

Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education

The refereed journal of the



Volume 12, No. 1
April 2013

David J. Elliott
Editor

Vincent C. Bates
Associate Editor

Electronic Article

The End(s) of Advocacy: Responding to Our Own Mandates Instead of Creating New Leadership

Vincent Cee

© Vincent Cee 2013 All rights reserved.

ISSN 1545-4517

The content of this article is the sole responsibility of the author. The ACT Journal and the Mayday Group are not liable for any legal actions that may arise involving the article's content, including, but not limited to, copyright infringement.



The End(s) of Advocacy: Responding to Our Own Mandates Instead of Creating New Leadership

Vincent Cee
University of Alaska Fairbanks

Introduction

In this paper I provide a synthesis of ideas published by several authors who wrote in the late 1960s through the early 1980s. Remarkably, these authors arrived at similar conclusions in disparate ways and disciplines, all of which hold rich implications for music education. The works I examine include Neil Postman's and Charles Weingartner's *Teaching as a Subversive Activity*, Christopher Alexander's *A Pattern Language*, *Music Society Education* by Christopher Small, Marilyn Ferguson's *The Aquarian Conspiracy*, Morris Berman's *The Reenchantment of the World*, and *The Turning Point* by Fritjof Capra. I suggest that reading obliquely across disciplines yields themes that allow music educators to renew, recast, and redirect our narratives (Postman 1995). Put another way, my contention is that our profession has overlooked and/or lost a generation of valuable insights published between 1969 and 1985.

My examination of this panel of author's contemporaneous, similarly humanistic, post-modern alternates to positivism is framed by this question: Why have music educators largely failed to study and apply these writers' arguments in our research and practice? An easy answer would be that these authors do not have anything to say to us because they are concerned with architecture, history, physics, publishing, and general education. Even Small once remarked that "I never felt I was writing for music educators per se" (personal conversation, Feb. 2008). Small's lifelong practice of consulting sources across myriad disciplines corroborates his statement. But in light of his work's focus on issues in music and education, I include Small's ideas as conduits back to music education.

One of the assumptions underscoring this paper is that the works of Charles Leonhard, Robert House, Allan Britton and James Mursell were post-World War II efforts to transform music education into a profession (complete with a research base) that distinguished music education from other types of education and learning. The work of

Leonard, House, Britton, and Mursell in the 50s was subsequently fortified and explicated by the Yale and Tanglewood Symposia in the 60s. During this time, Reimer (1963, 1970) produced a philosophical rationale for the profession (which built on the work of his mentor, Charles Leonhard) and provided a direction for music education research and teaching.

As an aside, it could be argued that among creating new foundational concepts for music education, the MayDay group worked from the mid 90s to the middle of the first decade of the 21st century to provide ample and reasoned critique of Aesthetic Education and the uptake of that work within the profession. In this paper, I turn slightly and focus on scholarly efforts inside and outside the music education profession between 1969 and 1985. A limitation of this paper is that my focus is largely restricted to music education in the United States.

In search of meaningful narratives for music education, one of the largest goals of this paper is to ask if music educators can pick up where the writers of the late sixties through the early eighties departed. In framing and asking that question, I claim the current MENC/NAfME driven Advocacy Movement is a prominent, yet false god/false narrative along the lines presented in Postman's (1995), *The End of Education: Redefining the Value of School*. Postman (1995) wrote: "The measure of a narrative's 'truth' or 'falsity' is in its consequences: Does it provide people with a sense of personal identity, a sense of community life, a basis for moral conduct, explanations of that which cannot be known?" (7). Postman also stated that "Without a narrative, life has no meaning. Without meaning, learning has no purpose. Without a purpose, schools are houses of detention, not attention" (7).

While I doubt MENC/NAfME thought of advocacy as a narrative—but just something "we" have to do (Kimpton 2005), I argue here that advocacy has become a major narrative that exists and grows unchecked. Advocacy, while popular and current, is a narrative fraught with problems. Without a meaningful and/or metaphysical narrative, our profession remains fractured and confused.

An additional purpose of this paper is to suggest that somewhere between the 1970s and 1995, the music education profession took a divisive turn and instead of providing new leadership, we began to respond to industrial and governmental mandates. These mandates share a common element that shifted the professional debate from *the essential nature of music learning* to *the utility of music learning*.

Furthermore, I argue that the writing within music education after 1995 has largely either hearkened to past glories or is focused on values defined solely in musical terms. Through the panel of writers I selected from the late 60s to the early 80s, I ask the reader to consider if music educators could reclaim and build on these still novel ideas to provide new leadership for music education that is external, synthetic, and full of momentum. Additionally, I include one example at the end of this paper showcasing an educational system that transcends and debunks most of our current educational reform efforts. This educational system is a summer science camp called the Alaska Summer Research Academy (ASRA). A brief review of my panel of authors follows.

Teaching as a Subversive Activity

Postman and Weingartner's (1969) work is a brassy, opinionated attack that calls for a completely reconfigured American educational experience. What is remarkable about this work is that instead of documenting a crisis invoking student test scores or dropout rates, these authors pervasively examined deeper systemic issues. To that end, Postman and Weingartner used Marshall McLuhan's prescient and now largely confirmed conclusions about media and culture.

Teaching as a Subversive Activity is wholly student-centric. Would and if we could apply the principles provided in this book, we would need to explore completely different curricular options—options that might reveal multiple world views in collision, lines drawn too darkly and broadly between disciplines, and a rethinking of the place of the student/teacher.

Postman and Weingartner, in their ultra-humanist stance, believed that perceptions of relevance and irrelevance could guide all activity within their proposed schools. While this might ignite robust discussions toward developing critical processes and inquiry, I fail to see what their claims would mean for mass-marketing or globalization. In other words, Postman and Weingartner's principles do not mesh with the demands and results of rapidly paced industrial and global change or "progress."

If we do (or did) live in a rational, linear, sequential science-math-language dominated world, one reason this book might not have influenced practice is because all of the examples, cases, and recommendations are situated within humanities-oriented thinking and experience.

A Pattern Language: Towns Buildings Construction

Christopher Alexander and other authors from the Center for Environmental Structure in Berkeley, California produced *A Pattern Language* in 1977. The authors' work departs from prior trade and architectural expertise. The book was written for general readers. Alexander and his colleagues maintained that all people ought to embrace autonomy in community architectural-design, and they suggested that people left to their own activity automatically create beautiful spaces. This is a shift from reverence for expertise and specialization, and is similar to the critiques by Postman and Weingartner, Small, and McLuhan.

In accord with all of the authors included in this paper, Alexander and his team insisted on interdependence and multiple complimentary and contradictory ideas existing in simultaneity. For these authors, buildings and structures situated in places and environments are "profound truths." While the authors did not explicitly confront the differences between paradoxes, dilemmas, and problems, they implicitly accounted for these phenomena and maintain that their 253 interrelated patterns are "very much alive and evolving. In fact, each pattern can be looked upon as a hypothesis" (xv). The 253 patterns are ordered from smallest to largest, yet they are all interrelated and the authors claim this is a language. The language is based on connections and the interdependence of the patterns.

Similar to Postman and Weingartner's work, *A Pattern Language* focused on the university as a marketplace: "Concentrated, cloistered universities, with closed admission policies and rigid procedures . . . dictate who may teach a course, kill opportunities for learning" (232). Further research is needed on access to programs—especially music/music education programs which may solely rely on unreliable models for admissions.

Music Society Education

Music Society Education (1977) still stands as a novel and savage critique of the post-Renaissance western classical art music tradition, and the social and institutional structures that have grown out of that tradition (Walser 1996, Pitts 2000). In *Music Society Education*, Small primarily cited scholars whose interests and expertise extend beyond music education. Small relied heavily on anthropologists, sociologists, and Marshall McLuhan, Ivan Illich, and Herbert Read. Also, Small interwove the ideas and activities of modernist and avant-garde composers, not as an end of western music history, but as a point of departure for his arguments.

According to Small's publisher, John Calder (2001), *Music Society Education* was, "a radical reevaluation of the purpose of music in the community" (503). It should be noted that Small seemed to gravitate naturally towards community ends and eschew hollow reform by stating "the purpose is to replace the education *system* with an educational *community*" (222). Additionally, Small cited Postman and Weingartner on education and critiqued the assumed superiority underlying knowledge as defined by scientific and not artistic bases. Here, Small joined other authors included in this paper, yet his assertions pointed to a shift in worldview rather than an explicit announcement.

Small claimed that the arts inherently change perception. If perceptual changes are made through arts education, then perhaps changes in education and, ultimately, changes in society might follow. Whether she knows Small's work or not, Greene (2000) has made this same claim. Ultimately, Small leaves the reader with the idea that musical activity is process, and that ritual is the mother of all arts, always situated in community.

The Aquarian Conspiracy

In her book, *The Aquarian Conspiracy*, Ferguson (1980) is more explicit in introducing a change in worldview, more so than Small or Alexander. Ferguson's ideas, similar to other authors included in this paper, are a rejection of Cartesian and Newtonian thinking. She calls for a restructuring of human relationships with nature. Ferguson also invokes McLuhan's 1964 *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man* (55) and suggests that a new worldview is not an option, but rather a reality that is already happening. Change and the increasing inevitability of change are central to Ferguson's work. Moreover, Ferguson works to show how to *build in the capacity for change* in complex systems.

Much like McLuhan and Capra, Ferguson suggests that an East-meeting-West movement will drive the paradigm shifts and their attendant concerns she identifies. That these works operate from documented crises and provide positive, holistic, humanistic conclusions suggests to me that they imply important applications for music education, if we choose new directions.

The Reenchantment of the World

Berman (1981) suggested that a "split between fact and value has roots in the Scientific Revolution of the 16th and 17th centuries" (16). Berman asserted that a re-relationship with

nature is essential to what he calls “participating consciousness.” For Berman, participating consciousness “involves merger, or identification with one’s surroundings, and bespeaks a psychic wholeness that has long since passed” (16). Berman laments that the last time western civilization enacted widespread participating consciousness was during the “age of Alchemy.” Berman employed systematic historical investigation to provide new insights into Newton, Descartes, and Bacon, all thinkers who lived contemporaneously with the creation of some of the seminal works that formulate the western art music canon fundamental to our music programs, which now demand advocacy.

The Turning Point

Like Berman, Capra (1982) rejected the Cartesian-Newtonian worldview that he claimed is antithetical to framing problems and finding solutions in a new systems thinking or systems view of life. Capra’s systems view of life is interdependent and holistic and culminates in his suggestion that we are moving from a petroleum age to a solar age. Capra’s book lends itself to applications in education because he wrote about social activity and social behavior, after using his physics background to identify a change in worldview. According to Fosnot (1986), these connections to education are easy to make, since the educational system remains inherently Newtonian: that is, and despite the well known works of Dewey and Freire, students are still viewed by many “educators” as passive receptacles for knowledge and as objects/subjects to be observed.

Synthesis

When I originally discovered the sources I have described to this point, I was shocked by the duplications in conclusions, regardless of discipline. Many similar books exist. For the purposes of this paper, I limited my choices to sources that are not widely cited in the literature of music education. A list of commonalities among includes the following:

- 1) None of the authors blame technological change; in fact, they all seem to embrace it.
- 2) The authors see electronic technology as a factor in what catapulted people into a paradigm shift.
- 3) The authors reject Cartesian-Newtonian science, and are even willing to work past Einstein for a new world view.

- 4) The authors claim humans are ruining our planet, and they call for a human realignment with nature.
- 5) The authors write broadly on economics, education, sociology, music, science and politics.
- 6) The authors cite McLuhan, without much variance, and build on his work, just as McLuhan (McLuhan and Powers 1989) did in the remaining decade of his life.
- 7) The authors are all human-centric; they advocate a return to nature, and their educational ideas are student-centric.
- 8) The authors all have some basis in Dewey. Small is the least explicit about his debt to Dewey.
- 9) The authors all believe that change and increasing change is a major factor worth studying and teaching.
- 10) For the most part the authors' predictions have come true, especially those grounded in McLuhan's work.

Advocacy is in our blood, but does it have to be?

According to Edward Bailey Birge (1938/1966), "Public school music in the United States has its roots in attempts to improve singing in the church service" (2). While this is a form of utility, it is not the same as the utility we currently discuss when we claim "music makes us smarter" or any of the news on today's MENC/NAfME website. Birge pointed to early notions of music education advocacy: "Meanwhile, the singing school had justified its existence and had become a popular institution" (11). He added that "Music in the schools was always regarded as an experiment; it had to prove its expediency in each separate instance" (57). While some advocacy for anything people do probably always exists, the current music education advocacy movement includes some strange fanatical characteristics. Here I find it helpful to consider Santayana's quip: "Fanaticism consists of redoubling one's efforts after having forgotten one's aim."

Advocacy has served as a "false-god narrative" because of its logical emptiness, viral compactness, and the speed with which it can be delivered to inservice teachers and MENC/NAfME leaders. As an aside, Bowman (2006) captures a problematic tendency in our profession when he critiques music education as aesthetic education (MEAE):

MEAE was seldom subjected to thorough or critical scrutiny. Indeed, it could be argued that its utility was due in no small part to an elusiveness and vagueness that permitted its use wherever an affirmative adjective was needed: aesthetic this, aesthetic that, aesthetic whatever.

It is my contention that the word (or concept of) “advocacy” seems to have replaced “aesthetic” in current MENC/NAfME discourse—again without measured critique. Will we let this pattern continue?

While there are some outliers, when we examine how convoluted our research base is, and how much of a disconnect exists between research and inservice teaching, it seems as if we have nothing left to communicate as a profession. There are exemplary inservice teachers across all areas of professional duty, yet it seems reasonable to conclude that the profession does not offer meaningful, substantive support to our inservice teachers, either through research or advocacy. As Kimpton (2005) lamented:

Please show me proof that Justin Timberlake, Shari Lewis, country music stars, Bose stereo discounts, the ‘N Sync/Herbal Essences contests and lesson plans, and the Oscar Meyer composition contest are really helping teachers, and especially young teachers, keep their jobs and solve vexing and perpetual issues in how to teach music—and teach music well. Good teaching and solving the instructional capacity of young teachers requires more than a Web site of experts, the World’s Largest Concert, or a 75-minute panel discussion with three experts and five minutes of question and answer. (16)

Another attribute of advocacy is that it is, in itself, a form of mandate. I argue that our profession has become so good at responding to mandates that we have become our own enemy. Regelski (2000) provides a diagnosis of behavior in music education when he suggests that MEAE is:

[T]oo insubstantial to bring about discernible consequences of a pragmatic nature. This lack of results then creates a legitimization crisis for music education that in turn, necessitates political advocacy and the need for teacher accountability in the form of national standards. (61)

I acknowledge my argument might be too related to my own place or locale. In Fairbanks, Alaska, MENC/NAfME publications are mostly what teachers have to think about. But it struck me while writing this paper that, rather than serving as a narrative or external synthetic justification for our work, MENC/NAfME is simply a brand name, and we are simply co-opted consumers and marketers of our own obsolescence. The idea of a

“legitimation crisis” seems like another attendant narrative that is prominent in education and music education today.

More work needs to be conducted in order to critically examine our research base and decide how to build in the capacity for change before we begin to change. Ferguson’s *The Aquarian Conspiracy* allows for explicit connections here. *A Pattern Language* might provide a different means for organization. While it seems reasonable that inservice teachers would read the *Music Educators Journal* or *The Instrumentalist*, are those publications as tightly coupled with the *Journal of Research in Music Education* or the *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* as they could be? Is that even a desirable aim?

Humphrey’s assertion that we have worked with “missionary-like zeal” worries me (Humphreys 2004). It is my claim that we seem to be missionaries equipped with a virus and a mandate, yet our political and public constituencies seem to be immune to our virus—rather, it is our inservice teachers who catch the virus while our mandate sneaks past us with our soft stamp of approval, lost in the bombardment of numerous other mandates we process as just another “thing” we need to get done.

As an aside, I unexpectedly got a near-violent reaction out of one of the Tanglewood II authors at a conference in Boston after the panel unveiled their new ideas. I was bothering the group about including language that addresses a federal government suddenly interested in educational policy (Vinovskis 2009), when one of the Tanglewood II authors passionately exclaimed, “We need to replace ‘advocacy’ with ‘agitation!’” Another thinker on this topic, Kapalka-Richerme (2011), suggested replacing the word “advocacy” with the word “exchange” because she identified advocacy as a one-way monologue closed to other stimuli or impulses.

I proposed earlier that our profession is fractured and advocacy has ascended to the only narrative we seem capable of uttering in unison. Furthermore, I suggested a divisive turn that shifted the debate within the profession from the nature of music learning to the utility of music learning. I furthermore suggest that the utility of learning is also a false narrative. How we came to live with these false narratives (quite possibly among others) might underscore why the writers from the late 60s to the early 80s ideas never gained traction. There are at least two other reasons for the lack of uptake.

First, I claim that the political landscape of the 80s and 90s dramatically changed the relationship of the U.S. Federal Government and U.S. education efforts. While Sputnik is

most often cited for this change, by 1983, *A Nation at Risk* might have impacted the limited application of the movement these writers outlined and circumscribed. This has played out into the 2001 No Child Left Behind legislation and it appears that increasing intervention from the Federal Government will only continue. According to Vinovskis, between 1787 and the 1960s “...the federal government played only a small role in helping states and local communities to improve K-12 education” (10). The expanding role of the Federal Government in American public schools is a relatively recent phenomenon—or even an historical freak and demands different ways of thinking about what we do.

Second, politicians in the U.S.—specifically politicians involved with the National Governors Association (regardless of party)—tend to implicitly know that if they document a “crisis,” they can then attempt a testing-based solution to broadcast how they fixed a fixable “crisis.” A big problem is that when we talk about educational reform, we tend to only include/blame one third of the participants. Why does it seem that the textbook industry and the testing industry are immune from complaints? Why do those corporate entities seem to take so little public responsibility for crises, real or invented, in education?

Finally, Goodlad (2004) suggested that public school education is currently mired in at least four different reform ideas. I crafted Goodlad’s four choices into the following multiple choice question:

Which of the following choices might best improve public school education?

- a. Make it so that all parents can choose their students’ schools.
- b. Hold back all children who fail academic achievement tests.
- c. Put a qualified, caring, competent teacher in every classroom.
- d. Institute statewide standards-based testing and accountability.

For Goodlad, the correct response is to put a qualified, caring, competent teacher in every classroom. Goodlad reminds us that in numerous commission reports on school improvement “...from the 1950s into the 1990s, the education of the nation’s teachers was rarely mentioned.” Could this transfer to music education? Is there something we are missing when we pursue an Advocacy Movement that pushes us into the roles of missionaries, different from “qualified, caring [and] competent teachers?”

Narratives

Each author surveyed in this paper provided a unique, yet complimentary narrative that might be metaphysical in nature and contain the strength to guide new thinking in music education. Postman and Weingartner offered narratives of change, post-literate society, student-centric learning, critique and experimentation. These ideas taken in concert or separately could renew efforts in music education. Small provided the narratives of ritual, doing and experience. For Small, acknowledging and encouraging children's creativity through sociological and community lenses is a meaningful genesis for music teaching and learning. Berman, Capra, and Ferguson broadcasted a theoretical framework announcing a shift in worldview that underscores all of the other selections in this paper.

A Pattern Language could be used to organize and arrange music education. This might not be incompatible with National Standards, but it is more specific and allows for greater autonomy based on the idea that "no pattern is an isolated entity" (xiii). In other words, the National Standards are only one way of organizing—if they are that at all. Should all public school music education look and sound the same? Should all music education appeal to the same ideals? Can it? Are the ideals worthy of our aspirations? Do the standards function like this, or did we simply spend considerable effort and money on nine standards that when analyzed can be distilled into: 1) We should make music (Standards 1–5); and 2) We should think about music from time to time (Standards 6–9)? Kimpton (2005) remarked that

if we had taken just half of the money we expended on the national standards movement and spent it on creating models, collaborations, investments in new research for teacher education and mentoring, we might really have helped the supply of teachers be better equipped to teach well *with* the standards (16).

Finally, a narrative that might be developed centers on *what we already do in the arts* instead of the way we have conceived the current advocacy movement. In the arts, multiple, complimentary and contradictory ideas can be and are presented simultaneously. Replace "multiple ideas" with "profound truths" and through study in the arts we can and do study our human paradoxes and dilemmas (for Small, we study our environment), which, fundamentally different from problems, have no solutions.

For problems, the authors of *A Pattern Language* stated:

Each solution is stated in a way that it gives the essential field of relationships needed to solve the problem, but in a very general and abstract way—so that you can solve the problem for yourself, in your own way, by adapting it to your preferences, and the

local conditions at the place where you are making it. For this reason, we have tried to write each solution in a way which imposes nothing on you. It contains only those essentials which cannot be avoided if you really want to solve the problem. (xiv)

Alternatives

If the money in education is caught up in the testing and textbook industries, what happens when an alternative educational community evolves aside from those entities? The Alaska Summer Research Academy (ASRA) is one educational endeavor based on experiential learning, open ended possibilities, and fun-based inquiry. ASRA has been running for twelve years and brings students together from the remote bush/rural areas in Alaska and attracts students from the remainder of the United States. The age range of the students is 12–18 years old.

A typical day begins with the “Morning Exposure.” Students crowd into a lecture hall at 9:00 am. They are tired; this might well be the first time in their lives that they get to choose when to sleep and when to eat and how much or how little. The “Morning Exposure” is a forum for the above and beyond in science, music and art. In my four years of attendance, I have seen a living reindeer in the lecture hall, dog mushers with their dogs running around, scientists igniting and exploding objects, Hollywood and Saturday Night Live musicians performing, and more. It should be noted that this is only the first half hour of the day for ASRA. The ASRA Philosophy and Goals as they appear in the ASRA Handbook are included here in full:

ASRA PHILOSOPHY AND GOALS

Education is not the filling of a pail, but the lighting of a fire.

- William Butler Yeats

We do not cease to play because we grow old; we grow old because we cease to play.

- George Bernard Shaw

While the instructional modules at ASRA vary in scope and style, ASRA has a common philosophy: we want students to have fun and learn about things that excite them. We hope this attitude will lead to an increased interest in subjects the student will pursue in school or as a career in later life. ASRA is a work of the heart as much as it is one of the brain.

There are no grades or tests at ASRA, but there are challenging academic experiences. Working in small groups with experienced faculty role models

allows these bright young students to study in a different way than the typical classroom. Immersion in one subject allows the students at ASRA to study topics faster and reach a higher level than they would otherwise.

Unlike other programs where the emphasis is on homework and tests, the central goal of ASRA is fostering passion and creativity in a less traditional setting. It is not the end product that is most important, but the process of discovery and empowerment. Students at ASRA will learn with the ceiling of scores and grades removed and they can go as deep and high in one subject as they are able. This is made possible by instituting a flexible curriculum and restricting modules to small groups of students.

Goals of ASRA

- 1) Have fun. If the experience is fun, the rest will follow
- 2) Offer in-depth experience and advanced instruction
- 3) Foster curiosity and zeal for the world
- 4) Increase interest in college, higher learning and a variety of career paths
- 5) Showcase UAF as a college choice for high school students
- 6) Build a community within ASRA amongst educators, students and parents
- 7) Serve the community of Fairbanks and the world.

At ASRA, a set 5 to 1 student to teacher ratio with two teachers for each module is the norm. There is no bell system or need to move the students from subject to subject or room to room. If students are interested in something, they might spend hours on it, and if something fails to excite them, or if they do not have enough energy for that area they may move on to something else. Ravitch (cited in Postman 1995) presciently stated,

In this new world of pedagogical plenty, children and adults will be able to dial up a program on their home television to learn whatever they want to know, at their own convenience. If Little Eva cannot sleep, she can learn algebra instead. At her home-learning station, she will tune into a series of interesting problems that are presented in an interactive medium, much like video games...Young John may decide that he wants to learn the history of modern Japan, which he can do by dialing up the greatest authorities and teachers on the subject, who will not only use dazzling graphs and illustrations, but will narrate a historical video that excites his curiosity and imagination. (39)

While we might agree that Ravitch's televisions are now ipads, this sort of learning is going on all of the time (consider the description of the massive open online physics course in Ripley 2012). While Postman (1995) argued a student might not study algebra, and might watch a movie instead, he is careful to note, "What Ravitch is talking about here is not a new technology, but a new species of child..." (39).

While most of the students at ASRA can conceptually describe (electrical engineering or algebra for that matter) how an audio speaker works, it is more valued at ASRA for students to construct their own speaker from scratch. While this requires materials, the internet and possibly destroying an old speaker, the student ultimately owns this knowledge. Once students have coiled magnet wire around a magnet and worked to send an audio signal to a small cone fashioned out of a beverage cup, they embark on deeper, experiential understanding imbued with the demands of multiple tries and problem solving. What is interesting is that teaching algebra solely or teaching speaker building without any sort of explanation for why it works or does not, is incomplete. The former lends itself well to paper and pencil tests and the latter could be done mindlessly or even without a mind in an automated factory.

ASRA students reflexively oscillate between both sides of inquiry within the experience, which is really not much different from how humans seem to do this on their own. The work of the entire panel of authors for this paper supports this sort of natural human curiosity and creativity. If there is truth in this idea (widely supported by the panel of authors for this paper) about how humans explore their environments, what have we done that makes it so we have to advocate for music education? Furthermore, one interpretation of ASRA is that it is a reaction to rigor in the sciences. While scientists do not seem to need advocacy—at least not grass roots advocacy—what have we done to land in a situation where we need to make music look more academic and science more fun when both are humanly legitimate ways of knowing the world?

Conclusions

If the function of education is to hold social and economic classes together—or to permit little passage between socio-economic classes, then we have another reason why the work of these authors has not been more prominent. Nehring (2003) questioned why a liberal education never rises to full ascendancy in any system, and also asked why the idea of a liberal education never completely vanishes. Nehring concluded that the idea of a liberal education always remains, cushioned and protected by the upper-class in hard times, and simply trickles down when times are good.

Another notion about musical activity in the public schools is to just withdraw completely. Small (2008) suggested developing 24 hour, 7 days/week community music

centers outside of the public schools. This does make the idea that musicians have always bowed to a patronage system more tenable. There are prizes for being included in the academy and if public school music education is a hypothesis, perhaps it is time to try something else. While ASRA is expensive and community music centers are expensive, it is important to note that the textbook industry is expensive and so is the testing industry.

Keil (1985) reading from within the music profession, remarked,

Henry Pleasant's, *Serious Music and all that Jazz* (1969), John Blacking's *How Musical is Man?* (1972), Shepherd, Virden, Vulliamy and Wishart's *Whose Music?* (1977) and Christopher Small's, *Music Society Education* (1977), taken together suggest most forcibly that youth on four continents are fully justified in their deep involvement with Afro-European syntheses and their scorn for conventional music education in schools. Music educators have, by and large, failed to tap this vast reservoir of expressive power, much less provide the kind of strong guidance that would enable youth to grow into these styles rapidly and expertly. (89)

Keil's thinking leads me to believe that between the late sixties and our present time, the profession became deaf to multiple changes that now appear to be documented inside and outside of the profession. This deafness has forced us into the advocacy movement, that now after two decades, does not seem to bear fruit. I realize that some advocacy must exist for any sort of culture creation and change as evidenced by the title of Benham's (2010) book, *Music Advocacy, Moving from Survival to Vision*. However, music education seems to be in an age of deprofessionalization, and perhaps we are coyly acting too young by looking at the work of Leonard and House, Britton, and Mursell as a genesis instead of just a highlight. Perhaps our roots go deeper and while unreasonable to apply old times to the new, seeking narratives through oblique study might re-inform and newly guide our work as music educators.

I conclude by stating that music education has more to do than just re-legitimize itself through false narratives. As artists, we need to tell stories—narratives, narratives that are compelling and complete. Narratives that are spiritual, metaphysical, and whole. What are we doing as artists if we do not (and I return to Postman's 1995 criteria) "provide people with a sense of personal identity, a sense of community life, a basis for moral conduct, [and] explanations of that which cannot be known?"

References

- Alexander, Christopher, Sara Ishikawa, and Murray Silverstein. 1977. *A pattern language: Towns buildings construction*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Benham, John. L. 2010. *Music advocacy: Moving from survival to vision*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Education.
- Berman, Morris. 1981. *The reenchantment of the world*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Birge, Edward. B. 1938/1966. *History of public school music in the United States*. Washington DC: Music Educators National Conference.
- Bowman, Wayne. D. 2006. Musical experience as aesthetic: What cost the label? *Contemporary Aesthetics*. Retrieved on May 11, 2011 from <http://www.contempaesthetics.org/newvolume/pages/article.php?articleID=388>
- Calder, John. *Pursuit: The uncensored memoirs of John Calder*. London: Calder Publications Ltd.
- Capra, Fritjof. 1982. *The turning point: Science, society, and the rising culture*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Ferguson, Marilyn. 1980. *The Aquarian conspiracy: Personal and social transformation in our time*. New York: J. Tarcher.
- Fosnot, Catherine. T. 1986. Review of *The Turning Point* by Fritjof Capra. *Educational Communication and Technology* 34(3), 183–186. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30220970>
- Goodlad, John. I. 2004. Why we need public education. In *Letters to the Next President*, ed. C. Glickman, 54–60. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Greene, Maxine. 2000. *Releasing the imagination: Essays on education, the arts, and social change*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Humphreys, Jere. T. 2004. Popular music in the American schools: What history tells us. In *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education*, ed. Carlos X. Rodriguez, 91–105. Reston, VA: The National Association for Music Education.
- Kapalka–Richerme, Lauren. 2011. Apparently, we disappeared. *Music Educators Journal* 98(1), 35–40.
- Cee, Vincent. 2013. The end(s) of advocacy: Responding to our own mandates instead of creating new leadership. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 12(1): 64–81. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Cee12_1.pdf

-
- Keil, Charles. 1985. Paideia con Salsa: Ancient Greek education for active citizenship and the role of Latin dance-music in our schools. In *Becoming Human through Music*, ed. D. McAllester, 87–94. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Kimpton, Jeffry. 2005. What to do about music teacher education: Our profession at a crossroads. *Journal of Music Teacher Education* 14(2), 8–21.
- McLuhan, Marshall. 1964. *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McLuhan, Marshall and Bruce R. Powers. 1989. *The global village: Transformations in world life and media in the 21st century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Nehring, James H. 2003. The liberal impulse in American schooling: Three historical case studies. D.E. diss., University of Massachusetts Amherst.
- Pitts, Stephanie. 2000. *A century of change in music education: Historical perspectives on contemporary practice in British secondary school music*. Brookfield, VT: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Postman, Neil. 1995. *The end of education: Redefining the value of school*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Postman, Neil, and Charles Weingartner. 1969. *Teaching as a subversive activity*. New York: Delacorte Press.
- Regelski, Thomas. A. 2000. Accounting for all praxis: An essay critique of David Elliott's music matters. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* 144, 61–88.
- Reimer, Bennett. 1970. *A philosophy of music education*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- . 1963. The common dimensions of aesthetic and religious experience. Ed.D. diss., University of Illinois, Urbana.
- Ripley, Amanda. 2012. College is dead. Long live college! *Time* 180(18), 31–41.
- Small, Christopher. 1996. *Music Society Education*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Vinovskis, Maris. A. 2009. *From a nation at risk to no child left behind: National education goals and the creation of Federal education policy*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Cee, Vincent. 2013. The end(s) of advocacy: Responding to our own mandates instead of creating new leadership. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 12(1): 64–81. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Cee12_1.pdf

Walser. 1996. Forward to the 1996 edition. In *Music Society Education* by Christopher Small, ix–xi. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.

About the Author

Vincent Cee is Assistant Professor of Music Education at the University of Alaska Fairbanks. Vincent's teaching includes music education courses, the core curriculum, music technology, improvisation, and honors courses. He holds music education degrees from the University of Alaska Fairbanks (B.M.), Arizona State University (M.M.) and the University of Massachusetts Amherst (Ph.D.).

Vincent's research interests range from examining musical activity within institutions to issues in policy, curriculum, and philosophy. Vincent's research has been accepted for presentation by the International Society for Improvised Music, The National Association for Music Education, MayDay Group Colloquium, American String Teachers Association, and the Alaska Music Educators Association. Additionally Vincent contributes to *American String Teacher*, and the *Music Educator's Journal*. His work has been published in the MIT Press publication, *The Leonardo Music Journal*.

Vincent maintains an active performance schedule with the Fairbanks Symphony Orchestra, The Arctic Chamber Orchestra, and The Juneau Symphony. He teaches at The Fairbanks Summer Arts Festival, The Fairbanks Suzuki Institute, Alaska Summer Research Academy, Fairbanks Youth Orchestras, and is Artistic Director of the Fairbanks Summer Music Academy.