn or when you got pay raises or anything like that.
But that's -- in terms of your formal titles and your institutional affiliations --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- that is pretty -- pretty much encapsulates your career?
A Yeah.
Q Do you have any positions that are held across -- held at other institutions?
A No.
Q What --
A Sorry. I am an affiliate faculty at the graduate center of the City University of New York.
Q And just for the record, the City University of New York is also referred to as CUNY --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- and has many different colleges;

correct?

A Yes. CUNY is the way it's generally pronounced.

Q And Hunter College is one of those?

A Correct.

Q Is that generally associated with graduate teaching?

A At the graduate center? Yes, that's associated with graduate teaching.

Q And when you say, "at the graduate center," is that part of Hunter College or that is the Hunter College?

A It is not part of Hunter College. It is part of the City University of New York.

Q Okay.

A So it is -- the City University of New York is a consortium, I think they might call it, of roughly 24 different institutions.

Q Okay.

A And Hunter is one of them. There are about six four-year colleges, maybe more. There are two-year colleges, there's a nursing school, school of social work.

And the graduate center is generally viewed as the doctoral granting institution within

the City University of New York. They do grants and terminal master's degrees, I think, as well.

Q Okay. Do you belong to any academic societies, professional organizations?

A I do. Society -- Society of Music Theory and American Musicological Society.

Q Any others?

A I was a member of the New Directions Cello Association for many years. I think that membership has lapsed.

I was a member of -- I might still be a member of the Society for American Music. And I am a member of the Music Theory Society of New York State.

Q Okay. That's an independent organization or is it part of the Society for Music Theory, which I believe you mentioned before; did I get that right?

A That is cor- -- yes, you got that right.

No, it is not a part of the Society of -- for Music Theory. It's what we generally call a regional society.

Q Okay. I -- I believe it was for the Society -- is it "for" or "of" Music Theory?

A I think it's "for Music Theory."

Q So -- and if I say SMT, you'll know I'm referring to the Society for Music Theory?

A Correct.

Q So I believe it was in 2019 that you gave a plenary talk at the Society for Music Theory; correct?

A Correct.

Q And the title of that plenary talk was "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame."

Did I get that right?

A No.

Q Can you --

A It was --

Q Can you --

A It was --

Q Okay. Can --

A It was "Music Theory's White Racial Frame."

Q Thank you. Can you, if you remember, tell me the exact date of that talk?

A I can't tell you the exact date. I can only say that it was in November of 2019.

Q Was it in the beginning of the month, the end of the month?

A Well, SMT conferences are generally in

the first or second week of November, so before November 15. I mean, the date is -- we can find it out pretty easily I think.

Q Sure. And I also understand the limits of memory. That -- that -- that's fine. It's not about that. I'm trying to place it in time.

A Uh-huh.

Q And to the best of your knowledge, how was your talk received at the Society for Music Theory in 2019?

A It was received very well.

Q How were you selected to give the plenary talk?

A There was a program committee and they wanted to have a session, I think already entitled "Reframing Music Theory."

Q Uh-huh.

A The two people on the program committee I remember speaking with at some point were Betsy Marvin and Danny Jenkins.

And I think that Joe Straus, my colleague at the CUNY Graduate Center, had suggested my name to them at some point to be part of this multi-person plenary session.

MR. ALLEN: I don't --

COURT REPORTER: I can help you.

MR. ALLEN: Can we go off the record?

I'm sorry, there's a technical issue.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record. The time is 10:29.

(Whereupon, there was a recess taken from 10:29 a.m. to 10:31 a.m.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back on the record. The time is 10:31.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q I apologize for the interruption for technical difficulties.

I think you were in the middle of answering a question about how you had been selected to give the plenary talk in November of 2019 to the Society for Music Theory?

A Right.

Q Can you continue with your answer, please?

A Yeah. So Joe Straus had suggested me to the program committee and as I mentioned, Betsy Marvin and -- Elizabeth Marvin and Daniel Jenkins were the two names I remember from the program

committee.

Q Uh-huh.

A And there were four people who gave talks that day and I was one of them. And Betsy Marvin who is Elizabeth Marvin moderated that plenary session.

Q And all of the people you just mentioned are members of the SMT; right?

A I can't say that they are members now, but they certainly were at that moment. You needed to be a member in order to --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- present at the conf- -- at the conference.

Q What did you submit to this committee or panel for them to evaluate when selecting speakers?

A So I had been doing work that resulted in that plenary talk and ultimately in a very long article. The article is titled a little bit different and I wanted the difference between the talk and the article so that there could be a distinction between the two.

Q Uh-huh.

A You had mentioned "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame."

That in -- in fact is the -- the title of the long article --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- that I had published -- it looks like you have a copy of it there on the -- on the table. And -- and so "Music Theory's White Racial Frame" was the distilled version of that very long paper.

I had been doing that work going back to, I would say, 2017, 2018.

Q Uh-huh.

A And I had shown it to some colleagues at CUNY and certainly Joe Straus was one of them.

Q Uh-huh.

A And he thought that this work was important, interesting, so that's why he presented it or suggested to the program committee that I be considered for this -- for this slot.

Q And if you know, approximately how many members does the SMT have?

A 1200 is the number that sticks in my head from back then.

Q Uh-huh.

A So plus or minus at this point. Maybe a hundred or two plus or minus 1200.

Q Is it international in scope?

A The short answer is probably no in the sense that there are international societies.

So there's an International Musicological Society --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- which is clearly international in scope. But the Society for Music Theory certainly has members who are not located in the United States or who are not U.S. citizens, so in that sense it is international.

Q Okay. And approximately how long was the talk?

A My talk was about -- I -- I think about 22 minutes.

Q Okay.

A My portion of the plenary session was 22 minutes.

Q And all of these talks, you mentioned I think four in total, they were given at the same time?

A Correct. Well, sequentially.

Q By that I mean on the same day in the same session?

A Correct.

Q Okay. And after you had given the talk,

and by your account it was well received, was it available online?

A Yes.

Q And is it still available online?

A As far as I know, no.

Q Why has it been removed from its -- where it was online before?

A At some point, I removed it myself because I was getting hate mail based on people having viewed the talk.

And at some point I contacted I think it was Patricia Hall because the entire session was online and available open, maybe on a YouTube channel --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- via the SMT website.

I contacted Patricia Hall or -- yes, I think it was Patricia Hall as -- and she was the then-president of the Society for Music Theory and I said, Could you please remove my 22 minutes of the talk because people are watching it and sending me hate mail that got quite aggressive, the hate mail.

Q Uh-huh.

A And -- and she did.

Well, the Society for Music Theory did.

Not immediately, but -- but in -- in a few days I think that's when the talk was taken down.

Q When was this, again?

A Oh.

Q Within general terms, if you know?

A I would say -- well, it was in 2020. That's the --

Q That was the time the talk was up online; right?

A Yes. It was online after -- after November 2019, you know, maybe -- I -- I don't think it was immediately online --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- until I had asked her to take it off from the main Society of Music Theory.

I should say here that I had clipped my 22 minutes and made it available on my own professional website.

Q Uh-huh.

A And that was easy for me to take down. Since I had put it up, I could take it down.

Q Uh-huh.

A But the entire session was still available and because of the hate that I was getting, I sent that e-mail to Patricia Hall -- and

it's going to be a ballpark -- in the spring or summer, let's say, of 2020.

Q Okay. And who is Patricia Hall?

A She was -- was the president of the Society for Music Theory at that time.

Q Is she a professor as well?

A She's a professor of music theory, yes.

Q Where?

A University of Michigan, I believe.

Q Okay. And you don't have any indication that Timothy Jackson sent you hate mail as -- in response to this, do you?

A I do not.

Q Or that he organized any of this hate mail?

A That -- that I organized it?

Q No, my client, Timothy Jackson.

A Yeah.

Q You don't have any indication that he was organizing some kind of hate mail?

A I do not, no.

Q Okay. And I think you already answered this, but then a longer article based on this talk was eventually published; right?

A Correct.

Q And that article was titled "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame."
Correct?
A Correct.
Q And when did that come out?
A I think that came out some time in June of 2020.
Q And that was published by the Society for Music Theory?
A Yes.
Q What's the name of their journal?
A Well, they have about five official publications --
Q Okay. Well, what's the -- what's the name of the journal in which your article --
A Music Theory Online.
Q Okay. Was it already agreed that the plenary talks would be published as papers in this Music Theory Online journal?
A Well, my plenary talk was not published in Music Theory Online. That paper -- that paper, as I've said, is -- oh, gosh -- five, six, seven times longer than my plenary --
Q Uh-huh.
A -- address.

So that's not the same -- the paper -- the article that I see printed out over there, that was a separate thing from the plenary.

The actual plenary talks were in fact published in Music Theory Spectrum, which is another publication of the Society for Music Theory.

Q Was your -- was your talk in print form published in the Spectrum journal?

A Correct. Yes, it was.

Q So before we go onto the longer article --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- what was the process for publishing in Spectrum?

A I think the editor at that time was Marianne Wheeldon --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- who was a professor of music theory at the University of Texas-Austin. And she -- somebody had gotten in touch with her to publish these four plenary talks --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- as a package. It generally has happened -- I've been told; I've not really seen -- I -- I -- I've never been privy to the

conversations -- it's generally happened that plenary talks at the Society for Music Theory are published --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- in one of those two journals. Those are the main academic journals.

But how it actually came to pass, I think that was more Betsy Marvin and probably Joe Straus who were working with Marianne Wheeldon to actually see those plenary talks published in Music Theory Spectrum.

Q And I -- just to clarify for the record: Is Spectrum a journal that actually appears in print, like in a hard copy, old fashioned journal print?

A I think it no longer does.

Q Uh-huh.

A It might still -- they might still be burning off print copies.

Back then, I think they -- they still were.

Q Okay.

A But I think it's more or less all online at this point.

Q And was that plenary talk when it was

published in Spectrum, was that sent out for peer review before that publication?

A I -- I don't know.

Q Wouldn't you know as the author that your article was being sent out for -- for peer review?

A I -- one would think, yes, but I wasn't that involved. I essentially submitted what I had read at the plenary address --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- probably -- probably to Marianne Wheeldon. What she did as editor, I do not know.

Q Do you remember responding to reviewers?

A I do not, no.

Q And just for the record, can you describe what peer review means to an academic in music theory?

A Yes. Peer review generally happens -- it's often called singly-blind or double-blind.

Q Uh-huh.

A I don't call it that because to use the word "blind" like that is ableist language, which I don't support.

I call it single or doubly-anonymous review, as they do in Russia, for example.

And a singly-anonymous review is one in

which the reviewers know the identity of the author of the article.

And as you I'm sure know, the doubly-anonymous review is one in which all identities are withheld.

Q Identities meaning the personal identity of the --

A The personal identity of the reviewers --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- and the author of the article.

Q And so to the best of your recollection, there was no double-blind peer review of the Spectrum publication?

A I didn't say that I -- I didn't -- that there was no review. I said that I don't know.

Q You don't recall ever getting a reviewer's comments?

A That's correct.

Q You don't recall ever responding to the reviewer's comments?

A Yeah, correct. Of course.

Q You don't recall ever discussing with the editor peer reviews?

A That is correct, yes.

Q And certainly, if there was such

correspondence, that would be in your e-mail somewhere?

A Correct.

Q Or other papers?

A Uh-huh.

Q Did you do a diligent search of your records for those papers?

A Yes.

Q Did you turn any up?

A Excuse me. Can you repeat that question, please?

Q Did you conduct a diligent search of your records for peer review documents of the Spectrum publication?

A I am now looking at the documents requested at the end of the subpoena and I really looked at this request number one, two, and three and I don't recall seeing anything about peer review here.

So I don't think that I specifically looked for peer review in putting together the -- that PDF that I talked about.

Q You would agree that a document that discussed peer review of your paper that was presented at the 219 -- 2019, excuse me, plenary

address to the Society for Music Theory would be information concerning your plenary address; correct?

A Yes.

Q So that would be responsive to the first request there, which asks for each record constituting a communication that implements, mentions, discusses, or contains any information concerning your plenary address at the 2019 Society for Music Theory's annual meeting; correct?

A Yes.

Q Okay.

MR. PAINTER: I'm going to ask for clarification as to what you mean by "record."

Are these records in his possession or records in the possession of Hunter College, which have not been produced?

MR. ALLEN: We can discuss that off the record.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q But I just want to make a record here for the purposes of our deposition that if such a document was in your possession, that it would be responsive to the subpoena; do you agree?

A May I ask -- may I confer with my counsel on that?

Q You confer with your counsel -- well, let's -- for the purposes --

MR. ALLEN: Do you want to just confer here or you want to go off the record so he can confer with you?

MR. PAINTER: Well, I mean, it's a legal question as to what's responsive.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah.

MR. PAINTER: I -- deponents usually consult their counsel as to what is responsive and what is not.

MR. ALLEN: Uh-huh.

MR. PAINTER: And there are a lot of e-mails that are in the possession --

MR. ALLEN: Sure.

MR. PAINTER: -- of Hunter College --

MR. ALLEN: I understand.

MR. PAINTER: -- that have not been produced. And I don't believe he's gone through those in preparation for this deposition.

So if you are asking about those, I

think that just needs to be very clear on the record that you are asking about those and then he'd have an opportunity to review those.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q And my purpose here is to try to identify whether or not any such documents exist?

A Uh-huh.

Q If we need to follow up, that's fine with me. I'm not here to try to suggest you did anything wrong.

In fact, this often happens in depositions that you identify documents that someone wants, the other person didn't know they should have got, something like that. So it's really not about trying to impugn your reputation.

I just want to identify whether any such review of the Spectrum publication happened.

So if there are such documents they certainly exist in one of two places, as far as I can tell from what you've discussed so far: They exist either in your own personal records or in the records that are properly in -- in the control of Hunter College; is that correct?

A In control of Hunter College, yes.

Q Okay.
A Yes.
Q But as you sit here today, you don't remember seeing any such documents?
A Correct.
Q Do you remember there being any complaints that publications of these plenary sessions in Spectrum were not peer reviewed?
A No.
Q Do you have any reason to believe that the Society for Music Theory would not keep such documents themselves if they were generated in the process of peer review?
A Can you repeat that question?
Q Do you have any reason to believe that the Society for Music Theory would not have these peer review documents related to your article if they existed?
A I don't have any reason to believe that, that they would not have them.
Q And I guess conversely, would you expect the Society for Music Theory to maintain those records of past peer reviews?
A Sure. Yeah.
Q Okay.

MR. PAINTER: I'd ask you to clarify, are we asking about the article or the talk, the plenary session talk?

MR. ALLEN: I am talking about the article that was published in Spectrum --

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q -- which you said was based on the print that was presented in oral form at the plenary address.

A I would say more than based on. I would say it was virtually a verbatim --

Q Okay.

A -- replication of what I spoke.

Q So I want to move on a little bit.

Now, you've testified that there was a second paper which grew out of the research and presentation of the plenary talk which was published in Music Theory Online; correct?

A Uh-huh.

Q Can you describe how that paper came to be published in Music Theory Online?

A Yeah. So I mentioned that I began that work probably 2017, 2018.

Q Uh-huh.

A And strangely, it began as a response to

five articles that were going to appear in Music Theory Online on Kendrick Lamar's album, To Pimp a Butterfly.

And there were a lot of things swirling in my head about music theory and how we have dealt with race in the past. And I remember writing a very long -- so I was contacted by Noriko Manabe. She's currently a music theory professor at Indiana University. She was one of the authors.

And they said, Would you please write an introduction to these five papers?

And I agreed. But the introduction that I originally wrote was very long, 12-, 14,000 words, and it wasn't so much a traditional introduction to five papers on Kendrick Lamar.

But I -- I wrote that paper, that introduction, and ultimately I pulled it -- I wrote something completely different, which is available online now, 4,000 words, Hey, this is a great thing.

But that original response was the paper that ultimately became "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame." So that I wrote Winter/Spring 2018.

Q Let -- let me ask you a few questions about that original -- what did you call it -- a response to Kendrick Lamar?

A It was an introduction --

Q Introduction?

A -- to five papers on Kendrick Lamar's third studio album.

Q I see.

A It's called To Pimp a Butterfly.

Q And you said that was published or it was not published?

A It was.

Oh, the original introduction, very long --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- 12-, 14,000 words, I completely pulled that.

Q Uh-huh.

A That was not part of it. I rewrote something completely different --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- which is published as the introduction --

Q Okay.

A -- to -- to that, I think it's called, "A Symposium on Kendrick Lamar's To Pimp a Butterfly."

Q Where -- where was that published?

A That was also in Music Theory Online.

Q And was that article --
A If you --
Q -- an introduction --
(Whereupon, the court reporter requests clarification.)
BY MR. ALLEN:
Q So we'll refer to it as "an introduction"?
A Uh-huh.
Q In its final form, approximately how many words was it?
A 4,000 words.
Q And 4,000 words in ordinary journal pages would be about how much, in your experience?
A I have no idea.
Q Was that introduction peer reviewed?
A Yes.
Q Who were the reviewers?
A I do not know. It was -- it was anonymous.
Q It stands out in your mind that it was reviewed and you received the reviewers' comments?
A Uh-huh.
Q And you remember responding to the reviewers' comments?

A Uh-huh.

Q Okay. Now, that is separate from an article that you eventually published in Music Theory Online called "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame."

Correct?

A Correct.

Q So just focusing on that paper, explain the publication process in that case.

A Uh-huh. So I submitted that to Music Theory Online. And it took a fair bit of time for reviews to come back.

They came back. They were positive. But the editor at the time, that was Jeff Perry. Jeff Perry is a music theory professor at Louisiana State University.

Q Uh-huh.

A Does it help for me to say that? Should I be saying that, by the way? I -- you know, because you asked --

Q I appreciate it because you have to understand, this is -- this is likely to be or could be shown to a jury --

A Yeah, fair.

Q -- and they won't know these people from

Adam, nor do I, quite frankly.

A Sure.

Q So I think it helps to put it in context --

A I will --

Q -- without belaboring the point.

If they become relevant, Professor Ewell, it will be my job to ask about that.

A Uh-huh.

Q But I do appreciate it when you give these descriptions in brief of who they are and where they are located.

So with that said --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- please continue describing the process of publishing "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame" in Music Theory Online.

A Yeah, so the editor at the time was Jeff Perry.

Q Uh-huh.

A And there was some very interesting back-and-forth. And this is something that I actually outline in a monograph that I wrote --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- that came out last year. And that

monograph is entitled "On Music Theory and Making Music More Welcoming for Everyone." And I'm happy to -- to -- to repeat some of those things here.

So the reviews came back positive as -- accept with revisions.

Q Uh-huh.

A Jeff Perry and the Music Theory Online team e-mailed me, We are going to change this to a different decision.

And the decision was revise and resubmit. And that --

Q And just for the record -- again, this may be presented to people who have no idea how --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- the publication in academic journal works, but a revise-and-resubmit recommendation means, if I may summarize, We like it but we want these revisions with these revisions; we'd like to see it again and then it will be published.

Is that fair?

A Yup, that's fair.

Q Okay.

A Yeah.

Q And so fast forward to the next phase.

A Uh-huh.

Q What happened next?

A Well, since you clarified what revised and resubmit means, we often just say "R&R."

Q Which doesn't mean "rest and relaxation."

A It does not mean --

Q It means more work for the professor?

A Yeah, yeah.

Oh, let me clarify what "accept with revisions" --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- at least meant at the time.

Q Uh-huh.

A It meant this article will be published.

Music Theory Online said very clearly at the time in -- in their language, If you get to "accept with revisions," you can consider your article published and you can list it on your CV.

Q Uh-huh.

A So that's what that meant vis-à-vis the "revise and resubmit" --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- which is what you just outlined.

Q Uh-huh.

A They changed the "accept with revisions" to "revise and resubmit."

And I took issue with that. And I began to -- I drafted a memorandum to the chair of the publications committee at the time. That was Brian Alegant, who is now retired I think --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- from Oberlin as a music theory professor.

And I had a phone call with Brian Alegant regarding this case. And ultimately, I emerged victorious in this behind-the-scenes battle, let me say --

Q -- uh-huh.

A -- as to whether they were going to honor their own rules and not change the goal posts.

Q Right.

A Right? Or change the goal posts and get away with it.

Q Uh-huh.

A So it was one of those two things.

Frankly, I thought that they would get away with it. But I was a little surprised, happily surprised, when in fact they decided to honor their own rules and publish this article.

Q And so the Society for Music Theory honoring their own rules, that's important to you;

correct?

A Yes.

Q And in this case, you thought they did the right thing?

A Yes.

I should also add that any society honoring their own rules is important to me.

Q And I understand from your statement that you consider yourself a -- basically, an honest academic; right?

A I don't understand that question.

Q Sure. You want societies to honor their own rules; correct?

A Yes.

Q Professional societies that address academic work; correct?

A Yes.

Q And you, yourself, consider yourself an honorable academic in that sense?

A Yes.

Q Okay. And this is a perfect example of a question being unclear and you ask for clarification and I appreciate that.

A I appreciate the clarification.

Q So I want to turn to -- so this article

was peer reviewed. It came back, Accepted but we want a few changes.

Then the editorial board, it sounds like, changed that to revise and resubmit; correct so far?

A No, it was not the editorial board. It was the editors at Music Theory Online. Specifically, Jeff Perry and probably David Neumeyer --

MR. ALLEN: Uh-huh.

A -- retired music theory professor, University of Texas-Austin, I think.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Uh-huh. And then you pushed back on that; correct?

A Yes. Then I pushed back the editorial -- not the editorial board, but the publications committee was the next level.

Q Uh-huh.

A And this is a publications committee, by the way, of the Society for Music Theory.

Q Okay. And you eventually prevailed?

A Uh-huh.

Q They followed their own rules; right?

A Uh-huh.

Q And the article was eventually published

after, what I take to be, some few revisions?

A Correct.

Q So I want to turn now and ask a few questions about the substance of your article.

I understand you may not have a verbatim memory of the article and it's been some time, but --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- I really want you to explain in -- in general terms that can be understand -- -stood by the Jury, if you could, what is the white racial frame in music theory?

A Well, the right -- white racial frame is from sociologist Joe Feagin --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- who's written books called "White Racial Framing," who's talked about this concept from a sociological point of view for decades now.

And within -- within music theory, the white racial frame is essentially an acknowledgment that American music theory historically is deeply, deeply rooted in our own country's historic white supremacy.

Q So the white racial frame is about the historical background to music theory in the United

States?

A Yes, to a very large extent. Yes.

Q Okay. And how does the white racial frame justify the great array of privileges and assets held by white Americans?

I believe that's a quote from your article?

A Can you repeat that again, please?

Q Sure. How does the white racial frame in music theory "justify the great array of privileges and assets held by white Americans"?

A In music theory -- in American music theory, it's manifested in many, many different ways from the curricula that we put forth in the music theory classroom to the music theorists who have been elevated to study and whose works we read to the performances and the -- the pieces and the repertoire that we tell our students are the most important in -- in their music educations.

Q And how does that justify the great array of privileges and assets held by white Americans?

A It justifies it in the sense that virtually all of the repertoire, until the last, say, five to ten years, all of the repertoire, all of the theorists, all of the ideas put forth were in

fact created by white men in the history of music theory going back, well, centuries, frankly.

And when you look at it from a racialized perspective, as I have, you realize that whiteness plus maleness, the concepts of whiteness plus maleness, in fact give people who happen to be deemed white by society -- because, of course, whiteness as a concept is something that's been very, very flexible over -- over the centuries, since it was created by humans roughly 500 years ago, right -- it gives people who -- who might identify as such a great, great advantage because people by default believe that a person who presents as white and male are -- are more inclined to be like the great music -- so-called great music theorists of the past; right?

And it in fact tells our students that this is the model for what music theory should be because quite literally 100 percent of the music theorists we put forth in study were in fact white men, rather than realizing that historically, going back hundreds of years, without question, the country that became known as the United States has valued whiteness over all other forms of races over non-whiteness, let's say.

And it's only now that we are beginning to unpack some of the racialized histories of music education and music theory specifically, which is what I do, in order to unpack some of the -- as you -- as you quote from me, the array of privileges --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- that whiteness and male -- plus maleness -- I'm speaking about whiteness because I think that's where your -- your question is more focused on that.

Of course, I very clearly link this to maleness and patriarchy in all of my work because if you actually study race, as I have over many years now, you realize that patriarchy is tied right at the hip to the history of white supremacy.

Q Okay. And is this a fair summary -- and I'm not trying to put words in your mouths [sic] -- but the fact that only white men have written, published the corpus of music theory up to the present in the United States, that that has propped up white supremacy in the United States?

A No, that's not true. I -- I wouldn't say only white men because, in fact, people have theorized music all over the planet since there's

been music; right?

We've only put forth a select few in our country because historically, the -- the country that became known as the United States is rooted in two twin ideologies more than any other and those ideologies are white supremacy and patriarchy.

Q So these -- these doctrines of white supremacy and patriarchy were responsible for selecting the people in the United States who were considered music theorists?

A Well, when you say "responsible for selecting," it almost sounds as if there's, like, a fair egalitarian selection process that's going on behind the scenes.

And that's never been the case; right? It's -- it has quite literally been white men writing the rules.

It's not like in 1787 when the Constitutional convention was convened in Philadelphia that there were 55 people from all over the country and half of them were women and over here we have the Scots and over here we have the Cherokee and the Hopi.

No. No. No. We all know, they were 55 white propertied men, about half of whom who owned

slaves, and they wrote a rulebook, the Constitution, which benefited themselves.

And to be honest, do you blame them? I wouldn't do -- I -- I would have done the same thing. You had money, you had education, you had travel.

I don't blame somebody 240 years ago for writing a rulebook that benefited themselves. That's human nature.

This is -- there's not -- there's nothing about blame here.

Q And -- and let me ask a question about that specifically.

And so in your view, the Constitution itself was written to support white male privilege?

A You keep coming back to the word "privilege" and that's not exactly the word I would use.

White male supremacy, I would use --

Q Okay. Well, let's use your words.

It was written to the support white male supremacy?

A Not explicitly to support white male supremacy, but it was written with white male supremacy in mind; right. I mean, I, quite

literally, would have been three-fifths of a person because of the Three-Fifths Compromise; right?

And --

Q And by that, you are referring to the fact that you identify as black?

A Correct.

Q And people at that time certainly would have identified you as black; right?

A Correct. Correct.

Q And keep in mind, this will be on video, so we are not making things up and they'll see you; right?

A That's great.

Q Okay. So then that's what you are referring to?

A Absolutely, yeah.

Q Uh-huh.

A And so I probably would ask a question: How could that not be seen as supporting whiteness if -- if the Fugitive Slave Clause, which was part of the original Constitution, and the Three-Fifths Compromise, which was part of the original Constitution, quite clearly were anti-black in nature?

And the first naturalization law from

1790 very clearly said, If you want to be naturalized citizen, you have to be white.

Q Uh-huh.

A It also said you had to be -- you had to be a free white person, is the way they wrote the law.

Well, that's a white supremacist structure; right. That's what --

So if -- if you're -- if you're asking me whether the Constitution was written with white supremacy and patriarchy, by the way, in mind, my answer would be unequivocably yes, it was.

Q And that includes the First Amendment to the United States Constitution?

A The First Amendment of the Constitution to free speech, I think, is one of the high water marks of our Constitution --

Q Are you excepting that from the supports of white supremacy in your view?

A I --

Q Let me rephrase that.

A Yeah, yeah, please.

Q Are you excepting the First Amendment from the argument you just made about the sup- -- I guess you didn't say "support" --

MR. PAINTER: That mischaracterizes --

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, no, I'm trying to get it right.

MR. PAINTER: He didn't say the entire Constitution, every provision.

MR. ALLEN: Well, let me ask him a question.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q I'm asking if you except the First Amendment which guarantees free speech from the argument that you made about the 55, I believe, white men, half of them slave owners, who were advancing white supremacy at the time of the founding?

A Yeah. This is a very interesting conversation.

I -- I fully acknowledge some of the beautiful parts of the United States Constitution. My personal favorite is the 14th Amendment written by John Bingham, a Radical Republican --

Q Which is, of course, after the Civil War; right?

A Correct. One of the reconstruction amendments.

He was a Congressman from Ohio, a Radical Republican, and a white man, I'd like to point out for the record here.

And the First Amendment I think is a great amendment. I think the Second Amendment is an awful amendment, personally, but now we are just getting into speculation and --

Q And we don't need to --

A -- I --

(Whereupon, the court reporter requests clarification.)

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Well, I -- I want to -- I don't necessarily want to cut this short, but we have other things to talk about and I -- I just wanted to ask you the question about the first amendment since you had made those statements about the Constitution.

I wanted to return to music theory, if you don't mind?

A Please.

Q What role did music theory have in -- in forming the founders' drafting of the Constitution or the 1790 law that you mention?

A What role did music theory have --

Q Yes?
A -- in forming the Constitution of the United States?
Q Yes. We've been talking about the white --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- racial frame of music theory; correct?
A Yeah.
Q And you --
MR. PAINTER: Correction. A lot of this has not been about the white racial frame of music theory. We have been talking about the Constitution for at least five minutes.
BY MR. ALLEN:
Q And then we transitioned to talking about the Constitution when I asked you how did this, for lack of a better word, ideology of the white racial frame justify the great array of privileges and assets held by white Americans; right?
A Uh-huh.
Q Do you remember that question?
A Uh-huh.
Q And then we transitioned based on your answer to a discussion of the Constitution and

the -- the law in 1790?

A Uh-huh.

Q Which I think we all agree is atrocious.

A Uh-huh.

Q And my question then, returning to white racial framing of music theory, I wanted to know how those are connected. How is the white racial frame in music theory connected to the 55 founders, half of them slave owners, who drafted the Constitution?

A Well, that's actually pretty easy to answer. To race scholars like me, it's pretty easy to connect dots to see how the white supremacist foundings of the country are manifested in music.

Let's take the New York Philharmonic, for example. I think that's our oldest symphony orchestra. It was founded in 1842.

The first non-white person to play and be accepted into the orchestra was 120 years later. His name -- he's a black violinist. His name is Sanford Allen. He's still alive. He lives in New York City.

One hundred twenty years it took for them to accept into the orchestra a person who was not white.

Since I know a lot about patriarchy and

the his- -- the patriarchal underpinnings of the United States as well, I'll simply point out that the first woman to be accepted to play in the New York Philharmonic, not as just a per service player but someone who is part of the group taken in as a tenured member of the orchestra, that was Steffy Goldner. She was a harpist and that was in 1922. So it took 80 years for them to accept a woman into the orchestra.

So if the question is: How did the white supremacist underpinnings of a Constitution or just the founding of the count- -- of the country affect society writ large and, in my case, music and music theory, well, just look at -- look at the New York Philharmonic.

Look at the Metropolitan Opera founded in 1883. First opera written by a black composer performed in 2021, four -- three years ago. That was Fire Shut up in my Bones by Terence Blanchard, a very fine composer and trumpeter.

Q So let me interject for a second.

I don't think anyone would seriously question that there has been a racial discrimination in the United States, at least -- not least of which manifested in institutions like philharmonic

orchestras and so forth, just as you have described.

A Uh-huh.

Q My question was different.

My question was: How did music theory inform this white racial frame that you described? How did that inform the -- what you've described as the racial supremacy embedded in the Constitution and other laws dating back to the 18th century?

A Uh-huh. Well, I -- I mentioned performing institutions like New York Philharmonic or the Metropolitan Opera.

All of the people involved in those, they went to school and they learned music theory; right. It was very much a feedback loop in the world of classical music. It still is to a very large extent, although we are making some very interesting steps forward, I think, in a -- in -- in positive directions.

If in fact a student goes to an institution to learn music and they are told explicitly that the -- that white people's brains are bigger because racial phrenologists proved it, if they are told that black people couldn't possibly write good music because they are black, well, that's part of music education.

Music theory is a crucial part of music education. It has been, of course.

Q So maybe -- let me ask my question another way.

Is -- is what you are saying or what you were trying to advance in your article in Music Theory Online that the -- the embedded racial supremacy in our founding documents went on to influence music theory for generations to come?

A It influenced absolutely every aspect of American life up to and including music theory.

Q Okay.

A And it still influences these things today.

Q Is it your -- also your argument that this white racial frame in Western music theory has the purpose of upholding white supremacy?

A Well, this is the first time you've used the word "Western" and I -- I -- that's not a word I really use anymore. This is something I unpack also in my monograph from last year.

The whole concept of the West, it -- it never happened before 1860 roughly. It -- the -- the West was created out of thin air.

Why? Because Europe could no longer

ignore the money and the power that slave labor had generated in the United States of America. In other words, Europe could no longer ignore the United States of America.

So we needed a term to link the United States to Europe. The Europeans needed a term, frankly, and that term was "the West."

And that linked up the -- what we now call North America, which is usually considered to be Canada and the United States, despite the fact that North America is a continent that goes down to the Panama-Colombia border; right.

So I personally don't use "the West" in talking about some of the structures of -- of -- of music education.

And now, I'm sorry, Mr. Allen, you'll have to go back and repeat the -- the original question because --

Q Sure.

A -- I lost it.

Q So let's leave any conceptions of the West since that seems to be something you don't like.

So this white --

MR. PAINTER: Correction. I -- I

don't think he said he didn't like it.

THE WITNESS: You are right. I did not say --

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q You don't like this term, "Western"? You said it's --

A I didn't --

Q -- something like it was invented out of think air or something?

A Yeah, I didn't say I didn't like it. I said I don't use it.

Q Okay. Well, I'm sorry if I interpreted something that you refuse to use as something you don't like, so I stand corrected.

Let me ask the question a different way: This white racial frame in Wes- -- let me see -- white racial frame in what is contemporary United States music theory has the purpose of upholding white supremacy; is that your argument?

A No. No.

Q Do you argue that the contemporary white racial frame in classical music theory as it's taught in the United States discriminates against black Americans?

A Can you clarify what you mean by

"discriminates against black Americans"?

Q Let's start with some of the examples you've used.

It denies black Americans access to, say, philharmonic orchestras?

A You mean as members playing in the orchestra?

Q Sure, let's start with that.

A It has, yes.

Q As students of music?

A I don't understand the question.

Q As students in graduate programs in music theory, such as you teach?

A Could you give me a full question? I -- I --

Q Sure. I'm asking how -- or if music theory, as you've described it having this white racial frame, discriminates against black Americans, and you asked me to be more specific.

A I asked you to -- to -- to explain what you mean by "discriminating black Americans," yes.

Q And I said it keeps black Americans out of positions as performing artists in philharmonic orchestras, and you agreed?

A Yeah.

Q And I asked if it keeps black Americans out of music theory education programs, such as the one you teach.

So let's then move onto that question.

A Are you --

Q Is that an argument you would make, that this white racial frame discriminates against black Americans by keeping them out of music theory programs?

A I don't understand what you mean by "keeping out of."

You mean like not being admitted to study.

Q Sure. It excludes them?

A It excludes them as undergraduates or as masters or doctoral students?

Q Let's take them in turn. As undergraduates?

Do you know of any undergraduates who are black Americans who wanted to study in music theory who were excluded from a program in the United States because of the white racial frame of music theory?

A Well, so I 00 I often refer to history in these terms and now I would refer to Paul Brent, who

is the first black student to study at Peabody. That was 1949. He was most certainly excluded because of his blackness but he did ultimately get in before that.

It was quite routine to exclude black people from conservatories and from music education because -- quite explicitly because of their blackness.

Carl Seashore was a music theorist at the University of Iowa who died years ago. He was essentially a musical eugenicist and he is -- his goal was to prove the inferiority of black musicians in the country.

The reason I'm laying out the history here is because it sounds like you want me to answer something about today and I have a hard time answering such a question without laying out a little bit of --

Q Sure.

A -- the history as to exactly how and why blacks were in fact discriminated against in music educational settings in horrific ways, I might add, going back to the 19th century.

But Paul Brent was 1949. That's not that old. My folks were alive in 1949. That's not that

far in -- into the past.

And it's not that much of a leap to think that such discrimination could have happened in the late 20th century.

Now, if you are asking me if I know specifically, I'd have to think. I could probably come up with some instances where it actually has been part of the "do you get admitted or do you not get admitted" --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- "into this program as an undergraduate, as a masters student, as a doctoral student?"

Q So this is still happening today is -- is what you believe?

A If the question is racial discrimination is still happening --

Q No, that --

A -- in music --

Q -- wasn't my question.

Are students being excluded from undergraduate programs because they are black today?

A In undergraduate music programs?

I think that it -- not explicitly, but in fact implicitly yes, probably yes.

MR. PAINTER: Take a break fairly soon?
MR. ALLEN: You want a break?
MR. PAINTER: Yeah, pretty soon.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay.
MR. PAINTER: Brief break.
MR. ALLEN: Let's go off the record and take a break now. It's fine. It's 11:18.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record.
MR. PAINTER: Just go to the bathroom.
MR. ALLEN: Yeah, sure.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 11:18.
(Whereupon, there was a recess taken from 11:18 a.m. to 11:31 a.m.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back on the record. The time is 11:31.
BY MR. ALLEN:
Q Professor Ewell, I believe before our short break you were talking about -- we were answering questions about specific incidents of discrimination in the field of music theory and the

admission to undergraduate. You had also mentioned graduate schools.

So I want to continue with that line of questioning, if you don't mind.

Do you know of any black students who have been denied admission to the University of North Texas graduate program in music theory?

A Nope.

Q Do you know of any specific incident in which my client, Timothy Jackson, has discriminated against a black American?

A No.

Q Any black person, whether American or not?

A No.

Q While we are at it, do you know of any racist actions committed by my client?

A No.

I would ask, I guess, just to define "racist" because I -- could you define what you mean by "racist" as --

Q Well, this is something he's accused of, so I don't know how graduate students or faculty at the University of North Texas define that. Maybe you could illuminate.

Do you -- you know the fac- -- you know some of the faculty at the University of North Texas in their school of music; right?

A Yeah, a couple. The one that I knew best was Ellen Bakulina.

Q Uh-huh.

A She's also a Russianist --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- as am I -- who's no longer there.

Q Uh-huh. Do you know what she means by "racism"?

A And she's now associate professor of music theory at McGill University.

Sorry, could you repeat that?

Q Do you know what Ellen Bakulina means by racist?

A No.

Q Okay. So back to the -- to questions about the white racial frame in music theory, as you've described it in your article, how has the white racial frame in music theory impeded your career personally?

A I -- before I answer that I just want to once again highlight -- because you've said "white racial frame" quite a bit, that's not my -- I didn't

come up with this -- this phraseology.

It's Joe Feagin who just retired from Texas A&M University as a sociologist. He's 85 years old. He's an American icon, as a matter of fact.

And so I really have to just kind of say, I didn't come up with white racial framing. That's Joe Feagin. He's written many books on this topic.

And, you know, so part of me wants to say, We should be reading his work because he's the expert on white racial framing.

And I'm sorry, could you please repeat the question about the white racial frame of music theory?

Q Well, by mentioning Joe Feagin you are not suggesting that your articles weren't developing the idea of the white racial frame as it applied to music theory taught in the United States; right?

A No, they were very much --

Q Okay.

A -- using his ideas, yes.

Q Okay. And I understand -- I think you would -- we all would agree that scholars build on the scholarship of others; correct?

A Yes.

Q I'm most interested in the ideas that you've developed --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- defining, elaborating, identifying the white racial frame in music theory as it's taught in the United States; is that fair?

A Fair, yes.

Q And you've written on that in your article that grew out of your plenary talk in 2019 --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- and it was eventually -- and please say "yes" or "no."

Yes?

A Yes.

Q And that was eventually published in your article in Music Theory Online; correct?

A Yeah. Yes.

Q And in fact it has "white racial frame" in the title; correct?

A Yes.

Q Okay. So that's what I'm talking about; is -- can we agree on that?

A Yes.

Q All right. I'm asking: How did the

white racial frame in American music theory as you've described it impede your career as a black American man?

A Oh, that's a vast, vast question.

The first part I would say, it's hard for me to even know because much of anti-black -- much of anti-blackness happens behind the scenes. So if -- if something didn't happen for me, there's a chance that anti-blackness might be the reason why that happened.

So that's unclear to me how that might have happened.

In terms of how has it affected me, well, I've already mentioned the fact that the article under question was -- they changed decisions about the revision -- about the reviews from "accept with revisions" to "revise and resubmit."

I believe that anti-blackness was, in part, part of the reason that happened; right?

I believe that -- I had a very difficult tenure battle at Hunter College from 2014 to 2016 in which the chair of the music department at the time tried very, very vigorously to get me fired, something I just briefly mention in the introduction to my -- my monograph last year. That, I believe,

was most certainly driven by anti-blackness.

So -- I even mentioned at some point in that book that it -- you know, this two-year tenure battle that I had to wage because this particular one person was essentially claiming I was incompetent at what I did, and I do believe driven by anti-blackness, nobody should have to do -- go through that; right. That's not something that a white person should go through, that a -- or any non-white person should go through.

But to bring it back to anti-blackness, this is historically part of the fabric of the United States; part that we will continue to work through together, I hope, and -- and confront and make things better for our children and grandchildren.

Q So you've given two examples, this SMT --

A Decision on the --

Q -- decision on your -- not the Spectrum article, but the -- the one we've been discussing in Music Theory Online; right?

A Yes.

Q In which you eventually got them, in your words, to follow their own rules?

A Correct.

Q Did anyone ever say they wanted you to be converted to a "revise and resubmit" status because you were black?

A No.

Q So that was just your surmise that it had to do with anti-blackness?

A Correct.

Q In the tenure dispute, which was a second example you gave from your personal life, you mentioned, I believe, the chair --

A The chair of the department.

Q -- campaigned to get you denied tenure?

A Correct.

Q Did he ever say that was because you were black?

A No.

Q He said that was because you were incompetent?

A Yes.

Q And you disagreed?

A Well, yeah, I disagree that I was incompetent.

Q Correct. And it seems the school eventually agreed and sided with you?

A Correct.

Q And you were granted tenure?
A Correct.
Q Do you know of white professors at Hunter College who have gone through similar struggles with tenure.?
A Not similar anti-black struggles, no.
Q Let me rephrase that then because you yourself said you never heard anyone expressly say they were trying to deny you tenure because you were black; correct?
A Yes. And it's worth pointing out that that's almost always the case with anti-blackness in the United States. It's a very rare person who will say, I'm doing this because you are black.
That's just not the way anti-blackness works. I'm sure you understand that.
Q But nevertheless, you had no evidence that there was specific racist ideas leading to people arguing you were incompetent when you were up for tenure?
A You used the word "racist." I'm using the word "anti-black."
Yes, the answer if -- if you're going --
Q Okay.
A Could you revise --

Q Let's use your word, "anti-black."
A Correct. Okay.
Q Is it fair to say "anti-black racism"?
A I prefer "anti-blackness."
Q Okay. Let's use your term.
There was no evidence that you know of that anti-blackness led to individuals at Hunter College to oppose your tenure?
A Correct.
Q So, again, that's your surmise?
A That you -- my surmise -- my -- yeah. Surmise, my -- my -- my belief.
Q Okay.
A Yeah, my surmise.
Q And at the SMT plenary session, you were received quite well?
A Yes.
Q That wasn't anti-black; right?
A That was not anti-black. Correct.
Q Incidentally, because you are a black man, do you enjoy the benefits and privileges of patriarchy?
A Yes.
Q But you --
A I'm sorry, because I'm a man, not black

man. You said because I'm a black man.

Because I'm a man, cisgender, I enjoy the privileges of patriarchy.

Q Okay.

A So -- so get rid of the word "black" there, please.

Q I believe you've argued in your article in Music Theory Online that a reformed American music theory should be anti-racist; right?

A I'm not sure that's exactly how I put it, but you are not entirely incorrect.

Q So what would an anti-music -- anti-racist music theory look like?

A I wrote in my book, we cannot understand what anti-racism will look like in music theory in the future unless we understand what racist -- what racism in music theory looked like in the past, which is a slightly longer way of saying, I don't really know what anti-racist music theory would look like in the future. We are all still trying to figure that out, in my opinion.

Q Okay. You are writing a textbook on music theory now; correct?

A Yes.

Q Is that what -- something you state in

your textbook, that you don't know what music theory will look like?

A No.

Q So you have some idea of what it should look like; correct?

A Well, yes, of course, based on the textbook that I'm co-authoring, yes.

Q So what would an anti-racist American music theory look like now, today in 2024?

A Well, again, I don't know what the anti-racist music theory would look like.

I can tell you what we are doing in our book which would certainly more align with anti-racism than music theory textbooks in the past.

Should I say what the book is about?

Q Tell me what your book argues is more in line with anti-racist music theory in the present?

A Well, it's a music theory textbook, so we are not putting forth arguments about anti-racism and anti-blackness. That's just not something that usually happens in a -- in a music theory textbook.

Q Okay. That's fine.

Now, I want to transition to talk about someone I know you studied in depth, Heinrich Schenker.

You can assume that this case has Heinrich Schenker in its background in many regards, so I'm not going to ask you to describe who Heinrich Schenker was and is.

But I can assume for the record that you are very familiar with the work of Heinrich Schenker?

A Uh-huh. Yes.

Q And he was an Austrian, Jewish music theorist born in the middle of the 19th century and lived into the early third of the 20th century; correct?

A 1868 to 1935.

Q Okay. And he ended his life in Vienna, in the center of the state of Austria?

A He ended his life makes it sounds like he committed suicide.

Q I'm not -- I mean his life came to an end in Austria; correct?

A Correct.

Q In Vienna?

A As far -- as far as I know. I -- I'm -- I'm not a -- really a Schenker historian like that.

Q Uh-huh.

A But I do believe he died in Vienna, yeah.

Q Now, you argue in your article and elsewhere -- article in Music Theory Online that Heinrich Schenker has been very important in advancing this white racial frame in music theory; is that fair?

A The -- yeah. I'll go ahead and say yes. Yes.

Q Okay. And how did he contribute to the wait racial frame in music theory?

A Well, of course since he died in 1935, and had virtually nothing, you know, directly to do with American music theory, you have to draw a lot of historical parallels, right.

And so you first begin with his emigre students who came over here, Hans Weisse --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- would be the first name I would mention. But then Felix Salzer and Oswald Jonas and Ernst Oster.

Q Can I interrupt to ask you a question about that group of scholars --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- you just mentioned?

A Uh-huh.

Q All of them were music theorists?

A Yeah -- yes.
Q And were they all Jewish immigrants to the United States?
A That I don't know.
Q Okay.
A The reason I hesitated about music theorists is because the term "music theorists" was not so well defined back then. They probably would have said that they were a -- their specialty was musikwissenschaft, which is --
Q And that means "the science of music," correct?
A Exactly. Yeah. "Musicology," was what we say.
Q You just used a German word --
A For musicology --
Q One of these impossible German words that is about longer than the alphabet?
A Yes. Yes.
Q Okay.
A And you can keep making them longer by adding stuff at the end or the beginning. That's correct.
Q Thank you.
So please continue.

I -- I had asked you how Heinrich Schenker contributed to the white racial frame and you were discussing his students who came to the United States?

A Yeah. But the question, when you say how Heinrich Schenker contributed, it's a very active voice you are using.

And in fact, you can't use that active voice at all because Heinrich Schenker himself didn't contribute to our white racial frame in the sense that we in America created a system of music theory which has, as Joe Feagin would say, a very pro-White subframe of the white facial frame.

And -- and the ideas of tonal music were very often understood through some of the musical theories that Heinrich Schenker put forth.

But to say, How did he contribute to the white racial frame, that's -- you are using the active voice there that I just disagree with. It's --

Q Okay.

A He didn't.

Q So -- and thank you.

You mentioned tonal music?

A Uh-huh.

Q Can you please describe for the Jury and for the Court here on this record what is -- in terms of absolute -- you know, someone with no knowledge of music theory would be able to understand, such as myself, for instance.

What -- what does that mean? What is tonal music?

A Well, that's a -- it's a great question and it's a very -- you know, do you -- do you want the short, middle, or long answer?

I'm going to try to go for the --

Q Well, please, a brief -- you know, just for the record --

A Yeah. I'll try to go --

Q -- again, for the --

A I'll go --

Q -- record, but again --

A -- kind of middle -- middle length.

Q It makes it hard on him. That's why we can't speak over each other.

A Was it --

Q I apologize. And it was my fault.

But let me rephrase my question.

A Uh-huh.

Q So briefly describe for the record what

"tonal music" is in -- in ways that a -- an utter layperson can understand?

A So if you had asked me that ten, 15 years ago, I would have said something like, tonal music is music written in a key like C major or D minor that moves -- that has what we in music theory call triads and harmonies and chords that move in a certain logical progression within a key of -- in music; right.

Typical composers of such tonal music would be, for example, names that the Jury probably knows: Johann Sebastian Bach, Ludwig van Beethoven, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart, for example.

And tonal music represented a roughly 200 -- let's call it, 250-year period from the late 17th century, call it, 1650, with composers like with Arcangelo Corelli up through, let's say, 1900, roughly.

Today I would give a different answer because that very much is part of music theory's hegemony in promoting what essentially is a white -- white racially framed way of conceiving of tonal music or tonality; right.

Q And by "hegemony," you mean a system that maintains its own power?

A It's own power, yes.
Q Uh-huh.
A Yeah. Of course we haven't mentioned -- I haven't mentioned the term "colonial" or colonialization." That's often a term used in academic circles with --
Q Well, let's leave that aside and get back to the definition of "tonal music" as you would define it today?
A Yes, thank you.
So as far as I know, all peoples on our planet have musics; right? And if music has frequencies -- frequencies are -- are in music what we call pitches; right?
Q You mean the actual frequency of the sound?
A Of the sound.
Q Like the sound waves --
A Exactly.
Q Okay. Sorry, go ahead.
A Any -- any -- any sound has a frequency.
(Whereupon, the witness taps the table.)
A That --

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q I just want --

A -- has a frequency.

Q -- to be clear that you are not talking about the frequency with which music is heard or something like -- you know, the -- the oftenness, if that --

A Correct.

Q So let's -- now that we have cleared up that, I apologize --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- and I'll stop interrupting you. Go ahead.

A Yeah, I'm talking about acoustics and physics and --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- in physics, frequency is called "Nu," you know, the Greek letter --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- that goes like that?

Q Yeah.

A That's --

Q Please --

A So if somebody says, "What's new?"

You say, "Frequency."

That's a joke.

Q That's a music theory joke?

A That's -- that's a music theory joke.

Q Fair.

A And when musics have freq- -- sounding frequencies, which vib- -- any vibrating body will produce, right? --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- it has potential tones and tonality; right?

So in other parts of the world, the most -- two of the most developed such systems I could cite here would be ragas in the Indian subcontinent or different maqam systems in Turkey and the Middle East and Jordan in Arabic maqams -- Turkish and Arabic maqams, for example.

Q Uh-huh.

A Many, many, many centuries of tonalities which are just not the same as the Bach, Beethoven --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- functional tonality.

So in other words, rather than saying that -- you'll note that I put the word "functional" in front of "tonality," which is something that we

music theorists often talk about.

Functional means that the chords have certain characteristics and -- and progressions that they follow. So it's a word that we just use in music theory.

Rather than thinking that functional tonality is in fact the foundation for music theory in the United States of America, I now say that it is a foundation.

Q Uh-huh.

A And this simple grammatical shift from "the foundation" to "a foundation" --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- which it is --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- actually has caused a lot of panic behind the scenes because a lot of people don't want to acknowledge that there are many others, that they represent very interesting rich music theory traditions, potentially, and that we -- a country of 30 -- 330 million people coming from all over the planet and some of whom were here before people started arriving, right, indigenous folks -- have ways of thinking about music that are all valid and very interesting.

Q So everyone can have their own private music theory; is that what you mean?

A If you got rid of the word "private," I would agree with that statement.

Q Back to Heinrich Schenker, he is one of the primary music theorists of tonal music, as you described it, originally as -- let's say, this period from the enlightenment to the late 19th century that you described?

Enlightenment being the 18th century, sorry?

A And you said, One of the most important -- is that what you -- music theorists?

Q Yes.

A Yes, I think that Hugo Riemann would be slightly more important.

Q Okay.

A Heinrich Schenker was very much an American phenomenon. For most of the rest of the world --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- dealing with the Bach through Brahms, is what we sometimes call canonic composers or common practice composers. There's several ways --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- of talking about that -- those composers. Hugo Riemann and his theories actually were more important than Heinrich Schenker.

American music theorists might not want to acknowledge that, but that's a true statement.

Q And you examined his -- I think it's called Schenker Documents Online.

Can you describe briefly what that is?

A As far as I know -- I don't even know where it's housed -- but it is -- he was a very prolific writer --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- Heinrich Schenker was. And aside from his main works, Harmonielehre, and Kontrapunkt, and Freie Satz, Free Composition -- those are his three main works; Counterpoint is in two volumes --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- there are diaries and letters and correspondence and -- and essays and introductions and forwards and many other things.

As far as I understand, Schenker Documents Online is a repository -- an online repository of many of those documents transcribed from German and then translated by several people into English.

Q So a layperson could find this online?
A I think so, yeah.
Q And a layperson who didn't even speak German, which was Schenker's language, could also read these translations?
A Correct.
Q And they are in side by side, you have the original text and then the translation side by side?
A Correct.
Q Thank you.
And approximately how many pages of Schenker's original writings are online in this -- I think it's called the Schenker Documents Online Archive?
A I have no idea.
Q If I said it was approximately 6,000 pages, would that -- do you think that's inaccurate?
A I really couldn't say.
Q Do you have any reason to believe it's not thousands of pages?
A I have no reason to believe that it is not thousands of pages.
Q And I believe in your writings you said you'd identified 57 mentions in the Schenker

Documents Online of the word "race"?

A I believe so.

Q And is 57 mentions out of thousands of pages representative of an intellectual's work over their lifetime?

A In terms of talking about human race, I think it's significant.

Q Okay.

A And it -- I would add that I don't think every mention of the word "race" -- Rasse in German -- was necessarily about human race, but the vast majority -- you -- you could say, like, a race between a turtle and a tortoise or something; right? So that's -- it's not always human race, but it virtually always was.

Q Correct.

And you mention a -- a -- well, what is that? It's not a synonym.

I mean, race -- running a race and "race" meaning --

A Human race.

Q -- Nineteenth century conceptions of skin color in race, those are the same word in English, but they're not in German, are they?

A Correct.

Q Wettrennen is the word in German for "race"; right?

A I do not know.

Q How well you know German?

A I've got a reasonable reading knowledge.

Q Were you reading the Schenker Documents Online in the original or were you relying on the translation?

A I was relying on the translations, but I did check with the originals as I did that.

Q And were all the mentions of race in Schenker's Schenker Documents Online negative?

A I can't recall.

Q Disparaging of black people?

A I can't recall.

Q But you still maintain that the 57 mentions out of something like 6,000 pages, if that's accurate, is nevertheless very significant; correct?

A I did not say "very significant." I said "significant."

Q It's not cherry picking these 57 mentions out of all those pages?

A I obviously was trying to find instances where Heinrich Schenker had mentioned race.

Q If you searched some word like "tone" -- what's the German word for "tone"?

A Tone -- it's "ton," t-o-n -- but --

Q If you searched the -- the Schenker Documents Online for the word "tone," just give a guesstimate of how many times that would appear in Schenker's work?

A I really couldn't do that.

Q Do you think it would be more than 57?

A Probably.

Q A lot more?

A I couldn't say.

Q You do argue that Schenker's music theory was anti-black; correct?

A I argue that there are elements of anti-blackness in his music theories.

Q What's the connection between Schenker's anti-black ideology, if we want to call it that, and his ideas of music theory as it applies to tonal music?

A I don't think he thought that much about black music just for the simple reason that he didn't think that it was worth attention.

So the --

Q Let me ask my question again because I

think that's a different -- that's an answer to a different question.

I'm not implying that you are doing anything bad here; I just want an answer to a different question.

What's the connection between his anti-blackness and his music theory?

Not what's the -- you know, I don't know if he was hostile to black music or not, but I -- you have argued that he was anti-black.

A I --

Q Correct?

A I -- I'll just repeat what I said. I believe that there are strong elements of anti-blackness within his theories --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- and that he made comments as I cited --

Q Right.

A -- in my work that were unequivocally anti-black.

Q Okay. And what's the relationship between his anti-blackness as it was expressed in his work and his music theory of tonal music?

A I don't think that there's much

relationship at all in -- with respect to Heinrich Schenker.

Q Okay. So you would agree with Timothy Jackson in that regard?

A I do not know.

Q Have you argued that Heinrich Schenker had a very hierarchal theory of tones?

A I've argued that he had a hierarchical theory of -- of understanding tonality and --

Q Can you please describe that in terms that a layperson could understand, for the record?

A Well, his entire system of music theory was extremely hierarchical; right? And he found levels of hierarchies in what he would consider to be master works; right?

Q Like the great Bach, Beethoven, and so forth?

A Exactly.

Q Okay.

A There were 12 on his list, 12 composers.

And he would find these -- well, he called them Schichte -- these layers of -- of -- of hierarchies, right, and all great music would exhibit these layers and of course they were fundamental structures. We all know that.

Just for the layperson, the fundamental structure is a struct- -- the tonal structure of a so-called great piece of music.

Q Is that what some piece might refer to if they say it's written in C minor or whatever it --

A No, that --

Q It's not?

A That's just a key; right. So C minor is a key.

But if it's a C minor, a piece by Beethoven, well, then, a priori, it's going to be a great masterwork because he was one of the 12 composers whom Heinrich Schenker elevated above all others.

Q Uh-huh.

A And it would then exhibit these structural layers, it would exhibit this fundamental structure that -- with a simple harmonic motion from a tonic to a dominant to a tonic with a melodic dissent of scale degrees above that.

That's inside music theory baseball, but that is part of his -- well, it's some of the most basic parts of his music theory.

And yes, hierarchy was extremely important.

Q And so is it fair, I guess, from my -- my very uninformed understanding of music theory, is it fair to say that in his theory, certain tones were subordinate to others in the structure of an entire musical piece?

A Yes.

Q And would those vary from composition to composition, or was it always the case that there was a superior tone?

A Well, it would always be the case that it would come down to one of three fundamental structures that he conceived.

Q Okay. And how is that related to anti-blackness?

A Well, you could read my book and you'd probably get some ideas of how it might be related.

But you are asking a very specific question about Heinrich Schenker's music theories --

Q And its hierarchy?

A -- and its hierarchies.

And the way that I would answer that question is to say, again, Heinrich Schenker died in 1935 and he, as far as I know, never traveled to the United States of America.

What we have done since then in the

ensuing 85 -- yeah, 90 years is create a system of music theory that very much has relied on Heinrich Schenker's beliefs. His music theory -- music theoretical beliefs.

And in that 90 years, there have been strains of, among other things, anti-blackness, anti-womanness. And it very much represents what, again, I'll call it, the pro-white subframe of music theory's white racial frame.

Q So what's the relationship between the hierarchal nature of his theory of tones and this anti-blackness, anti-womanness that you've just sub -- described?

A That's something that -- that, you know, one would need so long to explain that. I mean, this is a deposition.

And I just have to fall back to the history and -- and simply say that over 90 years, we have created a system of tonal understanding based largely on Heinrich Schenker's theories in the United States of America in which the works of white men -- 12 for him -- but more broadly the concepts of whiteness and maleness are held in higher regard than those composers who may not have identified as both white and male.

Q So is it true that you have argued -- and I'm going to quote from your article in Music Theory Online -- "the notion of hierarchy of a strict ordering of the tones of composition is so thoroughly consistent with Schenker, his deeply conservative outlook on life and culture, that it is difficult to uncouple his theory entirely from two of his most consistently expressed ideological stances: One, the centrality of the German people in European culture; and two, the steady decline of culture and political order in Europe since the late 18th century."

A Those are not my words. Those are the words of William Drabkin, a very imminent Schenker scholar, so you should check your source there.

I quoted --

Q Did you quote him?

A I'm quoting him but --

Q Did you quote him positively? You agree with that?

A Were you suggesting that I had written that?

Q I think it's in your article; correct?

A Yeah, but -- but I didn't write those words.

Q Okay.
A You are aware of that; right?
Q I -- I don't know if you did or not.
I'm certain that you included them in your article.
So my question -- and this is a good chance for you to clarify for the Court -- you quoted another author's work; right?
A I did.
May I ask --
Q Approvingly?
A -- a question?
May I ask a question?
Q No.
A Oh.
Q I'm asking the question.
A Oh, okay.
Q I'm asking if you approve of that statement?
A May I ask a clarification?
Q Sure.
A You just said you don't know whether I wrote those words or not.
And I'm telling you that I did not write -- write the words that you just spoke.

Therefore, the -- the clarification is: Do you actually not understand that those were not my words that you just --

Q I think I said --

A -- read?

Q And I'm not sure if I did say this -- I think I said, You argued; okay?

And I'm not disputing that you wrote them or not.

A Uh-huh.

Q If you say you quoted another author's work, that's perfectly normal in academic scholarship.

I'm arguing -- excuse me, I'm not arguing -- I'm asking if you agree with that statement?

That's a very clear statement about the relationship with the -- between the hierarchy of tonal theory and ideologies of cultural supremacy of the German people?

A Could you --

Q Wouldn't you agree to that?

A Could you reread the --

Q Sure.

A -- the quote from William Drabkin?

Q Can you spell his name, just for the record?

A D-r-a-b-k-i-n.

Q Thank you.

MR. PAINTER: Can I ask for a clarification?

Which document are we referring to? Is this in -- is this an article written by --

MR. ALLEN: We are talking about the --

MR. PAINTER: -- the school?

MR. ALLEN: -- Music Theory Online article that the -- the deponent has testified that he published 2021.

THE WITNESS: 2020.

MR. ALLEN: 2020.

MR. PAINTER: Can we make that an exhibit to the deposition so he can have it in front of him?

Because that will also help. I assume it would have quotation marks.

MR. ALLEN: It's also publically available online.

THE WITNESS: It's a block

quotation.

MR. ALLEN: Let me -- let me do that after our next break.

MR. PAINTER: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: We will do that --

MR. PAINTER: So it's a block quotation --

MR. ALLEN: Correct.

MR. PAINTER: It's very helpful if it were part of it --

MR. ALLEN: Sure.

MR. PAINTER: -- then we would as- -- dealt with this right away, this block quotation --

MR. ALLEN: Sure.

MR. PAINTER: -- from another author.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q I think the record shows that the witness remembers it accurately enough to know which author he quoted and know that it was accurate quote from the author; correct?

A Yes.

MR. PAINTER: Yes, we've just got to reread the statement if you're going to

ask if he agrees with it --

MR. ALLEN: Absolutely. But I don't want to now break and go get it.

MR. PAINTER: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: I want to ask him this -- this question and then we can come back to this.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q You asked me to reread the quotation. "The notion of hierarchy of a strict ordering of the tones of composition is so thoroughly consistent with -- Schenker -- his deeply conservative outlook on life and culture that it is difficult to uncouple his theory entirely from two of his most consistently expressed ideological stances: One, the centrality of the German people in European culture; and two, the steady decline of culture and political order in Europe since the late 18th century." Now, to the best of your recollection, did I read that correctly?

A Yes.

Q And -- and we'll confirm. I want to get a clean copy of the article for you. I apologize for not do -- not doing that in advance.

That's a relatively clear statement of the relationship between Schenker's theory of hierarchy and tones and what the author, Dubkin, is arguing is an ideological theory of the hierarchy of the German culture or people.

A Uh-huh.

Q Correct?

A Uh-huh. Yes.

Q Do you argue that that also expresses anti-blackness?

A I did not argue that in that article, no.

Q Is there no relationship between Heinrich Schenker's hierarchal theory of tones and theories of -- I don't know -- bogus phrenology, bogus theories of the hierarchy of the races?

A I don't know. I couldn't answer that question.

Q Okay. You can't answer it yes or no?

A Correct.

MR. ALLEN: Can we go off the record briefly?

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record. The time is 12:10.

(Whereupon, there was a recess taken from 12:10 p.m. to 12:12 p.m.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back on the record. The time is 12:12.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q I want to make a transition, Professor Ewell, and talk about the University of North Texas.

As you know, my client, Timothy Jackson, is a professor there; correct?

A Correct.

Q Are you familiar with another professor there named Frank Heidlberger?

A Yes.

Q Explain for the record how you know Frank Heidlberger.

A I cannot recall the first time I ever met Frank Heidlberger. I remember meeting him in person only once and I think it was in the Vancouver conference of the Society for Music Theory.

I think I just ran into him on the street, as one does at these conferences, and I saw his name badge and just --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- introduced myself.

The Vancouver conference -- well, we'd have to go to the record for that. That was

probably 2018ish.

So I think that's the only time I met Frank Heidlberg -- -berg or -berger?

Q I believe it's Heidlberger?

A Heidlberger with an "e-r" at the end. Okay.

Aside from that, at the -- at the impetus of, I think it was, Ellen Bakulina, I had a piece published in Theoria, the journal at the University of North Texas, in a short -- in a small little group of -- of three authors: Ellen Bakulina, whom we've mentioned, Chris Segall, who's a professor of music theory at the University of Cincinnati, and me.

And this grew out of a -- of a session that we had given, I think it was for the Russian music theory interest group.

Q Uh-huh.

A And maybe it was in Vancouver. It was somewhere --

Q This is the 2018 conference that you mentioned?

A Don't quote me on the 2018. I'm pretty sure it was Vancouver, whenever that happened.

Q Is it fair to say it's a -- you met at a

conference and it was before COVID?

A Yes. Oh, yes. Yes.

Q Before the 2020 academic year?

A Correct on both counts, yes.

Q I'm going to introduce for the record Exhibit 2, which I'm handing to the court reporter who will hand it to you.

COURT REPORTER: One moment please.

MR. ALLEN: Just for the record, for the people -- sorry --

Sorry. Shall I let you mark the exhibit?

I've got to tell them what it is.

COURT REPORTER: One moment please. I can't take down -- once it's silent --

MR. ALLEN: Some day I'll invent an octopus court reporter.

(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 2, Theoria Volume 26, 2020, was marked for identification.)

MR. ALLEN: I'm introducing for the record Exhibit 2.

And for those who have got the exhibit pack online, this is the exhibit which in my notes was 09, Theoria volume

26, 2020.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q And, Professor Ewell, is that an accurate description of what I've just handed you?

A Yes.

Q So I've introduced this exhibit because you were just mentioning publishing in a journal.

Is this the journal which that discussion referred to?

A Oh, yes, for Theoria, yes.

Q And describe just briefly what is the journal Theoria?

A It's a journal that's housed at the University of North Texas Press, I believe, and Frank Heidlberger is the editor, the -- the -- the lead. I -- you know, he's essentially -- well, does it say it here?

Q He's listed on the --

A Yeah, editor.

Q -- first page --

A Yeah.

Q -- as the editor; correct?

A Frank Heidlberger, yeah. Uh-huh.

Q And that's the Frank Heidlberger you were referring to in your testimony?

A Correct.
Q And if you go the second page, there's a table of contents.
A Uh-huh.
Q Correct?
A Yeah.
Q And you were talking about publishing in a group of three some articles in Theoria; right?
A Uh-huh.
Q And in the title page where it says, "Russian Music Theory Panel SMT 2018," is that the series of articles you were referring to?
A Yes.
Q And you are listed here, I guess, the fourth article down in the table of contents, Philip Ewell, "Harmonic Functionalism in Russian Music Theory: A Primer."
Did I read that correctly?
A Correct.
Q And your article started on page 61; right?
A Yes.
Q Okay. I just wanted to establish we were talking about the same thing and it turns out the SMT conference seems to have been in 2018, just as

you remembered.

A I've got a good memory then.

Q So with that said, can you describe the process of publishing these articles with Frank Heidlberger's journal, Theoria?

A Yeah. I can recall -- again, I think the -- the -- the key -- Ellen may have been the chair of the Russian music theory interest group at that time.

Q Uh-huh.

A So she was almost certainly the go-between. She was of course teaching at the University of North Texas at the time.

Q Uh-huh.

A I think I mentioned that she moved to McGill.

Q Yup.

A Okay. So she was working with Frank, like the pivot between me and Chris -- Chris Segall -- and -- and -- and putting this together.

Q Uh-huh.

A And as far as I can recall, you know, we -- we worked on our articles, we, you know -- turning a presentation into an article --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- was, you know, something that we all do.

And we submitted them together. I think we each read each other's work and just commented on it.

Q Uh-huh.

A And -- and then ultimately, I don't know what Frank Heidlberger did with -- with them. I pre- -- so yeah, I'll just stop there.

Q And when you say, "We read each other's work," are you referring to Ellen -- please pronounce her last name? Bakulina?

A Bakulina.

Q Bakulina?

A Yeah.

Q I assume Russian?

A That's Russian.

Q In origin?

A Yes, correct.

Q Thank you.

So Ellen Bakulina and Christopher Segall and you read each other's articles?

A Uh-huh.

Q That's what you were referring to?

A Yes.

Q And did Frank Heidlberger solicit these articles?

A I'm not sure. I'm not sure how -- solicitation, whether Ellen approached him, he approached Ellen. I can't even recall whether Frank Heidlberger was at that session where we delivered --

Q I understand. It was 2018.

A Yeah. Yeah.

Q So do you remember these articles being peer reviewed in the processes we've discussed earlier?

A If I could just go briefly back to the -- the plenary because we talked about the plenary and the --

Q Correct.

A -- music theory Spectrum and then MTO.

Q Right.

A I didn't point out back then and I would just say it now because we are talking about peer review again, that as far as I can tell, as far as I recall, the plenary talks for music theory are never peer reviewed. So that didn't surprise me at all.

The -- this, eight years -- or six years ago, however many years ago, I don't think that it,

like, was sent out for the doubly-anonymous peer review.

Q Uh-huh.

A I don't think so. I don't know how Frank Heidlberger dealt with the behind-the-scenes, but I'm pretty certain that I didn't see any reviewer one, reviewer two --

Q Okay.

A -- you know, which you normally see when you are doing that.

So I do, of course, remember batting around these articles with Ellen and Chris.

Q Correct. And they are close colleagues of yours; is that fair to say?

A Yeah, yeah, yeah. They both went to the CUNY Graduate Center, but I -- well, I actually chaired Christopher Segall's dissertation committee.

Q Uh-huh.

A And -- and I -- I was also serving on Ellen -- Ellen's dissertation committee.

Q Is she junior to you?

A Yeah, they're both junior to me. They're both associate professors, both with tenure --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- and I'm a full professor, so --

Q Do you know if in this time period, 2018 to 2020 while these articles were in the works, let's say --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- were they tenured then, to your knowledge?

A I think they were both untenured.

Q Okay. And you had tenure at this time; right?

A 2016 is when I got tenure, yes.

Q Okay. So, again, although you have a very clear memory of the Music Theory Online article being peer reviewed -- correct?

A Yes.

Q -- you have no memory of getting peer reviews for these articles?

A Correct.

Q And do you consider the vetting of a conference proposal to give a paper at the Society for Music Theory in any way comparable to, I think what you called, double-anonymous peer review?

A Yes and no. It is usually anonymous.

Q Uh-huh.

A It is reviewed and -- and a decision is handed down. So yes.

No, in the sense that you are writing three- to 500 words about some ideas you want to present. So it's certainly different from -- from an article that appears in a -- in a journal.

Q And just for the -- the sake of the record of a lay Jury that may not be involved in publication, three- to 400 words is basically a paragraph; right?

A I would call it two paragraphs.

Q Okay. And it's certainly not a article that spans 24 pages such as you published in --

A Correct.

Q -- Theoria?

A Correct.

Q So in that sense, the 24-page paper that was published in Theoria was not peer reviewed, correct, to the best of your recollection?

A Yes, that's correct.

Q So if -- well, I'll strike that.

And do you have any reason to believe that the process for publishing the other two papers, the paper by Ellen Bakulina or Christopher Segall, which are also listed here, were subjected to any other process than -- or was it the same as yours?

A I -- I don't know.

Q Okay. Was there any controversy that you recall over the review process at UNT for the publication of these articles?

A Any controversy, you --

Q Yes?

A -- said?

No, not that I can recall.

Q Was there any criticism, to the best of your knowledge, that these articles were not subjected to double-anonymous peer review?

A Not that I recall, no.

Q While we are at it -- and this will be the last few questions before we break for lunch -- have you ever published -- besides this article, which we just talked about, and also the Spectrum article, which we talked about earlier, have you ever published articles that weren't subjected to peer review in any academic journal?

A I think the short answer would be no.

I could just elaborate a little bit and say that I have -- well, certainly over 30 publications, somewhere between 30 and 40, let's say. The article is one genere, let's call it; right.

Q Of course.

A So a review essay, book chapters, review -- conference review, the introduction I mentioned earlier. So obviously they all come with different sets of guidelines --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- and expectations.

The academic articles that I have published have all been peer reviewed with, I suppose, this exception.

And in my own mind, if I could just elaborate a little bit, because I do recall that this was not peer reviewed. This almost in my -- it's almost as if it wasn't an article in the same way that "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame" was, if that makes sense.

Q The -- the one that was published in Music Theory Online?

A Correct. Yeah.

Q Okay. And -- well, we've already discussed the -- the difference between that and Spectrum.

Okay. Just -- just one more question.

So have you ever known academic articles to cite Wikipedia in any way?

A No.

Q Do you know if Theoria has ever had articles that cite Wikipedia?

A I do not know.

Q Is that a sign that a journal is of inferior qualify, in your mind as an academic scholar?

A Well, it's highly unusual because of the open access, open nature of Wikipedia.

Q Is it appropriate to -- to cite anything like social media in the same way?

A It depends on the article, it depends on the journal, it depends on the editor, it depends on the topic --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- of -- of what's being written in what venue.

So you'd -- you'd have to be more specific.

Q Is it appropriate to cite, I don't know, content on YouTube in an academic article?

A If in fact the author -- of course, all of these decisions would ultimately fall with the editor and the editorial team; right?

And if in fact something is put up on

YouTube with some type of, I don't know, gravitas behind it, and I don't even know what that would look like frankly, I imagine that there -- I don't know, a Ted talk or something, that there's something that's out there, that that would potentially be more acceptable to the editor of an academic journal than Wikipedia would be because of the open nature of Wikipedia.

Q Would it be acceptable in an academic field to quote Wikipedia, for instance, as an example of what the state of common knowledge out there in the world may be?

A Sure. That would be acceptable, yeah.

Q Okay.

A I mean, that's -- that's my opinion, obviously.

Q Your opinion as an informed academic scholar?

A Absolutely yeah. But I'm sure there would be people who would disagree with me.

Q And, as you said, an author -- an author of at least 30 academic publications?

A Thank you for the compliment.

Q And how many books to date?

A Oh, just one.

Q Just one?
A Yeah.
MR. ALLEN: We'll go off the record.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record. The time is 12:27.
(Whereupon, there was a recess taken from 12:27 p.m. to 1:28 p.m.)
(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 3, Article Entitled "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame" Written by Philip Ewell, Published in Music Theory Online, was marked for identification.)
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back on the record. The time is 1:28.
BY MR. ALLEN:
Q Professor Ewell, I have taken the liberty of marking as Exhibit Number 3 for the record. This will be -- for the people who are remote, this will be sent to you as marked 023.
It's an article in Music Theory Online, which we've discussed earlier. And I'm going to ask you to confirm for the record that this is the article that we discussed earlier?
A Correct.

Q And it's titled, "Music Theory and the White Racial Frame"?

A Correct.

Q And if I could ask you to turn to section 4.4 in the article, I believe you'll find that on page 11?

A Uh-huh.

Q Right above that is a subsection where there's the quote that I had read aloud into the record earlier; correct?

A Correct.

Q And just as you said, it's a block quote from William Drabkin?

A Uh-huh.

Q And prior to introducing that quote, you said, "In numerous writings, he" -- meaning Schenker; correct? -- "insisted that his views" -- meaning Schenker's views -- "on racial and national hierarchies were key to his beliefs on life and on music."

Right?

A Right above the block quotation?

Q Yeah.

A Oh, yeah.

Okay. Can you -- can you say that again,

please?

Q Yeah, the -- the second to last sentence --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- before that quote is introduced is your writing; correct?

A Correct.

Q And it says, "In numerous writings, he" -- meaning Schenker -- "insisted that his views" -- meaning Schenker's view -- "on racial and national hierarchies were key to his beliefs on life and music."

Correct?

A Correct.

Q And in fact, you introduced that paragraph with the topic sentence, "I wish to recouple this severed link between Schenker's hierarchal beliefs about music and his hierarchal -- hierarchical beliefs about people."

Did I read that correctly?

A Yes.

Q So -- and this is the last question, just a yes or no question.

So it's fair to say, as we discussed earlier, that you were quoting William Drabkin,

which we read earlier into the record, with approval?

A It's not just yes or no.

It's -- it is his agreement with some of the -- the basic elements of recoupling this -- this severed link.

With approval? Ye- -- yeah, I think it's fair to just say with approval. Yeah, that's fair.

Q And you believe there's a link between this view of racial hierarchy, national hierarchies, and Schenker's belief about the hierarchy of tones?

A Yes. I believe so because Heinrich Schenker was very explicit himself in --

Q Okay.

A -- in making those connections.

Q And I have no further questions about that article, which we've already discussed.

I -- I would like to turn to discussing another journal called the Journal for [sic] Schenkerian Studies.

Are you familiar with that journal?

A Yes. Is it "Journal of" or "Journal for"?

Q I believe you are right it's "for Schenkerian Studies"?

A Oh, no, no.
You said "for" and I thought it was "of," but --
Q You know what, I don't want to make a mistake for the record here, so I --
So you were correct to point that out. It is the Journal of Schenkerian Studies.
A Good.
Q Thank you.
And so I -- I take from your answer that you are familiar with it?
A Of course.
Q Have you published in it?
A Yes.
Q When did you publish an article in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?
A Oh, when? 2004 or '05. It was one of my very first published articles.
Q Was that journal article handled by Timothy Jackson?
A I have no idea.
Q Was there any suggestion at that time that the Journal of Schenkerian Studies was publishing racist articles?
A What do you mean by "racist articles"?

Q Well, I don't -- I don't mean anything by it, but what I'm asking: Was anyone accusing the journal of being racist at that time, whatever they meant by it?

A I don't understand the question when you used -- if -- you'd have to define what "racist" means.

Q Do you recall anyone ever accusing the Journal of Schenkerian Studies at the time you published it -- in it of being racist?

A Again, race -- "racism" and "racist" are in -- as I state, very clearly in my monograph. I consider those words trip wires, which is why I don't often use them in my own work. They've become everything and nothing, specifically "racist."

So if you are asking me -- the question is if a journal is racist --

Q I'm not asking you if the Journal of Schenkerian Studies is racist, so please don't misunderstand my question. Let me rephrase it.

Did you hear of anyone else accusing the journal at the time you published in it of being racist, whatever they may have meant by that?

A It's hard to answer that question yes or no if you can't clarify what "racist" means in this

context.

Q Did you ever hear anyone say the journal was racist?

A No.

Q Thank you.

What was your understanding of Timothy Jackson's relationship to the Journal of Schenkerian Studies from the time you published in it back in -- in the -- you know, sounds like the 2000s, to 2020?

A Well, in that time, I have to be honest, I basically never thought of that journal.

Q Uh-huh.

A I published in it and then I -- then 20 years -- well, I don't know how many years, but almost 20 years passed.

Q Uh-huh.

A And if you were to say that Timothy Jackson was part of the original -- my original thing, I would -- I wouldn't be surprised.

But I just don't recall 20 years ago what his relationship was, if there was a relationship, to the journal at that point.

Q By "your thing," you mean your article?

A My article and it was in Volume 1, the very first issue of the journal.

And then up until Volume 12, which had the symposium of responses to my plenary talk --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- that -- it was at that time that it was kind of -- my memory was jogged that, Oh yes, Timothy Jackson has something to do with this journal, in fact.

Q Okay. So you anticipated my next question is that you were aware of a special symposium meant to be published in Volume 12 of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

A I was -- the clarification. I was aware when exactly?

Q Well, why don't you answer your own question.

When were you aware that there was a symposium to be published in Volume 12?

A Good. Okay. That's a question I can answer.

I think -- and I wrote about this in my book -- I think somewhere or somehow I heard that there might be a symposium in the fall of -- oh, God, this would have been the -- right -- some time the fall, winter of 2019 --

Q Uh-huh.

A I'm sorry, 2019 -- yes, 2019.
But then I for sure became aware of it when there was a call for papers announced. And I think, if I'm not mistaken, that was on December 31st, 2019.
And it had a very quick turnaround, which everybody was like, Wait, what's going on with this?
So it was a strange three-week turnaround, like, sub- -- submit this by then.
Q Uh-huh.
A So when that call for papers was announced, whatever date it was, but late -- call it late December 2019, I was of course aware --
Q Uh-huh.
A -- that this was happening.
Q Do you remember who you heard that from?
A I think it was the SMT Listserv where call- -- where such calls are usually put out.
Q Okay. And so you were a subscriber to the SMT list -- Listserv?
A Correct.
Q And you had already testified today, I believe, you were -- you were at that time a member of the Society for Music Theory, SMT?
A Yes.

Q Did you ever read any of the articles in the symposium which appeared in Volume 12, published in 2020?

A Not when it came out.

Q Have you since read them?

A Yes.

Q When did you read them?

A As I was writing my book, because that's when I actually did respond to ten of the authors of -- of that symposium.

And -- well, the book came out in 2023 April, so I would guess if I would say when I actually read the 15 responses -- and I have to put the "responses" in scare quotes because it didn't seem to me that they were really responses to what I had said in the plenary -- I would guess -- let me think here -- fall -- fall of '21, early 2022.

Q Okay.

A Some time in 2022 probably.

Q Okay. And this was the time leading up to the publication of your monograph; is that fair?

A Correct, yeah.

Q Okay.

A During the process. Because chapter three or four is in fact --

Q Okay.

A -- on the Journal -- Volume 12 of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies.

Q And just to be clear, by "monograph," we understand I mean an ac- -- an academic book?

A Correct.

Q All right. So I want to take you back to the time before you had read the responses published in the symposium and when you heard about it.

And what was your criticism of the symposium in that time window before you had actually read the symposium papers?

A I had seen on Twitter and probably Facebook -- I've -- I left Twitter between one and two years ago; I deleted my account.

But I was on Twitter and Facebook and I saw some of the quotations, and they were very strange, I thought to myself.

Q Uh-huh.

A And of course, I knew that I had not been contacted to be part of this symposium, which struck me as strange. So I knew about some of those things.

Most of what I was -- any -- if you are asking me what my opinion was of what was going on

not having read the actual responses, it was probably based on what I was seeing on social media.

Q What was based on what you were seeing on social media? What do you mean by that?

A My opinions about what the --

Q Okay.

A -- symposium was about.

Q And your opinions were that this seemed strange?

A Yes.

Q And stuff.

Do you think it was improper for the Journal of Schenkerian Studies to publish the symposium before you read it?

A I believe it was improper to do so without any participation by me.

Q Any other reason you thought it was improper for the Journal of Schenkerian Studies to publish the symposium besides not contacting you?

A The anonymous submission. One of the submissions was written anonymously, and that struck me as very strange also.

Q So we have -- there was -- you allege there was no contact to you. There's also an anonymous publication in the symposium.

Was there anything else that you criticized about the Journal of Schenkerian Studies publishing the symposium?

A I wouldn't say there was no contact. I mentioned in my book that two professors at the University of North contact -- North Texas contacted me as it was being put together.

One was Ellen Bakulina. The other was Stephen Slottow --

Q Okay.

A -- who I think is an associate professor of music theory --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- at the University of North Texas, also one of the managing editors, along with Timothy Jackson, of that -- of that volume.

Separately, they contacted me. Stephen Slottow wanted to know where he could find the slides to the presentation I had given.

Q The -- the plenary talk at the SMT --

A Correct.

Q -- in 2019?

A Correct. Yeah.

And at that point the slides were on my website --

Q Uh-huh.
A -- so I told him where to get them.
Q Uh-huh.
A And then Ellen Bakulina wrote an e-mail simply asking me if I had any questions about these responses that were being put together, to which I responded, No, I don't have any questions.
Q Did anything prevent Ellen Bakulina from inviting you to participate in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies symposium?
A I have no idea.
Q But she didn't invite you?
A No.
Q You don't know of anything that prevented her from inviting you to participate?
A No.
Q So let me again summarize: You -- you've identified the, I guess, failure of the journal to contact you in the way you wanted to be contacted; is that fair?
A No. It -- the way I want to be contacted is -- well, it's not really up to me.
I'm -- I am taking issue with the notion that somebody would respond to what effectually was nine minutes of a discussion of Heinrich Schenker --

there were another 13 minutes that had nothing to do with Heinrich Schenker that I spoke about at that plenary session, so Heinrich Schenker was roughly nine minutes -- that responses would be put together without having the person to whom they were responding have a chance to address the issues brought up in the responses, which is industry standard for such colloquies or symposiums in academia.

Q What made you think you were being excluded from commenting on the symposium responses to your plenary address?

A I have no idea.

Q Did anyone tell you you would not be allowed to respond to them?

A No.

Q And you now said that you actually were contacted both by Professor Slottow and Ellen Bakulina; correct?

A Yeah, but that was not to ask me to be part of this --

Q And you were --

A -- symposium.

Q -- you received the SMT call for papers; correct?

A I did.

Q But it's your testimony today that that also wasn't an appropriate way to contact you?

A Yes, it was not appropriate.

Q And can you just explain for the record what would have been the most appropriate way to contact you in your experience as an academic?

A Well, I've never been a respondent like that so I would only be speculating.

But it would -- I -- I presume that it would be one of the lead editors who would reach out to the person who was -- who -- who originally gave the talk to which people were responding to invite them to be part of a colloquy or symposium.

Q Did you reach out to anyone on the editorial board to ask them about that?

A No.

Q Why not?

A It's not my place to invite myself to a party thrown in my honor.

Q Was there any criticism of your paper aired at the plenary talk you gave in 2019?

A Not to my knowledge.

Q Was that proper?

A A lack of criticism?

Q That there wouldn't be any invitation to criticism of your paper at the symposium that you gave -- not symposium, the plenary talk you gave in 2019?

A The question is: Would that have been proper, you said?

Q Was it proper that there was no form for criticism of your plenary address?

A Yeah, plenary addresses never really --

Q Okay.

A -- have Q&As afterward. In music theory, I should say.

Q So, again, I'm trying to get a -- the universe of things that you thought was improper about the publication of the symposium in 2020 by the Journal of Schenkerian Studies.

It's not improper that it addressed your plenary talk; right?

A No.

Q But you've said that they didn't contact you in the way that you have argued is industry standard?

A Correct.

Q You've also identified the publication of an anonymous author?

A Correct.

Q Are there any other things you found to be improper about the Journal for -- of Schenkerian Studies publication of the symposium?

A Only -- I -- I would say only what I've read in what was ultimately called, I think, an ad hoc panel that some UNT professors had convened to look into how this journal issue was put together.

That is something I did read --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- and I think I've hit on the points that they made. And that's what I'm basing this on because I hadn't read --

Q Okay.

A -- the contents.

Q When did you read the ad hoc panel report?

A Probably shortly after it came out and I can't remember when that was.

Q And just for the record, is this the ad hoc panel that was published by the University of North Texas on its website on November 25th, 2020?

A You -- probably but, you know, I would need to see that document.

Q Do you remember it being around the end

of 2020 when that appeared?

A I can't recall.

Q Okay. You don't know of any other ad hoc panel that addressed the Journal for Schenkerian Studies, though; correct?

A Correct.

Q Okay. What were the things that you read in the ad hoc panel's report that stand out to you as improper?

A I think the two that I've mentioned: The -- the inclusion of an anonymous --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- author, and the lack -- oh, the lack of peer review that's -- that we hadn't talked about that. So three things.

The lack of peer review, the anonymous author, and the one that we just said, the fact that I was not part of the colloquy.

Q Okay. Any other things that you remember?

A No.

Q Okay. So as you sit here today, you only have identified the lack of peer review, the anonymous author's publication, and that you weren't contacted in the way that you feel was an industry

standard?

A Yes.

Q Okay. Did you ever argue that the Journal for Schenkerian Studies should be censored?

A I think I used in my book kind of as a question, Is there no reason for condemnation, or possibly I used the word "censure."

In other words, it seems so out of the ordinary, that anonymous authorship and just to not invite the person, that it -- that, you know, I prob- -- think in my book I used, Is there -- is there no situation in which condemnation is -- is -- is appropriate for out of the ordinary or as I just said, not industry standard aspects of the publication of this issue.

Q Do you approve of the censorship of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

A I don't know enough about it, frankly, to -- to say that I approve of it.

Q Are you aware that the Journal of Schenkerian Studies is no longer published by the University of North Texas Press?

A I was unaware of that.

Q Now that you do know of that, assuming that it's true, do you approve of that?

A I don't know enough about it to make a judgment on that.

Q Do you think a journal should be ordered to cease publication for pub- -- for publishing the symposium that was published in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies that was published in 2020?

A I would need to know more information. I really couldn't say.

Q What more information do you need to know? It stopped publication; right?

A You just said, "allegedly stopped publication," so --

Q No, I said it did stop publication.

A Well, you added -- you added the word "allegedly."

Q Let me do this.

A But that's okay. That's okay.

Q Assume that that's true.

A Okay.

Q Is that appropriate?

A I don't know enough about it to make a comment on it.

Q You commented earlier that you thought the First Amendment was a benefit to the United States; correct?

A Yes.
Q And you do though -- know that the University of North Texas is a public institution --
A I do, yes.
Q -- of the State of Texas?
Let me finish.
So is it appropriate in your view as an academic professional for a state institution to order the publication of a journal to cease over the publication of the symposium of a --
MR. PAINTER: Objection.
Are with you asking for a legal opinion interpreting the First Amendment or are you simply asking for an opinion generally as an academic --
MR. ALLEN: I believe I prefaced the question: In his experience as an academic professional.
MR. PAINTER: So you are not asking for First Amendment interpretation and the fact that it's a state institution and the legal questions are not a factor in your --
MR. ALLEN: Well, the state institution is a simple fact.

MR. PAINTER: Yes.
MR. ALLEN: That's not a legal issue in this case.
The First Amendment is something he's already testified to.
MR. PAINTER: Yes, but he's not provided legal opinion on that and you are not asking him --
MR. ALLEN: I'm not asking for a legal opinion.
BY MR. ALLEN:
Q So, Professor Ewell, I'm just asking in your experience as an academic professional and assuming it's true that the University of North Texas has instructed the University of North Texas Press to stop publishing the Journal of Schenkerian Studies, is that appropriate in your view?
A I don't have enough information to make that judgment.
Q And what more information would you need?
A Well, I could imagine I would need to know some more of the particulars about what actually happened behind the scenes and I'm just not privy to that information.
Q You've read the University of North

Texas, quote, ad hoc panel report; correct?
A Yes.
Q That wasn't enough information for you?
A Correct. It was not enough information.
Q Were you ever aware that Timothy Jackson also replied -- wrote a reply to that so-called ad hoc panel report?
A I was not.
Q Do you know of anywhere his response to the ad hoc panel report has been published?
A No.
Q To your knowledge, is that available on the University of North Texas' website?
A I have no idea.
Q Is that industry standard to issue a report condemning an academic and not allowing his response to be published on the website?
A I have no idea.
Q How long have you been a professor?
A Twenty-two years.
Q But you have no idea?
A I have no idea about the question you just asked me, yeah.
Q Did you feel personally demeaned by the symposium published in the University of North Texas

Press' Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

A Only in the sense that I was not invited to this process.

Q If you were invited, would you have responded?

A I would have needed to see the outlines of the symposium, who was saying what.

I wouldn't have agreed immediately, but I would have been interested in being part of it.

Q Did you ever speak with Ellen Bakulina about her failure to invite you to respond to symposium?

A No.

Q Why didn't you raise this issue with her?

A It wasn't my place, I felt.

Q Did you talk to any of the editors of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies about the failure to invite you?

A No.

Q Did you ever feel dehumanized by the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

A Well, you used the word "demeaned" and now you are saying "dehumanized." So I guess I would ask for a little clarification.

What's the difference between those two

things to you?

Q Well, I'm not testifying today, Professor Ewell. So why don't we start with what you understand by "dehumanized"? You can put that in the record.

A May I ask for points of clarification of you?

Q No. I'm asking you what you understand by "dehumanized"?

A I'd like a -- a minute just to consult with my counsel.

MR. ALLEN: He has to answer the question that's on the record.

MR. PAINTER: Okay. Are you saying, did he use the word "dehumanize"?

MR. ALLEN: I want him to explain what he understands by "dehumanize." That's a perfectly normal question in a deposition.

MR. PAINTER: Yeah. When he used it? Are you referring --

MR. ALLEN: He's an academic with 20 years-plus experience. If he's --

MR. PAINTER: But if you're referring --

MR. ALLEN: If he's going to testify that he has no idea --

MR. PAINTER: Yeah.

MR. ALLEN: -- what "dehumanize" means, he can put that on the record.

MR. PAINTER: Okay. But you are not asking about a specific time which he said "dehumanized" in the past? You are not asking him that, are you?

MR. ALLEN: Richard, I'm conducting my deposition and there's a question before him and I want him to answer it.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q If you don't know the definition of "dehumanize" or if you don't understand that word, you can just say so.

But I want to know what you understand by "dehumanize"?

A And I just am pointing out that you used whether I felt demeaned and then you asked whether I felt dehumanized.

And I think it's perfectly reasonable for me to say -- to ask you for -- as a point of clarification, and that's all it is really, what the difference is between demeaning and dehumanizing.

If you are asking me -- so I'll go ahead. We don't need to --

Q Yes.

A -- to go further down that rabbit hole -- whether I know what the word "dehumanizing" means, I have some ideas, yeah.

Q Well, please explain for the Court what you understand by the word "dehumanized"?

A To be treated less than human.

Q And did you feel that the Journal treated you less than human in this time period before you read the actual article?

A Only in the sense that they didn't reach out to me to simply make me part of the process.

Q So that, to you, is dehumanizing?

A I think I would prefer to say it's demeaning, the way that you said earlier, and not dehumanizing.

Q Okay. Incidentally, are you aware of an open letter -- or let me put it this way -- an open letter by the Society for Music Theory condemning the symposium published in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies in 2020?

A I was aware of that, yeah.

Q Do you believe that open letter was

consistent -- well, let me back up and strike that question.

What did the open letter say, to your knowledge?

A Oh, to my recollection, yeah, it was condemning -- it was an open letter on anti-racism in the Society for Music Theory.

It was drafted by eight music theorists. It had over 900 signatories because it was an open letter. I was one of the signatories.

Q Uh-huh.

A It -- it mentioned the Journal of Schenkerian Studies, Volume 12, although I don't think it mentioned Timothy Jackson's name.

And it essentially raised some points about how we can think about anti-racism in the field in the Society for Music Theory moving forward.

Q Do you think that was consistent with the SMT statement of -- on ethics?

A I don't know what you are talking about, the statement on ethics.

Q Sure.

(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 4, Printout from Society of Music Theory

Website, was marked for identification.)

MR. ALLEN: I want to introduce in the record as Exhibit 4 a printout from the website of the Society for Music Theory.

For the people online, this was marked in the exhibit pack as "07 SMT statement."

And I'm handing a copy to Professor Ewell's counsel.

MR. PAINTER: Do we have the letter too as an exhibit so he can look at that letter?

MR. ALLEN: I don't. Not right now.

MR. PAINTER: So his recoll- -- he'll just have to try to remember what was in that letter.

MR. ALLEN: Uh-huh. That's fine at this time.

MR. PAINTER: Okay.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Have you had a chance to review this, Professor Ewell?

A One second.

Q Sure.
A Okay.
Q So you testified earlier that you believe strongly in academic societies like the Society for Music Theory honoring its own policies; right?
A Yes.
Q They should follow their own rules; right?
A Correct.
Q This SMT policy on ethics should be followed by the Society for Music Theory; correct?
A Correct.
Q It "upholds and promotes the following basic principles of ethical conduct in our profession," in the first line; correct?
A Correct.
Q And they are numbered one through seven?
A Correct.
Q The first is, "Freedom of inquiry and the widest possible access to information of use to scholars."
Right?
A Correct.
Q Can we both agree that the censorship of an academic journal is not consistent with that

policy number one?

A Can I ask what you mean by "censor- -- censorship"?

Q Sure. Ordering an academic publication to cease and suppressing its publication?

A And now the original question, please?

Q Is suppressing the publication of an academic journal consistent with the principle number one in the SMT policy on ethics?

A I -- I would say no.

Q I want to skip down to number three.

"Respect for diverse points of view and the potential worth of scholarship on any aspect of music theory or any related subject."

Did I read that correctly?

A Uh-huh. Yes.

Q Is the -- I'm sorry.

Is the suppression of a journal, an academic journal, by a state institution such as the University of North Texas consistent -- consistent with principle number three?

A One second. I'm going to read it again, please.

Q Uh-huh.

A It's not consistent only in the sense

that the diverse points of view to which they claim they -- they followed should have included a response the person to whom they were responding.

So they did not respect the diverse points of view because that --

Q "They" being?

A "They," the -- the Journal of Schenkerian Studies, Volume 12, did not respect the diverse points of view.

If they had, I would have been invited -- and I shouldn't have to respond to a call for papers -- invited to be part of a colloquy because this is academic freedom and inquiry.

Q So that really wasn't my question.

Was suppressing the publication of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies consistent with principle number three?

A I don't know in the sense that -- in the sense that I don't believe that they completely followed point number three, whether --

Q "They" being the SMT?

A No, "they" being Volume 12 of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies.

And how exactly authorities at the University of North Texas deal with that, well, I

don't know. I can't comment on that. I just don't know enough.

Q Do you believe the SMT open letter condemning the Journal of Schenkerian Studies as you remember it was consistent with these policies on ethics that they have promulgated here?

A That's a tough one because I don't rec- -- remember it, obviously, verbatim. I -- I just -- I -- I -- that's too hard for me to answer because I just don't recall what -- what's written there.

Q If you believed the SMT had violated this policy on ethics at the time, would you have spoken up about it?

A If I believed that they had violated it?

I believe that it would have been virtually impossible for me to know that at the time. So that's a very hypothetical question that I would rather not answer yes to because of its hypothetical nature.

Q That's fair enough.

Do you remember anyone in the SMT raising the policy on ethics at that time in reference to the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

A Well, there were the eight authors of the

open letter. They certainly raised it.

Q No. No. I mean, did they raise this policy on ethics?

A Oh. Raise -- I don't recall anyone, no.

Q Okay. Were you aware of this policy on ethics in 2020?

A I don't think I was, no.

MR. ALLEN: I'm going to introduce in the record a document I've marked as Exhibit Number 5.

And for people who are viewing the deposition virtually, this was originally in your packet, 012, the Denton Record Chronicle article.

And I'm handing a copy to Professor Ewell's counsel.

(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 5, Article Titled "A UNT Professor Challenged Claims of Racism in Music Theory and Now He's Facing the Music" by Lucinda Breeding Dated August 2, 2020, was marked for identification.)

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q So, Professor Ewell, I -- I'm going to give you some time to look at this, but I want to

just represent for the record that this is an article with the title "A UNT professor challenged claims of racism in music theory and now he's facing the music" by Lucinda Breeding, a journalist, and it's dated August 2, 2020.

Did I read that correctly?

A Yes.

Q Now please examine it.

But I really don't want to discuss -- the whole article isn't that relevant to the entire discussion we are having today.

But I do want to address points in the article where she quotes you.

A Uh-huh.

Q So before we do that, do you remember being interviewed by Cindy Breeding?

A Lucinda, yeah?

Q Correct.

A Yeah. Yeah, I think so, yes.

Q Do you have any reason to think that she would misquote you in this article?

A No, other than it wasn't recorded, as far as I can recall so it's taking notes.

Q Did you make any objection to any of the quotations of you in this article to the paper?

A Can I -- may I read it?
Q You may, but I just want to get these -- some -- some general questions out of the way first.
A Please, go ahead. Ask again.
Q Did you ever object to the journalist or to the paper that you were misquoted?
A No.
Q Okay. So please go ahead and read. I -- and feel free to read the whole thing, but --
A Uh-huh. Uh-huh.
Q -- on page three of this document, I believe you are mentioned --
A Uh-huh.
Q -- and quotes by you?
A Uh-huh.
Q And then -- and so on it goes.
THE WITNESS: Can I use this pen?
MR. ALLEN: I'm going to ask you not to mark on the exhibit.
Perhaps -- I don't want to keep him from making notes, Richard --
MR. PAINTER: Okay.
MR. ALLEN: -- but I don't want him to mark on the exhibit.
THE WITNESS: Can I just --

MR. ALLEN: If you want -- do you mind --

MR. PAINTER: You can mark on my copy.

THE WITNESS: Can I?

MR. ALLEN: And we are actually going to take your notes and enter them into the record, too, just so you know.

MR. PAINTER: Yeah.

THE WITNESS: I've just got to circle something.

MR. ALLEN: Yeah, please.

MR. PAINTER: Yeah.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Again, this is a conversation for the record. That's why we are doing this.

MR. PAINTER: Okay.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q So I just want to call your attention to page three --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- where I believe you're -- you're mentioned with some extensive quotations by the

journalist, Ms. Breeding.

You are talking about the -- quote, a white racial frame of music theory; correct?

A Yes.

Q And there's a relatively lengthy quote from you.

A Uh-huh.

Q It says, "'In its most abstract form, music theory is not racist,' Ewell said. 'It's talking about music in an analytical way. But I look at this question from the angle of the United States and its history. It takes something as a simple Google search of the country's Naturalization Act of 1790, which is the very first citizenship act in the country and I can sum it up: The Naturalization Act of 1790 said in order to be a citizen of these United States, you've got to be white. Have a nice day.'"

Did I read that accurately?

A Yes.

Q And then it goes on to quote you still further, "'If you think about it from that angle, if you think of American music theory, then it has to be part of that white racial frame,' Ewell said."

It goes on, "Quite literally, the people

in the U.S. at that time, the people of color, they weren't important because they weren't white. We shouldn't be fooling ourselves that music theory can't be part of that history. That's as structural and institutional as it gets."

Did I read that correctly?

A Yes.

Q And is it fair to say that's more or less similar to what you've testified to today, this link between the Naturalization Act of 1790 and the white racial frame of music theory?

A Not quite.

So you -- it seems to me you are trying to draw a direct line between 1790 and 2024 when you say those two things. And --

Q I'm just trying to understand what you are saying?

A And I'm going to explain that.

So without weigh stations every ten to 20 years, it's -- it's hard to make that. It -- it doesn't sound -- it sounds nonsensical to say that the first Naturalization Act of 1790 is directly related to music theory's white racial frame. And that is inaccurate.

So if you are asking me that it is, my

answer is no, it's not. It's --

Q But here you say, "That's as structural and institutional as it gets."

Right?

MR. PAINTER: He should be allowed to finish --

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

MR. PAINTER: -- the question -- answer.

THE WITNESS: Yeah.

A And so the -- what's structural and institutional is how over decades and centuries all of these ideas of white superiority --

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Uh-huh.

A -- and non-white inferiority manifested themselves in many, many ways in our country, as I'm sure we all know here.

And ultimately, in my field, music theory, which really became a well defined field in the United States only in the 1960s, obviously very hard for something in 1790 to directly affect something that happened in the 1960s.

Absolutely is part of the same white supremacist structures and institutions that have

happened long before, frankly, 1790 in the United States of Am- -- well, in the country that became known as the United States of America.

Q Do you have any reason to think that that was misquoted, what Cindy Breeding wrote in this article?

A No.

Q Can we skip forward to page -- at the bottom, you'll see five of five?

A Uh-huh.

Q In the middle of that page there's another quote by you and it -- it begins the paragraph before.

"Ewell said he has seen some of the tweets about the journal before he 'unplugged.' He hasn't read the rebuttals and doesn't plan to, he said."

Did I read that correctly?

A Correct.

Q Do you understand that to be referring to your engagement with the Twitter comments about the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

A Among other comments, Facebook, and yeah.

Q And that's more or less consistent with what you discussed today about your getting off

Twitter; right?

A Yes. And also I can recall when -- this was kind of blowing up, I think, in July, August of 20- --

Q Uh-huh?

A -- '20. 2020?

Q Yeah.

A Yeah. Yeah. The pandemic was just starting, yeah. And I can recall I spoke with one journalist, and it might have been this person, actually --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- when I was unplugged and I was literally upstate with my wife and son.

Q And you say here -- or it says here in the article, "He hasn't read the rebuttals and doesn't plan to."

Correct?

A Uh-huh.

Q Is that -- was that accurate at that time?

A Yeah.

Q And then you are quoted saying, "I won't read them because I will not participate in my own dehumanization."

Did I read that right?

A Yeah.

Q Is that something you told to the journalist?

A Yes.

Q And you also say here, "They were incensed by my blackness challenging their whiteness. The Journal of Schenkerian Studies has done far more to damage Schenkerian studies than Schenkerian studies."

Did I read that correctly?

A You did and that's a bit of a misquote. It doesn't quite read. But --

Q But --

A -- you get the idea.

Q -- what is misquoted?

A Well, the Journal of Schenkerian Studies has done -- done far more to damage the field of Schenkerian studies than the field of Schenkerian studies itself.

Q That's a good clarification.

All right. And did anyone who was connected to the journal ever criticize you for your blackness?

A Anyone connected to the journal? So if I

take comments, for instance, from David Beach, who said, "Philip -- my suggestion to Philip Ewell is that he stop complaining about us white guys."

Q Who is Philip Beach?

A I'm sorry, David Beach --

Q David Beach?

A -- wrote in response to my nine minute plenary talk, "My advice to Philip Ewell is that he stop complaining about us white guys."

That would probably fall under the rubric of being incensed by my blackness.

Q Did he mention your blackness or just said you shouldn't complain about his whiteness?

A Did David Beach mention my blackness? I would have to go back to his actual report.

Q And at that time you hadn't read those reports, had you?

A Correct.

Q At this time had anyone from the journal expressly criticized you for being black?

A No.

Q And you did say that you would not participate in your own dehumanization; right?

A Correct.

Q You didn't say "demeaning" you or

anything like that here?

A Correct.

Q So you seem to know what that word meant at this time; right?

A I've always known what dehumanization means, Mr. Allen.

Q Did you equivocate about the meaning of that word with the journalist at this time?

A No.

Q And you basically said you weren't going to read the Journal of Schenkerian Studies symposium in 2020; right?

A Correct.

Q So that would suggest that had they reached out to you personally, you wouldn't have participated; right?

A No. Because that's kind of -- you are conflating, like, the timeline here.

Had they reached out to me in a -- in a expedient fashion before publication of this journal issue, I most likely would have been very interested in being part of a colloquy because I believe in collegiality and -- and respect among colleagues.

To post factum, after the journal comes out, to try to engage me in a response of sorts,

that is -- I'm uninterested in.

Q And yet you didn't raise that with Ellen Bakulina?

A I -- I already said that when I responded to Ellen Bakulina, I simply said -- she said, Do you have any questions about these responses?

I said, No, I have no questions. Have a nice day.

Q Did you raise the issue of not being invited with the journalist?

A No. To my knowledge, no.

Q If that was so important to you at the time, why didn't you raise that with the journalist when you were explaining your dehumanization?

A You know, back in 2020 a lot of things were happening so it wasn't like I was laser focused on one thing.

This one little aspect of a lack of industry -- industry standard following the -- the rules of inviting people to whom you are responding.

So in a brief ten-minute phone call probably with this journalist, no, I did not bring that up.

Q Did you bring up your other complaint that there were articles that weren't peer reviewed,

to your knowledge?

A To my knowledge, no. I don't think so.

Q How about the anonymous publication?

A I don't think so. I don't think so.

Q You were aware that people published in the symposium who supported your point of view in your plenary talk of 2019; correct?

A Only in the sense that two of them had reached out to me to -- to let me know that they were going to submit something and I -- I read it before it was even approved for publication.

And those are the pieces by Richard Beaudoin and Chris Seegal.

Q Uh-huh.

A And it was clear from what I wrote that they were supportive of some of the points I was making.

Q Did that dehumanize you?

A I don't think so, no.

Q And was that in any way improper as an academic professional?

A No.

Q Your full length article --

(Whereupon, the court reporter requests clarification.)

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Your full length article in Music Theory Online, I think you've said this before but if you could just remind us, when did that come out?

A I'm going to say June 2020.

Q So it came out right before the Journal of Schenkerian Studies published the symposium in July of 2020, to your knowledge?

A To be honest, I don't know which came out first.

Q Okay. Do you have any reason to believe that Timothy Jackson was solely responsible for not inviting you to participate?

A No, I have no reason to believe that.

Q You were aware that more than one person worked on the journal's editorial staff; correct?

A Yes.

Q Do you know of any reason that Timothy Jackson alone should have been made responsible for the whole editorial staff?

A No.

MR. ALLEN: Now, I'm going to mark for the record, the next exhibit is Exhibit 6. This will fit in the category -- and I obviously don't want

you to read all of these -- we'll go to selective portions of it and I'll explain what this is --

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- in a second.

I'm going to give this to you also, Richard.

I'm marking for the record Exhibit 6.

(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 6, Collection of Documents Submitted by Timothy Jackson to Ad Hoc Panel Convened at University of North Texas, was marked for identification.)

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Now, I'm going to direct your attention to the cover page -- or the first page, I should say.

A Uh-huh.

Q And I'm just going to represent to you -- because obviously this is not an e-mail to you -- this is a collection of documents which was submitted by Timothy Jackson to the, quote, ad hoc panel which was convened at the University of

North Texas to basically investigate Timothy Jackson and his role in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

MR. WALTON: Mr. Allen, what --

MR. ALLEN: Yes, Ben.

MR. WALTON: What document did you end up labeling Exhibit 6 here?

MR. ALLEN: Appreciate the clarification and I apologize. This was 011UNT2645.

MR. WALTON: Thank you.

MR. ALLEN: No, thank you, Ben.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q So you'll look at the bottom, Professor Ewell.

Do you see there's a page marking UNT02645?

A -002645, yes.

Q Correct. I'm just going to tell you, those are Bates numbers.

A Uh-huh.

Q These are numbers that attorneys assign to documents produced in discovery. It's a continuous series throughout the record in this case.

A Uh-huh.

Q I will be referring to them as basically equivalent of page numbers.

A Okay.

Q On the other hand, that's the sole alteration of this document by the attorneys.

A Okay.

Q It's a -- it's a document that was produced by the University of North Texas, thus the abbreviation "UNT."

So with that understood, I'm just going to call your attention to various parts of this record.

These were documents that were disclosed to the ad hoc panel by Timothy Jackson to disclose simply the internal workings of the journal that led to the publication of the symposium?

A Uh-huh.

Q I'm not asking you to comment on whether that's true, but I'm just going to ask you to assume that for the record. All right?

So can I direct your attention to page UNT2663, please?

This is a copy of an e-mail dated December 31st, 2019.

Did I read that correctly?

A The second one, yeah.
Q Sorry, the one at the bottom of the page?
A Uh-huh.
Q Correct?
A Uh-huh.
Q And it seems to be from someone named Bob Kosovsky?
A Uh-huh.
Q The thing I want to ask you about is the "to" line, SMT-announce@societymusictheory.org.
Do you recognize that e-mail?
A Yes.
Q Can you explain for the record what that e-mail is?
A It's a Listserv where music theorists make announcements.
Q And would you have received that e-mail?
A Yes.
Q And in fact I think you've testified you did receive that e-mail?
A Correct.
Q And this has the caption in the first line, "The Journal of Schenkerian Studies Volume 12 2019 Call for Papers."
Right?

A Correct.

Q If I could ask you to just review that through the next page.

And I was just going to ask if this is the call for papers that was sent out over the SMT Listserv, to the best of your knowledge?

A Yes, to the best of my knowledge. Yeah.

Q So to the extent that you've testified today that you didn't receive an invitation to participate in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies Volume 12, it's not because you weren't asked through this Listserv; it's because you weren't asked in the way that you would have preferred and thought of as industry standards?

A Well, when you say, "would have preferred or thought of," I would go a step further and say in 22 years, I've never heard of a general Listserv announcement making a call for papers tried to be substituted for a specific invitation to a person who -- whose work has been under scrutiny in responses as my work was with the Journal of Schenkerian Studies Volume 12.

In fact, I would go so far as to say is that is so far outside of industry standards to -- to think that this somehow represents an invitation

to Philip Ewell, a direct invitation to Philip Ewell, that that is a very strange thing indeed.

Q Now, I never said that it was a -- somehow a direct invitation to you, but you did receive it; right?

A I received it.

Q It's an invitation to participate; correct?

A Not to me specifically.

Q You specifically received it on a Listserv that you subscribe to; correct?

A Yeah, but thousands of people probably received that.

Q And you didn't respond to it, in fact; right?

A Along with -- along with other thousands of people that didn't respond, yeah. In fact, if I could say, Listservs aren't meant to be responded to.

Q The statement that you never received an invitation to participate in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies, which was made repeatedly at this time, was false, however; correct?

A No, I disagree.

Q You disagree that this announcement was an invitation which you received to participate in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

A Not --

MR. PAINTER: Could you clarify who the announcement came from? Did this come from the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Do you see where it says, "forwarded message from" on page -2663?

This is a question for you, Professor Ewell.

A Oh, I see. Yes, I --

Q Do you see the cc line, Levi Walls, LeviWalls@MyUNT.edu?

A Uh-huh.

Q And it says, "Forwarded message from: Levi Walls," the same e-mail, "LeviWalls@MyUNT.edu. Correct? Did I read that right?

A Yes.

Q Do you know who Levi Walls is?

A He was one of the student editors, I believe, of the journal issue.

Q And do you know who Bob Kosovsky is?

A I -- I know the name. I think he's somebody at SMT. He might have been a -- like an executive director of the Society for Music Theory, but I --

Q And do you --

A -- I don't think I've ever met him.

Q And do you have any reason to believe that this wasn't a message, the call for papers, forwarded to the SMT-announce list by Levi Walls?

A I think it was such a message.

Q Okay. And you received it, which we've already discussed?

A Yes.

Q And it is an invitation to participate in the journal; correct?

A Yes.

Q It's just not the one that you wanted?

A It's not the one that anybody who actually -- whose work is under scrutiny would expect. It's just not what happens. It never happens that way.

Q Did this call for papers dehumanize you?

A I can't comment on that.

Q Does that -- you can't comment on it because it's not true or it is true and you don't

want to comment on it?

A Just because I -- it's a very difficult thing to think about. I'd have to think about whether it dehumanized me.

I -- I hesitate to say whether it dehumanized me.

What I would prefer to say is that this is not the way colloquies or symposia happen in academia.

Q Do you find anything objectionable -- objectionable about the call for papers itself?

A Actually, if I remember, they just had mis- -- mis- -- misquoted something I said, but it's so -- it's so minimal that -- that I don't -- I wouldn't really raise any objection.

Something here written is not exactly what I said at that plenary session. And that's what happens of course when you take a plenary session.

Q I want to talk about the role of two individuals at the University of North Texas: One is a defendant named Benjamin Graf and the other is someone we've already discussed in -- a little bit named Levi Walls. Let me start with Mr. Graf.

Who is Benjamin Graf?

A Ben Graf was the other student -- to my knowledge, to my recollection, the other student editor of the journal issue, Levi Walls and Ben Graf.

I think that they were both mentioned in that ad hoc panel, which is when I found out, if -- if I remember correctly, that they were in fact the student editors.

And, of course, Timothy Jackson and Stephen Slottow were also mentioned in that ad hoc panel as the editorial advisors, I think, the faculty, and the editors, the -- the two graduate students, Levi Walls and Ben Graf.

And what else about Ben Graf? He -- I presumed that both students were graduate students working with Schenkerian studies, potentially with one of two faculty advisors.

Q Uh-huh.

A Excuse me.

That's my recollection of -- of Ben Graf.

Q So did you know Ben Graf before this episode in late 2020?

A I do not think so, no.

Q Were you aware that Benjamin Graf was on faculty at University of North Texas at this time?

A No, I thought he was a grad student.

Q And had you had any contact with him when he was the editor of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

A Somebody sent me -- after the issue came out, I think one of those two people, Levi Walls or Ben Graf, sent me a PDF of the journal issue because I had not been sent a copy --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- physical or otherwise.

And I do remember, I think -- I think on a Twitter direct message hearing from one or both of them just kind of explaining, saying, I'm sorry this happened.

Because it, you know, it had blown up, to a large extent.

And -- and me replying, It's okay.

I mean, it's --

Q Uh-huh.

A These things happen, I guess, yeah.

Q Do you remember the exact words that either of them used?

A No, I do not.

Q Okay. And I believe from your testimony today you've deleted your Twitter account?

A Yes.
Q So those are no longer retrievable?
A Not by me.
Q Now, I asked -- I asked you about Benjamin Graf.
But let me ask the same question about Levi Walls, although I know you've answered some of that.
What was your understanding of the role in -- of Levi Walls in the journal in July of 2020?
A I -- i thought he was a graduate student editor of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies, as I thought Ben Graf was, too.
Q Have you met with Benjamin Graf since that time?
A I saw Ben Graf at the Pedagogy into Practice conference that happened not too long ago.
And as far as I know, that's the first time I've ever met him in person. And we had lunch with a big group of people.
Q Did he talk about the Journal of Schenkerian Studies with you at all at that lunch?
A He did not.
Q What did you talk about, if I may ask?
A Music theory pedagogy. There were six of

us at a table and we had a nice lunch.

We talked about these issues -- I imagine -- I mean, I knew the name from the ad hoc panel and also he -- he -- he's still at University of North Texas, I think, Ben Graf.

So -- but I think he knew that he, you know, wasn't to -- I -- I -- I presume that he was told by someone, Don't talk with people about this and with Philip Ewell either.

So that's not something I pried and I wouldn't want to.

Q Did he tell you that?

A Oh, I can't recall. I can't recall whether we even mentioned the Journal of Schenkerian Studies, to be honest.

But I do remember that there was no substantive conversation.

Q Okay.

MR. ALLEN: I'm going to mark for the record Exhibit 7.

COURT REPORTER: One moment.

If I could, sir.

MR. ALLEN: Uh-huh.

(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 7, Facebook Exchange, One-Page Document

Dated July 25, 2020, was marked for identification.)

COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q And while you are reviewing that, it's a one-page document which seems to be the printout of a Facebook exchange; is that correct?

A Uh-huh. Uh-huh.

Q And it's dated July 25th, 2020.

MR. ALLEN: I'm going to inform the people online here that it's marked in your exhibit pack as 03UNT0441.

And you'll see that Bates stamp in the lower right-hand corner but it may not be legible because it's printed black on black.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q So is this a message you remember getting via Facebook?

A I certainly do now, yes. Uh-huh.

Q And that's your, I guess, avatar there, the -- the charming fellow playing the cello?

A Correct. Yeah.

Q And Benjamin Graf said to you, "At this time, the JSS would likely welcome a response from

you."

Right?

A Yes.

Q And JSS stands for Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

A Uh-huh.

Q Was that dehumanizing?

A No.

Q And then he says he felt -- or, "We felt uneasy about the situation from the beginning."

Do you see where he says that in the next sentence after --

A Uh-huh.

Q Did you have any discussion with him about how he felt so-called uneasy from this beginning?

A No.

Q He also claimed to get, quote, significant pressure from the advisory board.

Do you see that?

A I'd like to find it here.

MR. PAINTER: In the middle here.

THE WITNESS: Uh-huh. Okay.

A Uh-huh. Yes. Go.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Did he ever explain what he meant by that?

A No, not to my recollection, no.

Q If you skip down a few sentences, do you see the sentence that says, "I really enjoy reading"?

A Uh-huh.

Q It says -- he said to you here, "I really enjoy reading your blog post and the JSS advisors mentioned asking you about a response after your planned visit to UNT."

Did I read that right?

A Correct.

Q Were you planning to visit the University of North Texas around this time?

A Not around this time.

Q What is he referring to when he says, "your planned visit"?

A The planned visit was to have happened a year roughly beyond this. I think the fall -- if this is 2020, this -- I think the fall of 2021, perhaps, it was planned.

Q The -- your visit, you mean?

A Correct.

Q Ah.

A And it was -- it was about Russian music theory, which is -- I'm a Russianist. That's what --

Q Sure. Sure.

A -- that's my field.

Q And did that visit take place?

A It did not.

Q Why is that?

A I cancelled it.

Q Why did you cancel it?

A Because I didn't want to go down to the University of North Texas.

Q Why?

A Because this was blowing up and I didn't want to be part of it.

Q It was specifically because of the publication of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies Volume 12?

A Among other things happening around this, yeah.

Q So there was no opportunity for JSS advisors to ask you about a response at that visit?

A After the journal issue had come out, no.

Q And your response here in the gray bubble

is, "Thanks, Ben. I understand the difficult position you were in. Yes, the next time we meet, I'd be happy to get a coffee. Best, Phil."

Right?

A Correct.

Q And it sounds like you actually did meet for dinner?

A Lunch, yeah.

Q Lunch? Okay.

A Uh-huh.

Q What did you understand by the difficult position that Benjamin Graf was in?

A Well, graduate students -- and I thought he was a graduate student -- I think he had been a graduate student at the University of North Texas right prior to this.

But even so, I thought he was a graduate student, like Levi Walls, are under enormous pressure if they are caught between the faculty and -- and outward-facing scholarship, such as a journal.

So it's very difficult to walk that line. That's what I was referring to.

Q And having met Benjamin Graf in person, do you think of him as a weak person?

A I don't know him well enough to comment on that.

Q Do you think of him as in any way an uncourageous person?

A Again, I -- I just don't know him well enough -- well enough to comment on that.

Q In your experience of meeting him in person, did you have any reason to believe that he was lacking in courage in any way?

A It was one lunch with five other people at the table. I really can't comment on that.

Q And you've already testified that you thought he was a graduate student, not on faculty; right?

A Correct.

Q The fact that he was on faculty, does that change any of your testimony?

A No. Because there are, as you know, many, many levels of faculty rank and levels of vulnerability.

And I was presuming at the time, and I think accurately, that he was a graduate student.

But if he were in fact faculty, I'm pretty sure that he was not a tenured faculty, because tenure is what actually gives you power at a

university. So anyone who is not tenured walks a very fine line.

Q Do you know if Benjamin Graf benefited from editing the Journal of Schenkerian Studies in terms of advancing his career?

A I imagine that there's some small benefits, yeah, of -- of being listed as an editor of a journal, yeah.

Q He also says something here, you know, in the middle of this post or exchange with you, "We tried to distance ourselves from some of the content of the responses as a result, but as you well know, silence is complicity and I sincerely apologize for that."

Did I read that correctly into the record?

A Yes.

Q What did you understand by this phrase, "silence is complicity"?

A I imagine since I had only seen a few of the postings like on -- like on Twitter about some of the content, that someone could have been saying something at some point about some of the commentary that was getting some pushback that we shouldn't be publishing X, Y, or Z; right?

Q Uh-huh.
A And I presume that's what Ben is talking about when he says, "silence is complicity."
Q Was keeping silence about these supposedly improper methods for contacting you also complicity in the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?
A No.
Q So about this engagement that you, I guess, cancelled to visit the University of North Texas, is that a -- is that standard professional comportment to cancel an engagement you've already made to visit another school and --
A No.
Q -- give a talk?
A No.
Q If I could refer you back to Exhibit Number 6, that's the rather thick packet?
A Uh-huh.
THE WITNESS: I'm sorry, Mr. Allen, could I get a bathroom break?
MR. ALLEN: Oh, absolutely.
THE WITNESS: Yeah.
MR. ALLEN: And there's no question on --
THE WITNESS: Uh-huh.

MR. ALLEN: -- so let's go off the record.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record. The time is 2:41.

(Whereupon, there was a recess taken from 2:41 p.m. to 2:48 p.m.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back on the record. The time is 2:48.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q So, Professor Ewell, I'm going to ask you some questions about things that are in the contemporaneous documents of the journal only for the purpose of asking what you know about things that are said about either your talk or the individual's relationships to you and things like that.

A Uh-huh.

Q So I'm going to ask that you look at 2657, UNT2657?

A Uh-huh.

Q This is an e-mail by your colleague, the defendant, Ellen Bak- -- Bakulina --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- on December 1st, 2019.

Do you see that?

A Uh-huh.

Q And I just want to direct your attention to the first sentence.

It says, "I just had a conversation with a colleague about the SMT plenary session of which Ewell's talk was a part and he told me that I should have known all along -- told me what I should have known all along because this was announced right before the presentations that the plenary talks will be published in Music Theory Spectrum."

Did I read that correctly?

A Yes.

Q And is -- does that comport with your memory of how that worked, that they were always meant to be published in Spectrum from the get go?

A No, I did actually -- I did not know that back in 2019.

Q So that, as you understood it, is not an accurate statement?

A Well, accurate for Ellen. Let me reread it, what -- what you just wrote [sic].

Not an accurate statement from me. I didn't know that it was going to be published in Music Theory Spectrum in 2019. I had never given a plenary talk before November 2019.

Q So if you skip down to -2657 at the bottom there --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- there's some sort of "from Ellen Bakulina"?

A Uh-huh.

Q Then it goes forward.

It says, "Dear Ellen, hyphen" -- or, excuse me -- "comma, colleagues, comma."

And that appears to be an e-mail signed by Timothy Jackson.

Do you see that one that spills over to the next page, UNT02658?

A To Levi Walls, to Timothy Jackson, Benjamin Graf, Stephen Slottow, Diego Cubero, and it's from Timothy Jackson?

Q Well, it's -- it's not entirely clear here, but if you see at the bottom, it says, "Best, Tim," at the bottom of the e-mail?

A Of the next page, yeah.

Q Yes.

A Okay. Yeah.

Q So this message, "All things considered, JSS" --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- "should go forward with the call as planned"?

Right?

A Okay.

Q Now, if we -- if we look up to the previous e-mail which we were just talking about, Ellen Bakulina says in her last sentence, "Does the prospective Spectrum publication means that" -- I guess that's a typo -- "means that perhaps we should wait with our call for responses until after that publication appears."

Did I read that right?

A Yes.

Q So they are addressing that within the journal?

A Uh-huh.

Q Timothy writes this next e-mail, "The JSS should go forward with the call as planned"?

A Uh-huh.

Q Right?

And then do you see right under that, Benjamin Graf on December 2nd, 2019, in the morning, 9:14 a.m. --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- writes, "I agree with Tim"?

A Uh-huh.
Q Right?
A Uh-huh.
Q Did Benjamin Graf ever discuss with you agreeing that the call should go forward?
A No.
Q Is that consistent in your view with him being pressured?
A No, not pressured.
Q Does it look like he's opposing the publication --
A No.
Q -- of some special symposium?
A No.
Q And, again, these were records disclosed to the so-called ad hoc panel.
A Uh-huh.
Q That's why I'm presenting it to you. All right.
Do you remember in July 27, 2020 an apology posted by Levi Walls on Facebook?
A I -- I'm -- I wouldn't deny it existed. I don't recall it.
Q Let me ask it this way: Do you have no memory of it now as you sit here today because you

think you didn't read it?

A I -- if it were posted as a general Facebook post, it's entirely possible I did not read it.

If it were a direct message to me which I would have found because I did -- I digged -- dug -- I dug -- digged -- I dug in my Facebook direct messages --

Q Yes.

A -- and I would have found it, I presume. So the -- I rarely read Facebook posts.

Q Okay.

A Although back then I was reading them slightly more often than I -- certainly than I do now.

Q Yes.

MR. ALLEN: I'm going to mark for the record -- record as Exhibit 8 a Facebook post by Levi Walls.

(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 8, Facebook Post by Levi Walls, was marked for identification.)

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q And I just have one question, given your previous answers to my questions.

I just want you to look at this, maybe briefly, and tell me if you remember reading this at the time?

A Sure.

MR. WALTON: Which document is this, Mr. Allen?

MR. ALLEN: Thank you. I was going to just say that.

This is also marked 08 Jackson 0234.

MR. WALTON: Thanks.

THE WITNESS: Okay.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q So just, again, did you ever read this at the time?

A I think I did.

Q And in that case, you knew at that time, this date being dated July 27th, 2020; correct?

A Uh-huh. Yeah.

Q -- that Levi Walls, who you formerly testified you knew, was a graduate student working on the journal --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- was claiming to have no control over the content of the journal; right?

A That's what it says here, yeah. I kind

of skimmed through it, yes.

Q If you skip down to Jackson -235, that's the second page of this Exhibit Number 8?

A Uh-huh.

Q There's a second sentence that begins on the page, "However, after Philip Ewell's SMT presentation, Timothy Jackson decided that it was the responsibility of the journal to 'protect Schenkerian analysis.'"

Then he says, "Although, after serious thought, I essentially agreed with Ewell's talk, it was not up to me what did or did not go into the journal."

Did I read that correctly?

A Yes.

Q Is that your understanding at the time of what had happened inside the journal?

A Among other things.

Q Okay. Well, and I just want to focus on this thing for now.

A Uh-huh.

Q So now if I could get you to go back to Exhibit 6, that's the big packet?

A Uh-huh.

Q And go to UNT2705.

There's an e-mail at the bottom of that page that says, "Walls, Levi," it gives his e-mail. And it says, "to me," meaning to Timothy Jackson.

Do you see that?

A Uh-huh.

Q Could I ask you to review that e-mail?

A Uh-huh.

This is -2705, Bates number?

Q UNT02705?

A Uh-huh.

Q An e-mail beginning on the bottom of that page dated November 15th, 2019?

A Uh-huh.

Okay.

Q So this e-mail says in the second sentence that begins in that e-mail addressing Timothy Jackson, "You've likely heard about it" -- referring to a particular Schenker paper from SMT -- "as it caused quite a stir. I was very ambivalent about it because it suggested that analysis that utilizes levels of hierarchy is inherently racist which strikes me as naive."

Did I read that correctly?

A Yes.

Q Do you understand this to be referring to

your paper at the SMT?

A I think so.

Q Does that sound like someone who agreed with your paper?

A Agreed but misunderstood. "Inherently racist" is not something I would say, but yeah.

Q So does that seem to suggest that he was lying in his Facebook post on July 27th, 2020?

A No, because this is November 2019, after my talk -- a week after my talk. And the 2020 Facebook that you just referenced was after the publication of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies.

And apparently, Levi Walls had worked on that so had been kind of deeply involved in it. So clearly he changed some opinions.

Q Don't you think he changed his opinions because the journal was attacked by almost every single academic in the SMT?

A I disagree. I don't think every single academic attacked the journal.

So that's -- that's -- to answer your question -- can you state the question again?

Q You don't think that Levi Walls was posting an apologia on Facebook because the journal was being attacked as racist?

A No.

Q You don't think Levi Walls was misrepresenting his actual true feelings about your work because the entire Society for Music Theory had published an open letter condemning the Journal of Schenkerian Studies?

A You say "entire Society for Music Theory" and it wasn't. It was 900 signatories. So they don't speak for absolutely 100 percent of the membership, obviously.

And I don't believe that Levi Walls was misrepresenting his beliefs. I believe that they had changed, just from the two documents you showed me.

Q He never said he changed his beliefs, did he?

A Well, something changed, did they -- did they not -- did it not?

Q Yeah, the thing that changed was the Journal of Schenkerian Studies came under attack; right?

MR. PAINTER: Do you have a question?

A Yeah, is there a question there?

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Did you understand my question?

MR. ALLEN: Could you read back the question to the witness?

(Whereupon, the referred-to text was read back by the court reporter.)

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Is that question unclear to you?

A No, it's not unclear. It's just a question of whether I agree with it or not.

The Journal of Schenkerian Studies came under attack -- okay. Fair. I'll go ahead and say yes.

Q Thank you.

Could I direct your attention to UNT02707? That's the -- the next -- I want -- I know this is causing you to jump around.

A Uh-huh.

Q But, again, these were documents provided to the so-called ad hoc panel convened to --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- investigate my client.

A Uh-huh.

Q Do you see an e-mail at the bottom of that page from Monday, November 18th, 2019?

A Yes.
Q And, again, this would have been within plus or minus a week of your talk; right?
A A week, two weeks, yeah.
Q Okay. And again it's by Levi Walls?
A Uh-huh.
Q Okay.
A After -- after the talk. Let's not -- not plus or minus. It's after, plus.
Q Correct.
Levi Walls writes to Dr. Jackson.
Did I characterize that correctly?
A It just says to me.
Q Do you see it says, "Dear Dr. Jackson"?
A Correct. Okay. Yes.
Q And it says at the end, "Regards, Levi"?
A Yes.
Q And then he goes on in the second paragraph that begins in this e-mail, "Yes, the paper's willful ignorance of Schenker's Jewish identity is indeed troubling. That seems to mark it as implicitly antisemitic at the very least. I think that had he limited his criticisms to Schenker, the man, it would have been slightly less problematic. But his claim that the entire

theoretical world view and, by extension, those who help spread it, is racist becomes very problematic when we consider the intimate connection between Schenkerian analysis and the Jewish identity."

And then he ends that paragraph, "Ewell's talk certainly failed in that regard."

Do you see that?

A Uh-huh.

Q So, again, is this consistent with a graduate student who agrees with your talk?

A In November of 2019, it is.

Q You think this indicates his agreement with your talk?

A Oh no. No. No. No. I think that this does not in- -- indicate agreement.

Q Okay.

A I think that he had some qualms about my talk in November of 2019.

I also would just point out the misreading that the entire theoretical world view is racist.

It's a common misquotation attributed to me. I've seen it many times. But it's not true. I've never said that.

And -- it -- I would love to see somebody

actually point to where I wrote that because they would be looking for a very long time.

Q Have you ever sought out Mr. Walls to discuss your work?

A No.

Q Has he ever sought out you to discuss your work?

A Again, a direct message?

There were a lot of -- a lot of communications going back and forth.

I don't remember seeing -- I mean, in my Facebook direct messages, I searched.

Q Uh-huh.

A And that was a search term. So I -- did I have something in my Facebook direct messages?

I mean, you -- you looked at it. I -- I can't recall.

And it's possible that if it's not there, that it -- there was a Twitter direct message. Probably it would have happened in one of those two places if I had any contact with Levi Walls.

Q And so to sum up, you don't recall that ever happening?

A Correct.

Q Okay. Let me ask you to jump to --

A May I -- may I -- may I --
Q Please.
A -- qualify?
I gave a talk -- a remote talk in Florida and -- and Levi Walls was also giving a talk at some point.
And I recall, I -- it must have been from my Hunter e-mail because virtually all of these communications were professional and from my Hunter e-mail.
I recall writing Levi Walls just saying, I see you are giving a talk in Florida.
Q Uh-huh.
A I look forward to listening to it.
I don't think I was actually able to attend his --
Q Uh-huh.
A -- his virtual talk.
Q Uh-huh.
A And I also don't know whether he attended my virtual talk because it -- it wasn't one -- I don't think it was one where all the Zoom windows were available.
Q Right.
A Even if it was, as a -- as a keynote

speaker I don't pay attention --

Q Of course.

A -- to the -- the Zoom gallery.

But I just want -- since we are talking about Levi Walls, I did have -- I think I instigated an e-mail saying, I see you're giving a talk. I look forward to hearing your talk.

And that's what it was.

Q There was no more substantive discussion between you about that?

A About -- that's correct.

Q Okay. Could I ask you to skip to UNT02708?

There's an e-mail here from Timothy Jackson to Mr. Levi Walls dated November 19th, 2019?

A Uh-huh.

Q And it appears to be from Timothy Jackson?

He says, "Dear Levi, It occurred to me that it might be appropriate for the journal to solicit responsible -- responses to Ewell from a number of prominent Schenkerians."

Did I --

A Correct.

Q -- read that --

Now, it's relatively long and I don't want to spend that time on it.

But if we skip down to the next page, there's a response from Levi Walls; right?

And this is November 19th, 2019 at 3:16 p.m.?

A Yes.

Q And he writes, "Dear Dr. Jackson, I agree that a response in the JSS would be very appropriate. It would be nice to have it for the upcoming issue, although it is very forthcoming around mid-December. A response in Issue 13 would of course be quite late. Did you have any particular Schenkerians in mind? Dr. Graf and I can discuss some candidates tomorrow at our weekly meeting and get requests out as early as tomorrow evening."

Did I read that right?

A Yes.

Q Does that sound like someone who has no control over the content of the journal?

A No.

Q One of Levi Walls' claims was that he was instructed by Timothy Jackson, something like, to -- to censor people who were in favor of your paper.

Do you recall anything to that effect?

A No.

Q Let me direct your attention to UNT02758. This time we'll be looking to the top of the page. But before I ask you a question about this communication internal to the journal, I want to ask if you remember in the UNT so-called ad hoc panel report --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- a kind of very graphic description of Mr. Walls being forced into Timothy Jackson's car and coerced to basically publish something he didn't want to publish?

A I do remember something about a car, yeah.

Q Okay. But you don't remember that in detail?

A No, I don't.

Q Right? Its connection to censorship?

A I do not, no.

Q Okay. So if we look at the top of page -- sorry, UNT2758, do you see how that e-mail is signed by Levi Walls?

A Uh-huh.

Q And if we look at the very bottom of the

previous page, it states from February 13th, 10:54 a.m.?

A Very bottom --

Q Of the -- of the page -02757?

A Two seven --

Q I'm sorry to jump around but the e-mail spills over --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- from one page to the next --

A Okay.

Q -- in an inconvenient way.

A Yeah. Could you say what you just said again?

Q So the e-mail is from Levi Walls; right?

A Uh-huh.

Q It's dated February 13th?

A 10:54 a.m.

Q Yes.

A Uh-huh.

Q It says, "To me" -- meaning Timothy Jackson -- "and Benjamin Graf."

Did I read that right?

A Correct.

Q He writes, "Dear Dr. Jackson," he copies some other people who are working on the journal?

A Uh-huh.
Q But not Dr. Slottow?
A Uh-huh.
Q He says, "Dr. Graf and I were wondering what your thoughts were concerning the submission from Clark Beaudoin" --
A Beaudoin.
Q Beaudoin.
A Uh-huh.
Q Thank you.
-- "and Lett. As you may have seen, these responses are, at least implicitly, anti-Schenkerian. Despite disagreeing with much of what they have to say, Dr. Graf and I think it is important to publish these responses."
Did I read that right?
A Yes.
Q So it sounds like he was in favor of publishing responses that were favorable to you; right?
A Correct.
Q Do you know if those three responses were in fact published?
A They -- so Beaudoin, Lett, and Clark, yes. We're talking about Suzannah Clark, Harvard

University; Richard Beaudoin, Dartmouth College --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- Stephen Lett, who is no longer, I think, in the field.

Q Is that consistent with someone who is being pressured not to publish these pro-Ewell papers?

A Again, I would take issue with the conflation of this timeline.

Q Uh-huh.

A Because we started with Levi Walls in July --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- after the publication of Volume 12, and you've gone back to November.

Q Correct.

A Now we are in February; right?

So I think that it's quite reasonable to presume that once all of the journal responses were collated into an issue, it seems that Levi Walls read it and then began to take issue with some of the points that were being raised there and so essentially -- well, as I said, changing his opinion.

Which, over the course of eight months,

is not so unreasonable, I think.

Q Isn't the simpler explanation that at the moment it appeared there was a massive social media attack on the journal and they, quote, changed their mind?

MR. PAINTER: Asks for speculation.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q That's all right. You can answer.

THE WITNESS: Do I have to?

MR. PAINTER: You should give some answer, whatever answer you think is the --

THE WITNESS: Okay.

A Can you repeat the question, please?

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Isn't the simplest explanation that they were attacked on social media and by the SMT and by everyone claiming the journal was racist and they, quote, changed their mind then?

A No.

Q You don't find that plausible at all, do you?

A I wouldn't say plausible at all. I would say that's not the actual issue, though.

Q Somehow they are saying at the time the

journal articles are being gathered and published, they -- Levi Walls disagrees with your work?

A Uh-huh.

Q They want to solicit these papers, they want to solicit others.

And then all of a sudden, they change their mind after the journal comes out?

A I think it's probably a little bit of both, don't you?

Q Well, I'm not the one testifying.

A That's true. I apologize.

I think it's entirely reasonable, however, to think that two things can be true at once.

Q Do you know that after the attack on the journal, Levi Walls openly expressed his fear for his career?

A I do not know that.

Q Just one last example here. If you could skip to UNT02697?

A Six, nine -- six, nine, seven. I'm in the sevens...

Q -2697?

A -2697, yes.

Q And this is an e-mail from Benjamin Graf

to JSS authors and advisory board; do you see that?

A Yeah, start- --

Q Oh, sorry, I should say, the bottom of the page?

A Uh-huh. Yeah.

Q March 14th, 2020?

A Uh-huh.

Q And I'm just going to represent to you this was the time when the special volume -- the special symposium and the entire Volume 12 went to the press.

A Okay.

Q So it was finished in its editorial phase and it was just going into production.

A Uh-huh.

Q Just going to skip down past the numeral three on that bottom of that page; do you see that?

A Uh-huh.

Q "Levi Walls has done excellent work on this volume and the journal will be in good hands as he takes over sole editorship of the JSS. In my view, the additional content that we collected this winter following Ewell's SMT plenary makes a great addition to an already remarkable publication."

Did I read that correctly?

A Yes.
Q Is that consistent with Benjamin Graf telling you in his Facebook message to you that, I don't know, he was complicit in some sort of silence?
A Huh.
Q Or he didn't want to do it or --
A No.
Q Okay. He says, "Cheers getting this to press."
Right?
A Uh-huh. Yes.
Q Then on March 20, there's another message from Ben Graf to Barry Wiener, maybe pronounced it Wiener.
You would know?
A I don't know.
Q You don't know.
Was Barry Wiener critical of you or in favor of you?
A Critical.
Q Ben Graf writes to a critical respondent, I suppose we'll call him, "Thank you, Barry. I should note that I enjoyed reading your response to Ewell."

Did I read that correctly?

A Yes.

Q Do you have any reason to believe that Benjamin Graf would lie about that?

A No.

MR. ALLEN: I think I have one last document to present to you and I think we will probably be able to wrap this up.

I can't promise that Benjamin Walton won't have some questions for you.

THE WITNESS: Sure.

MR. ALLEN: But let me move on.

I'm going to -- we're done talking about Mr. Walls and Mr. Graf.

I want to ask you some additional questions about your colleague, Ellen Bakulina.

THE WITNESS: Bakulina.

MR. ALLEN: So if I could mark this for the record. We are introducing here Exhibit Number 9. This is marked in the exhibit folder 06 UNT2559.

(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 9, Document Presented to Ad Hoc Review Panel, was marked for

identification.)

MR. ALLEN: Sorry.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Now, before you look at this, again, I'm not suggesting that you know anything about this document.

It's because some things are represented about you in the document that I want to ask you questions about it.

A Sure.

Q This is also a document that was presented to the so-called ad hoc journal review panel that UNT convened to investigate solely Timothy Jackson for the supposed whatever they thought the journal of Schenkerian studies did wrong, I suppose.

And you can see that in the header; do you see that in the first message?

A "Talk with UNT ad hoc journal review panel"?

Q Yes?

A Yes.

Q And that's Ellen Bakulina --

A Uh-huh.

Q -- and her e-mail at UNT?

A Correct.
Q And I understand she's no longer there. So if you skip down a few pages, you'll see that there's an attachment that says, "Dear Dean Richmond"?
A Uh-huh. "Dear Dr. Richmond," yeah.
Q Uh-huh. And you'll see -- I just want to -- you see how there's a subheading A, close paren?
A Uh-huh.
Q I guess it's the third paragraph.
A Uh-huh.
Q She gives a little bit of a history of her participation in the journal?
A Uh-huh.
Q And then she also says -- I'm just going to begin with the sentence, "The e-mails were an exchange." Do you see that?
A One second.
Q Third sentence?
A Yes. Go.
Q "The e-mails were an exchange of opinions on Ewell's keynote talk. They led to another string of e-mails which were directly related to the call

for responses. The string was initiated by Levi Walls whose initial e-mail, November 25th, 2019, was sent to several theory faculty, included some that are not on the JSS editorial board. The second e-mail exchange led to the formulation of the call. I discussed the formulation with the editors but didn't make any substantive suggestions."

A You said "editors" when it said "others," but aside from that, yes.

Q I apologize for misspeaking and thanks for catching that.

A Uh-huh.

Q Now, did Ellen Bakulina ever talk to you about her role on the journal?

A No.

Q So you don't know whether she's representing this accurately or not?

A Correct.

Q If you could skip down to UNT02560.

And this is one of the infelicities of electronic documents.

A Uh-huh.

Q But do you see there's a page number smack in the middle of the page number three?

A Uh-huh.

Q I want you to look at the paragraph right before that?

A "In retrospect"?

Q Correct.

A Uh-huh.

Q This is Ellen Bakulina in a letter to her dean, who is Dean Richmond.

"In retrospect, I regret that I did not contact Ewell to ask if he would like to write a response to the responses or to simply inform him about what is happening in JSS. A lack of such timely contact with Ewell on part -- on the part of JSS editorship is part of what is currently being condemned on social media. In fact, I did think of contacting him in December 2019, partly because he is a long-time friend and a former mentor of mine."

Did I read that correctly?

A Yes.

Q Now, you've testified today that she did contact you in around that timeframe; right?

A Yes. I would say it was probably February 2020.

Q But at that time she expressed no concern that you hadn't been personally invited?

A The only thing that was stated in her

e-mail was -- it was maybe one sentence and it was -- the title of the -- the subject title was "JSS responses."

Q Uh-huh.

A And it was of the order, "Dear Phil, Do you have any questions about" --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- "these JSS responses," because the call for papers had gone out.

So I was aware at that point that --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- that this was being put together.

And as I said earlier, I responded, No, I have no questions.

Q And she doesn't say anything about that here, does she?

A She does not.

Q Do you know of any reason that she lacked the power to invite you personally?

A I presume I -- I presume that she was not part of the backbone of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies.

As it -- as it was shown in the ad hoc report, Steven Slottow and Timothy Jackson were the editorial advisors.

Q Uh-huh.

A And to be honest, I didn't know if Ellen Bakulina, who is a Russianist --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- like me, whether she was involved with journal at all in any capacity, whatsoever. And --

Q If she --

A If I may.

Q Please.

A And therefore it didn't even strike me to -- to wait for an invitation from Ellen Bakulina because I just didn't think she was involved with the production of this journal.

Q Right. And does this message to the dean of her school of music clarify that she was indeed involved in the production of the journal, at least in the fall and winter of 2020?

A Well, what you've read confirms that she regrets that she did not contact me.

It doesn't really clarify what role she played, if any, in the journal's structure. And she may have had a role, maybe on the editorial board. I don't know.

Q And also, I believe I misspoke. I meant fall and winter of 2019, not fall and winter of

2020. That was when --

A Uh-huh. Nineteen going into '20.

Q Yes.

Do you -- this is true that -- what she says here that you were long-time friends and she was a former mentee of yours; right?

A Yeah, I -- I mentioned that she -- that I was on her dissertation committee --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- when she was at the graduate center, yes.

Q Are you still in regular contact with her?

A Regular, no. I haven't heard from her in a while.

Q Okay.

A If I could try to say when, it would be -- it actually was some -- let's call it, five, six months ago because she's working on a project -- this is irrespective of the Journal of Schenkerian Studies or the University of North Texas -- Thomas Christensen, Carmel Raz, and one other person are putting together this big, thick, multi-volume work on music theory.

And Ellen is kind of spearheading some of

the Russian music theory aspects. And she and Thomas Christensen, a music theorist -- music theorist at the University of Chicago, invited me to write a section on -- on the music theorist Modest Rezvoi, who was a Russian music theorist who in 198 -- sorry, 1830 translated some very significant terms.

Q And can I just interrupt you to say that she's involved in a very significant work of scholarship?

A Yes.

Q Do you know her to be an especially fragile individual?

A I -- I can say with a little bit more certainty than -- because you asked the same questions of Ben Graf, I think.

She -- could you clarify "fragile individual," in what respect?

Q Well, do you know that she is afraid to speak her mind?

A Yeah. Yeah. Occasionally, yes.

Q And do you think she's particularly cowardly?

A I wouldn't use the word "cowardly," but I also wouldn't say "forceful" and -- and "ambitious"

and I wouldn't say the opposite of "cowardly" either.

Q Do you know of any reason she couldn't have spoken up and said you needed to be invited, for instance?

A I think probably because she was pre-tenure, if I'm not mistaken. I think she was at this time.

Q Do you know that she was threatened with a denial of tenure if she spoke up in some way?

A No, I do not know that.

Q And in fact, she did feel at least comfortable enough to reach out to you?

A Correct.

Q But she didn't mention any of these three concerns at the time that you said were hallmarks of the improper publication of Volume 12?

And let me list them: The anonymous publication, right; the failure to invite you in person; and I believe you said the failure to have peer review of the article; right?

A Uh-huh. Yeah.

I didn't use the word "hallmarks," but yes, you remembered the three points, correct.

Q She didn't mention any of those things?

A Correct. She did not.

Q Do you know of any reason she couldn't have spoken up if she really did object to that at the time?

A Other than the fact that she's pre-tenure and pre-tenure people are in fact, as you know, vulnerable and often hesitant to speak up.

Q She wasn't hesitant to speak up when she condemned Timothy Jackson, was she?

A I don't know how she condemned -- condemned Timothy Jackson.

Q Do you know that the faculty circulated a petition condemning -- condemning Timothy Jackson after the publication in July 25, 2020?

A I think I have a recollection of that. I -- I can't specifically say.

Q Her lack of tenure didn't prevent her from signing onto that, did it?

A And 900 people signed an anti-racist letter to SMT, most of whom I would presume were un-tenured also, so...

Q So she had at least enough civil courage to do that; right?

A Civil courage?

Yeah, let's just say that she signed the

letter, yes, she did.

Q So just to close this off, the things that she's representing here to her dean and by extension, the so-called ad hoc panel investigating the journal and Timothy Jackson, you didn't discuss this with her?

A No.

Q And you haven't discussed it since?

A No.

Q Okay.

MR. ALLEN: Can we go off the record?

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off the record. The time is 3:28.

(Whereupon, there was a recess taken from 3:28 p.m. to 3:32 p.m.)

(Whereupon, Plaintiff's Exhibit 10, E-mail Exchange Between Philip Ewell and Rachel Gain, was marked for identification.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back on the record. The time is 3:32.

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Professor Ewell, I'm marking for the purposes of the record Exhibit Number 10.

This is an e-mail exchange with what appears to be you and a defendant named Rachel Gain. It is Bates-stamped UNT1146.

Do you recognize this document?

A Yes.

Q Do you remember sending this document?

A Yes.

Q Do you know who Rachel Gain is?

A She was a graduate student at UNT. I believe she's at Yale University now.

Q Your alma mater?

A My alma mater. That's right. Not --

Q Have you had --

A -- far from here.

Q Have you had any further contact with her?

A I gave a talk at Yale -- two things: The same talk in Florida, the virtual talk I gave --

Q Uh-huh.

A -- was also attended, probably virtually, by Rachel Gain. And when I e-mailed -- I think I may have e-mailed from my Hunter e-mail both Levi Walls and Rachel Gain and -- essentially saying hi.

You know, I had had this e-mail -- this Facebook exchange with Levi Walls -- Walls or Wall?

Q Walls.
A With an "S"?
Q Yeah.
A Okay. With -- yeah.
Q To interrupt you, just for the record, you were -- when you said, "this," you were referring to the exhibit --
A Exhibit 7.
Q Thank you.
A Uh-huh. And this note from -- in -- in Exhibit 10 from Rachel Gain. And I had sent an e-mail essentially saying the same thing that I said to Levi Walls, which is, I look forward to your talks. I'm giving a talk. I hope to see you there.
Q Uh-huh.
A And then I gave an in-person talk at Yale University fall of '22.
Q Uh-huh.
A It was whenever Rachel Gain moved. She was there at the talk.
Q Uh-huh.
A And along with maybe a hundred other people and -- and I saw her. It was the first time I've ever physically met Rachel Gain.
Q Did she discuss with you any of the

circumstances of the publication of Volume 12 of the JSS?

A No.

Q Did she discuss with you any of her criticisms of Timothy Jackson?

A No.

Q And this e-mail seems to have been initiated by her; correct?

A Correct.

Q And she e-mails you on July 27th, 2020, at 7:30 in the evening, an apology from the UNT graduate students; right?

A Correct.

Q Do you know why she was claiming to speak on behalf of the UNT graduate students?

A I thought at the time -- I think that she had some type of student counsel leaders position where she -- I don't know if it's elected or something, but, you know, there was a student body, graduate student alliance. You know, graduate students have organizations among them.

And I think that she was contacting me kind of on -- maybe it's even said here that -- the graduate student --

Yeah, so that's my -- my recollection

is -- the MHTE graduate student body -- oh, and she was the vice president. There it is.

So I'm looking at the third page.

Q Yes.

A I don't want to do your job for you but --

Q No, go ahead.

A But yeah, on the third page the actual apology that they were writing was from the president -- it seems there are two presidents and then a vice president, Rachel Gain, of the MHTE graduate student body.

I do not know what MHTE stands for.

Q Just for the record, do you see where it says "Division of Music History, Theory, and Ethnomusicology" in the top of that letter?

A In the -- I see actually in the top of the email on the very first page that that's listed, so that must be MHTE.

Q Correct.

A Uh-huh.

Q All right. So in this letter of apology that I suppose these MHTE graduate students sent to you, do they discuss anything about the three objections that you had to the Journal of

Schenkerian Studies in Volume 12?

Again, the anonymous publication, the failure to peer review, and the failure to reach out to you individually?

A Well, I -- I don't recall, but the actual apology is on the third page of your exhibit.

And I don't know if they -- may I read this and --

Q Please.

A -- and then we can actually just put -- put some teeth onto that question.

Okay. It seems they did not mention any of those three specific things.

Q They are just engaging with what we might call viewpoints; correct?

A Yeah, I would say opinions but yeah, sure, viewpoints.

Q Fine. And in fact, they say in her cover e-mail to you: "I would also like to offer my personal apologies for everything that has happened. There are no excuses for the views published, platform [sic], and encouraged by our department's publication and faculty members. I am sincerely sorry."

Right?

A Correct.
Q And she also -- jumping back to the letter -- says something about structural racism. Do you see that?
A Can you give me a line number? First paragraph, second paragraph?
Q First paragraph, seven lines down?
A Uh-huh. Okay. Hold on.
Yes, okay. Got it.
Q Did you ever lecture Rachel Gain on the meaning or not of racism?
A No, I don't lecture anyone on the meaning of racism. Never have, never will.
Q So you didn't bring up the lack of meaning of that term that you've kind of testified to today with her?
A No.
Q Okay.
MR. ALLEN: Okay. Ben, I have no further questions for this witness.
MR. WALTON: All right. Can we go off the record and take a brief break?
MR. ALLEN: Yes. And I've been instructed to change chairs.
THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going off

the record. The time is 3:39.

(Whereupon, there was a recess taken from 3:39 p.m. to 3:47 p.m.)

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are going back on the record. The time is 3:47.

MR. WALTON: Dr. Ewell, we are back after a brief break and it's now my turn to ask a few questions.

I'll try -- try to keep these as -- as targeted as possible.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. WALTON:

Q Just, first off, it's nice to meet you remotely. Sorry I couldn't be there in person. But to clarify for the record, you and I have never spoken before right now; correct?

A That is correct.

Q Okay. Could you -- I -- I know there's been a lot of talk back and forth throughout the day.

I was wondering if you could give me something as a handle to just as -- as clearly and succinctly as you could, summarize what you see as

the relationship, if any, between Heinrich Schenker's ideas and music theory as it has developed in the United States?

A Yeah. So the second part of what you just -- what you just ended with is extremely important, "music theory as it's been developed in the United States."

Because Mr. Allen had asked about Heinrich Schenker and then almost immediately followed it up with the white racial frame.

And I essentially pushed back on that in the sense that the direct connection between Heinrich Schenker and music theory's white racial frame, well, there is none. That's 1935 and now it's 2024. So one must make connections; right?

And the reason -- I often will say not just Heinrich Schenker, but the legacy of Heinrich Schenker. That's really the main point of -- of my crit- -- my criticism of Heinrich Schenker.

It's really not so much about the person, it's very much about the legacy that he left via these emigres to -- first to the east coast and Chicago -- there was one person there. That might have been Oswald Jonas. And -- and then what happened in the ensuing 90 years after Heinrich

Schenker died.

So if -- if one studies race scholarship as virtually no music theorists do, it need be said, right, it's not a common thing, then it actually becomes pretty clear to see how and why a figure like Heinrich Schenker could become so extremely popular, especially in the 1930s and '40s where racial segregation and the Jim Crow racism were just on fire in our country.

So when the -- the -- the writings, the pseudoscientific writings of Schenker, the anti-black racist writings, the anti-Asian racist writings, the anti-Islam writings -- he -- he mocked the Arabic language in one very interesting, poignant footnote, for example -- then we can begin to see how in the 1930s in the United States and the 1940s, well, that just fit perfectly -- it fit perfectly with the American mind; right? It wasn't just music theory, it -- it was America.

We were living in the 1930s and '40s through a virulently racist -- and now I will just say that word, a word I generally don't say -- a virulently racist period of our country, thousands upon thousands of African Americans slaughtered in lynchings and mass race occurs -- sorry, mass --

mass massacres, race massacres; right.

So when I start -- you're asking about the connections of Heinrich Schenker and how I'm putting these things together now.

Well, one must really tell the story in great detail going through the years and one cannot distill and say, How does Heinrich Schenker, the person, connect to today's music theory's white racial frame?

The short answer to that question is, well, in almost no way, actually, if you are going to ask me that specifically.

But that's not how I answered a question that was very similar put to me by Mr. Allen because I have to relate this history of how these things actually happened.

It's very common among race scholars to do that and I think I did it pretty effectively in music theory.

I don't know if I answered that question -- did I answer that question, Mr. Walton?

Q I -- I think so. And, you know, my question was not coming from a request to clarify a specific thing from earlier today.

It was just more of a broad question for

those of us who aren't either sociologists, race scholars, or music theory scholars, how would you describe your -- your thesis, as it were, in a nutshell?

A Uh-huh. Yeah, well, the thesis is that the -- the historic white supremacy -- and patriarchy, by the way, it's something I always hasten to add -- of the United States of America have manifested themselves in the field of music theory. Obviously they've manifested themselves from top to bottom in any academic field, in any walk of life.

And that's something that most people would concede, they would acknowledge that -- that historically the country does have a white supremacist and patriarchal past; right? That's not an open question.

The question for me as an American citizen and as a Ph.D. holder in music theory is -- who hap -- who happens to be a black person, is how those things have come together to create a situation in which, as I put in that article that we talked about earlier, out of about 1200 people, there were two associate professors who were black. I was one of them. Now I'm a full professor.

That's an unacceptable percentage. It's an unacceptable percentage to have two black associate professors, out of -- associate out of 1200 -- 200 people, maybe, let's say, that would be one percent; right?

Black Americans are roughly 14 percent of the country. I'd like to see 14 percent associate professors in my field. That would be a fair system.

But apparently there are people who don't want that.

We all know that what we are living through in the United States of America, we will get through it and we will get through it together. Together. We will fight through these racial problems, our racial past.

If I can go down one small rabbit hole, I spent some time in Norway this summer and I gave a talk -- a couple of talks: One at the University of Oslo, the other at the Music Academy in Oslo.

And you all probably know, I'm sure you've all been to Europe, you probably know that Europeans are really good at pointing the fingers at Americans when it comes to racism; right.

And I tell my colleagues in Norway and I

tell anyone else who will listen, you know what, I'm a black American. We're fine. Leave me and leave us out of this.

Look at yourselves in the mirror, my Norwegian colleagues. You look at yourselves in the mirror and you ask yourselves about your own views about black people, for example, or about your Somali immigrants, about your own anti-blackness; right.

So I'm going to climb back out of my rabbit hole and simply say that these -- these anti-black elements, these anti-woman elements, these anti-Jewish elements, these anti-Islam elements, anti-Asian elements are in fact part of contemporary music theory.

In part, why? Because they are part of our American society. It's not all about our country. Our country has many beautiful, great things about it and I do, in fact, highlight those things.

I don't get credit for that and I'm fine with that. People don't want to talk about Phil Ewell actually praising the United States, which I do. I'm okay with that.

And if people want to criticize me

because -- and they call me a racist and a sexist and an anti-Semite because of something I -- fine. You know, I'm -- I'm a big boy. I can handle the pressure.

But I do -- I do think it's extremely important to make the connections to show how some of the structural anti-black, structural white supremacist elements, and structural patriarchal elements in music theory have manifested themselves in the United States.

And let me just end by that very same statistic. You are asking, how?

I'm like, well, I've explained how in lots of writings. One result would be two black associate professors. The numbers don't lie. The numbers do not lie.

There are 94 percent white people who have power in music theory. Tenure. That's the result of the racial segregationism, the anti-blackness, etc., of -- of Heinrich Schenker's American legacy, among other problems that we have in music theory. Heinrich Schenker was obviously not alone.

Q Do you -- just to clarify, do you believe that white males today should not have a say in

music theory's development?

A Not at all. That's -- that -- that -- I -- I was about to say, that's a silly question. I don't mean to say that. I'm sorry, Mr. Walton. I don't want to say that.

But no, of course not. I believe that white men should have absolutely a seat at the table right here, whether we are in a -- in a table in -- in New Haven.

But for my purposes, a table of discussions of music theory moving forward. I'm honored and humbled that hundreds -- hundreds of white men have reached out to me from high school students who are literally 14 years old who are Zooming with me for an interview or -- or just asking for some -- some questions, you know, to my colleague John Snyder, who finished my book a few weeks ago and just wrote me -- he's at the University of Houston as a professor of musicology.

And he's certainly in his seventies, a white man. He just said, Thank you for your thought-provoking book. It was very, well, thoughtful.

To which I said, Thank you for reading it, John. I look forward to seeing you at the next

conference; right.

I welcome white men with open arms and I'm really honored and humbled that so many have taken me up on these calls.

Q I'm -- I'm going to jump around just a little bit and these questions will appear disjointed just because I'm trying to save time.

Do you -- you were asked at some point during the day about the idea of censorship.

Do you have any personal reason to believe that UNT censored any material that was presented for publication in any of its academic journals?

A I have no reason to believe that happened, no.

Q Okay. Moving to Levi Walls, do you have any personal knowledge as to why he appeared to change his opinions regarding your presentation?

A Personal knowledge, no.

Q And did you ever talk with Dr. Benjamin Graf about any pressures he may or may not have been feeling in his position?

A No.

Q And did you ever talk with Dr. Graf about why he said or wrote any of the specific things that

you've -- you've looked at earlier today?

A No.

MR. WALTON: All right. Well, I hope that was less than 15 minutes.

I'll pass the witness.

Thank you for your time, Dr. Ewell.

THE WITNESS: My pleasure. Thank you.

REDIRECT EXAMINATION

BY MR. ALLEN:

Q Let me just ask two brief questions.

Do you consider Timothy Jackson to be a white man?

A I've never met Timothy Jackson and I've only seen a profile picture in The New York Times because Michael Powell published something. And he certainly looked like he presented as white.

Q Did you embrace Timothy Jackson's viewpoints because he expressed criticism of you?

A I don't understand that question.

Q Let me strike it.

You just testified in response to Attorney Walton's questions that you embraced white

men who had contacted you, something to that effect. Did I misrepresent that testimony?

A Slightly. I've -- I've welcomed white men who contact me to have discussions, adult conversations, about race and music theory, patriarchy, etc.

Q Have you welcomed Timothy Jackson's criticism of your work?

A No.

Q In fact, you've said it's dehumanizing; right?

A I'm thinking about the chapter that I responded to Timothy Jackson. I do not believe I used the word "dehumanizing" in that chapter. And that's the most rigorous unpacking of his particular response, so no.

Q You did say it was dehumanizing to the journalist of the Denton Record Chronicle, however; correct?

A Yeah.

Q So isn't it true that you only welcome white people who agree with you?

A That's not true, no.

MR. ALLEN: I'll pass the witness.

MR. WALTON: We'll reserve.

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. PAINTER:

Q I think we are going to clarify one issue on -- and I guess I would ask the question as your counsel -- about the peer review.

There was some confusion with your plenary talk.

A Uh-huh.

Q And the plenary talk you were invited to give and I believe there was testimony about how that process worked.

But then you gave the plenary talk and then they republished your plenary talk.

Did they republish that word for word?

A Yes, more or less.

There might have -- you know, when you give a plenary, maybe there's something on a slide that doesn't make it into the text, maybe there's a comma that you want to add.

So I can't say verbatim exactly what I -- what I spoke. But, you know, 98, 99 percent verbatim and more or less no change in the content of the talk itself.

Q Did they do that from a tape recording or -- or from the -- a piece of paper that you -- because you read the talk that you give them a copy of the paper?

A A piece of paper. And, in fact, Marianne Wheeldon, the editor at the journal at the time, had asked us to reproduce the -- the PDF word text of those talks.

So it -- it wasn't up to them. We basically went -- I had put in a comma if I needed one and I essentially handed over the PDF of what I had read in front of the -- in front of the plenary.

And I should also say that sometimes people extemporize a little bit in addition to speaking from script.

My particular talk, since I knew it would be, well, let's say, controversial -- speaking about whiteness as a black person is almost always controversial in a white supremacist system; right?

I literally had scripted every word that I read that day. So the plenary talk was in fact the PDF that I had sent for publication.

Q And you sent it after you gave the talk?

A Correct. Yeah.

Q And is this common with plenary talks

that when -- if they are published, they are published word for word what was said, with that exception that some people give some extemporaneous comments, but that it's a set talk and then it's published.

And have you ever heard of any type of peer review process ever be used really for republication of plenary talks?

A No. Plenary talks are not peer reviewed generally in -- in -- in music academia.

MR. PAINTER: Okay. No further questions.

MR. ALLEN: I have no further questions.

MR. WALTON: Nothing further here either.

THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Okay. This is the end on the video deposition of Philip Ewell. The time is 4:04.

MR. WALTON: Dr. Ewell, thank you for your time.

THE WITNESS: Thank you.

(Whereupon, there was a discussion off the record.)

MR. WALTON: Cliff, we will take an

electronic only copy of the transcript. No need to order a paper copy but I would like a PDF.

COURT REPORTER: Okay. Thank you.

(Thereupon, the deposition was concluded at 4:04 p.m. EDT.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I hereby certify that I am a Notary Public, in and for the State of Connecticut, duly commissioned and qualified to administer oaths.

I further certify that the deponent named in the foregoing deposition was by me duly sworn, and thereupon testified as appears in the foregoing deposition; that said deposition was taken by me stenographically in the presence of counsel and reduced to typewriting under my direction, and the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of the testimony.

I further certify that I am neither of counsel nor attorney to any of the parties to said suit, nor am I an employee of any party to said suit, nor of any counsel in said suit, nor am I interested in the outcome of said cause.

Witness my hand and seal as Notary Public this 3rd day of October, 2024.



_____

Clifford Edwards

Connecticut Notary Public No. SNPC.0129714

My commission expires: 9/30/2026

J U R A T

I have read the foregoing 260 pages and hereby acknowledge the same to be a true and correct record of the testimony.

_____

PHILIP ADRIAN EWELL

Subscribed and sworn to
_____.
Before me this _____ day of _____,
2024.

_____

Notary Public
My Commission Expires:

DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET

Page No._____Line No._____ Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

Page No._____Line No._____Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

Page No._____Line No._____ Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

Page No._____Line No._____Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

Page No._____Line No._____ Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

Page No._____Line No._____Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

SIGNATURE:_____DATE:_____

NAME: PHILIP ADRIAN EWELL

DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET

Page No._____Line No._____ Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

Page No._____Line No._____Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

Page No._____Line No._____ Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

Page No._____Line No._____Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

Page No._____Line No._____ Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

Page No._____Line No._____Change to:_____

_____

Reason for change:_____

SIGNATURE:_____DATE:_____

NAME: PHILIP ADRIAN EWELL

Exhibits

EwellP 1 3:11 6:21, 24 7:1 12:10

EwellP 2 3:13 117:6,18, 22

EwellP 3 3:14 130:8,18

EwellP 4 3:18 158:24 159:4

EwellP 5 3:20 164:10,17

EwellP 6 4:6 178:24 179:9,10 180:6 199:16,17 207:23

EwellP 7 4:10 191:20,24 239:8

EwellP 8 4:12 205:18,20 207:3

EwellP 9 4:13 226:21,23

EwellP 10 4:15 237:17,25 239:11

-

-002645 180:17

-02757 219:4

-235 207:2

-2657 202:1

-2663 185:11

-2697 223:23,24

-2705 208:8

-berg 116:3

-berger 116:3

-stood 54:10

0

00 72:24

011UNT2645 180:9

012 164:13

023 130:20

0234 206:9

03UNT0441 192:12

05 134:17

06 226:22

07 159:8

08 206:9

09 117:25

1

1 6:21,24 7:1 12:10 136:24

10 237:17, 25 239:11

100 56:19 210:9

10:09 5:7

10:29 26:7,9

10:31 26:9, 11

10:54 219:2, 17

11 131:6

11209 6:11

11:18 75:9, 16,18

11:31 75:18, 20

12 104:20 105:12 107:22 137:1,10, 17 139:2 140:2 158:13 162:8,22 182:23 183:11,22 195:19 221:14 224:10 235:17 240:1 242:1

12- 44:13 45:13

120 65:18

1200 28:20, 24 248:23 249:4

12:10 114:23,25

12:12 114:25 115:2

12:27 130:5, 7

13 144:1 217:12

13th 219:1, 16

14 249:6,7 252:14

14,000 44:13 45:13

14th 62:20 224:6

15 25:2 92:3 139:13 254:4
15th 208:12
1650 92:16
1787 58:18
1790 61:1 63:24 65:1 168:14,16 169:10,14, 22 170:22 171:1
17th 92:16
1830 234:6
1842 65:16
1860 68:23
1868 87:13
1883 66:17
18th 67:8 97:10 108:12 113:19 211:25
19 5:6
1900 92:17
1922 66:7
1930s 246:7, 16,20
1935 87:13 88:10 106:23 245:14
1940s 246:17
1949 73:2, 24,25
1960s 170:21,23
198 234:6
1989 15:18
1992 17:14
1994 17:8, 12
19th 73:23 87:10 97:8 216:15 217:5
1:28 130:7, 15
1C 6:10
1st 200:24

2

2 117:6,18, 22 164:21 165:5
20 136:14, 15,20 155:23 169:20 172:6 225:13 233:2
20- 172:4
200 92:15 249:4
2000s 136:9
2001 17:9
2002 19:24
2004 134:17
2007 19:24
2009 20:8
2014 80:21
2016 20:15, 22 80:21 124:10
2017 28:9 43:23
2018 28:9 43:23 44:22 116:21,23 119:11,25 122:8 124:1
2018ish 116:1
2019 24:4, 22 25:10 26:17 31:11 38:25 39:9 79:10 137:24 138:1,5,13 142:22 145:22 146:4 177:7 181:24 182:24 200:24 201:17,24, 25 203:22 208:12 209:9 211:25 213:11,18 216:15 217:5 229:2 230:15 232:25
2020 31:6 32:2 33:7 111:16,17 117:3,19 118:1 124:2 136:9 139:3 146:15 147:22 148:1 150:6 157:23 164:6,22 165:5 172:6 175:12 176:15 178:5,8 188:22 190:10 192:1,9 194:22

204:20
206:17
209:8,10
224:6
230:22
232:17
233:1
236:14
240:10

2021 21:1
66:18
111:15
194:22

2022
139:17,19

2023 139:12

2024 5:6
86:9
169:14
245:15

20th 74:4
87:11

21 139:17

219 38:25

22 29:14,17
30:20
31:17
183:17
239:17

24 22:18
125:11

24-page
125:15

240 59:7

25 192:1
236:14

250-year
92:15

25th 147:22
192:9
229:2

26 117:19
118:1

2657 200:19

27 204:20

27th 206:17
209:8
240:10

2:41 200:4,
6

2:48 200:6,
8

2nd 203:22

3

3 130:8,18

30 96:21
126:22,23
129:22

31st 138:5
181:24

324 6:10

330 96:21

3:16 217:6

3:28
237:14,16

3:32
237:16,22

3:39 244:1,
3

3:47 244:3,
5

4

4 158:24
159:4

4,000 44:19
46:12,13

4.4 131:5

40 126:23

400 125:7

40s 246:7,
20

4:04 258:19
259:6

4:21-cv-00033
5:5

5

5 164:10,17

500 56:10
125:2

55 58:20,24
62:12 65:8

57 99:25
100:3
101:16,22
102:9

6

6 178:24
179:9,10
180:6
199:17
207:23

6,000 99:17
101:17

61 119:20

7

7 191:20,24
239:8

77th 6:10

7:30 240:11

8

8 205:18,20
207:3

80 66:8

85 78:4
107:1

9

9 226:21,23

90 107:1,5,
18 245:25

900 158:9
210:8
236:19

91 17:16 18:1,6,20 19:5
92 18:5,14
94 251:17
98 256:23
99 256:23
9:14 203:23

A

A&m 78:3
a.m. 5:7 26:9 75:18 203:23 219:2,17
abbreviation 181:9
abide 9:12
ability 10:19
ableist 36:21
absolute 91:3
absolutely 9:24 60:16 68:10 113:2 129:19 170:24 199:21 210:9 252:7
abstract 168:8
ac- 140:5
academia 144:9 187:9 258:10
academic 23:3 35:6 36:15 49:15 52:10,16,19 93:6 110:12 117:3 126:19 127:8,24 128:6,21 129:7,9,17,22 140:5 145:7 151:8,15,18 152:13 153:16 155:22 160:4,25 161:4,8,19 162:13 177:21 209:18,20 248:11 253:12
academician 16:5
Academy 249:20
accept 49:5 50:8,16,24 65:23 66:8 80:16
acceptable 129:6,9,13
accepted 15:20 53:1 65:18 66:3
access 71:4 128:9 160:20
account 11:25 30:1 140:15 189:25
accurate 8:17 10:7 101:18 112:21 118:3 172:20 201:19,20,22
accurately 112:20 168:19 197:22 229:17
accused 76:22
accusing 135:2,8,21
achieve 20:11
acknowledge 62:18 96:18 98:5 248:14
acknowledgment 54:20
acoustics 94:14
act 168:14,16 169:10,22
actions 76:17
active 90:6,8,19
actual 34:4 93:15 141:1 157:12 174:15 210:3 222:24 241:8 242:5
ad 147:6,16,20 148:3,8 153:1,6,10 179:12,24 181:14 188:6,10 191:3 204:16

211:20
218:7
226:24
227:12,19
231:23
237:4

Adam 48:1

add 52:6
73:22
100:9
248:8
256:21

added 150:14

adding 89:22

addition
224:24
257:14

additional
224:22
226:15

address
33:25 36:8
39:1,2,9
43:9 52:15
144:6,12
146:8
165:12

addressed
146:17
148:4

addresses
146:9

addressing
203:14
208:16

admission
76:1,6

admitted
72:12
74:8,9

ADRIAN 6:9

adult 255:4

advance 68:6
113:25

advancing
62:14 88:4
198:5

advantage
56:12

advice 10:8
12:18 13:5
15:5 174:8

advisors
188:11,17
194:10
195:23
231:25

advisory
193:19
224:1

affect 10:25
66:12
170:22

affected
80:13

affiliate
21:19

affiliations
21:10

afraid
234:19

African
246:24

afterward
146:11

aggressive
30:22

agree 38:23
39:25 65:3
78:23
79:23 97:4
104:3
108:19
110:15,22
160:24
203:25
211:10
217:8
255:22

agreed 33:17
44:12
71:24
82:24
154:8
207:11
209:3,5

agreeing
204:5

agreement
133:4
213:12,15

agrees 113:1
213:10

ahead 88:6
93:20
94:13
157:1
166:4,8
211:12
241:7

air 19:1
68:24 70:9

aired 145:22

album 44:2
45:4

Alegant
51:4,8

Alejandro
5:8

align 86:13

alive 65:20
73:25

allege
141:23

allegedly
150:11,15

Allen 5:15,
16 6:14
7:5,13
12:8,13
25:25
26:2,12
39:19,21
40:5,10,
14,17,20
41:5 43:4,

6 46:6
53:9,12
62:3,7,9
63:12
64:15
65:20
69:16 70:4
75:3,7,14,
21 94:1
111:10,13,
17,23
112:2,5,8,
11,15,18
113:2,5,8
114:20
115:3
117:9,16,
21 118:2
130:3,16
151:16,24
152:2,9,11
155:12,16,
22 156:1,
4,10,13
159:3,15,
19,22
164:8,23
166:18,23
167:1,6,
12,15,20
170:14
175:6
178:1,22
179:5,16
180:3,4,7,
11,12
185:9
191:19,23
192:4,10,
17 194:1
199:19,21,
23 200:1,9
205:17,23
206:6,7,12
211:1,3,7
222:7,15
226:6,12,
19 227:2,3
237:11,23
243:19,23
245:8
247:14
254:12
255:24
258:13

alliance
240:20

allowed
144:15
170:5

allowing
153:16

alma
238:11,12

aloud 131:9

alphabet
89:18

alteration
181:5

Am- 171:2

Amadeus
92:13

ambitious
234:25

ambivalent
208:19

amendment
61:13,15,
23 62:11,
20 63:4,5,
6,16
150:24
151:13,20
152:4

amendments
62:25

America
69:2,4,9,
11 90:11
96:8
106:24
107:21
171:3
246:19
248:8
249:13

American
23:6,12
54:21
55:12
68:11
76:11,13
78:4 80:1,
3 85:8
86:8 88:12
97:19 98:4
168:23
246:18
248:18
250:2,17
251:21

Americans
55:5,11,21
64:20
70:24
71:1,4,18,
21,22
72:1,8,20
246:24
249:6,24

analysis
208:20
213:4

analysis.'
207:9

analytical
168:10

angle
168:11,22

announced
138:3,12
201:8

announcement
183:18
185:1,6

announcements
182:16

annual 39:10

anonymous
46:20
124:22
141:20,25

146:25
148:11,16,
24 149:9
177:3
235:18
242:2

anonymously
141:21

answering
8:5 11:11
26:16
73:17
75:24

answers
205:25

anti-asian
246:12
250:14

anti-black
60:23 80:6
83:6,22
84:1,3,18,
19 102:14,
18 103:10,
21 246:12
250:12
251:7

anti-blackness
80:7,9,18
81:1,7,11
82:6
83:12,15
84:4,7
86:20
102:16
103:7,15,
23 106:14
107:6,12
114:10
250:8
251:20

anti-islam
246:13
250:13

anti-jewish
250:13

anti-music
85:12

anti-racism
85:15
86:14,19
158:6,16

anti-racist
85:9,13,19
86:8,11,17
236:19

anti-schenkerian
220:13

anti-semite
251:2

anti-woman
250:12

anti-womanness
107:7,12

anticipated
137:8

antisemitic
212:22

anymore
68:20

Apartment
6:10

apologia
209:24

apologies
242:20

apologize
26:13
91:22
94:10
113:24
180:8
198:13
223:11
229:10

apology
204:21
240:11
241:9,22
242:6

apparently
209:13
249:10

appeared
8:17 139:2
148:1
222:3
253:17

appears
35:13
125:4
202:10
203:11
216:17
238:2

applied
78:17

applies
102:19

applying
16:1

approached
122:4,5

approval
133:2,7,8

approve
109:18
149:16,19,
25

approved
177:11

Approvingly
109:11

approximately
28:18
29:11
46:10
99:12,17

April 139:12

Arabic
95:15,16
246:14

Arcangelo
92:17

Archive
99:15

argue 70:21

88:1
102:13,15
114:9,11
149:3

argued 85:7
103:10
104:6,8
108:1
110:7
146:21

argues 86:16

arguing
83:19
110:14,15
114:4

argument
61:24
62:12
68:15
70:19 72:6

arguments
86:19

arms 253:2

array 55:4,
10,20 57:5
64:19

arriving
96:23

article
27:19,21
28:2 32:23
33:1,15
34:2,11
36:5 37:2,
10 42:17
43:2,5
46:1 47:3
50:13,17
51:23
52:25
53:25
54:4,6
55:7 68:6
77:20
79:9,17
80:14
81:20 85:7
88:1,2
108:2,23
109:5
111:8,14
113:24
114:11
119:15,20
120:24
124:12
125:4,10
126:15,17,
24 127:14
128:12,21
130:9,21,
24 131:5
133:17
134:15,19
136:23,24
157:12
164:14,18
165:2,10,
13,21,25
171:6
172:16
177:23
178:2
235:21
248:22

articles
44:1 78:16
119:8,12
120:4,23
121:22
122:2,10
123:12
124:2,16
126:4,10,
18 127:8,
24 128:3
134:18,24,
25 139:1
176:25
223:1

artists
71:23

Arts 16:11

as- 112:13

asks 39:6
222:6

aspect 68:10
161:13
176:18

aspects
149:14
234:1

assets 55:5,
11,21
64:20

assign
180:21

assistant
19:24
20:19

associate
20:19,24
77:12
123:23
142:11
248:24
249:3,7
251:15

Association
23:9

assume 11:16
87:1,5
111:22
121:16
150:18
181:19

assuming
149:24
152:14

atrocious
65:3

attachment
228:4

attack
210:20
211:12
222:4
223:15

attacked
209:17,20,
25 222:17

attend

215:16

attended
215:20
238:20

attention
102:23
167:21
179:17
181:11,21
201:2
211:15
216:1
218:3

attorney
5:16,19,
22,25 6:3,
6 9:8
13:11
14:16
254:25

attorneys
13:21
180:21
181:5

attributed
213:22

audibly 9:18

August
164:21
165:5
172:3

Austria
87:15,19

Austrian
87:9

author 36:4
37:1,10
112:17,20,
22 114:3
128:22
129:21
146:25
148:13,17

author's
109:8
110:11
148:24

authorities
162:24

authors 44:9
116:11
139:9
163:25
224:1

authorship
149:9

avatar
192:21

aware 109:2
137:9,12,
16 138:2,
13 149:20
153:5
157:19,24
164:5
177:5
178:15
188:24
231:10

awful 63:6

B

Bach 92:12
95:19
97:22
104:16

back 17:24
18:7,13
19:8 20:6
26:10
28:8,21
35:20
47:12,13
49:4 53:1,
13,15
56:2,22
59:16 67:8
69:17
73:23
75:19
77:18
81:11 89:8
93:7 97:5
107:17
113:7
115:1
122:13,19
130:14
136:8
140:7
158:1
174:15
176:15
199:16
200:7
201:17
205:13
207:22
211:3,6
214:10
221:15
237:21
243:2
244:4,6,21
245:11
250:10

back-and-forth
48:22

backbone
231:21

background
15:13
54:25 87:2

bad 103:4

badge 115:21

Bak- 200:22

Bakulina
77:5,15
116:8,11
121:12,13,
14,21
125:22
142:8
143:4,8
144:19
154:10
176:3,5
200:22
202:5
203:7
226:17,18
227:23

229:13
230:6
232:3,11

ballpark
32:1

Barry
225:14,19,
23

baseball
105:21

based 30:9
32:23
43:7,10
64:24 86:6
107:19
141:2,3

basic 15:13
105:23
133:5
160:14

basically
18:25 52:9
125:7
136:11
175:10
180:1
181:1
218:12
257:10

basing
147:12

Bates 180:19
192:13
208:8

Bates-stamped
238:3

bathroom
75:13
199:20

batting
123:11

battle 51:10
80:21 81:4

Beach 174:1,
4,5,6,14

Beaudoin
177:13
220:6,7,8,
24 221:1

beautiful
62:19
250:18

Beethoven
92:12
95:20
104:16
105:11

began 20:9
43:22,25
51:1
221:21

begin 88:14
228:17
246:15

beginning
5:2 24:23
57:1 89:22
193:10,16
208:11

begins
171:12
207:5
208:16
212:19

behalf
240:15

behind-the-scenes 51:10
123:5

belaboring
48:6

belief 84:12
133:11

beliefs
107:3,4
131:19
132:11,18,
19 210:12,
15

believed
163:12,15

belong 23:3

Ben 5:21
180:4,11
188:1,3,
13,14,20,
21 189:7
190:13,16
191:5
196:1
199:2
225:14,22
234:16
243:19

benefit
150:24

benefited
59:2,8
198:3

benefits
84:21
198:7

Benjamin
187:22,25
188:24
190:5,14
192:24
196:12,24
198:3
202:15
203:22
204:4
219:21
223:25
225:2
226:4,9
253:20

Betsy 25:19
26:23 27:4
35:8

big 190:20
207:23
233:23
251:3

bigger 67:22

Bingham
62:21

bit 15:9
16:3 27:19

43:14
47:11
73:18
77:25
126:21
127:12
173:12
187:23
223:8
228:13
234:14
253:6
257:14

black 60:5,8
65:19
66:17
67:23,24
70:24
71:1,4,18,21,22
72:1,7,20
73:1,5,12
74:22
76:5,11,13
80:2 82:3,15 83:10,14 84:20,25 85:1,5
101:14
102:22
103:9
174:20
192:15,16
248:20,24
249:2,6
250:2,7
251:14
257:18

blackness
73:3,8
173:7,24
174:11,12,14

blacks 73:21

blame 59:3,7,11

Blanchard
66:19

blind 36:21

block 111:25
112:6,14
131:12,22

blog 194:10

blowing
172:3
195:15

blown 189:15

board 53:3,5,16
145:16
193:19
224:1
229:4
232:22

Bob 182:6
185:25

body 95:6
240:19
241:1,12

bogus 114:14

Bones 66:19

book 81:3
85:14
86:13,15,16 106:15
127:2
137:21
139:8,11
140:5
142:5
149:5,11
252:17,22

books 54:16
78:8
129:24

border 69:12

born 87:10

bottom 171:9
180:13
182:2
202:2,18,19 208:1,11 211:24
218:25
219:3
224:3,17
248:11

boy 251:3

Brahms 97:22

brains 67:21

break 75:1,3,6,8,23
112:3
113:3
126:14
199:20
243:22
244:7

Breeding
164:21
165:4,16
168:1
171:5

Brent 72:25
73:24

Brian 51:3,8

briefly
15:14 16:8
19:19
80:24
91:25 98:8
114:21
118:11
122:13
206:2

bring 7:23
81:11
176:22,24
243:14

brings 21:2

broad 247:25

broadly
107:22

Brooklyn
6:10

brought 7:6
144:7

bubble
195:25

build 78:23

burning
35:19

Butterfly
44:3 45:6, 23

C

call 22:17
23:21
36:20,23
44:24 51:8
69:9 92:6, 15,16
93:14
97:23
102:18
107:8
125:9
126:24
138:3,11, 12 144:24
162:11
167:21
176:21
181:11
182:24
183:5,18
186:8,22
187:11
203:1,10, 18 204:5
225:23
228:25
229:5
231:9
233:18
242:15
251:1

call- 138:18

called 36:18
45:6,22
47:4 54:16
94:17 98:7
99:14
104:22
124:21
133:19
147:6

calls 138:18
253:4

campaigned
82:12

Canada 69:10

cancel
195:11
199:11

cancelled
195:10
199:9

candidates
217:15

canonic
97:23

capacity
232:6

caption
182:22

car 218:11, 14

career
15:13,15
19:20
21:13
77:22 80:2
198:5
223:17

Cari 6:2

Carl 73:9

Carmel
233:22

case 5:5
47:9 51:9
52:3 58:15
66:13
83:12 87:1
106:8,10
152:3
180:24
206:16

catching
229:11

category
178:25

caught
196:19

caused 96:16
208:19

causing
211:17

cease 150:4
151:9
161:5

cellist
15:19
16:2,4
18:4

cello 15:24
18:2,3,8
23:9
192:22

censor
217:25

censor-
161:2

censored
149:4
253:11

censorship
149:16
160:24
161:3
218:19
253:9

censure
149:7

center 21:20
22:8,11,24
25:22
87:15
123:16
233:10

Central 20:3

centrality
108:9
113:16

centuries
56:2,9

95:18
170:12

century 67:8
73:23 74:4
87:10,11
92:16
97:9,10
100:22
108:12
113:19

certainty
234:15

certificate
16:19,21,
24 17:4

chair 14:22
51:2 80:22
82:10,11
120:8

chaired
123:17

chairs
243:24

challenged
164:19
165:2

challenging
173:7

chance 80:9
109:7
144:6
159:23

change 49:8
51:14,16
197:17
223:6
243:24
253:18
256:24

changed
50:24 53:4
80:15
209:15,16
210:13,15,
17,19
222:4,19

changing
221:23

channel
30:14

chapter
139:24
255:12,14

chapters
127:2

characteristic
s 96:3

characterize
212:12

charming
192:22

check 101:10
108:15

Cheers 225:9

Cherokee
58:23

cherry
101:22

Chicago
234:3
245:23

children
81:15

chords 92:7
96:2

Chris 116:12
120:19
123:12
177:13

Christensen
233:22
234:2

Christmas
19:2

Christopher
121:21
123:17
125:22

Chronicle
164:14
255:18

CIEE 17:22

Cincinnati
116:13

Cindy 165:16
171:5

circle
167:11

circles 93:6

circulated
236:12

circumstances
240:1

cisgender
85:2

cite 95:13
127:25
128:3,10,
20

cited 103:18

citizen 61:2
168:17
248:19

citizens
29:9

citizenship
168:14

City 15:21
20:7
21:20,21
22:14,16
23:1 65:21

civil 62:22
236:22,24

claim 162:1
212:25

claimed
193:18

claiming
81:5
206:23
222:18
240:14

claims
164:19

165:3
217:23

clarification
11:16
39:14 46:5
52:22,24
63:11
109:20
110:1
111:6
137:12
154:24
155:6
156:24
173:21
177:25
180:8

clarified
50:2

clarify
35:12 43:2
50:8 70:25
109:7
135:25
185:5
232:15,20
234:17
244:17
247:23
251:24
256:5

Clark 220:6,24,25

classical
16:14
67:15
70:22

classroom
17:3 55:15

Clause 60:20

clean 113:24

clear 9:20,21 11:13,18 13:6
41:1 94:4
110:17
114:1
124:12
140:4
177:15
202:17
246:5

cleared 94:9

client 32:17
76:10,17
115:7
211:22

Cliff 5:10
258:25

climb 250:10

clipped
31:16

close 123:13
228:8
237:2

co-authoring
86:7

coast 245:22

coerced
218:12

coffee 196:3

collapse
18:17

collated
221:20

colleague
25:21
200:21
201:5
226:16
252:17

colleagues
28:11
123:13
175:23
202:9
249:25
250:5

collected
224:22

collection
179:11,23

College
14:23
15:21
20:3,7,12
22:4,11,12,13
39:18
40:19
41:24,25
80:21 83:4
84:8 221:1

colleges
21:25
22:21,22

collegiality
175:23

colloquies
144:8
187:8

colloquy
145:14
148:18
162:12
175:22

colonial
93:4

colonialization 93:5

color 100:23
169:1

comfortable
235:13

comma 202:9
256:21
257:10

comment
150:22
163:1
181:18
186:23,24
187:1
197:1,6,11

commentary
198:23

commented
121:4

150:23

commenting
144:11

comments
37:17,20
46:22,25
103:17
171:21,23
174:1
258:4

committed
76:17
87:17

committee
25:14,18
26:23
27:1,15
28:16 51:3
53:17,19
123:17,20
233:8

common 97:24
129:11
213:22
246:4
247:17
257:25

communication
39:7 218:6

communications
214:10
215:9

comparable
124:20

complain
174:13

complaining
174:3,9

complaint
176:24

complaints
42:7

completely
44:18
45:13,17
162:19

complicit
225:4

complicity
198:13,19
199:3,6

compliment
129:23

comport
201:13

comportment
199:11

composer
66:17,20

composers
92:10,16
97:23,24
98:2
104:20
105:13
107:24

composition
98:15
106:7,8
108:4
113:11

Compromise
60:2,22

concede
248:14

conceived
106:12

conceiving
92:22

concept
54:17 56:8
68:22

conceptions
69:21
100:22

concepts
56:5
107:22

concern
230:23

concerns
235:16

concluded
259:6

condemnation
149:6,12

condemned
230:14
236:9,10,
11

condemning
153:16
157:21
158:6
163:4
210:5
236:13

conduct
38:12
160:14

conducting
156:10

conf- 27:13

confer 40:1,
3,6,7

conference
27:14
115:18,24
116:21
117:1
119:25
124:19
127:3
190:17
253:1

conferences
24:25
115:20

confirm
113:23
130:23

confirms
232:18

conflating
175:18

conflation

221:9

confront
81:14

confusion
256:8

Congressman
63:1

connect
65:12
247:8

connected
65:7,8
173:23,25

connection
102:17
103:6
213:3
218:19
245:12

connections
133:15
245:15
247:3
251:6

conservative
108:6
113:13

conservatories
73:6

conservatory
15:25
16:18
18:14

considered
28:17
58:10 69:9
202:23

consistent
108:5
113:12
158:1,19
160:25
161:8,20,
25 162:16
163:5
171:24
204:7
213:9
221:5
225:2

consistently
108:8
113:15

consortium
22:17

constituting
39:7

Constitution
59:1,14
60:21,23
61:10,14,
15,17
62:6,19
63:18,23
64:2,13,
17,25 65:9
66:11 67:7

Constitutional
58:19

consult
40:12
155:10

consulted
14:5,12

consulting
12:9

contact
141:24
142:4,6
143:19
145:3,7
146:20
189:2
214:21
230:9,12,
20 232:19
233:12
238:15
255:4

contact@philipewell.com. 12:2

contacted
30:11,17
44:7
140:21
142:6,17
143:19,21
144:18
148:25
255:1

contacting
141:19
199:5
230:15
240:22

contemporaneous 200:12

contemporary
70:17,21
250:15

content
128:21
198:11,22
206:24
217:21
224:22
256:24

contents
119:3,15
147:15

context 48:4
136:1

continent
69:11

continue
13:23
17:21
26:20
48:15 76:3
81:13
89:25

continuous
180:23

contribute
88:8
90:10,17

contributed
90:2,6

control
41:23,25
206:23
217:21

controversial
257:17,19

controversy
126:2,5

convened
58:19
147:7
179:13,25
211:20
227:13

convention
58:19

conversation
9:13,14
14:25 15:1
62:17
167:16
191:17
201:4

conversations
35:1 255:5

conversely
42:21

converted
82:2

copies 35:19
219:24

copy 7:6
8:11 28:5
35:14
113:24
159:10
164:15
167:4
181:23
189:8
257:3
259:1,2

cor- 23:19

Corelli
92:17

corner
192:14

corpus 57:20

correct 11:3
21:3 22:1,
5 24:3,6,7
29:21,24
32:25
33:3,4
34:9
37:18,21,
24 38:3
39:3,10
41:24 42:5
43:18
47:6,7
52:1,13,16
53:4,14
54:2 60:6,
9 62:24
64:7 78:24
79:17,20
81:25
82:7,13,
23,25
83:2,10
84:2,9,19
85:23 86:5
87:12,19,
20 89:12,
23 94:8
99:6,10
100:16,25
101:19
102:14
103:12
108:23
112:8,22
114:7,19
115:8,9
117:4
118:22
119:1,5,19
121:19
122:16
123:13
124:13,17
125:12,14,
17,18
127:19
130:25
131:3,10,
11,17
132:6,7,
13,14
134:6
138:21
139:22
140:6
142:21,23
144:19,25
146:23
147:1
148:5,6
150:25
153:1,4
160:9,11,
12,15,16,
18,23
165:18
168:3
171:19
172:18
174:18,24
175:2,13
177:7
178:16
180:18
182:4,21
183:1
184:9,12,
24 185:20
186:15
192:7,23
194:14,25
196:5
197:15
206:17
212:10,15
214:24
216:11,24
219:23
220:21
221:16
228:1
229:18
230:4
235:14,24
236:1
240:8,9,13
241:20

242:15
243:1
244:18,19
255:19
257:24

corrected
70:14

Correction
64:10
69:25

correctly
113:21
119:18
132:20
161:15
165:6
169:6
171:18
173:11
181:25
188:7
198:15
201:11
207:14
208:23
212:12
224:25
226:1
230:17

correspondence
38:1 98:19

Council
17:23

counsel 5:12
10:9
12:18,22
13:2 14:1
40:1,3,12
155:11
159:11
164:16
240:17
256:7

count- 66:12

Counterpoint
98:16

countries
16:16

country
56:23
58:3,21
65:13
66:12
73:13
96:20
168:15
170:17
171:2
246:9,23
248:15
249:7
250:18

country's
54:22
168:13

counts 117:4

couple 77:4
249:19

courage
197:9
236:22,24

court 5:9,13
6:25 7:7
8:25 9:11
26:1 46:4
63:10 91:2
109:7
117:6,8,
14,17
157:7
177:24
191:21
192:3
211:6
259:4

cover 179:18
242:18

COVID 117:1

cowardly
234:23,24
235:1

create 107:1
248:21

created
56:1,10
68:24
90:11
107:19

creating
9:17

credit
250:21

crit- 245:19

critical
225:19,21,
22

criticism
126:9
140:10
145:21,25
146:2,8
245:19
254:21
255:8

criticisms
212:23
240:5

criticize
173:23
250:25

criticized
142:2
174:20

CROSS-EXAMINATION
244:12
256:2

Crow 246:8

crucial 68:1

Cubero
202:15

cultural
110:19

culture
108:6,10,
11 113:13,
17,18
114:5

CUNY 21:23
22:2 25:22
28:12

123:16

curricula
55:14

cut 63:14

CV 50:17

D

D-R-A-B-K-I-N
111:3

damage
173:9,18

Daniel 26:24

Danny 25:20

Dartmouth
221:1

date 5:6
24:20,21
25:2
129:24
138:12
206:17

dated 164:21
165:5
181:23
192:1,9
206:17
208:12
216:15
219:16

dating 67:8

David 53:7
174:1,5,6,
14

day 27:4
29:22
117:16
176:8
244:22
253:9
257:21

day.' 168:18

days 31:1

deal 162:25

dealing
97:22

dealt 44:5
112:13
123:5

dean 228:4
230:7
232:14
237:3

Dear 202:8
212:14
216:19
217:8
219:24
228:4,6
231:5

decades
54:18
170:12

December
19:2
138:5,13
181:24
200:24
203:22
230:15

decided 17:5
51:22
207:7

decision
49:9,10
81:18,19
124:24

decisions
80:15
128:23

decline
108:10
113:17

deemed 56:7

deeply
54:21,22
108:5
113:12
209:14

default
56:13

defendant
187:22
200:22
238:2

defendants
5:22,25

define
76:19,20,
24 93:9
135:6

defined 89:8
170:20

defining
79:4

definition
93:8
156:14

defunct
11:25

degree
15:16,19
16:15,17

degrees 23:2
105:20

dehumanization
172:25
174:23
175:5
176:14

dehumanize
155:15,17
156:4,15,
18 177:18
186:22

dehumanized
154:20,23
155:4,9
156:8,21
157:8
187:4,6

dehumanizing
156:25
157:5,15,
18 193:7
255:10,14,
17

Dekalb 17:24

18:1 19:14

deleted
140:15
189:25

delivered
122:7

demeaned
153:24
154:22
156:20

demeaning
156:25
157:17
174:25

denial
235:10

denied 76:6
82:12

denies 71:4

Denton
164:13
255:18

deny 83:9
204:22

department
14:23
80:22
82:11

department's
242:22

depends
128:12,13

deponent
5:20
111:14

deponents
40:11

depos- 11:22

deposation
10:10

deposed 6:12
9:5

deposition
5:3 6:18
7:2,7,16
8:15,25
9:7 10:11
11:23
14:16
15:3,11
39:23
40:24
107:16
111:19
155:19
156:11
164:12
258:18
259:5

depositions
9:9 41:13

depth 86:24

describe
15:14
19:20
36:14
43:20 87:3
91:1,25
98:8
104:10
118:11
120:3
248:3

describing
48:15

description
118:4
218:10

descriptions
48:11

detail
218:17
247:6

developed
79:2 95:12
245:3,6

developing
78:16

development
252:1

diaries
98:18

died 73:10
87:25
88:10
106:22
246:1

Diego 202:15

difference
27:20
127:21
154:25
156:25

difficult
80:20
108:7
113:14
187:2
196:1,11,
22

difficulties
26:14

digged
205:6,7

diligent
38:6,12

dinner 196:7

direct 7:11
12:3
169:14
179:17
181:21
184:1,5
189:12
201:2
205:5,7
211:15
214:8,12,
15,19
218:3
245:12

directions
23:8 67:18

directly
88:11
169:22
170:22

228:25

director
186:3

disagree
82:21
90:19
129:20
184:25
185:1
209:19

disagreed
82:20

disagreeing
220:13

disagrees
223:2

disclose
181:14

disclosed
181:13
204:15

discovery
180:22

discriminated
73:21
76:10

discriminates
70:23
71:1,18
72:7

discriminating
71:21

discrimination
66:23
74:3,16
75:25

discuss
14:15
39:19
165:9
204:4
214:4,6
217:15
237:5
239:25
240:4
241:24

discussed
12:22 13:1
14:22
38:24
41:21
122:11
127:21
130:22,24
132:24
133:17
171:25
186:12
187:23
229:6
237:8

discusses
39:8

discussing
9:8 37:22
81:20 90:3
133:18

discussion
64:25
118:8
143:25
165:11
193:14
216:9
258:23

discussions
252:11
255:4

disjointed
253:7

Disparaging
101:14

dispute 82:8

disputing
110:8

dissent
105:20

dissertation
123:17,20
233:8

distance
198:11

distill
247:7

distilled
28:7

distinction
27:22

diverse
161:12
162:1,4,8

Division
241:15

DMA 16:2,6,9

Doctor 16:11

doctoral
22:25
72:16
74:12

doctrines
58:7

document
7:14,19
8:14,22
12:7 14:7
38:23
39:24
111:7
147:24
164:9
166:11
180:5
181:5,7
191:25
192:6
206:5
226:7,24
227:6,8,11
238:4,6

documents
6:19
12:11,18
14:5,11
38:13,15
41:7,13,19
42:4,12,17
68:8 98:7,

22,23
99:14
100:1
101:6,12
102:5
179:11,23
180:22
181:13
200:12
210:13
211:19
229:21

dominant
105:19

dots 65:12

double-anonymous
124:21
126:11

double-blind
36:18
37:12

doubly-anonymous
36:23 37:4
123:1

Drabkin
108:14
110:25
131:13
132:25

drafted 51:2
65:9 158:8

drafting
63:23

draw 88:12
169:14

driven 81:1, 6

drugs 10:22

Dubkin 114:3

dug 205:6,7

duly 6:11

E

e-mail 31:25
38:1 143:4
179:22
181:23
182:11,14, 17,20
185:19
200:21
202:10,19
203:6,17
208:1,2,6, 11,15,16
211:24
212:19
215:8,10
216:6,14
218:22
219:6,14
223:25
227:25
229:2,5
231:1
237:18
238:1,22, 24 239:12
240:7
242:19

e-mailed
49:8
238:21,22

e-mails
11:24
40:16
228:17,23, 25 240:10

e-r 116:5

earlier
122:12
126:17
127:4
130:22,24
131:10
132:25
133:1
150:23
157:17
160:3
231:13
247:24
248:23
254:1

early 87:11
139:17
217:16

earn 16:20
21:7

easily 25:3

east 95:15
245:22

easy 18:9
31:20
65:10,11

editing
198:4

editor 34:15
36:11
37:23
47:14
48:18
118:15,19, 22 128:13, 24 129:6
188:3
189:3
190:12
198:7
257:6

editorial
53:3,5,15, 16 128:24
145:16
178:16,20
188:11
224:13
229:4
231:25
232:22

editors 53:6
142:15
145:11
154:16
185:23
188:8,12
229:6,8

editorship
224:21

230:13

EDT 259:6

education
57:3 59:5
67:25 68:2
69:15 72:2
73:6

educational
15:15
17:23
73:22

educations
55:19

Edwards 5:10

effect 218:1
255:1

effectively
247:18

effectually
143:24

egalitarian
58:13

elaborate
126:21
127:12

elaborating
79:4

elected
240:18

electronic
229:21
259:1

elements
102:15
103:14
133:5
250:12,13,
14 251:8,9

elevated
55:16
105:13

Elizabeth
26:24 27:5

Ellen 77:5,
15 116:8,
11 120:7
121:11,21
122:4,5
123:12,20
125:22
142:8
143:4,8
144:18
154:10
176:2,5
200:22
201:20
202:4,8
203:7
226:16
227:23
229:13
230:6
232:2,11
233:25

Ellen's
123:20

email 241:18

embedded
67:7 68:7

embrace
254:20

embraced
254:25

emerged 51:9

emigre 88:14

emigres
245:22

encapsulates
21:13

encouraged
242:22

end 8:25
12:15
24:24
38:16
87:18
89:22
116:5
147:25
180:6
212:16
251:11
258:18

ended 17:24
87:14,16
245:5

ends 213:5

engage
175:25

engagement
171:21
199:8,11

engaging
242:14

English
98:25
100:23

enjoy 84:21
85:2
194:6,10

enjoyed
225:24

enlightenment
97:8,10

enormous
196:18

enroll 17:5

ensuing
107:1
245:25

enter 167:7

entire 30:12
31:23 62:6
104:12
106:4
165:10
210:4,7
212:25
213:20
224:10

entitled
25:15 49:1
130:9

episode
188:22

equivalent
181:2

equivocate
175:7

equivocation
10:5,6

Ernst 88:19

essay 127:2

essays 98:19

essentially
9:2 36:7
54:20
73:11 81:5
92:21
118:16
158:15
207:11
221:23
238:23
239:12
245:11
257:11

establish
119:23

ethical
160:14

ethics
158:20,22
160:10
161:9
163:6,13,
23 164:3,6

Ethnomusicology 241:16

eugenicist
73:11

Europe 68:25
69:3,6
108:11
113:18
249:22

European
108:10
113:17

Europeans
69:6
249:23

evaluate
27:16

Eve 19:3

evening
217:17
240:11

eventually
32:24 47:3
53:21,25
79:12,16
81:23
82:24

evidence
83:17 84:6

Ewell 5:3,20
6:9,14 7:3
48:7 75:22
115:5
118:3
119:16
130:11,17
152:12
155:3
159:24
164:24
168:9,24
171:14
174:2,8
180:14
184:1,2
185:13
191:9
200:10
216:21
225:25
230:9,12
237:18,24
244:6
250:23
254:6
258:19,20

Ewell's
159:11
164:16
201:6
207:6,11
213:5
224:23
228:24

exact 24:20,
21 189:21

EXAMINATION
7:11
254:10

examine 6:19
7:17,24
165:8

examined 8:5
98:6

examples
71:2 81:17

excellent
224:19

excepting
61:18,23

exception
127:10
258:3

exchange
17:23
191:25
192:7
198:10
228:18,23
229:5
237:18
238:1,25

exclude 73:5

excluded
72:21 73:2
74:21
144:11

excludes
72:14,15

excuse 11:22
38:10,25
110:14
188:19
202:9

excuses
242:21

executive

186:3

exhibit
6:16,21,24
7:1,25 8:6
12:10
104:24
105:16,17
111:19
117:6,12,
18,22,24
118:6
130:8,18
158:24
159:4,8,13
164:10,17
166:19,24
178:23,24
179:9,10
180:6
191:20,24
192:12
199:16
205:18,20
207:3,23
226:21,22,
23 237:17,
25 239:7,
8,11 242:6

exhibits 9:1

exist 41:7,
20,22

existed
42:18
204:22

existence
15:2

expect 42:21
186:20

expectations
127:7

expedient
175:20

experience
46:14
145:7
151:17
152:13
155:23
197:7

expert 78:11

explain
11:21 47:8
54:9 71:20
107:15
115:13
145:5
155:16
157:7
169:18
179:2
182:13
194:2

explained
251:13

explaining
176:14
189:13

explanation
222:2,16

explicit
133:13

explicitly
59:23
67:21 73:7
74:24

expressed
103:23
108:8
113:15
223:16
230:23
254:21

expresses
114:9

expressly
83:8
174:20

extemporaneous
258:3

extemporize
257:14

extension
213:1
237:4

extensive
167:25

extent 14:25
55:2 67:16
183:8
189:16

extremely
104:13
105:24
245:5
246:6
251:5

F

fabric 81:12

fac- 77:1

Facebook
12:3
140:14,16
171:23
191:25
192:7,19
204:21
205:3,7,
11,19,21
209:8,11,
24 214:12,
15 225:3
238:25

facial 90:13

facing
164:20
165:3

fact 13:1
28:1 34:4
41:12
51:22
56:1,6,17,
20 57:19,
24 60:5
67:19
69:10
73:21
74:25 78:5
79:19
80:14 90:8
96:7
128:22,25

132:15
137:7
139:25
148:17
151:21,25
182:19
183:23
184:15,18
188:7
197:16,23
220:23
230:14
235:12
236:5,6
242:18
250:14,19
255:10
257:5,21

factor
151:22

factum
175:24

faculty
21:19
76:23 77:2
188:12,17,
25 196:19
197:13,16,
19,23,24
229:3
236:12
242:23

failed 213:6

failure
143:18
154:11,17
235:19,20
242:3

fair 47:11,
24 49:20,
21 57:17
58:13
79:6,7
84:3 88:5
95:4
106:1,3
116:25
123:14
132:24
133:8
139:21
143:20
163:21
169:8
211:12
249:8

fairly 75:1

fall 17:21
18:1,6,20
20:8
107:17
128:23
137:22,24
139:17
174:10
194:21,22
232:17,25
239:17

false 184:24

familiar
87:6
115:10
133:21
134:11

fashion
175:20

fashioned
35:14

fast 49:24

fault 91:22

favor 217:25
220:18
225:20

favorable
220:19

favorite
62:20

Feagin 54:14
78:2,8,15
90:12

fear 223:16

February
219:1,16
221:17
230:22

feedback
67:14

feel 148:25
153:24
154:20
157:10
166:9
235:12

feeling
253:22

feelings
210:3

Felix 88:18

fellow
192:22

felt 154:15
156:20,21
193:9,15

field 75:25
129:10
158:17
170:19,20
173:18,19
195:6
221:4
248:9,11
249:8

fight 249:15

figure 85:21
246:5

final 46:10

find 25:2
99:1
101:24
104:21
131:5
142:18
187:10
193:21
222:21

fine 13:16
25:5 41:9
66:20 75:8
86:22
159:19

198:2
242:18
250:2,21
251:2

fingers
249:23

finish 151:6
170:6

finished
17:8
224:13
252:17

fire 66:19
246:9

fired 80:23

fit 178:24
246:17

flexible
56:9

Florida
215:4,12
238:18

focus 207:19

focused
57:11
176:16

focusing
47:8

folder
226:22

folks 73:25
96:23

follow 41:9
81:24 96:4
160:7

fooling
169:3

footnote
246:15

forced
218:11

forceful
234:25

foreign
16:24

fork 16:3

form 34:7
43:8 46:10
146:7
168:8

formal 9:11,
13 21:9

forming
63:23 64:2

forms 56:24

formulation
229:5,6

forthcoming
217:11

forward
49:24
67:17
158:18
171:8
202:7
203:1,18
204:5
215:14
216:7
239:13
252:11,25

forwarded
185:10,18
186:9

forwards
98:20

found 20:7
104:13
147:2
188:6
205:6,10

foundation
96:7,9,12

founded
65:16
66:16

founders
65:8

founders'
63:23

founding
62:15
66:12 68:8

foundings
65:13

four-year
22:21

fourth
119:15

fragile
234:13,17

frame 24:9,
18 27:25
28:6 33:2
44:22 47:5
48:17
54:12,13,
20,24
55:4,9
64:7,12,19
65:7 67:5
68:16
70:16,17,
22 71:18
72:7,22
77:19,21,
25 78:13,
17 79:5,19
80:1 88:4,
9 90:2,10,
13,18
107:9
127:15
130:10
131:2
168:3
169:11,23
245:10,14
247:9

frame,'
168:24

framed 92:22

framing
54:17 65:6
78:7,11

Frank
115:11,13, 16 116:3 118:15,23, 24 120:4, 18 121:8 122:1,5 123:4

frankly 48:1 51:20 56:2 69:7 129:3 149:18 171:1

free 61:5, 16 62:11 98:15 166:9

freedom 160:19 162:13

Freie 98:15

freq- 95:5

frequencies 93:13 95:6

frequency 93:15,21 94:3,5,17, 25

friend 230:16

friends 233:5

front 6:22 95:25

111:20 257:12

Fugitive 60:20

full 20:24 71:14 123:25 177:23 178:2 248:25

fully 62:18

functional 95:22,24 96:2,6

Functionalism 119:16

fundamental 104:25 105:1,17 106:11

future 85:16,20

G

Gain 237:19 238:2,8, 21,23 239:11,19, 24 241:11 243:10

gallery 216:3

gathered 223:1

gave 24:4 27:3 82:9 145:12,22 146:3 215:4 238:17,18 239:16 249:18 256:14 257:23

general 31:5 54:10 166:3 183:17 205:2

generally 16:13 22:2,6,24 23:21 24:25 34:23 35:1 36:17 151:15 246:22 258:10

generated 42:12 69:2

generations 68:9

genere 126:24

German 89:15,17 98:24 99:4 100:11,24 101:1,4 102:2 108:9 110:20 113:16 114:5

give 8:18 10:6,15 15:5 25:12 26:17 48:10 56:6 71:14 92:19 102:5 124:19 164:25 179:6 199:14 222:10 243:5 244:23 256:12,19 257:3 258:3

giving 215:5,12 216:6 239:14

glasses 7:20,22

Global 5:11

Gmail 11:25 12:1

go-between 120:12

goal 51:14, 16 73:12

God 137:23
Goldner 66:7
Gomez 5:8
good 7:23
17:22
67:24
109:6
120:2
134:8
137:18
173:21
224:20
249:23
Google
168:13
Gor- 18:25
Gorbachev
18:25
gosh 33:22
grad 189:1
graduate
16:25
21:20
22:7,8,9,
10,24
25:22
71:12
76:2,7,23
123:16
188:12,15
190:11
196:13,14,
15,17
197:13,22
206:20
213:10
233:10
238:9
240:12,15,
20,24
241:1,12,
23
graduated
15:18
19:16
Graf
187:22,24,
25 188:1,
4,13,14,
20,21,24
189:7
190:5,13,
14,16
191:5
192:24
196:12,24
198:3
202:15
203:22
204:4
217:14
219:21
220:4,14
223:25
225:2,14,
22 226:4,
14 234:16
253:21,24
grammatical
96:11
grandchildren
81:16
granted 83:1
granting
22:25
grants 23:1
graphic
218:10
gravitas
129:1
gray 195:25
great 44:19
55:4,10,20
56:12,15
60:13 63:5
64:19 91:8
104:16,23
105:3,12
224:23
247:6
250:18
Greek 94:18
grew 43:16
79:9
116:15
group 66:5
88:21
116:11,17
119:8
120:8
190:20
guarantees
62:11
guess 42:21
61:25
76:19
106:1
119:14
139:12,16
143:18
154:23
189:20
192:21
199:9
203:9
228:11
256:6
guesstimate
102:6
guidelines
127:5
guys 174:3,
9

H

half 58:21,
25 62:13
65:8
Hall 30:12,
17,18
31:25 32:3
hallmarks
235:16,23
hand 117:7
181:4
handed 118:4
124:25
257:11
handing
117:6

159:10
164:15

handle
244:24
251:3

handled
134:19

hands 224:20

Hans 88:15

hap 248:20

happen 6:17
21:1 56:6
80:8 187:8
189:20

happened
14:24
34:24 35:1
41:18 50:1
68:23 74:3
80:10,12,
19 116:24
152:23
170:23
171:1
189:14
190:17
194:20
207:17
214:20
242:20
245:25
247:16
253:15

happening
74:14,17
138:15
176:16
195:20
214:23
230:11

happily
51:21

happy 20:4
49:2 196:3

hard 35:14
73:16 80:5
91:19
135:24
163:9
169:20
170:22

harmonic
105:18
119:16

Harmonielehre
98:14

harmonies
92:7

harpist 66:7

Harvard
220:25

hasten 248:8

hate 30:9,
22 31:24
32:11,14,
20

Haven 252:9

he'll 159:17

head 9:20
28:20 44:5

header
227:17

hear 13:11
135:21
136:2

heard 83:8
94:5
137:21
138:16
140:9
183:17
208:17
233:14
258:6

hearing
189:12
216:7

hegemony
92:21,24

Heidlberg
116:3

Heidlberger
115:11,14,
16 116:4,5
118:15,23,
24 121:8
122:1,6
123:5

Heidlberger's
120:5

Heinrich
86:24
87:2,3,6
88:3 90:1,
6,9,16
97:5,18
98:3,13
101:25
104:1,6
105:13
106:18,22
107:2,20
114:12
133:12
143:25
144:2,3
245:1,9,
13,17,19,
25 246:6
247:3,7
251:20,22

held 21:15,
16 55:5,
11,21
64:20
107:23

helpful
112:9

helps 48:3

hesitant
236:7,8

hesitate
187:5

hesitated
89:6

Hey 44:19

hierarchal
104:7

107:11
114:13
132:18

hierarchical
104:8,13
132:19

hierarchies
104:14,23
106:20
131:19
132:11
133:10

hierarchy
105:24
106:19
108:3
110:18
113:10
114:3,4,15
133:10,11
208:21

high 61:16
252:13

higher
107:23

highlight
77:24
250:19

highly 128:8

hip 57:16

his- 66:1

historian
87:23

historic
54:22
248:6

historical
54:25
88:13

historically
54:21
56:21 58:3
81:12
248:15

histories
57:2

history 56:1
57:16
72:24
73:14,20
107:18
168:12
169:4
228:13
241:15
247:15

hit 147:11

hoc 147:7,
16,21
148:3,8
153:1,7,10
179:12,24
181:14
188:6,10
191:3
204:16
211:20
218:7
226:24
227:12,19
231:23
237:4

Hold 243:8

holder
248:19

hole 157:4
249:17
250:11

hometown
17:25

honest 52:9
59:3
136:10
178:9
191:15
232:2

honor 51:13,
22 52:12
145:20

honorable
52:19

honored
252:12
253:3

honoring
51:25 52:7
160:5

hope 81:14
239:14
254:4

Hopi 58:23

horrific
73:22

hostile
103:9

housed 98:10
118:13

Houston
252:19

Hugo 97:15
98:2

human 59:9
100:6,11,
14,21
157:9,11

humans 56:10

humbled
252:12
253:3

hundred
28:24
65:22
239:22

hundreds
56:22
252:12

Hunter 14:23
20:7,11
22:4,11,
12,13,20
39:17
40:18
41:24,25
80:21 83:3
84:7
215:8,9
238:22

Huseby 5:10

hyphen 202:8

hypothetical
163:18,20

I

icon 78:4

idea 46:15
49:13
78:17 86:4
99:16
134:21
143:11
144:13
153:14,18,
21,22
156:2
173:15
253:9

ideas 55:25
78:21 79:1
83:18
90:14
102:19
106:16
125:2
157:6
170:13
245:2

identification
7:4 117:20
130:13
159:2
164:22
179:15
192:2
205:22
227:1
237:20

identified
60:8 99:25
107:24
143:18
146:24
148:23

identify
41:6,13,17
56:12 60:5

identifying
79:4

identities
37:5,6

identity
37:1,6,8
212:21
213:4

ideological
108:8
113:15
114:4

ideologies
58:5,6
110:19

ideology
64:18
102:18

ignorance
212:20

ignore 69:1,
3

Illinois
17:25 18:3
19:12,14
20:2

illness
10:24

illuminate
76:25

imagine
129:3
152:21
191:3
198:6,20

immediately
31:1,12
154:8
245:9

immigrants
89:2 250:8

imminent
108:14

impede 80:2

impeded
77:21

impetus
116:7

implements
39:7

implicitly
74:25
212:22
220:12

implying
103:3

important
28:15
51:25 52:7
55:19 88:3
97:13,16
98:3
105:25
169:2
176:12
220:15
245:6
251:6

impossible
89:17
163:17

improper
141:12,15,
18 146:14,
17 147:3
148:9
177:20
199:5
235:17

impugn 41:16

in- 213:15

in-person
239:16

inaccurate
99:18
169:24

incensed
173:7
174:11

incident
76:9
incidentally
14:18
84:20
157:19
incidents
75:24
inclined
56:14
included
109:4
162:2
229:3
includes
61:13
including
68:11
inclusion
148:11
incompetent
81:6
82:18,22
83:19
inconvenient
219:11
incorrect
85:11
independent
23:15
Indian 95:13
Indiana 44:8
indication
32:10,19
indigenous
96:23
individual
234:13,18
individual's
200:15
individually
242:4
individuals
84:7
187:21
industry
144:7
146:21
148:25
149:14
153:15
176:19
183:14,24
infelicities
229:20
inferior
128:6
inferiority
73:12
170:16
influence
68:9
influenced
68:10
influences
68:13
inform 67:5,
6 192:10
230:10
information
39:2,8
150:7,9
152:18,20,
24 153:3,4
160:20
informed
129:17
inherently
208:21
209:5
initial
229:2
initiated
229:1
240:8
inquiry
160:19
162:13
inside
105:21
207:17
insisted
131:17
132:9
instance
91:5
129:10
174:1
235:5
instances
74:7
101:24
instigated
216:5
institution
22:25
67:20
151:3,8,
21,25
161:19
institutional
21:10
169:5
170:3,12
institutions
21:16
22:18
66:25
67:10
170:25
instructed
152:15
217:24
243:24
intellectual's
100:4
interest
11:11
116:17
120:8
interested
21:7 79:1
154:9
175:21
interesting

28:15
48:21
62:16
67:16
96:19,25
246:14

interfere
10:18

interject
66:21

internal
181:15
218:6

international
17:23
28:25
29:2,3,6,
10

interpretation
151:20

interpreted
70:12

interpreting
151:13

interrupt
12:20 16:8
88:20
234:8
239:5

interrupting
94:12

interruption
26:13

interview
252:15

interviewed
165:16

intimate
213:3

introduce
5:12 6:16
117:5
159:3
164:8

introduced
115:23
118:6
132:5,15

introducing
117:21
131:15
226:20

introduction
44:11,12,
14,17
45:1,2,10,
20 46:3,8,
16 80:24
127:3

introductions
98:19

invent
117:16

invented
70:8

investigate
180:1
211:22
227:13

investigating
237:4

invitation
146:1
183:9,19,
25 184:1,
5,8,22
185:2
186:14
232:11

invite
143:12
145:13,19
149:10
154:11,18
231:19
235:19

invited
154:2,4
162:10,12
176:10
230:24
234:3
235:4
256:11

inviting
143:9,15
176:20
178:13

involved
36:7 67:12
125:6
209:14
232:5,12,
16 234:9

Iowa 73:10

irrespective
233:20

issue 26:5
51:1
136:25
143:23
147:8
149:15
152:2
153:15
154:14
175:21
176:9
185:24
188:3
189:5,7
195:24
217:11,12
221:8,20,
21 222:24
256:5

issues 144:6
191:2

items 12:17

J

Jackson 5:4,
16 32:11,
17 76:10
104:4
115:7
134:20
136:18
137:6
142:16

153:5
178:12,19
179:12,24
180:1
181:14
188:9
202:11,14,16 206:9
207:2,7
208:3,17
212:11,14
216:15,18
217:8,24
219:21,24
227:14
231:24
236:9,11,13 237:5
240:5
254:14,16
255:13

Jackson's
136:7
158:14
218:11
254:20
255:7

Jacoby 6:2

January
18:5,14
19:7,8

Jeff 47:14
48:18 49:7
53:7

Jenkins
25:20
26:24

Jewish 87:9
89:2
212:20
213:4

Jim 246:8

job 19:21
20:2,6,7
48:8 241:5

Joe 25:21
26:22
28:12 35:8
54:14
78:2,8,15
90:12

jogged 137:5

Johann 92:12

John 62:21
252:17,25

Johnson 18:4

joke 95:1,2,3

Jonas 88:18
245:24

Jordan 95:15

journal
33:11,15,19 34:8
35:13,14
46:13
49:15
116:9
118:7,8,12,13
120:5
125:4
126:19
128:5,13
129:7
133:19,21,22 134:7,16,19,23
135:3,9,17,18,22
136:2,7,11,22,25
137:7,11
140:2,3
141:13,18
142:2
143:9,18
146:16
147:3,8
148:4
149:4,17,20 150:3,5
151:9
152:16
154:1,17,21 157:10,22 158:12
160:25
161:8,18,19 162:7,16,22
163:4,24
171:15,22
173:8,17,23,25
174:19
175:11,20,24 178:6
180:2
181:15
182:23
183:10,21
184:22
185:3,7,24
186:15
188:3
189:3,7
190:10,12,21 191:14
193:4
195:18,24
196:21
198:4,8
199:6
200:12
203:15
206:21,24
207:8,13,17 209:12,17,20,24
210:5,20
211:11
216:20
217:21
218:6
219:25
221:19
222:4,18
223:1,7,16
224:20
227:12,15,19 228:14
229:14
231:21
232:6,13,16 233:20

237:5
241:25
257:6

journal's
178:16
232:21

journalist
165:4
166:5
168:1
172:10
173:4
175:8
176:10,13,
22 255:18

journals
35:5,6
253:13

JSS 192:25
193:4
194:10
195:22
202:24
203:17
217:9
224:1,21
229:4
230:11,13
231:3,8
240:2

judgment
150:2
152:19

July 172:3
178:8
190:10
192:1,9
204:20
206:17
209:8
221:12
236:14
240:10

jump 211:17
214:25
219:6
253:5

jumping
243:2

June 33:6
178:5

junior
123:21,22

jury 47:23
54:11 91:1
92:11
125:6

justifies
55:22

justify
55:4,10,20
64:19

K

keeper 9:2

keeping
72:8,11
199:4

Kendrick
44:2,15,25
45:3,23

key 92:5,8
105:8,9
120:7
131:19
132:11

keynote
215:25
228:24

kind 18:10,
19 32:20
78:6 91:18
137:5
149:5
172:3
175:17
189:13
206:25
209:14
218:10
233:25
240:23
243:15

knew 18:7
77:4
140:20,22
191:3,6
206:16,20
257:16

knowledge
14:14 25:8
91:4 101:5
124:6
126:10
129:11
145:23
153:12
158:4
176:11
177:1,2
178:8
183:6,7
188:2
253:17,19

Knoxville
19:22

Kontrapunkt
98:14

Kosovsky
182:7
185:25

L

labeling
180:6

labor 69:1

lack 64:18
145:25
148:13,16,
23 176:18
230:11
236:17
243:14

lacked
231:18

lacking
197:9

Lamar 44:15,
25

Lamar's 44:2

45:3,23

language
17:18,20, 21 36:21 50:15 99:4 246:14

lapsed 23:10

large 55:2 66:13 67:15 189:16

largely
107:20

laser 176:16

late 74:4 92:15 97:8 108:11 113:18 138:12,13 188:22 217:13

Laura 5:4

law 60:25 61:6 63:24 65:1

laws 67:8

lawsuit 5:23 6:1

lay 125:6

layers
104:22,24 105:17

laying
73:14,17

layperson
92:2 99:1, 3 104:11 105:1

lead 118:16 145:11

leaders
240:17

leading
83:18 139:20

leap 74:2

learn 67:20

learned
67:13

leave 10:8 69:21 93:7 250:2

lecture
243:10,12

led 84:7 181:15 228:24 229:5

left 20:1 140:14 245:21

legacy
245:17,21 251:21

legal 13:5 40:9 151:12,22 152:2,7,10

legible
192:15

length 91:18 177:23 178:2

lengthy
168:5

Leningrad
17:18 18:20

Lett
220:11,24 221:3

letter 94:18 157:20,21, 25 158:3, 6,10 159:12,14, 18 163:3 164:1 210:5 230:6 236:20 237:1 241:16,22 243:3

letters
98:18

letting 15:8

level 53:17

levels
104:14

Levi
185:15,19, 22 186:9 187:24 188:3,13 189:6 190:7,10 196:18 202:14 204:21 205:19,21 206:19 208:2 209:13,23 210:2,11 212:5,11, 16 214:21 215:5,11 216:5,15, 19 217:4, 23 218:23 219:14 221:11,20 223:2,16 224:19 229:1 238:22,25 239:13 253:16

Leviwalls@myunt.edu
185:16

Leviwalls@myunt.edu.
185:19

liberty
130:17

lie 226:4
251:15,16

life 68:11
82:9
87:14,16,
18 108:6
113:13
131:19
132:11
248:12

lifetime
100:5

Likewise
11:15

limited
212:23

limits 25:4

lines 243:7

link 57:12
69:5
132:17
133:6,9
169:9

linked 69:8

list 50:17
104:20
138:20
186:9
235:18

listed
12:15,17
118:18
119:14
125:23
198:7
241:18

listen 250:1

listening
215:14

Listserv
138:17,20
182:15
183:6,12,
17 184:12

Listservs
184:19

literally
56:19
58:16 60:1
168:25
172:14
252:14
257:20

Litigation
5:11

lived 18:16
87:11

lives 65:20

living
246:20
249:12

located 29:8
48:12

logical 92:8

long 16:20
27:18
28:2,7
29:11
44:7,13
45:11
91:10
107:15
153:19
171:1
190:17
214:2
217:1

long-time
230:16
233:5

longer 32:23
33:23
34:10
35:16
68:25 69:3
77:9 85:18
89:18,21
149:21
190:2
221:3
228:2

looked 12:17
38:17,21
85:17
214:16
254:1,19

loop 67:14

lost 69:20

lot 17:3
40:15 44:4
64:10
65:25
88:12
96:16,17
102:11
176:15
214:9
244:21

lots 251:14

Louisiana
47:15

love 213:25

lower 192:14

Lucinda
164:21
165:4,17

Ludwig 92:12

lunch 126:14
190:19,22
191:1
196:8,9
197:10

lying 209:8

lynchings
246:25

M

made 31:17
61:24
62:12
63:17
103:17
144:10
147:12
178:19
184:23

199:12

mail 30:9, 22 32:11, 15,20

main 31:15 35:6 98:14,16 245:18

maintain 42:22 101:16

maintains 92:25

major 92:5

majority 100:12

make 39:22 72:6 81:15 111:18 115:4 134:4 150:1,21 152:18 157:14 165:24 169:20 182:16 229:7 245:15 251:6 256:20

makes 87:16 91:19 127:16 224:23

making 9:10 49:1 60:11 67:16 89:21 133:15 166:21 177:17 183:18

male 56:14 57:8 59:15,19, 21,23,24 107:25

maleness 56:5,6 57:9,13 107:23

males 251:25

man 63:2 80:3 84:21,25 85:1,2 212:24 252:21 254:15

Manabe 44:7

managing 142:15

manifested 55:13 65:13 66:25 170:16 248:9,10 251:9

maqam 95:14

maqams 95:15,16

Marc 18:3

March 224:6 225:13

Marianne 34:16 35:9 36:10 257:5

mark 14:23 117:11 166:19,24 167:3 178:22 191:19 205:17 212:21 226:19

marked 6:21, 23 7:3 117:19 130:12,20 159:1,8 164:9,22 179:14 192:1,11 205:22 206:9 226:21,25 237:19

market 20:7

marking 130:18 179:8 180:15 237:24

marks 61:17 111:22

Marvin 25:20 26:24 27:4,5 35:8

Mary 5:24

mass 246:25 247:1

massacres 247:1

massive 222:3

master 104:15

master's 23:2

masters 15:20 72:16 74:12

masterwork 105:12

mater 238:11,12

material 253:11

matter 5:3 78:4

Mcgill 77:13 120:16

meaning 11:2
37:6
100:20
131:16,18
132:9,10
175:7
208:3
219:20
243:11,12,
15

means 36:15
49:17
50:3,6
77:10,15
89:11 96:2
135:7,25
156:5
157:5
175:6
203:8,9

meant 50:11,
13,19
135:4,23
137:10
175:3
184:19
194:2
201:15
232:24

media 5:2
128:11
141:2,4
222:3,17
230:14

meet 196:2,
6 244:15

meeting
39:10
115:16
197:7
217:16

melodic
105:19

member 23:8,
11,12,13
27:11 66:6
138:23

members
27:8,9
28:19 29:8
71:6
242:23

membership
23:10
210:10

memorandum
51:2

memory 10:25
25:5 54:6
120:2
124:12,15
137:5
201:14
204:25

men 56:1,21
57:19,24
58:16,25
62:13
107:22
252:7,13
253:2
255:1,4

mentee 233:6

mention
63:24
80:24
88:18
100:10,17
174:12,14
235:15,25
242:12

mentioned
23:17
26:23
27:7,24
29:18
43:22 67:9
76:1 80:14
81:2 82:10
88:23
90:24
93:3,4
101:25
116:12,22
120:15
127:4
142:5
148:10
158:12,14
166:12
167:25
188:5,10
191:14
194:11
233:7

mentioning
78:15
118:7

mentions
39:8 99:25
100:3
101:11,17,
22

mentor
230:16

message
185:11,18
186:8,10
189:12
192:18
202:23
205:5
214:8,19
225:3,13
227:18
232:14

messages
12:3 205:8
214:12,15

met 13:16
115:15
116:2,25
186:6
190:14,19
196:24
239:24
254:16

methods
199:5

Metropolitan
66:16
67:11

MHTE 241:1,
11,13,19,

23
Michael 5:15 254:18
Michigan 32:9
mid-december 217:12
middle 26:15 87:10 91:10,18 95:15 171:11 193:22 198:10 229:24
million 96:21
mind 46:21 59:25 60:10 61:11 63:20 76:4 127:11 128:6 167:2 217:14 222:5,19 223:7 234:20 246:18
mine 230:16
minimal 187:14
minor 92:5 105:5,8,10
minus 28:23, 24 212:3,9
minute 155:10 174:7
minutes 29:14,17 30:20 31:17 64:14 143:25 144:1,4 254:4
mirror 250:4,6
mis- 187:13
mischaracterizes 62:2
misquotation 213:22
misquote 165:21 173:12
misquoted 166:6 171:5 173:16 187:13
misreading 213:20
misrepresent 255:2
misrepresenting 210:3,12
misspeaking 229:10
misspoke 232:24
mistake 134:5
mistaken 17:22 138:4 235:7
misunderstand 135:20
misunderstood 209:5
mocked 246:13
model 56:18
moderated 27:5
Modest 234:4
moment 6:25 27:10 117:8,14 191:21 222:3
Monday 211:25
money 59:5 69:1
monitor 5:7
monograph 48:23 49:1 68:21 80:25 135:12 139:21 140:4
month 24:23, 24
months 221:25 233:19
morning 203:22
motion 105:18
mouths 57:18
move 14:19 15:12 43:14 72:4 92:7 226:12
moved 15:22 120:15 239:19
moves 92:6
moving 158:17 252:11 253:16
Mozart 92:13
MTO 122:17
multi-person 25:24
multi-volume 233:23

music 14:23
15:19
16:1,4
17:9
19:17,25
23:5,12,
13,16,21,
24,25
24:2,5,9,
17 25:9,16
26:18
27:24 28:6
29:7
30:19,25
31:15
32:5,7
33:1,9,16,
19,21
34:5,6,18
35:2,10
36:15
39:1,10
42:11,16,
22 43:18,
21 44:1,5,
8,21 45:25
47:3,4,10,
15 48:16,
17 49:1,2,
7 50:14
51:6,24
53:6,10,20
54:12,19,
21,25
55:10,12,
14,15,19
56:1,15,
18,19
57:2,3,20,
25 58:1,10
63:19,22,
25 64:7,12
65:6,8,13
66:13
67:4,13,
15,20,24,
25 68:1,6,
9,11,16
69:15
70:18,22
71:10,12,
16 72:2,8,
20,22
73:6,9,21
74:19,23
75:25 76:7
77:3,13,
19,21
78:13,18
79:5,17
80:1,22
81:21
85:8,9,13,
15,17,19,
23 86:1,9,
11,14,17,
18,21 87:9
88:2,4,9,
12,25
89:6,7,11
90:11,14,
24 91:4,7
92:1,4,5,
6,9,10,14,
20,23
93:8,12,13
94:5 95:2,
3 96:1,5,
7,19,24
97:2,6,13
98:4
102:13,16,
19,20,22
103:7,9,24
104:12,23
105:3,21,
23 106:2,
18 107:2,
3,8 108:2
111:13
115:18
116:13,17
119:11,16
120:8
122:17,22
124:12,20
127:15,18
130:9,11,
21 131:1,
20 132:12,
18 138:24
142:12
146:11
157:21
158:7,8,
17,25
159:5
160:5,11
161:14
164:19,20
165:3,4
168:3,9,
10,23
169:3,11,
23 170:19
178:2
182:15
186:3
190:25
195:2
201:10,24
210:4,7
232:15
233:24
234:1,2,4,
5 241:15
245:2,6,13
246:3,19
247:8,19
248:2,9,19
249:20
250:15
251:9,18,
22 252:1,
11 255:5
258:10

musical
16:11
73:11
90:15
106:5

musicians
73:12

Musicological
23:6 29:3

musicology
89:13,16
252:19

musics 93:12
95:5

musikwissenschaft 89:10

N

naive 208:22
named 115:11 182:6 187:22,24 238:2
names 26:25 92:11
Naperville 20:2
national 131:18 132:11 133:10
naturalization 60:25 168:13,16 169:10,22
naturalized 61:2
nature 9:8 59:9 60:24 107:11 128:9 129:8 163:20
necessaries 15:10
necessarily 13:2 63:14 100:11
necessit- 15:10
needed 18:9 27:10 69:5,6 154:6 235:4 257:10
negative 101:12
Neumeyer 53:8
nice 168:18 176:8 191:1 217:10 244:15
Nineteen 233:2
Nineteenth 100:22
nod 9:15
nods 9:19
non-white 65:17 81:10 170:16
non-whiteness 56:25
nonsensical 169:21
Noriko 44:7
normal 9:14, 16 110:12 155:18
North 6:4,7 20:3 69:9, 11 76:7,24 77:2 115:6 116:10 118:14 120:13 142:6,14 147:22 149:22 151:3 152:14,15, 25 153:13, 25 161:20 162:25 179:13 180:1 181:8 187:21 188:25 191:5 194:16 195:13 196:15 199:10 233:21
Northern 18:2
Norway 249:18,25
Norwegian 250:5
note 95:24 225:24 239:10
notes 117:25 165:23 166:21 167:7
notice 7:7
notion 108:3 113:10 143:23
November 24:22 25:1,2 26:17 31:11 147:22 201:25 208:12 209:9 211:25 213:11,18 216:15 217:5 221:15 229:2
Nu 94:17
number 5:2,5 6:21,24 28:20 38:17 130:18 161:1,9, 11,21 162:17,20 164:10 199:17 207:3

208:8
216:22
226:21
229:23,24
237:25
243:5

numbered
160:17

numbers
180:19,21
181:2
251:15,16

numeral
224:16

numerous
131:16
132:8

nursing
22:22

nutshell
248:4

O

oath 11:3

Oberlin 51:6

object 13:11
166:5
236:3

objection
151:11
165:24
187:15

objectionable
187:10,11

objections
241:25

obligated
11:5

Occasionally
234:21

occurred
216:19

occurs
246:25

October
18:23

octopus
117:17

offer 242:19

offered
16:16

offers 16:6

official
33:12

oftenness
94:6

Ohio 63:1

oldest 65:15

one-page
191:25
192:6

online 30:2,
4,7,13
31:8,10,12
33:16,19,
21 35:23
43:18,21
44:2,19
45:25
47:4,11
48:17 49:7
50:14 53:6
68:7 79:17
81:21 85:8
88:2 98:7,
22 99:1,
13,14
100:1
101:7,12
102:5
108:3
111:13,24
117:24
124:12
127:18
130:12,21
159:7
178:3
192:11

open 30:13
128:9
129:8
157:20,25
158:3,6,9
163:3
164:1
210:5
248:17
253:2

openly
223:16

opera 66:16,
17 67:11

opinion
85:21
129:15,17
140:25
151:13,14
152:7,10
221:24

opinions
141:5,8
209:15,16
228:23
242:16
253:18

opportunity
10:16 41:3
195:22

oppose 84:8

opposing
204:10

opposite
235:1

oral 43:8

orchestra
65:16,18,
23 66:6,9
71:7

orchestras
67:1 71:5,
24

order 16:23
27:11 57:4
108:11
113:18
151:9
168:16

231:5
259:2

ordered
150:3

ordering
108:4
113:11
161:4

ordinary
46:13
149:9,13

organization
23:15

organizations
23:4
240:21

organized
32:14,16

organizing
32:20

origin
121:18

original
44:20,24
45:10
60:21,22
69:17
99:8,13
101:7
136:18
161:6

originally
19:12
44:13 97:7
145:12
164:12

originals
101:10

Oslo 249:20

Oster 88:19

Oswald 88:18
245:24

other's
121:4,10,
22

outline
48:23

outlined
50:22

outlines
154:6

outlook
108:6
113:13

outward-facing
196:20

owned 58:25

owners 62:13
65:9

P

p.m. 114:25
130:7
200:6
217:6
237:16
244:3
259:6

pack 117:24
159:8
192:12

package
34:23

packet
164:13
199:17
207:23

pages 8:7
46:13
99:12,18,
21,23
100:4
101:17,23
125:11
228:3

Painter
5:18,19
7:9 39:13
40:8,11,
15,18,21
43:1 62:1,
5 64:10
69:25
75:1,4,6,
12 111:5,
12,18
112:4,6,9,
12,16,24
113:4
151:11,19
152:1,6
155:14,20,
24 156:3,6
159:12,16,
21 166:22
167:3,9,
13,18
170:5,8
185:5
193:22
210:22
222:6,10
256:4
258:11

Panama-colombia
69:12

pandemic
172:8

panel 27:16
119:11
147:7,16,
21 148:4
153:1,7,10
179:12,25
181:14
188:6,11
191:4
204:16
211:20
218:8
226:25
227:13,20
237:4

panel's
148:8

panic 96:16

paper 28:7
33:21 34:1

38:24
43:16,20
44:16,20
47:8
124:19
125:15,22
145:21
146:2
165:25
166:6
208:18
209:1,4
217:25
257:2,4,5
259:2

paper's
212:20

papers 33:18
38:4,7
44:11,15
45:3
125:22
138:3,11
140:12
144:24
162:12
182:24
183:5,18
186:8,22
187:11
221:7
223:4
231:9

paragraph
125:8
132:16
171:13
212:19
213:5
228:11
230:1
243:6,7

paragraphs
125:9

parallels
88:13

paren 228:9

part 10:6
17:4
22:11,13,14 23:16,20 25:23
45:16
60:20,22
66:5 67:25
68:1 74:8
78:9 80:5,19 81:12,13 92:20
105:22
112:10
136:18
140:21
144:21
145:14
148:18
154:9
157:14
162:12
168:24
169:4
170:24
175:22
195:16
201:6
230:12,13
231:21
245:4
250:14,16

partial 9:19

participate
143:9,15
172:24
174:23
178:13
183:10
184:8,22
185:2
186:14

participated
175:16

participation
141:16
228:14

particulars
152:22

partly
230:15

parts 62:19
95:11
105:23
181:11

party 145:20

pass 35:7
254:5
255:24

passed
136:15

past 42:23
44:6 56:16
74:1 85:17
86:14
156:8
224:16
248:16
249:16

patriarchal
66:1
248:16
251:8

patriarchy
57:13,15
58:6,8
61:11
65:25
84:22 85:3
248:7
255:6

Patricia
30:12,17,18 31:25
32:3

Paul 72:25
73:24

pay 21:8
216:1

PDF 12:19
13:24 14:7
38:22
189:7
257:7,11,22 259:3

Peabody 73:1

peace 19:1

pedagogy
190:16,25

peer 36:1,
5,15,17
37:12,23
38:13,18,
21,24
42:8,13,
17,23
46:16 53:1
122:11,20,
23 123:1
124:13,15,
21 125:16
126:11,19
127:9,13
148:14,16,
23 176:25
235:21
242:3
256:7
258:7,9

pen 166:17

people 16:14
18:17
25:18
27:3,7
30:9,21
47:25
49:13
56:6,11,13
57:24
58:9,20
60:7
67:12,23
73:6 83:19
96:17,21,
22 98:24
101:14
108:9
110:20
113:16
114:5
117:10
129:20
130:19
132:19
145:13
159:7
164:11
168:25
169:1
176:20
177:5
184:13,18
189:6
190:20
191:8
192:11
197:10
217:25
219:25
236:6,19
239:23
248:13,23
249:4,10
250:7,22,
25 251:17
255:22
257:14
258:3

people's
67:21

peoples
93:11

per- 16:13

percent
56:19
210:9
249:5,6,7
251:17
256:23

percentage
249:1,2

perfect
10:17
52:21

perfectly
9:16
110:12
155:18
156:22
246:17,18

performance
16:14

performance-oriented
17:1

performances
55:17

performed
66:18

performing
67:10
71:23

period 92:15
97:8 124:1
157:11
246:23

Perry 47:14,
15 48:19
49:7 53:7

person 41:14
56:13 60:1
61:5
65:17,23
76:13
81:5,9,10
83:13
115:16
144:5
145:12
149:10
162:3
172:10
178:15
183:19
190:19
196:24,25
197:4,8
233:22
235:20
244:16
245:20,23
247:8
248:20
257:18

personal
11:24
37:6,8
41:22
62:20 82:9
242:20
253:10,17,

19

personally 63:6 69:13 77:22 153:24 175:15 230:24 231:19

perspective 56:4

pertaining 12:4

Petersburg 15:25 16:18 17:11,14 18:15,21 19:9

petition 236:13

Ph.d. 16:1,7 17:9 19:17 248:19

phase 49:24 224:13

phenomenon 97:19

Phil 196:3 231:5 250:22

Philadelphia 58:20

philharmonic 65:14

66:4,15,25 67:10 71:5,23

Philip 5:3, 19 6:9 7:2 119:15 130:11 174:2,4,8 184:1,2 191:9 207:6 237:18 258:18

phone 14:25 51:8 176:21

phrase 198:18

phraseology 78:1

phrenologists 67:22

phrenology 114:14

physical 189:10

physically 239:24

physics 94:15,17

picking 101:22

picture 254:17

piece 105:3, 4,10 106:5 116:8 257:2,5

pieces 55:17 177:12

Pimp 44:2 45:6,23

pitches 93:14

pivot 120:19

place 15:3 25:6 145:19 154:15 195:7

places 41:20 214:21

plaintiff 5:17

Plaintiff's 7:1 117:18 130:8 158:24 164:17 179:10 191:24 205:20 226:23 237:17

plan 171:16 172:17

planet 57:25 93:12

96:22

planned 194:12,19, 20,23 203:2,18

planning 194:15

platform 242:22

plausible 222:21,23

play 65:17 66:3

played 232:21

player 66:4

playing 71:6 192:22

pleasure 254:7

plenary 24:5,8 25:12,24 26:17 27:5,18 29:16 33:18,20, 23 34:3,4, 21 35:2, 10,25 36:8 38:25 39:2,9 42:7 43:3, 8,17 79:9

84:15
122:14,22
137:2
139:16
142:20
144:3,12
145:22
146:3,8,9,
18 174:8
177:7
187:17,18
201:5,9,25
224:23
256:9,11,
14,15,19
257:12,21,
25 258:8,9

poignant
246:15

point 19:19
25:19,23
28:23
30:8,11
35:24 48:6
54:18 63:2
66:2 81:2
122:19
134:6
136:22
142:24
156:23
162:20
177:6
198:23
213:19
214:1
215:6
231:10
245:18
253:8

pointing
83:11
156:19
249:23

points
147:11
155:6
158:15
161:12
162:1,5,9
165:12
177:16
221:22
235:24

policies
160:5
163:5

policy
160:10
161:1,9
163:13,23
164:3,5

political
108:11
113:18

popular
246:7

portion
29:16

portions
179:2

position
20:9
196:2,12
240:17
253:22

positions
21:15
71:23

positive
47:13 49:4
67:17

positively
108:19

possession
39:16,17,
24 40:16

possibly
67:23
149:7

post 175:24
194:10
198:10
205:3,19,
21 209:8

post-soviet
18:11

posted
204:21
205:2

posting
209:24

postings
198:21

posts 51:14,
16 205:11

potential
95:9
161:13

potentially
96:20
129:6
188:16

Powell
254:18

power 69:1
92:25 93:1
197:25
231:19
251:18

practice
97:24
190:17

praising
250:23

pre- 121:9

pre-tenure
235:7
236:5,6

precisely
9:12

prefaced
151:16

prefer 84:4
157:16
187:7

preferred
183:13,15

preliminary
15:10

preparation
14:2 40:23

prepare
11:22
13:15

presence 9:9

present
15:16 21:3
27:13
57:21
86:17
125:3
226:7

presentation
43:17
120:24
142:19
207:7
253:18

presentations
201:9

presented
28:15
38:25 43:8
49:13
226:24
227:12
253:12
254:19

presenting
204:18

presents
56:13

president
32:4
241:2,10,
11

presidents
241:10

press 118:14
149:22
152:16
224:11
225:10

Press' 154:1

pressure
193:19
196:19
251:4

pressured
204:8,9
221:6

pressures
253:21

presume
145:10
191:7
199:2
205:10
221:19
231:20
236:20

presumed
188:15

presuming
197:21

pretty 21:12
25:3
65:10,11
75:4
116:23
123:6
197:24
246:5
247:18

prevailed
53:21

prevent
143:8
236:17

prevented
143:14

previous
203:6
205:25
219:1

pried 191:10

primary 97:6

Primer
119:17

principle
161:8,21
162:17

principles
160:14

print 34:7
35:14,15,
19 43:7

printed 34:2
192:15

printout
158:25
159:4
192:6

prior 131:15
196:16

priori
105:11

private
97:1,3

privilege
59:15,17

privileged
12:24 13:3
14:18

privileges
55:4,10,21
57:6 64:19
84:21 85:3

privy 34:25
152:24

pro-ewell
221:6

pro-white
90:13
107:8

prob- 149:11

problematic
212:25
213:2

problems
249:16
251:21

process
34:13
42:13 47:9

48:15
58:13
120:4
125:21,24
126:3
139:24
154:3
157:14
256:13
258:7

processes
122:11

produce 95:7

produced
14:6,12
39:18
40:22
180:22
181:8

production
224:14
232:13,16

profession
160:15

professional
12:1 16:4
19:20 20:4
23:4 31:18
52:15
151:8,18
152:13
177:21
199:11
215:9

professor
6:14 19:25
20:3,19,24
32:6,7
34:18 44:8
47:15 48:7
50:6 51:7
53:10
75:22
77:12
115:5,8,10
116:12
118:3
123:25
130:17
142:11
144:18
152:12
153:19
155:3
159:11,24
164:16,18,
24 165:2
180:14
185:12
200:10
237:24
248:25
252:19

professors
83:3
123:23
142:5
147:7
248:24
249:3,8
251:15

professorship
20:5 21:6

profile
254:17

program
15:21,23
17:20,22
25:14,18
26:23,25
28:16
72:21
74:11 76:7

programs
16:2,6,7
71:12
72:2,9
74:22,23

progression
92:8

progressions
96:3

project
233:19

prolific
98:11

prominent
216:22

promise
226:9

promoted
20:16,20,
23

promotes
160:13

promoting
92:21

promotion
20:19

promulgated
163:6

pronounce
121:12

pronounced
22:3
225:14

proper
145:24
146:6,7

properly
41:23

propertied
58:25

proposal
124:19

propped
57:21

prospective
203:8

protect
207:8

prove 73:12

proved 67:22

provided
152:7
211:19

provision
62:6

pseudoscientific 246:11
pub- 150:4
public 151:3
publically 111:23
publication 34:6 36:2 37:13 38:14 41:18 47:9 49:15 125:7 126:4 139:21 141:25 146:15,24 147:4 148:24 149:15 150:4,10, 12,13 151:9,10 161:4,5,7 162:15 175:20 177:3,11 181:16 195:18 203:8,11 204:11 209:12 221:14 224:24 235:17,19 236:14 240:1 242:2,23 253:12 257:22
publications 33:13 42:7 51:3 53:16,19 126:23 129:22
publish 34:20 51:23 134:15 141:13,19 218:12,13 220:15 221:6
published 28:4 32:24 33:8,18,20 34:5,8 35:3,10 36:1 43:5, 17,21 45:7,8,19, 24 47:3 49:19 50:13,17 53:25 57:20 79:16 111:15 116:9 125:11,16 126:15,18 127:9,17 130:11 134:13,18 135:10,22 136:8,13 137:10,17 139:2 140:8 147:21 149:21 150:5,6 153:10,17, 25 157:22 177:5 178:7 201:10,15, 23 210:5 220:23 223:1 242:21 254:18 258:1,2,5
publishing 34:13 48:16 118:7 119:7 120:4 125:21 134:24 142:3 150:4 152:16 198:25 220:19
pulled 44:17 45:13
purpose 10:10 41:6 68:17 70:18 200:13
purposes 9:17 39:23 40:4 237:25 252:10
pushback 198:24
pushed 53:13,15 245:11
put 8:22 12:19 13:24 31:21 48:3 55:14,25 56:20 57:18 58:2 85:10 90:16 95:24 128:25 138:18 139:13 142:7 143:6 144:4 147:8 155:4 156:5 157:20 231:12 242:10,11 247:14 248:22

257:10

putting
38:21
86:19
120:20
233:23
247:4

Q

Q&as 146:11

qualify
128:6
215:3

qualms
213:17

Quartet 18:4

Queens 15:21

question
8:13,21
9:20,22,24
10:4,11
11:9,10,
12,15,17
26:16
38:10 40:9
42:14
52:11,22
56:22
57:10
59:12
60:18 62:8
63:16
64:22 65:5
66:10,23
67:3,4
68:3 69:18
70:15
71:11,14
72:4 73:17
74:16,20
78:13
80:4,15
88:20 90:5
91:8,23
102:25
103:2,5
106:18,22
109:6,12,
13,16
113:6
114:17
127:23
132:22,23
135:5,16,
20,24
137:9,15,
18 146:5
149:6
151:17
153:22
155:13,18
156:11
158:2
161:6
162:14
163:18
168:11
170:8
185:12
190:6
199:23
205:24
209:22
210:23,24
211:2,4,8,
10 218:5
222:14
242:11
247:10,13,
21,23,25
248:17,18
252:3
254:22
256:6

questioning
76:4

questions
6:20 8:5,9
10:19 12:4
13:9 15:13
44:23 54:4
75:24
77:18
126:14
133:16
143:5,7
151:22
166:3
176:6,7
200:11
205:25
226:10,16
227:9
231:6,14
234:16
243:20
244:8
252:16
253:6
254:13,25
258:12,14

quick 138:6

Quimby 5:24

quotation
111:22
112:1,7,14
113:9
131:22

quotations
140:17
165:25
167:25

quote 55:6
57:5
108:2,17,
19 110:25
112:21
116:23
129:10
131:9,12,
15 132:5
153:1
168:2,5,21
171:12
179:24
193:18
222:4,19

quoted
108:16
109:8
110:11
112:21
172:23

quotes
139:14
165:13

166:14

quoting
108:18
132:25

R

R&r 50:3

rabbit 157:4
249:17
250:11

race 44:6
57:14
65:11
100:1,6,
10,11,12,
14,19,21,
23 101:2,
11,25
135:11
246:2,25
247:1,17
248:1
255:5

races 56:24
114:15

Rachel
237:19
238:2,8,
21,23
239:11,19,
24 241:11
243:10

racial 24:9,
17 27:25
28:6 33:2
44:22 47:5
48:16
54:11,13,
17,20,24
55:3,9
64:7,11,18
65:6,7
66:23
67:5,7,22
68:7,16
70:16,17,
22 71:18
72:7,22
74:16
77:19,21,
25 78:7,
11,13,17
79:5,19
80:1 88:4,
9 90:2,10,
18 107:9
127:15
130:10
131:2,18
132:10
133:10
168:3,24
169:11,23
245:10,13
246:8
247:9
249:15,16
251:19

racialized
56:3 57:2

racially
92:22

racism 77:11
84:3 85:17
135:11
164:19
165:3
243:3,11,
13 246:8
249:24

racist
76:17,20,
21 77:16
83:18,21
85:16
134:24,25
135:3,6,
10,11,15,
17,19,23,
25 136:3
208:21
209:6,25
213:2,21
222:18
246:12,21,
23 251:1

racist,'
168:9

Radical
62:21 63:1

ragas 95:13

raise 154:14
164:2,4
176:2,9,13
187:15

raised
158:15
164:1
221:22

raises 21:8

raising
163:22

ran 115:19

rank 21:4
197:19

rare 83:13

rarely
205:11

Rasse 100:10

Raz 233:22

re-notice
7:2,15
8:15,19

reach
145:11,15
157:13
235:13
242:3

reached
175:15,19
177:9
252:13

read 36:8
55:16 99:5
106:15
110:5
113:21
119:18
121:4,10,
22 131:9
132:20
133:1

139:1,5,7,
13 140:8,
12 141:1,
14 147:6,
9,13,16
148:7
152:25
157:12
161:15,22
165:6
166:1,8,9
168:19
169:6
171:16,18
172:16,24
173:1,11,
13 174:16
175:11
177:10
179:1
181:25
185:20
194:13
198:15
201:11
203:12
205:1,3,11
206:13
207:14
208:23
211:3,6
216:25
217:18
219:22
220:16
221:21
224:25
226:1
230:17
232:18
242:7
257:3,12,
21

reading
78:10
101:5,6
194:7,10
205:13
206:2
225:24
252:24

realize 56:4
57:15

realizing
56:21

reason
42:10,15,
19 73:14
80:9,19
89:6
99:20,22
102:22
125:20
141:17
149:6
165:20
171:4
178:11,14,
18 186:7
197:8
226:3
231:18
235:3
236:2
245:16
253:10,14

reasonable
101:5
156:22
221:18
223:12

rebuttals
171:16
172:16

rec- 163:8

recall
37:16,19,
22 38:18
101:13,15
115:15
120:6,22
122:5,22
126:3,8,12
127:12
135:8
136:20
148:2
163:10
164:4
165:23
172:2,9
191:13
204:23
214:17,22
215:7,11
218:1
242:5

receive
182:20
183:9
184:6

received
8:12 16:17
25:9,11
30:1 46:22
84:16
144:24
182:17
184:7,11,
14,21
185:2
186:11

recess 26:8
75:17
114:24
130:6
200:5
237:15
244:2

recognize
8:14
182:11
238:4

recoll-
159:16

recollection
37:11
113:20
125:17
158:5
188:2,20
194:4
236:15
240:25

recommendation
49:16

reconstruction

62:24

record 9:2, 11,18 11:21 12:9 13:8 16:9 21:21 26:3,7,11 35:12 36:14 39:6,15, 20,22 40:7 41:2 49:12 63:3 75:7, 11,20 87:5 91:2,13, 17,25 104:11 111:2 112:19 114:20,23 115:2,13, 25 117:5, 9,22 125:6 130:3,5, 15,18,23 131:10 133:1 134:5 145:5 147:20 155:5,13 156:5 159:4 164:9,13 165:1 167:8,16 178:23 179:8 180:23 181:12,20 182:13 191:20 198:16 200:2,4,8 205:18 226:20 237:12,14, 22,25 239:5 241:14 243:22 244:1,5,17 255:18 258:24

recorded 165:22

recording 257:1

records 38:7,13 39:16,17 41:22,23 42:23 204:15

recouple 132:17

recoupling 133:5

REDIRECT 254:10

refer 46:7 72:24,25 105:4 199:16

reference 163:23

referenced 209:11

referred 21:22 118:9

referred-to 211:5

referring 24:2 60:4, 15 111:7 118:25 119:12 121:11,24 155:21,25 171:20 181:1 194:18 196:23 208:18,25 239:7

reflect 12:9

reformed 85:8

Reframing 25:16

refuse 70:13

regard 104:4 107:23 213:6

regional 23:22

regret 230:8

regrets 232:19

regular 233:12,14

relate 247:15

related 42:17 106:13,16 161:14 169:23 228:25

relationship 103:22 104:1 107:10 110:18 114:2,12 136:7,21 245:1

relationships 200:15

relaxation 50:4

relevant 12:17 48:7 165:10

relied 107:2

relying 101:7,9

remarkable 224:24

remember 24:19

25:19
26:25
36:12
42:4,6
44:6 46:24
64:22
115:16
122:10
123:11
138:16
147:19,25
148:20
159:17
163:5,8,22
165:15
187:12
188:7
189:11,21
191:16
192:18
204:20
206:2
214:11
218:7,14,
16 238:6

remembered
120:1
235:24

remembers
112:20

remind 178:4

remote
130:19
215:4

remotely
244:16

remove 30:20

removed
30:6,8

Renaldo 6:5

repeat 38:10
42:14 49:3
55:8 69:17
77:14
78:12
103:13
222:14

repeatedly
184:23

repertoire
55:18,23,
24

rephrase
61:21 83:7
91:23
135:20

replication
43:13

replied
153:6

reply 153:6

replying
189:17

report
147:17
148:8
153:1,7,
10,16
174:15
218:8
231:24

reporter
5:9,13
6:25 7:8
9:1 26:1
46:4 63:10
117:6,8,
14,17
177:24
191:21
192:3
211:6
259:4

reports
174:17

repository
98:22,23

represent
7:15 96:19
165:1
179:21
224:8

representative
100:4

represented
92:14
227:7

representing
229:17
237:3

represents
107:7
183:25

reproduce
257:7

Republican
62:21 63:2

republication
258:8

republish
256:16

republished
256:15

reputation
41:16

request
38:17 39:6
247:23

requested
12:12,18
38:16

requests
46:5 63:11
177:25
217:16

requires
10:5

reread
110:23
112:25
113:9
201:20

research
43:16

reserve
255:25

residing
6:10

respect
12:11
104:1
161:12
162:4,8
175:23
234:18

respond
139:9
143:24
144:15
154:11
162:11
184:15,18

responded
143:7
154:5
176:4
184:19
231:13
255:13

respondent
145:8
225:22

responding
36:12
37:19
46:24
144:6
145:13
162:3
176:20

response
8:18 14:6,13 32:12
43:25
44:20,25
153:9,17
162:3
174:7
175:25
192:25
194:11
195:23,25
217:4,9,12
225:24
230:10
254:24
255:16

responses
137:2
139:13,14,15 140:8
141:1
143:6
144:4,7,11
176:6
183:21
198:12
203:10
216:21
220:12,15,19,22
221:19
229:1
230:10
231:3,8

responsibility
207:8

responsible
58:8,11
178:12,19
216:21

responsive
39:5,25
40:9,13

rest 50:4
97:19

resubmit
49:10
50:3,20,25
53:4 80:17
82:2

result
198:12
251:14,19

resulted
27:17

retired 51:4
53:10 78:2

retrievable
190:2

retrospect
230:3,8

return 17:10
63:19

returning
65:5

review 36:2,5,15,17,24,25
37:4,12,15
38:13,18,21,24
41:4,18
42:13,17
122:21
123:2
124:21
126:3,11,19 127:2,3
148:14,16,23 159:23
183:2
208:6
226:24
227:12,19
235:21
242:3
256:7
258:7

reviewed
42:8
46:16,22
53:1
122:11,23
124:13,24
125:16
127:9,13
176:25
258:9

reviewer
123:6,7

reviewer's
37:17,20

reviewers
36:12
37:1,8
46:18

reviewers'
46:22,25

reviewing
192:5

reviews
37:23
42:23
47:12 49:4
80:16
124:16

revise 49:10
50:20,25
53:4 80:17
82:2 83:25

revise-and-resubmit
49:16

revised 50:2

revision
80:16

revisions
49:5,18
50:9,16,24
54:1 80:17

rewrote
45:16

Rezvoi 234:5

rich 96:19

Richard 5:18
7:5 156:10
166:21
177:12
179:7
221:1

Richmond
228:5,6
230:7

rid 85:5
97:3

Riemann
97:15 98:2

right-hand
192:14

rigorous
255:15

road 9:12
16:3

role 63:22,
25 180:2
187:20
190:9
229:14
232:20,22

room 8:4

rooted 54:22
58:4

roughly
22:18
56:10
68:23
92:14,18
144:3
194:21
249:6

routine 73:5

rubric
174:10

rulebook
59:1,8

rules 9:12
51:14,23,
25 52:7,13
53:23
58:17
81:24
160:7
176:20

running
100:19

Russia 15:24
18:7,8
36:24

Russian
18:16
116:16
119:11,16
120:8
121:16,17
195:2
234:1,5

Russianist
77:7 195:3
232:3

S

sake 125:5

Salzer 88:18

Sanford
65:20

Satz 98:15

save 253:7

scale 105:20

scare 139:14

scenes 58:14
80:7 96:17
152:23

Schenker
86:25
87:2,4,7,
23 88:3
90:2,6,9,
16 97:5,18
98:3,7,13,
21 99:14,
25 101:6,
12,25
102:4
104:2,6
105:13
106:22
108:5,14
113:12
131:17
132:9
133:13
143:25
144:2,3
208:18
212:24
245:9,13,
17,18,19
246:1,6,11
247:3,7
251:22

Schenker's
99:4,13
101:12
102:7,13,
17 106:18
107:3,20
114:2,13
131:18

132:10,17
133:11
212:20
245:2
251:20

Schenkerian
133:20,25
134:7,16,
23 135:9,
19 136:7
137:11
140:3
141:13,18
142:2
143:10
146:16
147:3
148:4
149:4,17,
21 150:6
152:16
154:1,17,
21 157:23
158:13
162:7,16,
23 163:4,
24 171:22
173:8,9,
10,17,19
175:11
178:7
180:2
182:23
183:10,22
184:23
185:3,7
188:16
189:3
190:12,22
191:14
193:4
195:18
198:4
199:6
207:9
209:12
210:6,20
211:11
213:4
227:15
231:21
233:20
242:1

Schenkerians
216:22
217:14

Schichte
104:22

scholar
108:15
128:7
129:18

scholars
65:11
78:23
88:21
160:21
247:17
248:2

scholarship
78:24
110:13
161:13
196:20
234:10
246:2

school 22:22
67:13 77:3
82:23
111:12
199:12
232:15
252:13

schools 76:2

science
89:11

scope 28:25
29:7

Scots 58:22

script
257:15

scripted
257:20

scrutiny
183:20
186:19

search 38:6,
12 168:13
214:14

searched
102:1,4
214:12

Seashore
73:9

seat 252:7

Sebastian
92:12

section
131:5
234:4

Seegal
177:13

Segall
116:12
120:20
121:21
125:23

Segall's
123:17

segregation
246:8

segregationism
251:19

select 58:2

selected
25:12
26:16

selecting
27:16
58:9,12

selection
58:13

selective
179:2

sending
30:21
238:6

sense 29:2,9
52:19
55:22
90:11

125:1,15
127:16
154:2
157:13
161:25
162:18,19
177:8
245:12

sentence
132:3,16
193:12
194:6
201:3
203:7
207:5
208:16
228:17,21
231:1

sentences
194:5

separate
34:3 47:2

Separately
142:17

September
5:6

sequentially
29:21

series
119:12
180:23

service 66:4

serving
123:19

session
25:15,24
27:6
29:16,23
30:12
31:23 43:3
84:15
116:15
122:6
144:3
187:17,19
201:5

sessions
42:8

set 258:4

sets 127:5

settings
73:22

sevens
223:22

seventies
252:20

severed
132:17
133:6

sexist 251:1

shift 96:11

short 29:1
63:14
75:23
91:10
116:10
126:20
247:10

shortly
147:18

show 251:6

showed
210:13

shown 28:11
47:23
231:23

shows 112:19

Shut 66:19

sic 57:18
133:19
201:21
242:22

side 8:24
99:7,8,9

sided 82:24

sign 128:5

signatories
158:9,10
210:8

signed
202:10
218:23
236:19,25

significant
100:7
101:18,20,
21 193:19
234:6,9

signing
236:18

silence
198:13,19
199:3,4
225:5

silent
117:15

silly 252:3

similar
83:4,6
169:9
247:14

simple 96:11
102:22
105:18
151:25
168:13

simpler
222:2

simplest
222:16

simply 10:15
14:24 15:2
66:2
107:18
143:5
151:14
157:14
176:5
181:15
230:10
250:11

sincerely
198:13
242:23

single 36:23
209:18,19

singly-anonymous 36:25
singly-blind 36:18
sir 191:22
sit 42:3 148:22 204:25
situation 149:12 193:10 248:22
skimmed 207:1
skin 100:22
skip 161:11 171:8 194:5 202:1 207:2 216:12 217:3 223:20 224:16 228:3 229:19
slaughtered 246:24
slave 60:20 62:13 65:9 69:1
slaves 59:1
slide 256:19
slides 142:19,24
slightly 85:18 97:16 205:14 212:24 255:3
slot 28:17
Slottow 142:9,18 144:18 188:10 202:15 220:2 231:24
smack 229:24
small 116:10 198:6 249:17
SMT 24:1,25 27:8 28:19 30:16 81:17 84:15 119:11,25 138:17,20,24 142:20 144:24 158:20 159:8 160:10 161:9 162:21 163:3,12,22 183:5 186:2 201:5 207:6 208:18 209:1,18 222:17 224:23 236:20
SMT-ANNOUNCE 186:9
Smt-announce@societymusictheory.org. 182:10
Snyder 252:17
so-called 56:15 105:3 153:6 193:15 204:16 211:20 218:7 227:12 237:4
social 22:23 128:11 141:2,4 222:3,17 230:14
societies 23:4 29:2 52:12,15 160:4
society 23:5,6,12,13,16,20,22,24 24:2,5 25:9 26:18 29:4,7 30:19,25 31:15 32:5 33:8 34:6 35:2 39:1,9 42:11,16,22 51:24 52:6 53:20 56:7 66:13 115:18 124:19 138:24 157:21 158:7,17,25 159:5 160:4,11 186:3 210:4,7 250:17
sociological 54:18
sociologist 54:14 78:3
sociologists 248:1
sole 181:4 224:21
solely 178:12

227:13

solicit
122:1
216:21
223:4,5

solicitation
122:4

Somali 250:8

son 172:14

sort 202:4
225:4

sorts 175:25

sought
214:3,6

sound 93:16, 17,18,21
169:21
209:3
217:20

sounding
95:5

sounds 18:17
53:3 58:12
73:15
87:16
136:9
169:21
196:6
220:18

source
108:15

Soviet
18:10,17

spans 125:11

speak 11:10
91:20 99:3
154:10
210:9
234:20
236:7,8
240:14

speaker
216:1

speakers
27:16

speaking
25:19 57:9
257:15,17

spearheading
233:25

special
16:23
137:9
204:13
224:9,10

specialty
89:9

specific
71:19
75:24 76:9
83:18
106:17
128:19
156:7
183:19
242:13
247:24
253:25

specifically
38:20 53:7
57:3 59:13
74:6
135:15
184:10,11
195:17
236:16
247:12

Spectrum
34:5,8,14
35:11,13
36:1 37:13
38:13
41:18 42:8
43:5 81:19
122:17
126:16
127:22
201:10,15, 24 203:8

speculating
145:9

speculation
63:7 222:6

speech 61:16
62:11

spell 111:1

spend 217:2

spent 249:18

Spicer 14:23

spills
202:12
219:7

spoke 43:13
109:25
144:2
172:9
235:10
256:23

spoken
163:13
235:4
236:3
244:18

spread 213:2

spring 32:1

St 15:25
16:18
17:11,14
18:15,21
19:9

staff
178:16,20

stamp 192:13

stances
108:9
113:16

stand 70:14
148:8

standard
144:8
146:22
149:1,14
153:15
176:19
199:10

standards

183:14,24

stands 46:21
193:4
241:13

Stanford
15:17

start 17:12
71:2,8
155:3
187:24
247:2

start- 224:2

started 9:7
96:23
119:20
221:11

starting
15:15
17:13
172:9

state 10:15
16:9 23:14
47:15
85:25
87:15
129:11
135:12
151:5,8,
21,24
161:19
209:22

stated
230:25

statement
10:7 52:8
97:4 98:5
109:19
110:16,17
112:25
114:1
158:20,22
159:9
184:21
201:19,22

statements
63:17

states 16:15
19:6 29:8
55:1 56:23
57:21,22
58:4,9
61:14
62:19 64:3
66:2,24
69:2,4,6,
10 70:18,
23 72:22
78:18 79:6
81:13
83:13 89:3
90:4 96:8
106:24
107:21
150:25
168:12,17
170:21
171:2,3
219:1
245:3,7
246:16
248:8
249:13
250:23
251:10

stations
169:19

statistic
251:12

status 82:2

steady
108:10
113:17

Steffy 66:6

step 183:16

Stephen
142:9,17
188:10
202:15
221:3

steps 67:17

Steven
231:24

sticks 28:20

stir 208:19

stop 94:12
121:9
150:13
152:16
174:3,9

stopped
150:10,11

story 247:5

Stowers 6:5,
6

strains
107:6

strange
138:8
140:18,22
141:9,22
184:2

strangely
43:25

Straus 25:21
26:22
28:12 35:8

street 6:10
115:20

strict 108:3
113:10

strike
125:19
158:1
232:10
254:23

strikes
208:22

string
228:24
229:1

strong
103:14

strongly
160:4

struck
140:21
141:21

struct-
105:2

structural
105:17
169:4
170:2,11
243:3
251:7,8

structure
61:8
105:2,18
106:4
232:21

structures
69:14
104:25
106:12
170:25

struggles
83:4,6

student
67:19 73:1
74:12,13
185:23
188:1,2,8
189:1
190:11
196:14,15,
18 197:13,
22 206:20
213:10
238:9
240:17,19,
20,24
241:1,12

students
16:24
55:18
56:17
71:10,12
72:16
74:21
76:5,23
88:15 90:3
188:13,15
196:13
240:12,15,
21 241:23
252:14

studied
18:2,3
86:24

studies
133:20,25
134:7,16,
23 135:9,
19 136:8
137:11
140:3
141:13,18
142:2
143:10
146:16
147:4
148:5
149:4,17,
21 150:6
152:17
154:1,17,
21 157:23
158:13
162:8,16,
23 163:4,
24 171:22
173:8,9,
10,17,19,
20 175:11
178:7
180:2
182:23
183:10,22
184:23
185:3,8
188:16
189:4
190:12,22
191:15
193:5
195:18
198:4
199:6
209:12
210:6,20
211:11
227:15
231:22
233:21
242:1
246:2

studio 45:4

study 15:24
17:18,21
18:7,14
55:16
56:20
57:14
72:13,20
73:1

stuff 18:2
89:22
141:11

sub- 138:9

subcontinent
95:14

subframe
90:13
107:8

subheading
228:8

subject
161:14
231:2

subjected
125:23
126:11,18

submission
141:20
220:5

submissions
141:21

submit 27:15
138:9
177:10

submitted
14:1 36:7
47:10
121:3
179:11,24

subordinate
106:4

subpoena
8:11,14,19
12:4,16
14:6,13,21

15:2 38:16
39:25

subscribe
184:12

subscriber
138:19

subsection
131:8

substance
13:5 54:4

substantive
191:17
216:9
229:7

substituted
183:19

succinctly
244:25

sudden 223:6

suffering
10:24

suggest
41:10
175:14
209:7

suggested
25:22
26:22
28:16
208:20

suggesting
78:16
108:21
227:5

suggestion
134:22
174:2

suggestions
229:7

suicide
87:17

sum 168:15
214:22

summarize
49:17
143:17
244:25

summary
57:17

summer 17:15
32:2
249:18

sup- 61:24

superior
106:9

superiority
170:13

support
36:22
59:15,21,
23 61:25

supported
177:6

supporting
60:19

supportive
177:16

supports
61:18

suppose
127:10
225:23
227:16
241:23

supposed
227:14

supposedly
199:5

suppressing
161:5,7
162:15

suppression
161:18

supremacist
61:7 65:12
66:11
170:25
248:16
251:8
257:19

supremacy
54:23
57:16,22
58:6,8
59:19,22,
24,25
61:11,19
62:14 67:7
68:8,17
70:19
110:19
248:6

surmise 82:5
84:10,11,
12,14

surprise
122:23

surprised
51:21,22
136:19

Suzannah
220:25

swear 5:13

swirling
44:4

sworn 6:11

symphony
65:15

symposia
187:8

symposium
45:23
137:2,10,
17,22
139:2,10
140:9,11,
12,21
141:7,14,
19,25
142:3
143:10
144:11,23
145:14
146:2,3,15
147:4
150:5
151:10

153:25
154:7,12
157:22
175:11
177:6
178:7
181:16
204:13
224:10

symposiums
144:8

synonym
100:18

system 6:4,7
90:11
92:24
104:12
107:1,19
249:9
257:19

systems
95:12,14

T

t-o-n 102:3

table 28:5
93:23
119:3,15
191:1
197:11
252:7,8,10

takes 168:12
224:21

taking 11:3
143:23
165:23

talk 24:5,
8,20 25:9,
13 26:17
27:18,21
29:12,13,
25 30:10,
21 31:2,8
32:23
33:20 34:7
35:25
43:3,17
63:15 79:9
86:23 96:1
115:5
129:4
137:2
142:20
145:13,22
146:3,18
154:16
174:8
177:7
187:20
190:21,24
191:8
199:14
200:14
201:6,25
207:11
209:10
212:3,8
213:6,10,
13,18
215:4,5,
12,18,21
216:6,7
227:19
228:24
229:13
238:17,18
239:14,16,
20 244:21
249:19
250:22
253:20,24
256:9,11,
14,15,25
257:3,16,
21,23
258:4

talked 38:22
54:17
122:14
126:16,17
148:14
191:2
248:23

talking 43:4
64:4,13,16
69:14
75:23
79:22
94:4,14
98:1 100:6
111:10
119:7,24
122:20
158:21
168:2,10
199:2
203:6
216:4
220:25
226:13

talks 27:3
29:18
33:18
34:4,21
35:2,10
122:22
201:9
239:14
249:19
257:8,25
258:8,9

tape 257:1

taps 93:22

targeted
244:10

taught 70:23
78:18 79:5

teach 71:13
72:3

teaching
22:7,9
120:12

team 49:8
128:24

technical
26:4,14

Ted 129:4

teeth 242:11

telling
109:24
225:3

tells 56:17

ten 55:24

92:3 139:9
169:19

ten-minute
176:21

Tennessee
19:22

tenure 20:1, 11,18
80:21 81:3
82:8,12
83:1,5,9, 20 84:8
123:23
124:8,10
197:25
235:10
236:17
251:18

tenured
20:20 66:6
124:5
197:24
198:1

Terence
66:19

term 69:5, 6,7 70:5
84:5 89:7
93:4,5
214:14
243:15

terminal
23:2

terms 21:4,9
31:5 54:10
72:25
80:13 91:3
100:6
104:10
198:5
234:7

testified
6:12 43:15
111:15
138:22
152:5
160:3
169:9
182:19
183:8
197:12
206:20
230:19
243:15
254:24

testify 10:1
156:1

testifying
155:2
223:10

testimony
8:18
118:25
145:2
189:24
197:17
255:2
256:12

Texas 6:4,7
76:7,24
77:2 78:3
115:6
116:10
118:14
120:13
142:6,14
147:22
149:22
151:3,5
152:15
153:1,25
161:20
162:25
179:14
180:1
181:8
187:21
188:25
191:5
194:16
195:13
196:15
199:10
233:21

Texas'
153:13

Texas-austin
34:19
53:11

text 99:8
211:5
256:20
257:7

textbook
85:22
86:1,7,18, 21

textbooks
86:14

Thad 5:15

then-president
30:19

theoretical
107:4
213:1,20

Theoria
116:9
117:19,25
118:10,12
119:8
120:5
125:13,16
128:2

theories
90:16 98:2
102:16
103:15
106:18
107:20
114:13,15

theorist
73:9 87:10
234:2,3,4, 5

theorists
55:15,25
56:16,20
58:10
88:25 89:7
96:1 97:6, 13 98:4
158:8
182:15

246:3

theorized
57:25

theory 17:9
19:17,25
23:5,13,
16,21,24,
25 24:2,5,
9 25:10,16
26:18
27:24 29:7
30:19,25
31:15
32:5,7
33:1,9,16,
19,21
34:5,6,18
35:2,10
36:16 39:1
42:11,16,
22 43:18,
21 44:2,5,
8,21 45:25
47:4,11,15
48:16,17
49:1,7
50:14
51:6,24
53:6,10,20
54:12,19,
21,25
55:10,12,
13,15
56:2,18
57:3,20
63:19,22,
25 64:7,12
65:6,8
66:14
67:4,13
68:1,7,9,
11,16
70:18,22
71:13,17
72:2,8,20,
23 75:25
76:7
77:13,19,
21 78:14,
18 79:5,17
80:1 81:21
85:8,9,13,
15,17,19,
23 86:1,9,
11,14,17,
18,21
88:2,4,9,
12 90:12
91:4 92:6
95:2,3
96:5,7,19
97:2
102:13,19
103:7,24
104:7,9,12
105:21,23
106:2,3
107:2,3,11
108:2,7
110:19
111:13
113:14
114:2,4,13
115:18
116:13,17
119:11,17
120:8
122:17,22
124:12,20
127:15,18
130:9,12,
21 131:1
138:24
142:12
146:11
157:21
158:7,17,
25 159:6
160:5,11
161:14
164:20
165:3
168:3,9,23
169:3,11
170:20
178:2
186:3
190:25
195:3
201:10,24
210:4,7
229:3
233:24
234:1
241:15
245:2,6
246:19
247:19
248:2,10,
19 250:15
251:9,18,
22 252:11
255:5

theory's
24:17 28:6
39:10
92:20
107:9
169:23
245:13
247:8
252:1

thesis
248:3,5

thick 199:17
233:23

thin 68:24

thing 6:15
34:3 44:19
52:4 59:5
119:24
136:19,23
166:9
176:17
182:9
184:2
187:3
207:20
210:19
230:25
239:12
246:4
247:24

things 9:14
44:4 49:3
51:19
60:11
63:15
68:13

81:15
98:20
107:6
140:23
146:14
147:2
148:7,15,
19 155:1
169:15
176:15
189:20
195:20
200:11,13,
15 202:23
207:18
223:13
227:7
235:25
237:2
238:17
242:13
247:4,15
248:21
250:19,20
253:25

thinking
96:6,24
255:12

Thomas
233:21
234:2

thought
28:14
51:20 52:3
102:21
134:2
136:11
140:18
141:17
146:14
150:23
183:14,16
189:1
190:11,13
196:13,17
197:13
207:11
227:15
240:16

thought-provoking
252:22

thoughtful
252:23

thoughts
220:5

thousands
99:21,23
100:3
184:13,17
246:23,24

threatened
235:9

three-
125:2,7

three-fifths
60:1,2,21

three-week
138:8

thrown
145:20

tied 57:15

Tim 202:19
203:25

time 5:7
6:17 7:23,
24 9:25
13:12 16:1
17:4 25:6
26:7,11
29:20 31:8
32:5 33:6
34:15
47:11,14
48:18
50:11,15
51:3 54:6
60:7 62:14
68:18
73:16
75:15,20
80:22
114:23
115:2,15
116:2
120:9,13
124:1,8
130:5,15
134:22
135:3,9,22
136:8,10
137:4,23
138:23
139:19,20
140:8,11
156:7
157:11
159:20
163:13,18,
23 164:25
169:1
172:21
174:16,19
175:4,8
176:13
184:24
188:25
190:15,19
192:25
194:16,17
196:2
197:21
200:4,8
206:3,14,
16 207:16
214:2
217:2
218:4
222:25
224:9
230:23
235:8,16
236:4
237:14,22
239:23
240:16
244:1,5
249:18
253:7
254:6
257:6
258:19,21

timeframe
230:20

timeline

175:18
221:9

timely
230:12

times 33:23
102:6
213:23
254:17

Timothy 5:4, 16 32:11, 17 76:10
104:3
115:7
134:20
136:6,17
137:6
142:15
153:5
158:14
178:12,18
179:12,24
180:1
181:14
188:9
202:11,14, 16 203:17
207:7
208:3,17
216:14,17
217:24
218:11
219:20
227:14
231:24
236:9,11, 13 237:5
240:5
254:14,16, 20 255:7, 13

title 24:8
28:1 79:20
119:10
165:2
231:2

titled 27:19
33:1 131:1
164:18

titles 21:10

today 8:18
9:18 10:20
11:23 42:3
68:14
73:16
74:14,22
86:9 92:19
93:9
138:22
145:2
148:22
155:2
165:11
169:9
171:25
183:9
189:25
204:25
230:19
243:16
247:24
251:25
254:1

today's 5:6
247:8

told 34:24
67:20,23
143:2
173:3
191:8
201:6,7

tomorrow
217:15,16

ton 102:3

tonal 90:14, 24 91:7
92:1,4,10, 14,22 93:8
97:6
102:19
103:24
105:2
107:19
110:19

tonalities
95:18

tonality
92:23
95:9,22,25
96:7 104:9

tone 102:1, 2,3,5
106:9

tones 95:9
104:7
106:3
107:11
108:4
113:11
114:3,13
133:11

tonic 105:19

top 218:4, 21 241:16, 17 248:11

topic 78:8
128:14
132:16

tortoise
100:13

total 29:19

touch 34:20

tough 163:7

traditional
44:14

traditions
96:20

transcribed
98:23

transcript
259:1

transition
86:23
115:4

transitioned
64:16,24

transitioning
18:10

translated
98:24
234:6

translation 99:8 101:8
translations 99:5 101:9
travel 59:6
traveled 106:23
treated 157:9,10
triads 92:7
trip 135:13
troubling 212:21
true 57:23 98:5 108:1 149:25 150:18 152:14 181:19 186:25 210:3 213:23 223:11,13 233:4 255:21,23
trumpeter 66:20
truth 11:6
truthfully 10:19
Turkey 95:14
Turkish 95:16
turn 38:9 52:25 54:3 72:17 131:4 133:18 244:7
turnaround 138:6,9
turning 120:24
turns 119:24
turtle 100:13
tweets 171:15
twenty 65:22
Twenty-two 153:20
twin 58:5
Twitter 140:13,14,16 171:21 172:1 189:12,25 198:21 214:19
two-year 15:22 22:22 81:3
type 129:1 240:17 258:6
Typical 92:10
typo 203:9

U

U.S. 29:9 169:1
uh-huh 7:18 8:1,10 9:15 12:23,25 13:18,20,22,25 14:9 16:11 17:2,7,17,19 18:12,22,24 19:4,15,18,23 20:21 21:11,24 25:7,17 27:2,12,23 28:3,10,13,22 29:5 30:15,23 31:13,19,22 33:24 34:12,17,22 35:4,17 36:9,19 37:9 38:5 40:14 41:8 43:19,24 45:12,15,18 46:9,23 47:1,10,17 48:9,14,20,24 49:6,14,25 50:10,12,18,21,23 51:5,12,18 53:9,13,18,22,24 54:8,15 57:7 60:17 61:3 64:6,21,23 65:2,4 67:2,9 74:10 77:6,8,10 79:3,11 87:8,24 88:16,22,24 90:25 91:24 93:2 94:11,16,19 95:8,17,21 96:10,13,15 97:21,25 98:12,17 103:16 105:15 110:10 114:6,8 115:22 116:18 118:23 119:4,9 120:10,14,21,25 121:6,23 123:3,18,24 124:4,

23 127:6
128:15
131:7,14
132:4
136:12,16
137:3,25
138:10,14
140:19
142:13
143:1,3
147:10
148:12
158:11
159:19
161:16,24
165:14
166:10,13,
15 167:23
168:7
170:15
171:10
172:5,12,
19 177:14
179:4,20
180:20,25
181:17
182:3,5,8
185:17
188:18
189:9,19
191:23
192:8,20
193:6,13,
23,24
194:8
196:10
199:1,18,
25 200:17,
20,23
201:1
202:3,6,25
203:16,19,
24 204:1,
3,17
206:18,22
207:4,21,
24 208:5,
7,10,13
211:18,21,
23 212:6
213:8
214:13
215:13,17,
19 216:16
218:9,24
219:8,15,
19 220:1,
3,9 221:2,
10,13
223:3
224:5,7,
15,18
225:12
227:24
228:6,7,
10,12,15
229:12,22,
25 230:5
231:4,7,11
232:1,4
233:2,9
235:22
238:19
239:10,15,
18,21
241:21
243:8
248:5
256:10

ultimately
17:5 19:21
27:18
44:17,21
51:9 73:3
121:7
128:23
147:6
170:19

un-tenured
236:21

unacceptable
249:1,2

unaware
149:23

unclear
52:22
80:11
211:8,9

uncouple
108:7
113:14

uncourageous
197:4

undergrad
15:18

undergraduate
15:15
74:12,22,
23 76:1

undergraduates
72:15,18,
19

underpinnings
66:1,11

understand
11:2,9,13
25:4 40:20
47:22
52:8,11
54:5,10
71:11
72:10
78:22
83:16
85:14,16
91:5 92:2
98:21
104:11
110:2
122:8
135:5
140:5
155:4,8
156:15,17
157:8
169:16
171:20
196:1,11
198:18
208:25
211:2
228:2
254:22

understandable
9:16

understanding
104:9

106:2
107:19
136:6
190:9
207:16

understands
155:17

understood
11:17
13:7,10,13
90:15
181:10
201:18

uneasy
193:10,15

unequivocably
61:12

unequivocally
103:20

uninformed
106:2

uninterested
176:1

Union 18:17

United 16:14
29:8 54:25
56:23
57:21,22
58:4,9
61:14
62:19 64:3
66:2,24
69:2,3,5,
10 70:17,
23 72:21
78:18 79:6
81:13
83:13 89:3
90:4 96:8
106:24
107:21
150:24
168:11,17
170:21
171:1,3
245:3,7
246:16
248:8
249:13
250:23
251:10

universe
146:14

university
6:3,7
15:18,21
17:6 18:3
19:22 20:8
21:20,22
22:14,16
23:1 32:9
34:19 44:9
47:16
53:11
73:10
76:6,24
77:2,13
78:3 115:5
116:9,13
118:14
120:13
142:6,14
147:21
149:22
151:3
152:14,15,
25 153:13,
25 161:20
162:25
179:13,25
181:8
187:21
188:25
191:4
194:15
195:13
196:15
198:1
199:9
221:1
233:21
234:3
238:10
239:17
249:19
252:19

unpack 57:2,
4 68:20

unpacking
255:15

unplugged
171:15
172:13

unreasonable
222:1

UNT 126:3
147:7
164:18
165:2
181:9
194:12
218:7
227:13,19,
25 238:9
240:11,15
253:11

UNT02560
229:19

UNT02645
180:16

UNT02658
202:13

UNT02697
223:20

UNT02705
208:9

UNT02707
211:16

UNT02708
216:13

UNT02758
218:3

UNT1146
238:3

UNT2559
226:22

UNT2657
200:19

UNT2663
181:22

UNT2705

207:25
UNT2758 218:22
untenured 124:7
unusual 128:8
upcoming 14:15 17:24 217:11
upholding 68:17 70:18
upholds 160:13
upstate 172:14
USSR 17:18
utilizes 208:21
utter 92:1

V

valid 96:24
valued 56:24
van 92:12
Vancouver 115:17,24 116:19,24
vary 106:7
vast 80:4 100:12
venue 128:17
verbatim 43:11 54:5 163:8 256:22,24
Vermeer 18:4
version 28:7
vetting 124:18
vib- 95:6
vibrating 95:6
vice 241:2, 11
victorious 51:10
video 60:10 258:18
Vienna 87:14,21, 25
view 54:18 59:14 61:19 132:10 133:10 151:7 152:17 161:12 162:1,5,9 177:6 204:7 213:1,20 224:22
viewed 22:25 30:10
viewing 164:11
viewpoints 242:15,17 254:21
views 131:17,18 132:10 242:21 250:6
vigorously 80:23
violated 163:12,15
violinist 65:19
virtual 215:18,21 238:18
virtually 43:11 55:23 88:11 100:15 163:17 164:12 215:8 238:20 246:3
virulently 246:21,23
vis-à-vis 50:19
visa 18:13
visas 18:9
visit 194:12,15, 19,20,24 195:7,23 199:9,12
voice 90:7, 9,19
volume 117:19,25 136:24 137:1,10, 17 139:2 140:2 142:16 158:13 162:8,22 182:23 183:11,22 195:19 221:14 224:9,10, 20 235:17 240:1 242:1
volumes 98:16
vulnerability 197:20
vulnerable 236:7

W

wage 81:4

wait 88:9
138:7
203:10
232:11

walk 196:22
248:12

walks 198:1

Wall 238:25

Walls
185:15,19,
22 186:9
187:24
188:3,13
189:6
190:7,10
196:18
202:14
204:21
205:19,21
206:19
208:2
209:13,23
210:2,11
212:5,11
214:3,21
215:5,11
216:5,15
217:4
218:11,23
219:14
221:11,20
223:2,16
224:19
226:14
229:2
238:23,25
239:1,13
253:16

Walls'
217:23

Walton 5:21
180:3,5,10
206:5,10
226:9
243:21
244:6,14
247:21
252:4
254:3
255:25
258:15,20,
25

Walton's
254:25

wanted 9:4
18:7 25:15
27:20
63:15,19
65:6 72:20
82:1
119:23
142:18
143:19
186:17

War 62:22

watching
30:21

water 61:16

waves 93:18

ways 55:13
73:22 92:1
96:24
97:24
170:17

weak 196:25

website
30:16
31:18
142:25
147:22
153:13,17
159:1,5

week 19:8
25:1
209:10
212:3,4

weekly
217:15

weeks 212:4
252:18

weigh 169:19

Weisse 88:15

welcomed
255:3,7

Welcoming
49:2

Wes- 70:16

West 68:22,
24 69:7,
13,22

Western
68:16,19
70:5

Wettrennen
101:1

whatsoever
232:6

Wheeldon
34:16 35:9
36:11
257:6

white 24:9,
17 27:25
28:6 33:2
44:21 47:4
48:16
54:11,13,
16,20,22,
24 55:3,5,
9,11,21
56:1,7,14,
20 57:16,
19,22,24
58:6,7,16,
25 59:15,
19,21,23,
24 61:2,5,
7,10,19
62:13,14
63:2 64:5,
11,18,20
65:5,7,12,
24 66:10
67:5,21
68:16,17
69:24
70:16,17,
19,21

71:17
72:7,22
77:19,21,
24 78:7,
11,13,17
79:5,19
80:1 81:9
83:3 88:4
90:2,10,
13,18
92:21,22
107:9,21,
25 127:15
130:10
131:2
168:3,18,
24 169:2,
10,23
170:13,24
174:3,9
245:10,13
247:8
248:6,15
251:7,17,
25 252:7,
13,21
253:2
254:15,19,
25 255:3,
22 257:19

whiteness
56:4,5,8,
24 57:8,9
60:19
107:23
173:8
174:13
257:18

who'd 16:24

widest
160:20

Wiener
225:14,15,
19

wife 14:17,
20 172:14

Wikipedia
127:25
128:3,9
129:7,8,10

willful
212:20

William
108:14
110:25
131:13
132:25

window
140:11

windows
215:22

winter
137:24
224:23
232:17,25

Winter/spring
44:22

wires 135:13

withheld
37:5

witnesses
13:19

Wolfgang
92:13

woman 66:3,8

women 58:21

wondering
220:4
244:23

word 36:21
59:16,17
64:18
68:19
83:21,22
84:1 85:5
89:15
95:24 96:4
97:3
100:1,10,
23 101:1
102:1,2,5
149:7
150:14
154:22
155:15
156:15
157:5,8
175:3,8
234:24
235:23
246:22
255:14
256:16
257:7,20
258:2

words 9:19
44:13,19
45:13
46:11,12,
13 57:18
59:20 69:3
81:24
89:17
95:23
108:13,14,
25 109:23,
25 110:3
125:2,7
135:13
149:8
189:21

work 16:25
22:23
27:17
28:8,14
43:23 50:6
52:16
57:13
78:10
81:13 87:6
100:4
102:7
103:20,24
109:8
110:12
121:4,11
135:14
183:20,21
186:19
210:4
214:4,7
223:2
224:19
233:23
234:9

255:8

worked
120:23
178:16
201:14
209:13
256:13

working 35:9
120:18
188:16
206:20
219:25
233:19

workings
181:15

works 49:16
55:16
83:16
98:14,16
104:15
107:21
124:2

world 67:14
95:11
97:20
129:12
213:1,20

worth 83:11
102:23
161:13

wrap 226:8

Wright 5:4

writ 66:13

write 44:10
67:24
108:24
109:25
230:9
234:4

writer 98:11

writes
203:17,25
212:11
217:8
219:24
225:22

writing 44:6
58:17 59:8
85:22
125:1
132:6
139:8
215:11
241:9

writings
99:13,24
131:16
132:8
246:10,11,
12,13
251:14

written 7:8
54:16
57:19
59:15,21,
24 61:10
62:20
66:17 78:8
79:8 92:5
105:5
108:21
111:8
128:16
130:10
141:21
163:10
187:16

wrong 41:11
227:16

wrote 44:13,
16,17,22
48:23 59:1
61:5 85:14
109:23
110:8
137:20
143:4
153:6
171:5
174:7
177:15
201:21
214:1
252:18
253:25

Y

Yale 17:6
19:16
238:10,17
239:16

Ye- 133:7

year 20:14
48:25
68:21
80:25
117:3
194:21

years 16:22
20:4 23:9
55:24
56:10,22
57:14 59:7
65:18,22
66:8,18
73:10 78:4
92:3
107:1,5,18
122:24,25
136:14,15,
20 140:15
153:20
169:20
183:17
245:25
247:6
252:14

years-plus
155:23

York 6:11
15:22 20:8
21:20,22
22:14,17
23:1,13
65:14,21
66:4,14
67:10
254:17

Youtube
30:13
128:21
129:1

Yup 11:4,7,
19 49:21
120:17

Z

Zoom 215:22
216:3

Zooming
252:15