
**Reviewed by Tracy McMullen**

In 1991, Scott Deveaux warned that an “official history of jazz had taken hold,” aided and abetted by the work of academics. From a “chaotic diversity of style and expression” came a “coherent whole, … a skillfully contrived and easily comprehended narrative” (525). Deveaux attributed this primarily to textbooks, which reinforced the narrative of neat stylistic decades (1920s New Orleans jazz, 1930s Swing, 1940s Bebop, etc.) and the institutionalization of jazz studies within colleges and universities. Because jazz was a relatively recent art form, Deveaux could watch the official history develop and cohere before his eyes. Now it may be hip-hop’s turn. Like jazz, hip-hop is a new art form minted in the United States through the expressive practices of African Americans. The rise of hip-hop has been concurrent with the rise of ethnic studies departments and, more recently, the inclusion of popular music as a serious field of study in the academy. Thus, while jazz studies took decades to be accepted as a legitimate field within music departments, hip-hop studies is better positioned to find its way into a multitude of academic disciplines. It is important, therefore, to take lessons from the development of jazz studies as the field of hip-hop studies takes shape. Is it possible for hip-hop studies to resist the model of “official history” with monograph-style counters from the margins (“women in hip-hop,” “Latinx in hip-hop”)? What would the field look like if scholars could collectively eschew the tendency to create a dominant narrative with its immutable “key elements,” masterpieces, and great innovators? Rather than center and margin, perhaps hip-hop as a field could choose flow as a model—an early example of which might be the foundational and helpfully plural text, *The Hip-Hop Studies Reader* (Forman and Neal 2012).

An important essay in *The Hip-Hop Studies Reader* questions how “social scientists” find their knowledge about the inner city. Robin D.G. Kelley writes that for many social scientists researching povferty “the ‘real Negroes’ were the young jobless men hanging out on the corner passing the bottle, the brothers with the nastiest verbal repertoire, the pimps and hustlers, and the single mothers who raised streetwise kids who began cursing before they could walk,” and not the men and women who went to work every day in countless occupations (138). And the trusted interlocutor in regard to “authentic black urban culture” was the black man (139). Social scientists aren’t the only ones taking certain young black men as
their central informants. The volume also includes reporter Robert Ford’s two late-1970s articles for *Billboard Magazine* describing this new art form, with its focus on “rapping DJs.” Ford names many men: Kool Herc, Eddie Cheeba, DJ Hollywood, DJ Starski, Kurtis Blow, DJ Easy Gee, and Cool DJ AJ. And then we hear this: “[Cheeba] travels with an entire show, which includes seven female dancers and another DJ, Easy Gee, who does most of the actual spinning” (42). Who were these seven women? What kind of dancing were they doing? How did they see their role within the “entire show”? How did it occur that their dancing was not considered an “element” of hip-hop? How was it that they were (needed) there but not there? As the story of hip-hop began to be narrated by Ford and other men, the ubiquitous activities of women were conveyed as general backdrop, not “key elements.”

Kelley’s cogent intervention would trouble Ford’s presumptive authority, yet it is Ford’s journalism that has become an urtext of hip-hop history, being cited regularly (including in Loren Kajikawa’s *Sounding Race in Rap Songs*), not Kelley’s. Ford’s original article and its frequent citation demonstrate how men’s activities and narratives inform the growing official history. This cohering narrative is as follows: With a pre-history comprised of Caribbean mobile DJ units; artists like the Last Poets, Gil Scott Heron, and Iceberg Slim; and Blaxploitation film, hip-hop begins in the South Bronx and has four elements: MCing, b-boying, graffiti, and DJing. Its founding fathers are Kool DJ Herc, Afrika Bambaataa, and Grandmaster Flash. Stylistically, it has moved from Party to Message to Gangsta to the “Beyond” that we have today, including its proliferation around the world. This skeleton is fleshed out in various ways, but this is the general story as it is coalescing in encyclopedias and textbooks. Some hip-hop scholars have questioned this narrative—for example, the “four elements.” Pertinent to the seven mystery women above, Melissa Campbell wonders why “booty dancing” isn’t one of the elements of hip-hop (2004, 499). Or Double-Dutch, as Kyra Gaunt asks in her powerful volume on black girls’ expressive culture and its influence on hip-hop (2006, 113). Gaunt’s book, *The Games Black Girls Play*, makes a convincing case for the ways in which black girls’ activities inform black expressive practice, including, significantly, hip-hop. But these voices are relegated to the margins if, as a field, we produce books that unquestioningly accept the “official story” as the foundation.

Unfortunately, *Sounding Race in Rap Songs* does assume the official story as its foundation and in so doing falls prey to what Paul Gilroy, Kyra Gaunt, and many others have criticized: that despite its diasporic richness and complexity, “contemporary black cultures from Harlem to London . . .
are reduced to black masculinity as the primary, if not sole, signifier of race in mass popular culture” (Gaunt 2006, 114, italics in original). Examining four touchstone rap songs from 1979 to 1999—“Rapper’s Delight” by The Sugarhill Gang, “Rebel without a Pause” by Public Enemy, Dr. Dre’s “Let Me Ride,” and Eminem’s “My Name is”—Sounding Race in Rap Songs argues for the ways that rap “sounds race.” Kajikawa’s focus on sound—including music production, sampling, rapping, and musical form—offers a necessary rejoinder to the often verbal and visual focus in hip-hop analysis. In this way, Sounding Race adds complexity to a growing official history. The author’s decision not to employ a more intersectional analysis of how race is sounded, however, significantly weakens his intervention.

Sounding Race illuminates the shift from hip-hop as an activity to hip-hop as a form: the rap song. Kajikawa acknowledges both the negatives of this—commodification, systematization, predictability—but also the positives, such as setting the stage for the virtuosity of rap and for message rap. While scholars like Greg Dimitriadis (2012) and Tricia Rose (2008) have previously discussed how hip-hop was removed from its context as an activity and turned into a commodity that singled out the MC, Kajikawa’s formal analysis of how the music changed from a more responsive, less-predictable form to a very systematized song form is useful. In a clear visual format that non-music students can understand, Kajikawa shows the flexible, responsive, and asymmetrical form of Grandmaster Flash’s DJing recorded live at the Audubon Ballroom in 1978. There is significant improvisation in how Flash interacts with the rappers, Melle Mel and Kid Creole, and with his own musical decisions. As Kajikawa puts it, “Because Flash did not always loop breakbeats the same way, the musical surface constantly shifted, and MCs had to adjust their flows to match it” (31). The author follows this analysis by graphing the very symmetrical musical form of “Rapper’s Delight.” He also offers graphs to demonstrate how longer phrases helped to give the later West Coast G-funk style its signature, somewhat lilting, laid-back sound (104). And while most scholars know “Rapper’s Delight” was performed by a live band, it is less known that Dr. Dre used live musicians to perform certain phrases from albums which were then easier for him to manipulate (94). These detailed examinations of hip-hop production in its earlier years expands our understanding of the genre as a musical phenomenon and the visual supplements greatly aid teaching classes of students with little musical training. Such attention to the changes in hip-hop’s early sounding—from asymmetry to symmetry, improvised flow to rap song—is interesting and important work.

Although the book takes sound as its focus, Kajikawa also gives compelling analyses of two videos. He compares Dr. Dre’s song and video “Let
Me Ride” to NWA’s “Straight Outa Compton” in terms of mobility, or lack thereof, in Los Angeles. We see that in NWA’s video the group is always on foot, confined to the neighborhood of Compton bound on all sides by freeways. Such quarantine is highlighted in the video, which shows a map of Compton fenced in by freeways dissolving into an image of NWA walking the streets. Only the police are in automobiles, free to move in and out of the neighborhood. In contrast, Dr. Dre, in “Let Me Ride” focuses on the freedom the automobile provides him in Los Angeles. Kajikawa makes use of pertinent stills from the videos, for example, walking feet and the outlined map of Compton that police are surveying from “Straight Outa Compton” compared to “spinning chrome wheels,” Dre’s Chevy Impala, and the expanse of freeways as freedom in “Let Me Ride.” Kajikawa contextualizes his analysis within a tradition of the “transcendence of travel” in African American stories described by Robert Farris Thompson, including the sound of the train whistle to, in more modern times, the “revolving shiny hubcaps” and the “turning of a rubber tire” (111). Kajikawa argues that “by reconceiving the gangsta’s relationship to urban space, Dr. Dre rearticulated blackness not as conflict and rebellion but as transcendence and mobility” (86). This mobility is connected to Dr. Dre’s significance in rap’s neo-liberal turn toward individual consumerism as the heroic model. As Kajikawa notes, “G-funk rejected previous forms of black politics centered on collective action. Promising ‘no medallions, dreadlocks, or black fists.’ . . . These symbols of black freedom find themselves supplanted by the gangsta, whose ruthless entrepreneurial activity through rap leads to financial success . . . coded here as the true form of liberation” (114). Kajikawa does not discuss how Dr. Dre’s freedom is also represented in the video by his ability to cycle through a series of women, who trade places in his car throughout the video. The video begins with him leaving a house where a woman is questioning him and, we understand, trying to pin him down. Thus, “black freedom” is, in fact, black male freedom, in this case, from the domesticating black woman.2

While Kajikawa offers this video analysis, Sounding Race’s central aim is to demonstrate how rap has sounded race in various rap songs. Kajikawa writes, “unlike rock and roll, rap never became ‘white’” (5). Rap music has remained an overt signifier of blackness, not just lyrically and visually, but sonically. He goes on: “Rap has cultivated a mainstream audience and become a multi-million-dollar industry by promoting highly visible (and often controversial) representations of black masculine identity. . . . Unlike the worlds of DJing and b-boying, where hip-hop’s ethnic diversity is reflected at the highest level of competition, rap moguls have consistently put their money on black [artists]” with Eminem as the exception (5). (As I
will discuss further, the slippage between “black” and “black masculinity” is never adequately theorized.)

A focus on sound is necessary, especially in light of the recent critique by Gustavus Stadler (2015) on the whiteness of sound studies. For example, in his chapter on Public Enemy, Kajikawa emphasizes the concept of noise within the construction of blackness. The “harsh timbres and clashing rhythms,” also known as the “organized noise,” of PE’s Bomb Squad, articulated a sound for many of a “black fist in the air,” a “power to symbolize black resistance” (50), and “the sound of insistence” (76). Kajikawa argues that these sounds were a Gramscian rearticulation of race (as evidenced by music critics’ interpretations), redeploying the sounds and concepts of earlier hip-hop to offer a new “sonic portrayal of black identity” (79).

The concept of noise has been central to the aesthetics and politics of hip-hop, as evidenced in just a short list: Public Enemy’s 1987 song “Bring the Noise”; Organized Noize, the Atlanta based hip-hop production company in existence since 1992 (and subject of a recent documentary by Quincy Jones); and books Black Noise (Rose 1994), Global Noise (2002) and Home Girls Make Some Noise (2007). Further, given that “sounding” was a common early synonym for “rapping” and that much of this long-standing verbal expressive practice has focused on phonetic play (often more than semantic play, according to Henry Louis Gates), rapping itself has a significant place in sound studies (see Gates 2014, 57, 73, 75).

By engaging sound, Sounding Race extends the study of hip-hop beyond its more usual focus on “words and imagery” toward “a more holistic approach sensitive to the way producers and fans experience rap music as music” (149). Hoping to describe how ideas are attached to sounds (10), Kajikawa seeks “to explain how the choices rap producers make—selecting one sound and not another one—amplify and in some cases transform the information that listeners receive from a song’s lyrics or music video” (12). According to Kajikawa, this offers insights that a focus on lyrics alone could miss. For example, Dr. Dre’s use of the funky and celebratory sounds of Parliament Funkadelic “cast life in the ‘hood as less about violent struggle and more about the celebration of a certain kind of freedom and mobility. . . [A]nalyzing lyrics alone might lead one to miss these changes within the genre” (101). Kajikawa further argues for the ways in which Public Enemy sound black power through their noisy layering of samples and how producer Dr. Dre cannily chose sounds that signified whiteness for Eminem (133). Kajikawa asks important questions: how is it that rap music “sounds” race? “How did rap music gain the ability to make race audible in these ways?” (3). While I may have found these questions insufficiently answered in the book, I found the direction of the inquiry important.
In his musical and video analysis and through his privileging of sound, Kajikawa contributes valuable new insights and vantage points for the understanding of hip-hop. For these reasons, I am disappointed that he uncritically accepts so much of the “official history,” in particular the “masculinist focus of . . . hip-hop [history]” (Gaunt 2006, 51). This made using the book in the classroom fraught. I had to continually undo and unpack the assumptions and even (in my view) sexism that undergirded his analyses of the sound of race for my students. Focusing on how race sounds is crucial—but the fact that this sounding race is, in fact, sounding masculinity is never adequately acknowledged in the book, let alone analyzed as to how race (in particular, blackness) becomes associated with masculinity. This seriously undercuts Kajikawa’s analysis of how race is sounded. In many instances, the lack of gender analysis made describing how race was being constructed almost impossible, in my view.

For example, in describing hip-hop’s early commercial years Kajikawa never mentions that as rap was first developing as a commercial genre many of the first groups had women in them. In fact, rap’s move out of its context as activity toward an increasingly commodified form is a key period when the dialogic between men and women drops out, something Kajikawa doesn’t mention. H. Rap Brown said that “some of the best dozens players were girls” (quoted in Gates 2014, 49, 79). Female groups, rappers, and clubs, such as the Mercedes Ladies, were part of the early hip-hop scene. Funky 4 Plus One More, with rapper Sha Rock, was the first rap group to perform on national TV (in 1981) and their 1985 “That’s the Joint” had “formed its own community: thirty or forty raps were recorded in response[,] . . . from the point of view of Sally, Sally’s mother, and other characters in the song. When these raps were played back to back on the radio, they created a litany of neighborhood gossip” (Wheeler 1991, 207). The all female rap group J. J. Fad signed to Ruthless Records and released their hit “Supersonic” in 1987 one year before Straight Outta Compton, something we don’t see in the official history of the Hollywood film of the same name (and vociferously challenged in many hip-hop blogs). As women’s voices dropped out, the one-sided sexual play and challenge could become unmitigated misogyny with little real chance for women to speak back with anything close to the same cultural decibel level. Henry Louis Gates discussed this around the same time, noting that scholars of African American verbal expressive culture didn’t record women, therefore what is represented in the recordings “[has] a phallocentric bias” (2014, 60). As Kajikawa rightly says, producers became attracted to black male rappers (46), but this happened over the course of years and for specific reasons that have to do with the topic of his book: constructing the sound of black-
ness. Kajikawa never gives an explanation for why the producers became attracted to male rappers, leading a classroom of students to believe this preference is natural.

Another example involves Kajikawa's discussion of Def Jam Records' move to incorporate rock elements into rap. Kajikawa acknowledges the sad irony that rock is considered “white,” despite the fact that it had “its roots in black rhythm-and-blues” (69) (a citation of Maureen Mahon's excellent 2004 work on black rock would have been useful). Kajikawa leaves gaping chasms in his discussion of Def Jam's construction of rap authenticity via rock, however, when he doesn’t discuss how constructions of gender play into it. Producer Rick Rubin put forward the heavy rock idea in order to appeal to young white men and boys. Rubin was a classic disco-basher who wanted to distance rap from the form. He loved bands like Aerosmith and to combine them with a rap group like Run DMC sounded like the golden ticket. Rick Rubin was also instrumental in eliminating Kate Schellenbach from the Beastie Boys in order to turn them away from the type of punk band that would countenance a female drummer, into the rock-boy rap he wanted (See Schellenbach interviewed in Barshad 2011). Rubin's actions provide a clear example of how women are on the scene but pushed off the stage in order to construct the masculine image and sound that a producer wants. But according to Kajikawa, gender apparently plays no part in these decisions. He writes, “like rock and roll pioneers before them, rap musicians were bringing an authentic, raw (read as black) form of expression into mainstream U.S. culture” (70). Kajikawa then cites Robert Palmer: “The rock hits of the 50s had a rawer, more abrasive sound than the period's mainstream pop; think of Jerry Lee Lewis's ‘Great Balls of Fire’ compared to Patti Page's ‘How Much is that Doggie in the Window’” (70). The obviously gendered nature of this description of authenticity goes uncommented upon by Kajikawa, who uses it only to demonstrate rock's rawness as also linked to race (blackness). I had to unpack this with my students so that women are not offered as the natural embodiment of inauthenticity without a discussion of how this gender construction is deployed to shore up the construction of male authenticity.4

By offering such statements and examples without an analysis of the ways in which women are constructed as inauthentic in order to construct what is authentic, the book serves to perpetuate and instantiate this myth of women as inauthentic. In a final example concerning the producer Sylvia Robinson, Kajikawa seems to accept and reinforce the stereotype of female inauthenticity. Google “godmother of hip hop” and Sylvia Robinson's bio and picture will appear at the top of your page. Starting as a musician and songwriter, Robinson founded Sugarhill Records and effectively brought
into being and produced rap’s first commercial single, “Rapper’s Delight.” Shortly thereafter she produced Grandmaster Flash and the Furious Five’s highly influential “The Message.” To be introduced to Robinson through Kajikawa’s book, however, one could easily see her as the inauthentic female bent on commercializing an authentic black male art form. The narrative Kajikawa constructs is of artistic, authentic male artists being manipulated by her commercializing agenda: “Robinson translated Flash’s quick mix theory into a studio setting—only with a rigidity and evenness that was rarely, if ever, a goal in Flash’s live performances” (37); “‘The queen’ . . . had overthrown the kings at the party” (40); The musicians are “confused” and “frightened” by the demands of Robinson (36). Further, regarding “The Message,” “Robinson hounded the group for almost a year until she convinced MC Melle Mel to begin recording the track without Flash’s consent” (57). Flash and the Furious Five were not interested in recording the song. They thought it was too dark and edgy, nothing like the party rap that effectively defined the style at the time. Kid Creole said, “We was afraid of the song because we didn’t think that it would work” (quoted in 58).

It is impossible for me not to imagine how a male producer would be described if he had stuck to his guns, resisted the pressure of musicians sure his ideas would be a failure, and then went on to produce possibly the most influential rap song of all time (“The Message”). Yet, Kajikawa sets up a good versus evil narrative with the original sin suspiciously pointing toward a powerful woman (“Rapper’s Delight” is suggested as the “original sin” of hip-hop [39]). Kajikawa shares:

As Mark McCord writes about the Armory concert for Wax Poetics magazine, “At least for that one night, it didn’t matter if there was a record selling in stores all over the country, because it was the guys on the stage that night who were the real stars.” Even as “Rapper’s Delight” climbed the charts and attracted waves of outsiders who had never heard or cared about live DJs and MCs, Flash’s Armory performance exemplifies a dynamism and sense of musical spontaneity absent from Sugar Hill’s interpolation of the “Good Times” break. (39)

The inauthentic, commercial recording is getting all the attention when the real story is with the misunderstood male artists. I worry that Robinson as the inauthentic, untrustworthy woman who doesn’t understand the real artists becomes “the message” students get about Robinson, underplaying her pivotal and principal role in the birth of hip-hop. Kajikawa continues this male privileging in his decision to always write b-boying, rather than b-boying/b-girling as Felicia Miyakawa does in her entry for Hip hop in the Grove Dictionary of American Music, 2nd Edition (Grove Music Online 2012). We don’t hear of Cindy Campbell’s role in “founding” hip-hop
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through her activities throwing parties at 1520 Sedgwick Avenue in the Bronx. Women we know of and don’t know of all played a significant role in sounding race; however, we will not find out about that in Kajikawa’s book.

Kajikawa’s two references to gender analysis come into play when discussing whiteness and Asianness and are both one sentence allusions to the same source: page 416 of Ingrid Monson’s 1995 journal article, “The Problem with White Hipness: Race, Gender, and Cultural Conceptions in Jazz Historical Discourse.” The first instance occurs in the chapter on Eminem, where Kajikawa writes, “[Eminem’s] violent, misogynistic humor and self-characterization as ‘white trash’ confirm Ingrid Monson’s observation that gender and class continue to mediate racial authenticity across U.S. popular music’s color line” (136). In his second reference to gender analysis, nine pages later, Kajikawa writes that Chinese-American rapper Jin’s efforts to prove his “hardness” despite being Asian by using sexually explicit lyrics “[illustrate] once again how gender and sexuality mediate racial authenticity across the color line” (145) and cites Monson, page 416. Unfortunately, Kajikawa does not perform this intersectional analysis, but only cites the same quote two times to tell us it is important (when dealing with a white rapper and an Asian rapper). While Kajikawa will write, “Eminem’s violent, cartoonish, and misogynistic humor consciously distances him from conventional representations of whiteness, positioning him as a social rebel on par with, but clearly not the same as, his African American counterparts” (128), he does not offer further analysis or ramifications for this white male use of sexism to prove masculinity in a black musical form. While deploying very similar tactics to Eminem regarding his non-black rapper status, Jin did not generate the massive appeal of his white counterpart. Kajikawa acknowledges that while some might connect Eminem’s rise to a “world where the content of one’s microphone skills truly does matter more than the color of one’s skin” (141), the case of Jin puts the lie to this fantasy. And when we see that one’s microphone skills truly don’t matter more than the color of one’s skin we can also entertain the possibility that women MCs also fell by the wayside because of the identity constructions of the genre made by producers, performers, consumers, and critics.

The lack of a real discussion of how gender and sexuality mediate race significantly weakens Kajikawa’s analysis and makes an instructor have to constantly undo naturalized assumptions. In addition to the problem of under-theorizing black masculinity, the six uses of the word “women” in the volume also demonstrate why a gender analysis is important when telling this story. They are: “Gordon sits between two women: a young
blonde . . . and an elderly, grey-haired woman” (20); “includes marijuana, classic cars, and compliant women” (102); “gangsta lifestyle filled with endless sunshine, objectified women” (116); “the frequent targets of his lyrical outbursts were women and homosexuals” (136) and again “the frequent targets of Eminem’s rhymes were women and homosexuals” (139); and finally a reference to Don Imus and the Rutgers women’s basketball team in which Richard Goldstein of the Village Voice argued, “Eminem and Imus draw from the same well of resentment that has nourished the Angry White Male” (140). These attitudes about women are not unpacked, but merely stated. Their connection to how race is sounded is not pursued. There might be two nods to intersectionality, but *Sounding Race* does not adequately account for how sexism, homophobia and gender stereotypes often form the very definitions of racial difference. In my view, Kajikawa’s analysis teaches the class that race is one thing and it pertains to men.

It is troubling that we are still producing academic analyses of race (or gender or class, etc.) that are not intersectional. Indeed, Kimberlee Crenshaw’s 1991 essay on intersectionality goes as far back as Public Enemy’s “Fear of a Black Planet.” If Kajikawa indeed believes that gender, sexuality and class mediate race, then this methodology needs to be employed throughout the book, not simply cited by another scholar in the last chapters. To imagine that one simply cannot account for gender when talking about race—that it is just too much to cover, that “I can’t talk about gender, too”—is to misunderstand how race is constructed. Racial distinctions are constructed via reference to other identity markers like sexuality, class and gender. These markers need to be analyzed as definitive parts of race as a construct.

As the dominant hip-hop narrative is unfolding in popular culture (via Wikipedia, documentaries, blogs) and in the academy (textbooks, readers, history books), I would advocate that as scholars we embrace asymmetry, flow, and responsiveness and reject symmetry, stasis, and truisms. Like skilled rap artists, scholars can perpetually flip the script. It’s not a problem that Loren Kajikawa’s *Sounding Race in Rap Songs* is a book about a certain set of well-known rap songs and their influence. The problem is the symmetry provided by unquestioned assumptions that support his analysis. Let’s follow Grandmaster Flash in recalling: “If there was no Hip Hop in society / then there would be fewer alternative views. / See we not about to lose” (2009). And remember that in hip-hop, as scholar Elizabeth Wheeler has put it: “Nobody gets the last word for more than thirty seconds at a time” (136).
Notes

1. In her encyclopedia entry, “Hip hop,” in the Grove Dictionary of American Music, Felicia Miyakawa mentions B-girling as part of the “original four elements.” She also acknowledges the need to broaden the history to include women’s and “Latino/a contributions.” Fernando Orejuela’s recent textbook, Rap and Hip Hop Culture, includes a variety of lenses through which to read rap and hip-hop culture. I don’t want to malign encyclopedias or textbooks, but to call for vigilance in watching for official histories.

2. Tammy Kernodle’s cogent analysis of the black musical avant-garde in the 1960s unfortunately holds true for much hip-hop of the 1990s: “the search for creative liberation was centered in the need to liberate oneself and the art from [the] clutches of women—who have been traditionally viewed as the enforcers of the cultural rules of monogamy, the steady job, and the nuclear family” (Kernodle 2010, 85).

3. I write “young white men and boys” for specificity, rather than use the term “youth,” as Kajikawa does. The term youth gives a false sense of inclusivity. While young women and girls are also “youth,” they are rarely the ones spoken of via this term. As Jacqueline Warwick puts it, “so-called youth culture is actually boy culture” (Warwick 2007, 134).

4. I was surprised that Kajikawa did not argue that Dr. Dre’s privileging of funk music countered Rick Rubin’s “whitening” of rap through rock music with a return to a sound of blackness (that would also include copious disco samples in the West Coast G-funk style).
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