

Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education

I S S N 1 5 4 5 - 4 5 1 7

A refereed journal of the



Volume 13 Number 1
March 2014

Sociology of Music Education Special Issue

Vincent C. Bates
Editor

Brent C. Talbot
Associate Editor

Petter Dyndahl, Sidsel Karlsen, Ruth Wright
Guest Editors

‘Socialized Music’: Historical Formations of Community Music through Social Rationales

Deanna Yerichuk

© Deanna Yerichuk. 2014. The content of this article is the sole responsibility of the authors. 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.

Special Features: When this document is open in Adobe Reader, endnotes and citations can be viewed by placing the cursor over the corresponding number or date.

'Socialized Music': Historical Formations of Community Music through Social Rationales

Deanna Yerichuk
University of Toronto

Abstract

This article traces the formation of community music through professional and scholarly articles over the last century in North America, and argues that community music has been discursively formed through social rationales, although the specific rationales have shifted. The author employs an archaeological framework inspired by Michel Foucault to analyze the usage and contexts of the term 'community music' in four historical moments, including Progressive-Era manuals and guidebooks, mid-century articles in the Music Educators' Journal, writings of the Community Music Activity Commission established by the International Society of Music Education from 1982, and articles in the International Journal of Community Music. The author concludes that community music's social rationales have discursively produced a social rationality, which has largely overdetermined community music as an educational enterprise, while historically underdetermining what specifically constitutes the 'community' of community music. Keywords: community music; historical; music education; social; rationale; Foucault

While scholarship on community music is relatively recent, the term 'community music' and the practices that the term organizes are much older. Within a North American context, the term 'community music' proliferated nearly a century ago during the Progressive Era,¹ in which community music's value was articulated as its ability to promote social and cultural betterment, reconfiguring musical activities in community as "administering to the social as well as (or by means of) the musical needs" (Zanzig 1932, 5). In this way, community music was constituted by its *social* purpose, or what William Lee (2007) has called a 'social rationale': the ways in which music within community settings was articulated

less as an end in and of itself and more as a tool toward the social betterment of individuals, local communities, and societies at large.

The emergence of music's social rationale in the Progressive Era identified by Lee has formed the over-riding logic of community music over the last century in North America to discursively produce the contemporary scholarly field of community music. The social rationales have shifted over time, but collectively they articulate community music as a tool towards social betterment. Through a historical analysis of professional and scholarly literature over the past century situated primarily in North America, I examine the social rationales underpinning the field of community music that, even while changing throughout the century, have discursively produced a set of practices that can be known as community music. By rationales, I refer specifically to the kinds of arguments, explanations, reasons, and justifications employed by authors that not only define the purposes of community music, but in defining those purposes, also articulate the academic field of community music.

My analysis is inspired by Foucault's archaeological theories (Foucault [1970] 1972, Foucault [1966] 1994). Archaeology broadly endeavours to take a metahistorical view of the development of disciplines in terms of how disciplines shape what can be known, or as Foucault suggests, examine how knowledge is produced as an effect of discourse (Foucault [1970] 1972, 148). Key to archaeology is examining how knowledge is produced, particularly how certain knowledges are verified and validated to the exclusion of others. Foucault defines archaeology as:

...not exactly a discipline but a domain of research, which would be the following: in a society different bodies of learning, philosophical ideas, everyday opinions, but also institutions, commercial practices and police activities, mores—all refer to a certain implicit knowledge [*savoir*] special to this society. This knowledge [*savoir*] is profoundly different from the [formal] bodies of learning [*des connaissances*] that one can find in scientific books, philosophical theories, and religious justifications, but it [*savoir*] is what makes possible at a given moment the appearance of a theory, an opinion, a practice. (Foucault quoted in Scheurich and MacKenzie 2005, 846)

This distinction between *savoir*, implicit knowledges/practices, and *connaissances*, formal bodies of knowledge that verify and legitimate certain knowledges/practices,

is a useful jumping off point for analyzing community music. Certainly, music has been made in communities for a long time, but writings formalize and legitimate certain practices as ‘community music’, which have produced the scholarly field over time. Archaeology covers a much larger domain than I can within this article, so I take as a more narrow focus the literature on community music written in North America over the last century, analyzing how community music has been articulated in various writings with an eye to the production of the academic field of community music. From this theoretical standpoint, my analytical task is not so much to review the literature that has considered community music historically as it is to examine the appearance and usage of the term ‘community music,’ tracing its appearance(s) and effects. Sara Mills argues that Foucault's archaeological project is “the analysis of the system of unwritten rules which produces, organises and distributes the ‘statement’ (that is, the authorised utterance) as it occurs in an archive (that is, an organised body of statements)” (Mills 2003, 24). This is precisely the task I take up here in considering the social rationales of community music historically: tracing the writings on community music in North America that have, through the century, formed the ‘statement’, or authorised utterance, on community music, increasingly authorised through formal institutions through the formation of an academic discipline. In short, my project is to analyze how the collective assemblage of social rationales has discursively formed an over-riding social rationality in an emerging discipline of community music.

My analysis focuses on writings on community music published by three primary sources: the *Music Educators Journal*, the *International Journal of Community Music*, and monographs or book-length guides. While my examination is not exhaustive, I here attempt to identify the key themes related to how the term ‘community music’ has been shaped as an educational practice and discipline over the last century in North America, with an eye to the development of the rationales that have articulated the social rationality of community music as a scholarly field over time. While much of the literature, both historically and contemporaneously, asserts music’s social benefits, my analytic intent is not so much to test the veracity of the claims within the literature, but rather to explore the epistemological underpinnings that have made the term ‘community music’ intelligible as a scholarly

field located within Music Education. How is it that 'community music' has come to be seen as an educational enterprise? What have been the rationales in describing community music's purpose? What have the tensions been? Have these shifted over time, and if so, how? I take two analytical devices from archaeology (Foucault [1970] 1972, 46) as my primary guide in this work: (1) identify "surfaces of emergence," or the social/cultural contexts in which particular rationales appear; and (2) identify "authorities of delimitation," or which people/institutions can speak with authority to produce knowledge about community music. Further, I have endeavoured to examine the exclusions and the discontinuities (Foucault [1970] 1972, 229) necessary to produce community music discursively. By tracing the appearance and use of the term 'community music,' my analysis necessarily begins with writings on community music that were personal essays or practical guides, which not only offer some of the first instances, or emergences, of the term 'community music,' but also point to some early discursive formations of community music that are later picked up, transformed, or changed within academic institutions in North America many decades later.

'Socialized Music': The Emergence of Community Music in the Progressive Era

The Progressive Era in North America, from the late 1800s to the end of World War I, was marked by wide-spread social reform that focused in part on building democracy and strengthening citizenship. Progressive education, led largely by John Dewey, was one of the era's defining features.² This historical moment created the conditions in which music was sacralised through an emerging social rationale, which Lee (2007) describes as the reasons and justifications that music educators used in describing music's purpose, a *social* rationale because music within community settings was articulated as a tool toward the social betterment of individuals, communities, and societies at large. Music, and music education, were framed as "an important part of the cultural uplift of society and tied to political and economic improvement" (Lee 2007, 94). As J. Lawrence Erb argued in 1926, "it is the business of community music to afford to each individual the fullest opportunity to come into contact with this beneficent influence in the most effective way" (446).

Yerichuk, Deanna. 2014. 'Socialized music': Historical formations of community music through social rationales. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(1): 126–54. act.maydaygroup.org

Writings on community music in North America first appeared in the beginning of the twentieth century in the form of either practical guides or essays that argued the value of community music in terms of its social and socializing effects. Peter Dykema (1916), a prominent music educator who was an early advocate for community music,³ referred to community music as a ‘socialized music’ that was not so much a new idea as it was a “new point of view” (219) that emphasized the utility of music practices, a “usefulness for the greater social body” (223). This new point of view enabled Dykema to articulate community music not just as an effective tool toward socialization, but as an ideal technique in building a democratic nation. The Playground and Recreation Association of America, with assistance from Dykema, published the guide *Community Music: A Practical Guide for the Conduct of Community Music Activities* in 1926, and the guide also framed music as a tool for democracy that could accomplish a myriad of goals related to social betterment, including: improve work life and home life, enhance citizenship training, improve leisure pursuits aesthetically and morally,⁴ and much more.

These early writings predicated the social rationale of community music on an educational epistemology, in which community music was tacitly or explicitly framed as music-making outside of schools. Most guides and manuals were produced by music educators and focused on how to *create* community music initiatives, suggesting that community music was not about paying attention to music-making already circulating in various communities, thereby tacitly excluding pre-existing musical practices within definitions of community music. Instead, authors focused on ways to bring groups of people together with particular repertoires and processes led by trained volunteers or professionals. The one exception is Augustus Zanzig’s 1932 publication *Music in American Life: Present and Future*, which documents amateur music-making activities across the United States in the late 1920s. He is clear in his position that community music begins in the musical activities already underway within any given community. At the same time, he advocates for what he calls “musical development,” predicated on musical leadership that builds and develops amateur music activities:

Whatever kind of organization is formed or whatever else is done, its purpose is to help provide musical opportunity for the people *of a*

particular community. It should therefore be an outgrowth of that community's own conditions and possibilities. In other words, what is done must depend on what is already being done and on available leadership, musical interests, leisure, community spirit, financial support, and civic, social, educational, and other organizations or institutions which might help in musical developments. (1932, 157, italics original)

With the final emphasis on 'musical developments,' Zanzig articulates community music activities not simply as cultural phenomena to be observed as an anthropologist might, but understands existing musical activities as something to be nurtured, supported, and "developed," subtly positioning community music as an educational enterprise, albeit within a broader field of music-making possibilities within communities.

The need for such educational approaches was articulated in terms of access: community music was the mechanism to provide musical opportunities to people who would otherwise not have access to music. The educational efforts embedded in articulations of community music were largely in response to the perception that people had become alienated from music-making, or what Zanzig called "spectatoritis" (1932, 5). Community music held the potential to "return music to the people" (Playground and Recreation Association of America 1926, 10), even while the question of which "people" had been musically alienated from what kinds of music was not made explicit. Dykema (1916) rationalized community music's ability to return music to "the people" using the progressive education philosophies of John Dewey (1915). Dykema argued that community music was well suited for Dewey's call to encourage human interaction and companionship, which were markers of civilization. Further, Dykema argued that community music could spread among Americans' everyday lives because of the new phenomenon of leisure time created through industrialization and pursuant government legislation limiting work days and work weeks. With new-found free time, many Americans could turn to community music as a leisure-time pursuit that both encouraged social cohesion and promoted expressions of emotions and beauty through active music-making (Dykema [1934] 1991).

The relationship of industrialization to music-making opportunities was not without contention. Contrary to Dykema's positive analysis of the socio-musical possibilities emerging out of industrialization, Bartholomew and Lawrence (1920), in their guide *Music for Everybody: Organization and Leadership of Community Music Activities*, contended that industrialization actually *caused* general alienation from music-making. Further, they linked industrialization to the rise of technologies that made 'popular' and 'jazz' music more widely available. This, they argued, suppressed traditional 'folk' music. To these maladies, community music offered the remedy, according to Bartholomew and Lawrence, by introducing people to folk music that was specifically American, simultaneously fostering civic pride and "good fellowship and neighborliness" (8). Bartholomew and Lawrence use the terms 'popular,' 'jazz,' and 'folk' as markers of distinctively different categories of music, although did not define the scope of each term. Clearly, the category of 'folk' music for these authors was strongly linked to practices and ideals of community music, and by bracketing off 'popular' and 'jazz' musics, they discursively defined the territory of community music that likely had both class and race implications (Vaugeois 2009; Campbell 2000). Further historical research is needed to parse out exactly what these implications might be by examining what kinds of repertoire and musical practices, and therefore what cultures, were being evoked through the term 'folk music' as a marker of community music, and whose musics were being excluded by excluding 'jazz music' and 'popular music' from community music.

The 'community' of community music, was not overtly defined in these early writings, but authors tended to idealize community as inclusive of all Americans, despite the exclusion of groups of Americans from the actual music practices. Bartholomew and Lawrence argued that "[a]ny activity which deserves the name of 'community' should be designed to possess at least some feature of interest or to touch in some definite way the life of every man, woman, and child in the community, regardless of creed, race, or color" (1920, 58). While the emerging discourse of both progressive reform and community music suggested that all citizens would be included in social cohesion efforts through music, recent histories have noted the ways in which the proponents of progressive reform, in both educational and musical practices, excluded races and ethnicities in their

community-building work. Elizabeth Lash-Quinn (1993) documented the racial segregations inherent in America's settlement movement resulting in African Americans establishing their own settlement houses to support African American communities. Terese Volk (1998) argued that in addition, Native Americans and Asian Americans were also excluded from the progressive social and musical work of social reformers. These historical research studies bring to light some of the subjugated knowledges upon which community music was predicated. By articulating the field of community music as a planned educational endeavour that tended to exclude particular kinds of music, combined with social environments that may have excluded particular people, the field of community music began to emerge discursively as an inclusive ideal formed through particular sets of practices that legitimated some knowledges and subjugated others.

Yet, there was some debate on what musics constituted 'community music,' suggesting some discontinuities across these emerging authoritative statements that began producing the field of community music. In some cases, Western European Art Music was largely understood as the superior music to be used in community music activities, as was the case with the National Recreation Association, whose writers felt that popular music of the day only had a role insofar as offering an enticing carrot to encourage people to participate:

The community music movement takes music to the people where they are in their homes and neighborhoods; takes the community where it is now in its musical tastes and degree of development and carries it by successive stages to a higher plane of musical appreciation.
(Playground and Recreation Association of America 1926, 10)

For the authors of this guide, non-Western European musics offered a starting point in a progression toward Western European Art Music. However, not everyone celebrated Western European music as the endpoint for community music.

Bartholomew and Lawrence (1920) argued that the purpose for community music was to offer music-making opportunities to people who had been alienated musically due to "an invasion and domination of American music by foreign artists" (13) from Europe. They linked community music to democracy by suggesting that tastes in foreign music (specifically Western European music in this case) was "dangerous for

democracy” because it “means that the average personal opinion is borrowed rather than created” (14). This debate, however, tended to focus on the musics of white, Anglo-Protestant Americans, and musical practices of other cultures in America were largely overlooked or outright excluded in community music guides, producing knowledge about community music that was predicated on specific cultural beliefs yet framed as universal inclusion.

Writings in the Progressive Era were not unified in the specific social tasks or musical techniques of community music: from a Foucaultian perspective, these discontinuities in fact produced community music discursively in forming a universalism of an ideal within a contingency of practices. Some authors positioned community music as an antidote to industrialization while others felt industrial developments made community music possible; some authors felt European classical music was the ultimate aim of community music, while others emphasized American-based ‘folk’ music as the ideal musical focus. Through these differences and debates, however, the authors collectively articulated community music through a social rationale predicated on emerging ideals and practices of a democratic state, in which music could produce better citizens and a better nation. Further, these early writings framed community music as an educational endeavour toward developing democracy and civic participation, by bringing music to “the people.” Yet clearly, the exclusions embedded in these early guides, articles, and manuals, combined with legitimation through publications produced by key figures in the professional field of music education, began to produce the authorized statement of community music in terms of Western European musics and traditions even within an assumption of universal access. This social rationale of providing music to everyone was taken up mid-century by America’s national music education association, albeit with significant shifts away from democracy and industrialization toward debates about access and professionalization.

“Music for Everybody!” Extending Music Education into the Community

In the mid-twentieth century, writings on community music focused less on music as a socializing force to develop democracy and more on music-making as a social activity that could and should be available to all people outside of school. The Music

Educators National Conference (MENC), America's national association of school-based music educators, took up some of the themes introduced by Peter Dykema, moving the social rationale away from democracy and toward an emphasis on universal access, using the theme of "Music for Everybody!":

It is agreed that 'Music for Everybody, and Everybody for Music' reaches its fullest significance in a community when all of the people are active participants. They must participate not only as listeners to the performances of music played and sung by professionals, or by their neighbors, but by producing music themselves. (MENC 1950, n.p.)

MENC had established a committee on community music in 1931 (Normann 1939), and through to the early 1960s, several articles on community music appeared in the *Music Educators Journal*, a publication targeting music educators, in which MENC began to promote community music more broadly as both building support for school-based music, and as a mechanism to continue music education outside of school. MENC (1950) argued that music participation reduced 'the consciousness' of religious and political differences, as well as differences in economic and social status. Rather than explicit references to democracy, the organization focused on universal access to music, particularly in the form of music-making rather than music-listening, articulating community music's social purpose as 'Music for Everybody,' in which 'all' community members could and should actively participate in musical performance.

Perhaps because MENC comprised music educators, community music was articulated mostly as an extension of music education outside and beyond schools, which therefore required an educator to lead the activities. Most articles suggested that school-based music educators were well suited to lead community music activities, given what Swartz (1953) called a "new concern for the cultural growth of society as a whole" that "points to a need for a more intimate relationship between the music educators and the community he [sic] serves" (60). However, exactly *how* to achieve that cultural growth was debated. John C. Kendell, a former president of MENC, noted that while "[s]omeone has raised the question as to whether the broad philosophy advocated by the School-Community Music Relations and Activities Committee actually has the effect of advocating low-class music-if, indeed, some of it

is music at all” (1950, 20), there should be room for various approaches. In response to other articles advocating the role of the music educator in the community to spread “good music” (understood as Western European Art Music performed through orchestras, choruses, and bands), Kendell did not disagree so much as believe, similar to Zanzig several decades before, that community music activities needed to begin with where the people were at “to develop the musical tastes of the individual” (1950, 21). Through the debate of whether to start where the people were at and lead them to better taste, or to simply start with “good music,” it is clear that debates about diversity or cultural pluralism did not figure into discussions during this time period beyond references to music’s ability to reduce differences. The authoritative statement that began to emerge in the Progressive Era continued mid-century to produce community music as a form of education predicated largely on Western European culture, statements validated through America’s national music education association. Similar to writings earlier in the century, the MENC articles offered little analysis of who exactly was included, as well as how musical repertoires and practices might have served to exclude or include. There was some acknowledgement of various kinds of music, or at least different approaches to community music teaching, but the writings did not at this point grapple with the pedagogical implications of musical practices from various cultures.

While writings indicated that social purpose of community music was to educate groups of people in better musical taste and participation as a form of social betterment, the overarching social rationales also aimed to address and shift perceived boundaries between professionals and amateurs, which formed a new kind of social rationale for community music.⁵ Several writers felt that music-making had become an elitist musical practice, and that community music initiatives offered social music-making opportunities to anyone and everyone regardless of experience or skill. Henry Drinker took rather vivid umbrage at music’s perceived elitism:

The idea that most people are born unmusical and that the making of music is but for the chosen few is a wholly false, though widespread, obsession, like witchcraft, hellfire, the idea that bleeding was good for sick people, or that tomatoes were not fit to eat. (Drinker [1967]1991, 37)

Drinker framed music-making as an important component to the “spiritual life” (37) of individuals rather than merely a form of entertainment, arguing that amateurs are essential in “maintaining a cultured society” (38). In short, Drinker rationalized community music as a form of society-wide cultural edification and uplift.

While Drinker emphasized the amateur’s role in building society culturally and spiritually, Max Kaplan ([1954] 1991, [1956] 1991a, [1956] 1991b), a sociologist influential in music education,⁶ more directly examined the ‘social role’ of the musical amateur as an aspect of community music. His analysis of music’s social organization was perhaps the first article to consider community music’s social processes, in addition to its social goals, and it is possible that his status as a sociologist lent scientific weight to the value of music education overall, legitimating both community music and the larger field of music education. Kaplan argued that amateurs and professionals were allies that in fact shared many characteristics. He outlined four social ‘agencies’ that articulated music in relation to social processes, including agencies of instruction, agencies of production, agencies of distribution, and agencies of consumption.

While Kaplan’s model embedded music in social processes, his model still presupposed community music to be an educational environment, grounding his discussions of community music in relation to school-based music education. He argued that for school-based music educators, community music offered both proof of the work within schools as well as opened up further opportunities for music education beyond the school years. For Kaplan, school music education was in large part responsible for creating the ‘favorable conditions’ for so many music amateurs in America, while also suggesting that the potential for creative output by these amateurs is not yet fully harnessed outside of the school system (Kaplan [1954]1991). These sentiments were echoed by C.F. Nagro (1959) who commended community music in its “remarkable progress in the United States, starting from the era of the ‘singing school’ and the pioneering work of Lowell Mason (1792–1872), and other leaders” (28).⁷ Nagro’s statement echoes most writings on community music in mid-century North America, largely produced by members of MENC, which framed community music as an extension of school-based music education. More so than the previous era, community music was framed in its social betterment as a way that

legitimated the work *within* schools. Community music legitimated, and was legitimated by, music education in constructing its territory as a learning environment outside of school. At the same time, perhaps, community music legitimated the work of music educators by demonstrating music education's usefulness to a broader society.

Writings about community music in North America diminished from 1960 to the early 1980s. Volk (1998) argued that with the pressures of the Cold War (which emphasized science, math and technology in classrooms) as well as the Civil Rights Movement, which opened up cultural demands in classroom spaces, music educators faced substantial changes within classrooms. It is possible that these demands focused the majority of their efforts on implications within, rather than outside of classrooms. The lack of writing on community music within such political upheaval is surprising given the contemporaneous British context, which Higgins (2012) argues largely inspired community music practices in the United Kingdom. The gap in North American writing warrants further research, given the social and political upheaval of the era. However, another society, the International Society for Music Education, was well on its way in advocating for cultural pluralism within Music Education, and would become instrumental in influencing the development of community music as an academic discipline in North America beginning in the 1980s.

Cultural Pluralism and Community Music: The Influence of the Community Music Activity Commission

Beginning in the 1980s and into the 1990s, community music began to receive much more scholarly attention within North America thanks largely to the influence of the International Society for Music Education (ISME). The increase in scholarship also marked significant changes in the articulation of the social purposes of community music: the social rationales did not disappear, but with an emerging global focus in community music scholarship in North America, community music was increasingly framed not just as a means towards social ends, but as a phenomenon embedded within social and cultural processes, a perspective rarely discussed in North America earlier in the century, with the exception of Kaplan ([1954] 1991, [1956] 1991a, [1956]

1991b). It bears noting that with ISME's increasingly prominent global influence, it is difficult to centre the analysis only in North America. While America's Music Educators National Conference (MENC) established the Adult and Community Music Education Special Research Interest Group in 1996 (Coffman 2010), much of the research presented through MENC's committee was published through ISME and its Community Music Activity Commission, suggesting that as global concerns and approaches to community music of ISME infiltrated and influenced the American field, so too, American scholarship became entwined in global scholarship, shifting the social rationales of community music to include questions of cultural diversity in both music and social life.

In 1982, the International Society for Music Education established the Community Music Activity Commission to investigate music activities under the term 'community music,' entrenching the term as an academic field while shifting the grounds on which music educators in North America had defined the practices, approaches, and social rationales of community music. ISME arguably always highlighted intercultural education in community and school settings since it was established in 1953 by the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) with the mandate to "stimulate music education throughout the world as an integral part of general education and community life, and as a profession within the broad field of music" (McCarthy 2008, 39). ISME had even established several commissions prior to the Community Music Activity Commission that covered music outside of schools, including the Commission on the Education of the Amateur, Adult Education (established in 1974) which changed to the Out of Schools Commission in 1976 (see McCarthy 2004, 96-97). However, the 1982 establishment of the Community Music Activity Commission formalized the term 'community music,' articulating the field as a scholarly discipline.

The Community Music Activity (CMA) Commission largely defined community music as non-institutional or informal music learning, which was not so different from MENC mid-century. However, the very distinction of community from formal education provided the grounds by which the CMA Commission could focus on the loftier goal of 'furthering human development' as articulated by the first chair of the CMA Commission, Norwegian academic Einar Solbu:

Yerichuk, Deanna. 2014. 'Socialized music': Historical formations of community music through social rationales. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(1): 126–54. act.maydaygroup.org

...we limited our responsibility to 'that part of the musical environment which furthers human development', and we stated that we would limit ourselves 'to those activities which are not directly related to the formal charge of music education within institutional settings'. (1987, 23)

From its inception, the CMA defined the scope of community music as music education towards human development that occurred outside of schools.

While this territory seems similar to the previous rationales of community music within North America over the past century, particularly in its assertion as a non-institutional but educational terrain, the CMA Commission embedded this work within a framework of cultural diversity, endeavouring to value all forms of music. The established aim of the commission was to contribute to the realization of opportunities "to be involved in musical activities reflective of the pluralistic nature of society" (Solbu 1987, 23). The Commission's first policy statement emphasized music's role in cultural formations, arguing that "music is a basic means of human expression and communication, is one of the factors that creates social and cultural identity" (McCarthy 2004, 40). Unlike previous historical writings within the United States, the CMA Commission's writings questioned the assumed superiority of Western European Art Music, or at least, acknowledged diverse musical knowledges, repertoires, practices, and skills. Solbu questioned in his first report: "[i]s the influence of Western European Art Music over the last few centuries a threat to our local music traditions, whether we live in Europe, Africa, South America—or wherever it may be?" (1983, 59)

ISME's CMA Commission offered a global forum to consider community music practices from diverse cultural standpoints, which significantly affected the scholarly development of community music within North America, which, in turn, transformed the authoritative statement of community music by grappling with the cultural tensions underpinning western and non-western musics within Music Education, even at moments noting music practices of indigenous peoples (Drummond [1988] 2010, Burton [1996] 2010), which to this point had been all but ignored in community music writings. What (and who) had previously been excluded from the field of community music now became central tensions in the discursive production of community music.

The emergence of scholarship on community music, in a modernist era increasingly preoccupied with scientific production of knowledge, arguably began to legitimate community music through an increasing academic gaze that articulated community music as a valid academic discipline. As Foucaultian scholar Mills (2003) suggests, disciplines “prescribe what can be counted as possible knowledge within a particular subject area” (60). This historical moment, which in a North American context marks the emergence of academic scholarship on community music, simultaneously took up and challenged previous constructions of community music, but by virtue of those discussions occurring in academic circles, legitimated community music as a form of knowledge production. Academic institutions became the authorities of delimitation, verifying musical practices towards social ends in ways that produced community music discursively as an academic field.

Proliferation of Social Rationales in Contemporary Community Music

Scholarship on community music has proliferated significantly within the last decade, and community music continues to gain legitimacy through this scholarship. In addition to the increasing global reach of ISME’s Community Music Activity Commission (McCarthy 2008), the *International Journal of Community Music* was launched in 2006, publishing scholarship on community music from around the world, with an editorial board comprising a significant number of scholars located in North America. The production of an academic journal, at first an open-access, online journal, but now a subscription-based printed journal, indicates increased legitimacy of community music as a form of knowledge. The journal has become a central mechanism to collect, publish, and disseminate scholarship on community music from scholars around the globe. As such, I here want to examine some of the social rationales within the journal’s published scholarship that define, and produce, the contemporary field of community music.

Contemporary community music scholars have argued that music’s social function is to make society better, whether focusing on individuals, communities, nations, or even global change. Over the last five years, scholars writing about community music have made various claims regarding the social goals, outcomes, and/or benefits of music in community settings, including: civic engagement or—

harkening back to Dykema's work—strengthening democracy (Bell 2008, Jones 2009, Langston and Barrett 2010, Silverman 2009); building intercultural understanding and celebrating diversity (Higgins 2008, Jones 2009, Veblen and Olsson 2002); encouraging personal well-being and development (Garrett [1998] 2010, Sandbank 2010); fostering social well-being and development (Langston and Barrett 2010, Veblen 2008, Veblen and Olsson 2002); and working toward social justice (Elliott 2007, Higgins 2008, Silverman 2009). Community music scholars have largely employed qualitative research to substantiate music's social benefits and legitimate community music's social functions, as seen in Langston and Barrett's (2010) study of the accumulation of social capital in a community choir. Further, community music scholars have expanded their focus on the kinds of activities included under the term 'community music,' including informal music sharing (Veblen 2005); music in prisons (Cohen 2010); and non-institutional youth music programming (Balandina 2010) to name a few examples.

Yet, even while community music scholars work to widen the activities that might be considered 'community music,' its educational epistemology still strongly shapes the development of the scholarly field, which in turn tends to legitimate non-institutional educational music practices as community music. The editorial notes for the *International Journal of Community Music* states that it:

holds an open concept of community music. That is, we suggest that community music may be thought of in a variety of ways, including (but not limited to): music teaching-learning interactions (for all people of all ages, ability levels, and interests) outside 'formal' music institutions (e.g. public schools, university music departments, conservatories, symphony orchestras), and/or partnerships between formal institutions and community music programmes. (Editorial statement, 2011)

The "concept" of community music endeavours to remain open and inclusive to diverse musical practices, even while articulating the field as music teaching-learning interactions. The editorial statement, certainly an authoritative statement, asserts that while the field is open to various musical practices, it is primarily those practices understood as music teaching and learning that tend to validate, and be validated by, the scholarly field of community music, if in a culturally pluralist framework that

endeavours to acknowledge many musical practices. The ways in which music education continues to form community music's epistemological foundations can be seen in recent attempts to address cultural diversity in its scholarly activities. The ISME CMA Commission held in Beijing in 2010 worked extremely hard to include diverse world perspectives into the scholarship, and to include scholars from various world regions (Coffman, 2011). The 2011 issue of the *International Journal of Community Music* published papers presented from the Beijing Forum, and most community music examples were related to or delivered by school music programs, suggesting that the field continues to experience scholarly constraints and struggles in the tension between a fully inclusive ideal and a set of practices historically shaped by its relationship to the discipline of music education. The example is not meant as a critique of either the event or the field, but used to demonstrate a tension between the universalism of the ideal and the contingency of the practice, both of which constitute community music. In fact, this struggle could be understood as a kind of vibrancy in the field calling to mind the Foucaultian assertion that the very fact that contingency is ever-present always means the possibility of transformation of discourses is also always present (Foucault [1970] 1972, 130).

However, and perhaps more urgent, many community music scholars continue to normalize community and community music as always and only good. Several scholars (Veblen 2008, Elliott 2007, McCarthy 2004, Silverman 2009, Bell 2008) have produced research that is in many ways a contemporary extension of the 'music for everybody' position celebrated by MENC scholars mid-century: that is, all people have the right to make music and so all people should be able to make music. Through much community music literature, concerns about equity and social justice tend to be framed in terms of ensuring people can participate in whatever musical structures that currently exist, or advocating for similar musical structures to be replicated in community settings so that more people can access music-making. For example, several scholars position community music as a democratic space simply by virtue of its existence and/or because there are no auditions (Silverman 2009, Bell 2008), overlooking systemic barriers that might question whether specific spaces function democratically.

Conclusion: Social Rationales and The Emerging Social Rationality of Community Music

It's a matter of shaking this false self-evidence, of demonstrating its precariousness, of making visible not its arbitrariness but its complex interconnection with a multiplicity of historical processes, many of them of recent date. (Foucault [1978] 2003, 248)

The historical and contemporary social rationales that I have discussed do not simply describe an emerging field of community music but discursively produce community music through an over-riding social *rationality*. By 'rationality' I refer to an over-riding logic that has become naturalized to seem inevitable, universal, and self-evident. The social rationality of community music is grounded first in the fundamental assertion that music making in community (framed most often as music learning outside of schools) leads to social betterment. Second, writings have assumed that if music is an effective tool for social development, then music activities should be made available to people who cannot otherwise make music, and further, music activities that promote accessibility are more inclusive. Access was emphasized in Progressive Era writings from Zanzig (1932) and Dykema (1916), which suggested that providing musical activities to disenfranchised people improved those individuals as well as society overall. Mid-century, MENC (1950) focused on 'music for everybody' to argue that people outside of schools also deserved music education. ISME's Community Music Activity Commission argued that people from diverse cultural backgrounds deserved not only to have access to music, but to have these diverse musical practices included in discussions about community music. In contemporary scholarship, all of the above arguments can be seen, in addition to an emerging argument of access as a form of social justice or democracy. Through all examples, community music is consistently positioned as a fully inclusive project, by virtue of its focus on access and on social development.

This social rationality of community music discursively produces the field of community music, forming a discourse in which the objects of study "find the principles of their regularity" (Foucault [1970] 1972, 229). In using the term *discourse*, I mean the collection of statements that shapes what can be known,

recognized, and legitimated as community music. Lise Vaugeois (2009) defines discourse as “a group of statements which provide a conceptual framework for thinking and talking about a particular topic at a particular historical moment” (4). How things get talked about constructs our knowledge about them, governing our ability to think or act in particular ways. Community music was not a pre-existing phenomenon that has simply been documented over the years: the very statements made about community music *construct the very topic of community music*. The social rationales of community music that I have discussed in four key historical moments constitute discursive formations of community music in which particular ideas and practices at particular historical moments have been included and validated over the past century in North America (such as Western European repertoires and school-based music practices applied to community settings), while others have been excluded, or subjugated (such as jazz music or informal music making settings). The emerging discourse of community music, predicated on these inclusions and exclusions, produces effects that include material consequences both positive and negative, often unnoticed under the normative statements that form community music’s social rationality. Instead of taking these claims as self-evident, my analytical task has been, in line with the opening quotation at the beginning of this section, to identify the precariousness of the assumptions forming the social rationality of community music within specific historical moments.

Through my analysis, there have been two significant assumptions that have shaped the field of community music discursively in a social rationality: first, community music has been largely overdetermined as an educational enterprise. Community music is almost always defined in relation to music education. That is to say that whatever community music is, it is *not* music education within schools, establishing community music as an educational field, even if a form of education that is non-institutional. It is through this educational epistemology that debates about social and musical goals or purposes of community music become intelligible. Such debates seem to be of less concern in disciplines rooted in humanities and non-education-based social sciences. In those disciplines, questions of music and community are largely studied terms of how community functions to organize human musical practices or vice versa. Kay Kaufman Shelemay (2011), for example, reviews

the term 'community' in the field of ethnomusicology, developing a typology of 'musical communities': notably absent from her historiography of community are discussions about the relative goals or techniques of music and sociality. Community music as a disciplinary field is substantially formed by the fact that it emerged from music education, which, despite recent definitional impulses to include dispersed activities within community music, largely focuses on (non-institutional) educational activities. While on the surface, this seems merely self-evident, neither stupendous nor troublesome, consider that an educational environment assumes a teacher and participants, and, in the context of community music, assumes a goal of social betterment. Given this particular context, the epistemological assumption of education-based music-making combined with a goal of social betterment renders questions of power both relevant and extremely important: who is teaching and who is participating? Who is being excluded? What kinds of 'social betterment' are being fostered, and whose interests are being served?

Such critical questions have largely been ignored by community music scholarship, largely due to the second assumption that has shaped the field, namely that scholarship has underdetermined what specifically constitutes the 'community' of community music. While scholars have debated how to define community music,⁸ the *community* of community music is often normalized as always-already inclusive. The tensions, debates, and assertions that have constituted community music in North America over the last century largely, though not entirely, leave the term 'community' unexamined, or assume that 'community' is always and only a positive phenomenon.⁹ When 'community' is discussed, it is frequently discussed as an abstract concept (e.g. Bell 2008, Silverman 2006, Silverman 2009), or is simply a given in whatever context being studied (e.g. Jones 2009, Langston and Barrett 2010). Music's social purposes always seem positive. Whether towards democratic engagement, social inclusion, human development, encouraging active music-making, or creating a kind of cultural pluralism, community music is almost always understood as an always and only good thing.

The discourse that has constructed community music through many of the writings explored here tend to take for granted that inclusion is inherent in the very practices of community music. However, as Foucault ([1966] 1994) points out, and as

the rationales over the past century show, the hallmark of a rationality is its aspiration to universalism while developing in contingency. The danger of articulating a universal concept of community music through particular practices is the danger of substituting the part for the whole, constructing what can be known about community music through subjugating experiences and knowledges that may not comply with positive experiences of community music. The effects of these discursive formations, authorized through educational institutions and their scholars, exert power through the very production of knowledge. By framing community music as only positive, assuming a goal of social betterment, and asserting social and musical inclusion, community music scholarship elides the power relations always present within social/musical environments, along with subjugated experiences and knowledges both within the music activity and excluded from the music activity altogether. Without posing critical questions about who is doing the teaching, and who is learning (that is, who has the power to provide the educative musical experience for social betterment, and who is being socially bettered) there is a very real danger that community music is re-inscribing social relations rather than resisting them.

I would be remiss not to point out that community music as a scholarly discipline is arguably a kind of subjugated knowledge to the larger field of music education, particularly in North America, which has articulated the territory of music education primarily within schools, focusing on formal learning techniques based on ensemble playing and performance. Scholars focusing on community music have brought to light alternative music-making environments, as well as diverse learning and teaching techniques, repertoires, and participation. Community music scholarship has opened up new areas of investigation and consideration in a field that defined music education narrowly in its environments, processes, materials, and participant skills and experience. Community music's very presence in music education scholarship opens up the possibility of shifting the discourse of the overall field in important ways. However, in the process of legitimating certain knowledges, experiences and practices within a broader academic field, community music scholarship runs a risk of contributing to exclusionary practices, all the more troublesome in the context of a field that celebrates community music as an always-

already inclusive, even socially just, musical space that fosters social betterment of participants.

Historically, writings on community music have articulated the field through social rationales that have shifted over the past century. Through my examination of four key moments, including the Progressive Era, MENC writings mid-century, ISME's CMA commission, and the recent scholarly journal on community music, I believe that the moment is ripe to investigate the claims about community music's social power. The combination of education towards social betterment with partial views of the inclusions and exclusions that constitute specific communities suggests that while community music has, again and again, been articulated as an effective way to develop people, little attention has been paid to who is doing the developing and who is 'being developed.' Substantial research remains to be done to analyze constructions of community within community music scholarship, as well as investigating exclusions and contingencies upon which community activity is based. International comparisons can also contribute to a more complex historical and contemporary picture of community music as a discipline and as a discourse, building on work in the United Kingdom (for example, McKay and Higham 2012) and Australia (for example, Bartleet et al. 2009), which have importantly different historical developments and discursive formations. To begin, however, by acknowledging and tackling the tensions underpinning the ideals of inclusive community practices, a space opens up to determine more thoroughly how the term 'community' constitutes its own subjects, symbolically, materially, economically, politically, and socially.

References

- Allsup, Randall Everett, and Heidi Westerlund. 2012. Methods and situational ethics in music education. *Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education* 11(1): 124–48.
- Balandina, Alexandra. 2010. Music and conflict transformation in the post-Yugoslav era: Empowering youth to develop harmonic inter-ethnic relationships in Kumanovo, Macedonia. *International Journal of Community Music* 3(2): 229–44.
- Yerichuk, Deanna. 2014. 'Socialized music': Historical formations of community music through social rationales. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(1): 126–54. act.maydaygroup.org

- Bartholomew, Marshall, and Robert Lawrence. 1920. *Music for everybody: Organization and leadership of community music activities*. New York, NY: Abingdon.
- Bartleet, Brydie, Peter Dunbar-Hall, Richard Letts, and Huib Schippers, H. 2009. *Sound links: Community music in Australia*. Brisbane: Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre.
- Bell, Cindy. 2008. Toward a definition of a community choir. *International Journal of Community Music* 1(3): 229–41.
- Bowman, Wayne. 2009. The community in music. *International Journal of Community Music* 2(2/3): 109–28.
- Bradley, Deborah. 2009. “Oh that Magic Feeling!: Multicultural Human Subjectivity, Community, and Fascism’s Footprints.” *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 17(1): 56–72.
- Burton, J. Bryan. 2010. Community of learning: Music learning and performance practices among the native peoples of North America. *International Journal of Community Music* 3(3): 369. (Original work published 1996).
- Bush, Jeffrey. E., and Krikun, Andrew. 2013. Community music in North America: Historical foundations. In *Community Music Today*, eds. K. K. Veblen, D. J. Elliott, S. J. Messenger, & M. Silverman, 13–24. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- Campbell, Gavin. J. 2000. ‘A higher mission than merely to please the ear’: Music and social reform in America, 1900–1925. *The Musical Quarterly* 84: 259–85.
- Coffman, Don. 2010. Harmonizing the diversity that is community music activity through a bibliographic database. In *CMA XII: Harmonizing the diversity that is community music activity: proceedings from the International Society for Music Education (ISME) 2010 Seminar of the Commission for Community Music Activity*, ed. Don Coffman.
- _____. 2011. Editorial. *International Journal of Community Music* 4(1): 3–5.
- Cohen, Mary L. 2010. Editorial. *International Journal of Community Music* 3(1): 3–6.
- Dewey, John. 1915. *German philosophy and politics*. New York, NY: Holt.
- Yerichuk, Deanna. 2014. ‘Socialized music’: Historical formations of community music through social rationales. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(1): 126–54. act.maydaygroup.org

- Diner, Steven J. 1999. Linking politics and people: The historiography of the Progressive Era. *OAH Magazine of History* 13(3): 5–9.
- Drinker, Henry S. 1991. Amateurs and music. In *The music educator and community music: The best of MEJ*, ed. Michael Mark, 35–39. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference. Reprinted from “Amateurs and Music”, 1967, *Music Educators Journal* 54(1): 75–78.
- Drummond, John. 2010. The multicultural dimension: Thoughts on the special experience of the New Zealand seminar. *International Journal of Community Music* 3(3): 317–20. Original work presented in 1984.
- Dykema, Peter W. 1916. The spread of the community music idea. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 67: 218–23.
- _____. 1991. Music in community life. In *The music educator and community music, The best of MEJ*, ed. Michael Mark, 13–17. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference. Reprinted from Music in community life, 1934, *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 20(4), 34–74.
- Elliott, David. J. 2007. ‘Socializing’ music education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 6(4): 60–95. act.maydaygroup.org
- Erb, J. Lawrence. 1926. Music for a better community. *The Musical Quarterly* 12(1), 441–48.
- Foucault, Michel. [1970] 1972. *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books.
- _____. [1966] 1994. *The order of things: An archaeology of the human sciences*. New York: Random House.
- _____. [1978] 2003. Questions of method. In *The essential Foucault: Selections from essential works of Foucault, 1954-1984*, eds. P. Rabinow and N. Rose: 246–58.
- Garrett, Steven. 2010. The role of community music in helping disadvantaged young people in South Wales to confront social exclusion. *International Journal of Community Music* 3(3): 371–77. Original work presented in 1998.
- Higgins, Lee. 2007. Acts of hospitality: The community in community music. *Music Education Research* 9(2): 281–92.
- Yerichuk, Deanna. 2014. ‘Socialized music’: Historical formations of community music through social rationales. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(1): 126–54. act.maydaygroup.org

- _____. 2008. Growth, pathways and groundwork: Community music in the United Kingdom. *International Journal of Community Music* 1(1): 23–37.
- _____. 2012. *Community music in theory and in practice*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Jones, Patrick. 2009. Lifewide as well as lifelong: Broadening primary and secondary school music education's service to students' musical needs. *International Journal of Community Music* 2(2/3): 201–14.
- Kaplan, Max. [1954] 1991. The social role of the amateur. In *The music educator and community music, The Best of MEJ*, ed. Michael Mark, 41–45. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference. (Reprinted from Music, community and social change. 1954. *Music Educators Journal* 40(4): 26–28.)
- _____. [1956] 1991a. Music, community and social change, Part 1. In *The music educator and community music, The best of MEJ*, ed. Michael Mark, 19– 22. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference. (Reprinted from Music, community and social change. 1956. *Music Educators Journal* 43(1): 64–7.)
- _____. [1956] 1991b. Music, community and social change, Part 2. In *The music educator and community music, The best of MEJ*, ed. Michael Mark, 23–5. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference. Reprinted from “Music, community and social change”, 1956, *Music Educators Journal* 43(2): 47–9.
- Kendell, John C. 1950. Music for everybody—everybody's music. *Music Educators Journal* 36(6): 20–21.
- Krikun, Andrew. 2010. Community music during the New Deal: The contributions of Willem Van deWall and Max Kaplan. *International Journal of Community Music* 3(2): 165–74.
- Langston, Thomas W., and Margaret Barrett. 2010. Capitalizing on community music: A case study of the manifestation of social capital in a community choir. *Research Studies in Music Education* 30(2): 118–38.
- Lash-Quinn, Elizabeth. 1993. *Black Neighbors: Race and the Limits of Reform in the American Settlement House Movement, 1890–1945*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Lee, William R. 2007. A new look at a significant cultural moment: The Music Supervisors National Conference 1907–1932. *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 28: 93–110.
- Yerichuk, Deanna. 2014. ‘Socialized music’: Historical formations of community music through social rationales. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(1): 126–54. act.maydaygroup.org

Mark, Michael L. and Charles Gary. 2007. *A history of American music education, third edition*. Lanham, MD: MENC: The National Association for Music Education.

McCarthy, Marie. 2004. *Toward a global community: The International Society for Music Education 1953–2003*. Nedlands, AUS: International Society for Music Education.

_____. 2008. The Community Music Activity Commission of ISME, 1982–2007: A forum for global dialogue and institutional formation. *International Journal of Community Music* 1(1): 39–48.

McKay, George, and Ben Higham. 2011. *Community music: History and current practice, its constructions of 'community', digital turns and future soundings*. Swindon, UK: Arts Humanities Research Council. www.academia.edu

Mills, Sara. 2003. *Michel Foucault*. New York: Routledge.

Music Educators National Conference. 1950. *Music for everybody: A report and pictorial review prepared by the Committee on School-Community Music Relations and Activities*. Chicago, IL: MENC.

Nagro, C. F. 1959. Community music marches on. *Music Journal* 17: 28+56–58.

Normann, Theodore F. 1939. Community projects in music. *Music Educators Journal* 25(5): 33+35–36+84.

Playground and Recreation Association of America. 1926. *Community music: A practical guide for the conduct of community music activities*. Boston, MA: C.C. Birchard and Company.

Price, David. 2010. A view from the workshop floor: What skills and qualities are demanded of today's community music workers and how can they best be taught? *International Journal of Community Music* 3(3): 331–36. Original work presented in 2008.

Sandbank, Graciela. 2010. Community music in the rehabilitation of youngsters at risk. *International Journal of Community Music* 3(3): 405–9. Original work presented in 2006.

Shelemay, Kay K. 2011. Musical communities: Rethinking the collective in music. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 64(3): 349–90.

Yerichuk, Deanna. 2014. 'Socialized music': Historical formations of community music through social rationales. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(1): 126–54. act.maydaygroup.org

- Scheurich, James J., and Kathryn B. MacKenzie. 2005. Foucault's methodologies: Archaeology and genealogy. In *The Sage handbook of qualitative research, third edition*, eds. N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln: 841–68. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Silverman, Marissa. 2006. *Community music? Reflections on the concept*. *International Journal for Community Music*. www.intellectbooks.co.uk
- _____. 2009. Sites of social justice: Community music in New York City. *Research Studies in Music Education* 31(2): 178–92.
- Solbu, Einar. 1983. Community music activity. *International Journal of Music Education* 1(1): 58–59.
- _____. 1987. Adults and musical involvement. *International Journal for Music Education* 9(1): 23–25.
- Swartz, Jack 1953. Training music educators for community leadership. *Music Educators Journal* 39(5): 60–61.
- Vaugeois, Lise. 2009. Music as a practice of social justice. In *Exploring social justice: How music education might matter*, ed. Elizabeth Gould, June Countryman, Charlene Morton, and Leslie Stewart Rose: 2–22.
- Veblen, Kari. 2005. Community music and praxialism: Narratives and reflections. In *Praxial music education: Reflections and dialogues*, ed. David Elliott: 308–28. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- _____. 2008. The many ways of community music. *International Journal of Community Music* 1(1): 5–21.
- Veblen, Kari, and Bengt Olsson. 2002. Community music: Toward an international overview. In *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning*, ed. R. Colwell and C. Richardson: 730–44. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Volk, Terese. 1998. *Music, education, and multiculturalism*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Zanzig, Augustus D. 1932. *Music in American life: Present and future*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Yerichuk, Deanna. 2014. 'Socialized music': Historical formations of community music through social rationales. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 13(1): 126–54. act.maydaygroup.org

Notes

¹ This is not to conflict with Bush and Krikun (2013), who argue that community music in North America stretches back to the mid-nineteenth century, but rather to emphasize the wide-spread use of the term 'community music' during the early twentieth century.

² For an overview of the Progressive Era and the key scholarly debates, see Diner (1999). For an in-depth discussion of Dewey's educational theories particular to contemporary ethical considerations in music education, see Allsup and Westerlund (2012).

³ See Bell (2008), who argues Dykema's role in community music was instrumental in the development of both the field and the scholarly practice.

⁴ For a perspective on music and reform in America, particularly as a moral project, see Campbell (2000).

⁵ Mark and Gary (2007) argue that this split presaged the aesthetic turn in Music Education during the 1960s by focusing on access to the music itself and its inherent beauty.

⁶ Andrew Krikun (2010) analyzes Max Kaplan's contribution to community music during Depression-era America, arguing that Kaplan's efforts to bring music education to marginalized American communities during the New Deal era laid the groundwork for contemporary music education by respecting diversity of musical styles and promoting life-long musical participation.

⁷ His comment effectively dates community music back well before Dykema's early twentieth century writings, while still strongly linking community music to the rise of Music Education overall, as Mason is heralded as the founding father of Music Education in America.

⁸ The 2002 Community Music Activity Commission Proceedings (Rotterdam) offer perspectives on the debates in defining 'community music.'
http://issuu.com/official_isme/docs/2002_cma_proceedings?viewMode=magazine&mode=embed

⁹ Important exceptions include Bradley (2009) and Bowman (2009), who note music's 'urge to merge' can lead to negative effects as easily as positive ones.

About the Author

Deanna is a Ph.D. candidate in Music Education at the University of Toronto, investigating historical social and musical inclusion efforts of community music schools in Toronto's settlement houses, which earned her the 2012 SOCAN Foundation/CUMS Award for Writings on Canadian Music. As a professional singer, she operates a private voice studio, led the voice and choral department at Dixon Hall Community Music School for five years, and has been the guest conductor of Echo Women's Choir. Deanna can be reached at: d.yerichuk@utoronto.ca.