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Towards a Decolonized Music History Curriculum

Margaret E. Walker

In the concluding pages of his 1994 monograph, *The Canon and the Curricula: A Study of Musicology and Ethnomusicology Programs in America*, E. Eugene Helm wrote the following:

> The essential shape of American musicology as it became more or less established by the [nineteen] fifties and sixties is still intact as the century comes to an end, if university curricula are any indication. … [T]he creations of dead white males are, for the moment, only being supplemented (enriched, cheapened, reinforced, diluted, broadened, narrowed) rather than being extensively replaced by the products of alternate value systems.²

Now, a quarter of a century later, in spite of strong turns in musicological scholarship towards cultural theories, critical frameworks, and diverse repertories, the Eurocentric canonic curriculum seems still very much entrenched in required music history survey and “appreciation” courses in post-secondary degree programs in both Canada and the United States. To be fair, undergraduate core academic courses in recent decades have often included a mandatory “Music and Society” or “Music and Listening” course that includes music cultures and contexts beyond the expected Western Art Music composers and works. Furthermore, there are many individual professors who have spent sincere time

---

1. I am immensely grateful for the research opportunities provided for me by Katherine Schofield and Reinhard Strohm as many of the thoughts in this article arose from my experiences as a member of their respective team projects. I am also grateful for funding from the Queen’s University Research Office, Centre for Teaching and Learning, and Faculty Association in addition to helpful comments from my colleagues Colleen Renihan, Robin Attas, and the anonymous reviewers.

2. E. Eugene Helm, *The Canon and the Curricula: A Study of Musicology and Ethnomusicology Programs in America* (Stuyvesant, New York: Pendragon Press, 1994), 95. Helm’s intention in this volume was to study and report on current university music history study in (North) America rather than to argue for or against the inclusion of “the products of alternate value systems.”
and effort revising their music history courses with attention to representation, diversity, inclusion, and alternate modes of delivery and assessment. Nevertheless, the value system that underlies many of Helm’s arguments—that the musical inheritance of Europe is part of “the greatness and distinctiveness of Western civilization”—seems still to underpin most of the choices made in post-secondary music courses, textbooks, and performance requirements.

Helm never mentions colonialism in his mini-history of music and musicology, although he emphasizes that “it has been for centuries part of the very fiber of Western culture to study and absorb the rest of the planet’s cultures.” In the current environment of increasing calls to “decolonize” higher education, however, the role of colonialism in the history and historiography of Western art music and its pedagogies is worth serious attention. At the very least, we need to reflect on the role that European colonial power structures and extracted wealth have played in the creation of universities and academic scholarship, and re-examine our pedagogical content and methods, questioning their re-


4. Helm, *Canon*, 28. Helm, it must be clarified, was arguing for the integration of musicology and ethnomusicology, a re-examination of music criticism, and most of all, for a closer connection of musical performance to liberal arts study in undergraduate music curricula. Many of his points are compelling and not as dated as they might seem; nonetheless, he perhaps purposely presents an unashamedly Eurocentric bias.


6. In Africa, Europe, the United States, and other parts of the Americas, calls to decolonize universities and colleges are largely a result of the #RhodesMustFall movement, which dates from 2015 and focuses on anti-black racism. See, amongst other publications, Gurminder K. Bhambra, Dalia Gebrail, and Kerem Nişancoğlu, eds., *Decolonizing the University* (London: Pluto Press, 2018), and Sabelo J. Ndlovu-Gatshemi and Sephamandla Zondi, eds. *Decolonizing the University, Knowledge Systems and Disciplines in Africa* (Durham, North Carolina: Carolina Academic Press, 2016). In Canada, on the other hand, such calls are almost invariably linked to the rights of indigenous peoples and the Calls to Action arising from the 2015 *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada* http://www.trc.ca/website/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf.
relationships to this larger context. For example, if music history, music theory, music lessons, or music programs are presented without qualifiers, it is normally assumed in North America that they are predominantly the history, theory, lessons, or programs of Western Art Music. University music study still means largely Euro-American “classical” music, as much to us in 2020 as it did to Helm in 1994, and thus university music history means largely the history of European art music. What is worth pondering is not only the assumption that rigorous university music study must be centered around European elite music, but more crucially that this belief is so embedded in our institutions that it is often invisible.

To read that the standard history curriculum of most post-secondary music programs is Eurocentric is surely not a revelation to many readers. Furthermore, in spite of the addition of diverse content in some parts of the curriculum, to point out that learning a Eurocentric canon is still seen as a crucial educational foundation for music majors offers nothing new either. Yet, as conferences dedicated to curricular reflection and reform, such as the Guildhall School’s “Reflective Conservatoire” or the College Music Society’s two “Summits for 21st-Century Music School Design,” submit post-secondary music curricula to analysis and critique, ideas about music history reform often remain comparatively reserved. The most common suggestions for revision include expanding the canon to include marginalized composers or geographical areas, taking a thematic or topical approach instead of a chronological one, or subjecting canonic repertoire to critical analysis through theories of gender or race. While increasing the number of voices and stories in our music history classes or departing from the narrative of eras and works can be understood as types of decanonization, is it accurate to also see these initiatives as characteristic of decolonization? It is surely a great stretch to describe them as steps towards indigenization, an objective that often accompanies calls to decolonize.

7. I use the pronouns “us” and “we” in reference to a fairly homogeneous community of university music professors with the recognition that this will not include all readers (some of whom may appropriately translate my use of “we” to “you people”).
8. The Guildhall School of Music and Drama in London, England, hosts the Reflective Conservatoire Conference every three years “to address key issues in Higher Education within music and drama,” https://www.gsmd.ac.uk/about_the_school/research/whats_on/reflective_conservatoire_conference/, and the College Music Society in the United States has hosted two Summits that combine presentations, workshops, and collaborative curriculum redesign focused on American curricular requirements, https://www.music.org/events.
9. The nuanced differences between decolonization and indigenization are fluid and often contested. The Queen’s University Centre for Teaching and Learning, however, offers a useful definition. “If decolonization is the removal or undoing of colonial elements, then Indigenization could be seen as the addition or redoing of Indigenous elements,” https://www.queensu.ca/ctl/teaching-support/decolonizing-and-indigenizing/what-decolonizationindigenization
I nevertheless continue to wonder whether decolonizing existing university music history courses is even possible or whether the only way to decolonize is to decenter the Western art music canon so radically as to rewrite music history entirely. I confess to finding this type of deep, structural change immensely attractive on many levels, but I also worry that the resultant disconnect with the core Bachelor of Music courses in Western music theory, musicianship, and performance would create a clash of value systems (to borrow Helm’s phrase), potentially irresolvable for first- and second-year undergraduate students. An obvious solution is to advocate that the whole Bachelor of Music be radically rethought, decanonized, decolonized, and perhaps indigenized. Some institutions might well embrace this, but others might very likely react by connecting even more resolutely to their European conservatory-style roots, resulting in an even further siloed and exclusive approach. An increase in the division between “the West and the Rest” is surely not the answer, however one approaches the tangle of questions surrounding decolonization.

But why should North American university music history courses be decolonized, or even decanonized, at all? Perhaps more crucially, for whose benefit should such changes be made? Although the question of decolonizing higher education has in some ways exploded into the Canadian academy’s consciousness in recent years due to the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s investigation into Canada’s notorious residential schools, universities and colleges in the United States have been generally more concerned with racial and economic disparities facing African Americans. Both contexts are inextricably linked to settler colonial histories, but does attempting to address these types of fundamental inequities in the music history classroom become de facto decolonization? Indigenization is even more difficult, and, as Monique Giroux has argued, can easily become a catch-all phrase for overdue improvements to teaching.\(^\text{10}\) Furthermore, as in other academic disciplines, there is still a body of knowledge that remains an expected part of a good university music education. If we do try to decolonize by decentering this knowledge base, might we unintentionally end up preventing current music students from accessing necessary knowledge and skills that we take for granted? Is decolonizing about omitting material, altering delivery methods, changing assessment, or all of the above?\(^\text{11}\)


Can we decolonize and retain what is currently considered valuable? Or must the academy indeed be rebuilt around alternate value systems?

To begin by trying to answer any of these questions is to begin in the middle of the story. Before considering how music history teaching can be decolonized, or whether one should even embark on such an enterprise, one needs first to ask more pointedly what decolonization itself means, and particularly how it can interact with higher education. Decolonization, however, presupposes colonization, and the interaction of Western art music and colonial history is a story that is rarely included in undergraduate education. This is perhaps not surprising, as the familiar historical narrative and its canon of composers and “masterworks” were developed through the mid-nineteenth century and disseminated during its last decades, a period which also saw the apogee (or perhaps more accurately the nadir) of European colonial occupation and empire. Only after firmly placing Western art music history in this historiographic context will it be possible to return productively to questions of why and how to decolonize.

I assert strongly, however, that working towards a decolonized university music history curriculum is a necessary endeavor and should be embraced by North American schools of music. This ought to be the case whether one wants to address the continued inequities that arise from the legacy of plantation slavery or from the ongoing appropriation of indigenous lands and culture. Yet, just as decolonization is a process, many of the ideas presented here are in process and, like decolonization itself, without a clear and knowable end. Nevertheless, it is my hope that the collection of thoughts and data I present here may contribute constructively to the current discussion on decolonization in higher education, and specifically in music programs.

Decolonization

“Decolonization is not a metaphor,” Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang defiantly declare in their influential article that begins the first issue of the journal *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society.* The article is a challenging one for anyone of settler background, not in the sense of being theoretically or syntactically dense, but because of the unrelentingly “unsettling” ideas, claims, and counter-claims the authors present in order to “bring attention to how
settler colonialism has shaped schooling and educational research in the United States and other settler colonial nation-states.”13 Central to their argument is the claim highlighted in the article’s title, that decolonization is “a distinct project from other civil and human rights-based social justice projects” and “not a swappable term for other things we want to do to improve our schools and societies.”14 While other scholars, such as Marie Battiste, Shelia Cote-Meek, and Vanessa de Oliveira Andreotti, el al.,15 approach the history of injustice in the education system, including its hierarchies, exclusions, and unexamined Eurocentric foundations, through a broad critique of ongoing violences they accurately identify as part of coloniality, the legacy of colonialism, Tuck and Yang consistently pull the focus back to settler occupation of stolen Indigenous land.16

This tight focus on Indigenous sovereignty is crucial in the context of settler states like the United States and Canada where the transplantation and nationalist adoption of Western art music are part and parcel of settler colonial history. Yet, the difficulty in seeing practical, feasible ways to alter post-secondary teaching in this context sits at the core of the unsettling message in Tuck and Yang’s article. If decolonization is not a metaphor, can adding indigenous or other diverse content, exploring alternate methods of delivery and assessment, or dismantling hierarchies by “flipping the classroom” really assist in decolonizing university teaching?17

Although focused on the embedded coloniality of scholarly societies

17. An instructional strategy that emerged in the mid-2000s, the flipped classroom decen- ters the authority of the professor by focusing on problem-solving and discussion with peers rather than receiving knowledge through lectures.
rather than university music teaching, Tamara Levitz, in her 2017 address to the Society for American Music, offers thought-provoking examinations of similar questions. Beginning with a recognition of the desire of many scholars “to confront structures of inequality and white supremacy in the society,” and arguably in the academy more broadly, Levitz proposes ten actions that unrelentingly pull wider concerns about social justice back into the context of American settler colonialism and ongoing coloniality. All are worth deep thought, and many, such as her insistence that we rigorously examine what we mean by “American” music and her declaration that courses including indigenous music as a topic of study must address questions of repatriation or engage directly with Indigenous musicians and scholars, are easy to link to questions of curricular reform. Central, however, is her exposure of the structures of Eurocentrism and white supremacy, which underlie not only our musical scholarly societies, but also the academy itself and thus music programs and pedagogies. To be a champion of diversity, Levitz argues, without critically investigating white and Eurocentric structures, may only serve to reinforce the legacy of settler colonialism.

Yet, the history of European colonialism is a history of world-wide violence, “a massive multinational campaign… that spread over the face of the earth.” We, who teach in institutions that sit on Indigenous lands, cannot “[remain] silent on settler colonialism while talking about colonialisms.” Nevertheless, we cannot begin to think about decolonization in (Eurocentric) music programs without considering how European global colonialism shaped what we teach and how we teach it. Marie Battiste uses the metaphor of a keeper or rip current to represent the unseen yet “powerful Eurocentric assumptions of


19. It should be clarified that identifying white supremacist structures does not mean labeling musicologists or music professors as white supremacists. As Levitz explains, it is crucial “for people to understand the distinction between judging individuals and personal prejudice, and investigating the structural injustices and inequalities of white supremacy” (Levitz, “Decolonizing,” 9; emphasis in the original).


education, its narratives of race and difference in curriculum and pedagogy [and] its establishing culturalism or cultural racism as a justification for the status quo.” If, as she argues, “decolonization is a process of unpacking the keeper current,” decolonizing music history must start with a critical and uncensored look at the historiography of music history as a field of study.22

Western Art Music, Modernity and Colonialism

In university core music history classes, it is rare to teach about modernity in the Foucauldian sense of a period reaching from the late 1500s to the end of the twentieth century even though this period encompasses the emergence of tonal harmonic principles that define Western music.23 Most of us instead teach the expected and canonic narrative of musical eras—Medieval, Renaissance, Baroque, Classical, and so on—teaching modernism (not modernity) as a post-tonal rupture in the language of the Common Practice. But if modernity in music, as in literature and philosophy, had its genesis in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, then the musical works, composers, and stylistic genres we connect to the elaborate artistic and architectural styles known as Baroque, ought also to be placed in the global context of voyages of “discovery,” cartography, emergent trading companies and early colonies.24 In Out of Time: Music and the Making of Modernity, Julian Johnson argues that the advent of printed scores marked not only the entrance of music into the world of print capital, but also facilitated a psychological and ontological shift as music became conceived of spatially rather than experientially. Published music, he asserts, was mapped onto a horizontal and vertical axis and thus found “its longitude and latitude at much the same time as these were developed in navigation.”25

Johnson’s assertions regarding such conceptual shifts in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries build on the earlier work of Timothy Taylor, who associates the advent of both tonality and opera with early modernity, discovery, and the beginning of colonialism. Taylor’s larger intention is to problematize and historicize the concept of exoticism in music, but his thoughts about the beginning of Common Practice are worth contemplating. In a nutshell, Taylor “situate[s] tonality in discourses and ideologies of the ‘discovery’

25. Johnson, Out of Time, 118.
of the New World,” connecting the concepts and language of tonal harmony to the concepts and language of travel and exploration (home key, remote chords, arrival points, and so on). The binary of home and away, or in tonal harmony, the binary of tonic and dominant, maps onto the equivalent and arguably more powerful binary of “self” and “other.” Taylor links the rise of opera at the same moment in history to a similar necessity for “representational systems that allowed [Europeans] to manage a world in which they placed themselves at the center and others at various peripheries.”

Taylor’s argument and the examples he offers as proof are difficult to sum up adequately in the body of this article, and I urge both intrigued and skeptical readers to seek further clarification directly from his work. His intention, however, is not to postulate direct cause and effect, but rather, following Foucault, to ask how and why these two arguably revolutionary aspects of Western Art Music both arose when they did. His and Johnson’s insistence that the study of European music should not ignore the effects of colonialism on sixteenth and seventeenth century European cultural construction can also be applied to the entire intellectual legacy of early modernity. In his sweeping history, The Silk Roads: A New History of the World, global historian Peter Frankopan accentuates the effect of “discovery,” trade, and colonization on Europe’s economic culture by asserting:

The Enlightenment and the Age of Reason, the progression towards democracy, civil liberty and human rights, were not the result of an unseen chain linking back to Athens in antiquity or a natural state of affairs in Europe; they were the fruits of political military and economic success in faraway continents.

The links between such “economic success” and the opulence of the Baroque are surely obvious, but I know I am not alone in having taught music and politics in the court of Versailles without any mention of the wealth from North America and the Caribbean that funded Louis XIV’s extravagant use of music and dance.

The problem is, of course, that we have all learned a history that excluded this context. The nineteenth century scholars who wrote the history of Western music we still study did not include the impact of the rise of European

nations as conquerors and eventual world powers after 1500 and certainly never considered possible connections between trading companies, slavery, and commercial exploitation on the one hand and Western art music on the other. To borrow Taylor’s words: “The fact that things change is, one would think, elementary, yet it is striking just how little historicizing work gets done, as though [music history itself] is a fixed entity without a history.” Yet, the field of music history, and by extension musicology, with its narrative of great works, master composers, and evolution of style, is an epistemological framework that began to take form in the first half of the nineteenth century and became both codified and institutionalized in the last three decades of the 1800s. Historical studies entered the very influential Paris Conservatoire in 1871 and the Bachelor of Music examinations at Oxford were revised in 1872 to require “a critical knowledge of some classical scores” and “some knowledge of history of music.” As the newly-founded conservatories spread across Europe in the mid-nineteenth century and took root in North America in the 1880s and 1890s, they replicated the Conservatoire’s required performance study, large ensemble participation, theory, solfeggio, and history. It is crucial to emphasize at this point that undergraduate curricula in most post-secondary music programs in North America today essentially adhere to this same set of core courses. Expansions to include twentieth and twenty-first century repertoire, technological developments, and fields such as music education and ethnomusicology have not altered the foundational structure inherited from nineteenth century institutions.

The study of music history as a legitimate academic field emerged during these decades, which saw what Kevin C. Karnes identifies as “the radical transformations in musical thought that accompanied the institutionalization

31. C. F. Abdy Williams, A Short Historical Account of the Degrees in Music at Oxford and Cambridge, With a Chronological List of Graduates in that Faculty from the Year 1463, First Published London: Novello, Ewer and Co., 1893 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009), 41.
33. The Royal Conservatory of Music in Canada, founded as the Toronto Conservatory of Music in 1886, and its national examination system also remain remarkably embedded in Canadian university music programs, particularly in entrance audition and performance jury requirements.
of musicology in the second half of the nineteenth century.”  In his 1885 article “The Scope, Method and Aim of Musicology,” Guido Adler built on the work of Philipp Spitta, defining the emergent “scientific” field of music study, and separated “historical musicology” (the study of Western art music, composer biographies, and musical works) from “systematic musicology” (including what we now call ethnomusicology, but also pedagogy, acoustics, cognition, and more). Compilation of the Monuments of Music and complete works editions began in the second half of the nineteenth century and the first appearance of Grove’s Dictionary of Music and Musicians dates from 1879. Furthermore, histories of music containing the standard historical narrative also emerge from this same period. One example worth examining is Emil Naumann’s Illustrierte Musikgeschichte, published in German in 1885 and subsequently translated into English as The History of Music around 1886. Beginning with the history of “ancient” music, a section that also describes contemporary practices of non-Western cultures, Naumann’s subsequent chapters continually present European musical history as evolutionary and European music as unique. From “Book II: The Development of Music in the Middle Ages”:

And although music was the youngest of the arts, and was now but in its embryo state, the works of the composers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, and even down to the time of Sebastien Bach, were all the outgrowth of this religious era. Again, the introduction of harmony (polyphony), by which means music could alone become free and emancipate itself from the other arts, was also ow-

35. The implied hierarchy in this division remains foundational in curricular decisions to this day.

What is striking when reading *The History of Music* is not solely its documentation of the teleological or evolutionary narrative of Western elite music history, nor its contemporaneity with the establishment of the conservatory curriculum. It is the extent to which its content—composers, works, and stylistic compositional techniques—remain foundational in our current history courses.

Global historical accounts during these same decades paint a much grimmer picture. Jürgen Osterhammel, in *Unfabling the East: The Enlightenment’s Encounter with Asia*, marks the shift from eighteenth-century cosmopolitan critiques of European ethnocentrism to the mid-nineteenth century’s “simplistic view of the world that divided humankind into an active history-making ‘West’ and the passive, ahistorical ‘rest’.” Increasing prejudice and judicial violence accompanied this intellectual shift. European and Euro-American colonial discourse in the second half of the nineteenth century documents legal interference with and criminalization of sexuality, the culmination of educational and social reforms intending to civilize the “natives” through Eurocentric education and religion, and some of the most overt statements of Western and white superiority and scientific racism. These include, among many other examples, the Indian Penal Code 1862 with its criminalization of homosexuality, the 1869 Indian Act in Canada, which was followed soon after by forced attendance for aboriginal children in Canada’s notorious residential schools, and anthropological manuals categorizing skull types, eye shapes and nasal indices to facilitate the identification of a hierarchy of “races.” If context is as important as many of us argue in our research, how can we dissociate the creation of the field, the curriculum and the narrative from these larger historical and discursive moments?

The claim that Western art music and its historiography are linked to colonialism and ideas of white/European supremacy may seem immensely harsh to some while simultaneously long overdue to others. Radical critiques of the academy and pointed condemnations of musicology stand in striking contrast

38. Naumann, *History of Music*, 171. The editor, Oxford music professor Gore Ouseley, appends the following footnote to this statement:

“Our author does not appear to take cognisance of the fact that harmony seems to have arisen in the first instance among the northern tribes of Europe, and it was not for several centuries after they had freely adopted it for secular purposes that it was admitted into the music of the Church. For this reason it is open to more than a doubt whether the introduction of harmony can truly be attributed to the influence of Christianity.”

to both scholarly and pedagogical material that does not engage with issues of power, race, or colonialism at all. Yet, as historians, we cannot refuse to engage at the very least with the context of modernity and the impact that it had on European culture and thought. The relationship between the concepts of “Europe and non-Europe” or “self and other” and the growing belief in European exceptionalism through the long nineteenth century is worth serious thought, and the influence of this belief on post-secondary music study demands careful evaluation. Moreover, the potential impact on the intellectual development of all our students through revealing and critiquing the embedded concept of the superiority of Western art music brings us back to one of the questions that opened this article: Why should we engage in decolonial processes at all?

Unpacking European Exceptionalism

As I illustrated above, the Common Practice period, which still largely marks what we know, study, and perform as “Classical” music, is framed by early modernity and colonialism on one end (c. 1600) and the institutionalization of a teleological narrative assuming European musical superiority on the other (c. 1900). I think we need to think deeply about this context and invite our students to think deeply about it too. We need to ask seriously if to teach a history of music dating from late nineteenth century Europe without examining its origins is indeed to deliver a covert message of white superiority, however distasteful it may be to consider such a possibility. To return to Helm, when he asserts that the greatness and distinctiveness of Western civilization has stemmed since the Renaissance not from insular perpetuation of local beliefs and customs, … but from the revived spirit of the Argonauts, the eagerness to sail away from familiar shores across unknown seas in search of the unknown,” he is not only reinforcing the idea of Western “greatness,” he is also referring to exploration, trade, and ultimately, colonialism. This is not to cast undue blame on Helm; indeed, he addresses some of the same questions that I am asking and his focus on the musicological curriculum in higher education is to


41. Helm, Canon, 28.
be commended as it contrasts with other similar examinations of musicology solely as an academic field.\textsuperscript{42} He even, somewhat paradoxically, acknowledges that the dominance of the West has been dependent on extracted resources, stating that “the genius of Western society would be profoundly poorer” without “its exploitation of the non-West.”\textsuperscript{43} Yet unexamined statements like these are examples of the “keeper current”—to borrow Battiste’s term above—the narrative of Western exceptionalism that arose from the colonial experience and remains embedded in our discourse.

As long as the message that the legacy of Europe and thus Western Art Music remains comparatively “great” and “distinctive” is not examined and unpacked from its colonial baggage, its barely concealed message that European people are probably superior to other peoples will continue. I recognize, of course, that this is surely not something any of us consciously or overtly teaches. Nevertheless, the impact that this covert message potentially has on our students deserves our sincere attention. For white settler students of north and central European descent, the message of exceptionalism can reinforce an unexamined or unconscious sense of cultural superiority and entitlement. For students who are non-white or who do not identify as white, the result can be much more insidious and reproduce other experiences of injustice or trauma.\textsuperscript{44}

Even when this is not the case, the constant privileging of a Euro-American narrative bundles all alternate musics and cultures into a single, seemingly unimportant or ahistorical “other,” erasing both historical diversity and the ongoing process of cultural exchange. Presenting European art music, its history, theory, and notation, as not only more worthy of study than other musics, but also as unique and inimitable, positions white culture as a pinnacle of human achievement rather than one of many various, equally valuable, and often entangled global artistic practices.

I do not believe, however, that grappling with the colonial origins of the canon and the narrative should lead to a rejection or refusal of Western art music or its performers and audiences. I remain unconvinced that it is the “music itself” that supports coloniality, but believe that it is rather the narrative of evolution and consequent privileging of Western composers, works, and analytical tools that delivers this message of superiority. Yet, reversing the


\textsuperscript{43} Helm, \textit{Canon}, 29

\textsuperscript{44} The experiences of non-white students in the music history classroom is very poignantly expressed in David Chavennes and Maria Ryan, “Decolonizing the Music Survey: A Manifesto for Action” (2019). http://www.dchavennes.com/read1/2018/6/15/rygmnk175vgepbyn29p0zn0imrss9r.
message of exceptionalism and presenting Europe as exceptionally greedy, exceptionally violent or exceptionally intolerant cannot be the solution as this still leaves the binary of the West and the Rest intact and allows the continuation of the myth of European uniqueness. It is, in the end, this entrenched idea that European music stands out amongst all other musics in the world, even other elite or “classical” musics, that is enough to argue that unpacking the narrative is crucial for our students, if not also for ourselves.

The first step, therefore, must be to contextualize Western art music’s history and historiography firmly within a larger framework of critically and globally situated histories of music. I am not alone in this interest, happily, and the recent surge of interest in global music history is perhaps laying a foundation for this type of pedagogical change. The American Musicological Society, the International Musicological Society, and the International Council for Traditional Music all have new study groups on global music history, and the Society for Ethnomusicology has a Section for Historical Ethnomusicology. Katherine Schofield’s European Research Council funded “Musical Transitions to European Colonialism in the Eastern Indian Ocean” and Reinhard Strohm’s Balzan research project “Towards a Global History of Music,” two recent international research projects, both brought together large teams of musicologists and ethnomusicologists interested in historical work reaching far beyond Europe.\textsuperscript{45} Recent publications include \textit{Studies on a Global History of Music} and \textit{The Music Road} as the first two edited volumes from Strohm’s project, and \textit{Towards a Global Music History}, a monograph by composer and theorist, Mark Hijleh.\textsuperscript{46} The colonial encounter looms large in these efforts, which ideally will encourage the type of “post-European historical thinking” about music envisioned by Strohm for the Balzan project.\textsuperscript{47} Central to this approach to the history of music is moving beyond what Taylor explains as the “classical music ideology” that privileges the “idea of transcending the time and place in which a work was written.”\textsuperscript{48} The history of (Western) music may then be understood as the result of what Hijleh describes as “multivariate” streams “in the midst of an Old World/New World/Global continuum” rather than a series of progressive


\textsuperscript{47} Strohm, \textit{Towards a Global History of Music}.

\textsuperscript{48} Taylor, \textit{Beyond Exoticism}, 4.
stylistic changes marked by canonic works.49 Yet, we continue to teach the canonic works and the teleological narrative. As part of my ongoing research on post-secondary music history pedagogy, I am undertaking a survey of “core” or required, history courses in North American undergraduate music programs.50 Within a current total of over 200 universities and colleges in nine provinces and eight states, the vast majority continue to require two or three courses covering canonical Western art music history. There is variance, of course, as outlined at the beginning of this essay. Some schools include required courses in World Music or Music and Society before moving to the standard history. Others address embedded Eurocentricity by adding in diverse repertoire or requiring courses in alternate cultures or genres while yet other schools have created courses that approach Western music history through socio-cultural themes rather than composers and works. Nevertheless, Helm’s comment that began this essay is still by and large true. Furthermore, if, as I have argued, beginning the process of decolonizing music history means addressing the embedded narrative of European exceptionalism and supremacy, these revisions, although admirable, intelligent, and often courageous, more often address current surface-level issues of diversity rather than tackling the fundamental legacy of colonialism.

Conclusions?

Given the complexities involved, not only of simply defining what decolonization is or might be, but also of deciding what it should or could look like in post-secondary music programs and most specifically in music history, it is not surprising that one of the solutions put forward has been to dispense with music history altogether.51 Given the difficulty of finding material that does not reinforce the teleological narrative, or perhaps the seeming impossibility of imagining a non-evolutionary history of Western music, curricula that focus on critical theory and current social themes such as race, gender, and power structures rather than history are an understandable way forward. Yet, as I

49. Hijleh, Global Music, 64.
50. My current project “Unravelling Colonial Narratives in Music History Courses” is funded through Queen’s University by a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Institutional Grant. My ongoing research into music history pedagogy has been also supported by grants from the Queen’s University Faculty Association and the Queen’s University Centre for Teaching and Learning.
51. A music core curriculum without any music history was one idea that arose during a Roundtable on “Sustainable Curricula” at the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Society for Ethnomusicology in Albuquerque, New Mexico, 15 November, 2018.
argued strongly above, the evolutionary history that arose during the height of European colonialism in the nineteenth century is also deeply embedded in how we teach music theory, aural and analytical skills, and performance. Moreover, as decolonial scholars such as Battiste, de Oliveira Andreotti, and Levitz all assert, post-secondary institutions and the academy more broadly are also products of late colonialism and remain sites of embedded coloniality. Omitting the study of history will not erase colonialism’s traces or remove its consequences; rather, it will obscure and thus embed both even further.

So what can we do? Is it possible to teach Western art music history without addressing questions of colonialism and its effect on music? Perhaps, I believe it will become increasingly intellectually and ethically irresponsible to do so. More specifically, can we teach North American (whether framed as “American” or “Canadian” music) or South American music history and avoid addressing colonialism? I argue very strongly that this should never be considered again. Courses on United States or Canadian art music that do not dig into the settler colonial history and current contexts of coloniality will, in fact, contribute to racism through erasure. History and culture in the Americas are shaped by a triad of indigenous-settler-enslaved peoples and music history does not somehow float above this triad. Furthermore, to teach music of the Americas and focus only on elite music by composers of European descent cannot avoid reinforcing the colonial narrative of European exceptionalism.

Counteracting this history of European inimitability, which also connects to hegemonic ideas about musical evolution and universalism, is therefore the first, crucial step to moving towards a decolonized history of music. We need to address this idea of Western uniqueness actively and overtly by “ethnicizing” Europe and European music, including art music. We should also place the music of 1500–1700 firmly into the context of early modernity, including “discovery,” early settlement, and trade. Whether or not one agrees with Taylor’s theory of tonality, what we now teach as Renaissance and Baroque history needs to include the influence of the global exploration, extracted resources, and slavery on music in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. I am recommending, in a nutshell, that as far as possible we teach all music history as global, or at least as globally connected. Medieval music history might be a very fertile place to start through expanding beyond the usual emphasis on Paris and the Netherlands to include the music of the Arabic and Andalusian worlds. Additionally, if we drop the teleological account of the evolution of notation and polyphony (which only allows focus on a tiny part of the musical life of Europe at the time), we can begin to disrupt the narrative at its foundation.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, we must include the historiog-

raphy of the canon and the privileging of masterworks by master composers as part of music history and openly address the narrative (overt or covert) of European/white supremacy that the canon delivers. To claim that although our canonic history of Western art music was created during this period of high Imperialism, it somehow remained untouched by this context is similar to the positivist claim that Western art music itself is untouched by its social and political contexts. Furthermore, to omit this historiographic context and thus keep one’s students ignorant of the origin of the history they are learning is to be complicit in its narrative. Yet, perhaps like much of what I have asserted here, this idea is not unique. As Robin D. Moore and his team state in one of the essays in the collection College Music Curricula for a New Century:

Scholars recognize that all histories generate canons; rather than assume students will understand our selection criteria or that of a given textbook, we would do well to make our selection criteria explicit and transparent. We must teach not only music history but also music historiography across art, popular, and traditional idioms.

Deborah Bradley is even more blunt in her essay on “Decentering the European Music Canon” in the same volume:

The cultural amnesia of whiteness may make it difficult to recognize that our affinities for noncanonical musics emerge from the history of colonial conquest. … [Furthermore,] our colonial heritage and assumptions about what counts as “good music” reify music schools as cultures of whiteness that nicely “provide space” for the study of other cultures and other musics, without changing any basic operating premises. Changing foundational assumptions represents the greatest challenge facing the curricular reform movement.

Bradley’s assertions not only connect musical curricular reform to the more radical calls for change cited above, but also, perhaps somewhat surprisingly, to Helm’s observations that began this essay. It is possible that “chal-

53. Teaching historiography and the creation of the canon, who “made it” into the canon and who did not can also lead to a discussion of coloniality through addressing who makes it into undergraduate music programs and who does not.


lenging foundational assumptions,” like the narrative of great works and Eu-
ropean genius, may indeed lead to the replacement of the “creations of dead white males” with the products or more accurately the processes of “alternate value systems” and lead to the type of deep structural change I alluded to in my introductory paragraphs. Nevertheless, I do not insist that replacement is inevitable, or even necessary, for change. Rather, I hope that these first tentative steps towards decolonizing university music history curricula can lead to a more intellectually responsible and rigorous approach to historical study for both our students and ourselves. It is the teleological narrative, the European supremacist narrative, that binds us, rather than the musics we choose, and it is here we must start. We cannot decolonize without knowing about colonialism, and we cannot know about colonialism without engaging vigorously with its history and, for us, its musical history.
Narratives of Musical Resilience and the Perpetuation of Whiteness in the Music History Classroom

Travis D. Stimeling and Kayla Tokar

The music history classroom has a whiteness problem. Situated in departments and schools of music that have been designed to preserve, promote, and replicate the musical traditions of western Europe, the music history classroom is often deeply implicated in a project that centers whiteness and that celebrates proximity to whiteness as an admirable goal for persons of color.\(^1\) Even in classrooms in which students of color outnumber white students, our textbooks overwhelmingly feature the creative work of European and European American men. After at least three decades of advocacy for more inclusive textbooks and teaching materials, textbook authors occasionally attempt to remedy these biases by including a person of color (POC), an LGBTQ+ figure, or a woman as a token.\(^2\) Musicologists Kira Thurman and Kristen Turner, in their essay on diversifying the music history classroom, have pointed to some of the structural issues within music departments and schools of music that allow these biases to continue. Change is further complicated, they also note, by continued gaps in the musicological literature about women and POC. Offering tips for the creation of more inclusive playlists and reading lists, they suggest that such interventions as adding performers of color to class playlists can help students “learn that art music is not as much the repertoire of privilege as they thought it was” and can reveal “that the humanistic

---


issues they feel passionately about are applicable to music courses.”

That such a simple act as diversifying the artists on a course playlist could have meaningful impacts reveals just how important it is to expand representations of POC and indigenous people in the music history classroom.

Yet, even when we attempt to engage meaningfully with the musical lives of people of color and indigenous people, the narratives that emerge in our music history classrooms often continue to privilege white perspectives. For instance, conventional narratives of African American music-making have, for much of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries, drawn particular attention to the resilience of musical traditions in the face of ongoing efforts to silence black voices. In a particularly strong passage that highlights the role that white racism played in shaping Black musical expression, for example, the tenth edition of W. W. Norton’s *A History of Western Music* offers the following discussion of the spiritual:

> The one immigrant group that came to the United States against their will was Africans. Enslaved and brought over in inhuman[e] conditions, they came from many ethnic groups with different languages and customs. Mixed together on plantations or as domestic servants, they would have had a difficult time maintaining their original languages and cultures even if slaveholders had not actively worked to prevent this. But elements of their music were easier to preserve, because they had been widely shared among African societies and because white slaveholders did not consider singing a threat. Indeed, work songs were actively encouraged as a way to keep up the pace and the spirits, and many slaveholders required the enslaved people in their household or plantation to sing and dance for their entertainment.…

> The African American form of music with the greatest impact in the nineteenth century was the spiritual, a religious song of southern slaves, passed down through oral tradition. The texts were usually based on images or stories from the Bible, but they often carried hidden meanings of enslaved people’s yearning for freedom.4

Here, the spiritual stands primarily as a tool of resistance, with little attention given to its aesthetic or religious power.5 As ethnomusicologist David Garcia has shown, though, the ways we “listen for Africa” in our construction of

---


such narratives often tells us more about our own predilections, ideologies, and objectives. Narratives of musical resilience have proven to be vital in the celebration of African American musical achievement, in building solidarity around civil rights initiatives, and in articulating the key musical, social, and cultural differences between African American music-making and that of the European American majority. As ethnomusicologist Alison Martin recently argued, “To be resilient is to affirm black humanity, and to affirm black humanity is a radical act of self-care that is well within the realm of both resilience and resistance.”

But even as these narratives are useful in such a manner, they often obscure white supremacy’s central role in creating a need for Black musical resilience and can exacerbate the imbalances of power that have perpetuated white supremacy for generations. Many narratives of musical life in the US appear to presume that racial prejudice was natural and inevitable, embodying philosopher Robin James’s observation that “resilience discourse ‘naturalizes’ damage.” To be sure, any colonial system that relies on the forced labor of enslaved people would necessarily require oppressive behaviors and practices to maintain that system. But we must remember that, in the colonial U.S. and in other places connected to the transatlantic slave trade, these oppressive practices were part of a systemic effort that was led by individuals and groups who made active and deliberate choices to institute racist structures. As Christina Sharpe has argued in her powerful book In the Wake: On Blackness and Being, African Americans—even into the twenty-first century—must live with the traumas of transatlantic slavery and try to find space to live when “The disaster of Black subjection was and is planned.”

Although music histories often nod toward the oppression, exploitation, and death of musical African Americans, they seldom point to the individual choices that whites have made to create and sustain oppressive structures of white supremacy. In fact, as Joseph Byrd noted in his 2009 survey of blackface minstrelsy’s place in major music history and music appreciation textbooks,

although textbooks sometimes treat that fraught subject, “none dares make it a major theme, which it surely was.” This essay, then, offers a model unit on music of the late eighteenth century that works to balance narratives of white supremacist oppression and Black cultural resilience in an effort to engage more deliberately in the decolonization of the undergraduate music history survey. This unit also explicitly and implicitly extends this discussion to indigenous people and works to connect Africa, Europe, and the Americas in a way that does not deliberately privilege European perspectives. We begin with a close look at the 1740 Negro Code of South Carolina and its subsequent ban on the drumming of enslaved Africans, which might be seen as the first overt and documented example of white supremacy at work in music of the colonial United States. Deeper engagement with the facts of this case study allows us to link South Carolina to the Caribbean and Europe, as well as to West Africa, and opens a number of questions about the circulation of power during the age of the transatlantic slave trade. We then turn to a unit plan with potential assignments to help undergraduate students engage more deeply with important questions about race, power, and representation in music. We believe that this case offers a useful opportunity to introduce students to concepts of power and to begin important antiracist work in schools of music and music departments in the United States and elsewhere.

The Stono Rebellion, the South Carolina Negro Code of 1740, and the Drumming of Enslaved Africans

The South Carolina Negro Code of 1740 was a comprehensive legislative effort to codify the practice of slavery in the colony. Curious among the many restrictions in the law is a passage that prohibited enslaved Africans from owning and playing drums. Developed by white property-owning legislators in response to the 1739 Stono Rebellion, the act was intended to prevent future slave revolts and to bolster white dominance within the colony. In the wake of

13. Here, we are buoyed by Melanie Lowe’s call “for teachers of music history . . . to put this history in direct dialogue with our contemporary, everyday lives—to make music history not just musically relevant, but intellectually relevant, politically relevant, sexually relevant, spiritually relevant, psychologically relevant, even ecologically relevant not just in the ‘there and then’ of history but in the ‘here and now’ of today.” Melanie Lowe, “Teaching Music History Now: Making Tangible Connections to the Here and Now,” this *Journal* 1, no. 1 (2010), 46.
what historian Darold D. Wax described as the “most serious slave uprising in colonial America,” South Carolina legislators enacted draconian restrictions that touched all aspects of slave life, ostensibly preventing enslaved people from gaining the knowledge and collective power to overthrow a system that was highly dependent on their subjugation. That the Stono Rebellion included music and dance, though, undoubtedly led to punitive restrictions on the expressive culture of enslaved Africans in the South Carolina colony.

The Stono Rebellion occurred on Sunday, September 9, 1739, when a group of enslaved Africans attempted to march from the Stono River near Charles Town (modern-day Charleston) to St. Augustine, a city in Spanish Florida where the governor had promised to grant freedom to escaped slaves. That morning, approximately twenty enslaved Africans—led by a slave named Jemmy—hid near the Stono River outside of Charles Town until it was time to publicly take action. The rebels overtook a firearms warehouse where they killed two guards before raiding it, taking drums and white banners—a possible sign of their invocation of the Virgin Mary’s support for their efforts—before proceeding on their route to the accompaniment of drums. Early in their march, the rebel forces looked to be strong, and their ranks expanded as they acquired drums which called other enslaved people to the rebellion. As they marched, they killed nearly every white colonist they passed, but they spared the life of an innkeeper. Totaling nearly ninety and gaining confidence, the rebels stopped in an open field to dance, sing, and play their drums, an act that attracted the attention of Lieutenant-Governor William Bull, who gathered members of the South Carolina militia to launch a counterattack that killed many rebels and scattered the others. A group of the escaped rebels continued in their attempt to get to St. Augustine, but the militia searched for them for months, killing approximately forty people within the first two weeks.

In the year following the Stono Rebellion, legislators in South Carolina—themselves property-owning white colonists—undertook the creation, passage, and implementation of a sprawling piece of legislation intended to define every aspect of slavery in the colony. This “Act for the Better Ordering and Governing of Negroes and Other Slaves in This Province,” also known as the 1740 Negro Code, was far-reaching in its efforts to restrict the movement and actions of enslaved Africans, setting out punishments for any variety of behaviors deemed offensive and punishing slaveholders as well as enslaved people for their infractions. Of particular interest for music historians is a clause prohibiting enslaved people from the “using or keeping of drums, horns, or other loud instruments.” This article also states that any slaveholder who allows their slave to “beat drums” must pay a fine of ten pounds for every offense. Of particular interest here is that “drums, horns, or other loud instruments” are lumped into the same category as “wooden swords, and other mischievous and dangerous weapons,” the possession of which would allow “all masters, overseers and other persons whosoever . . . to disarm [the slave], take up [the weapon] and whip” them. As such, one might easily infer that possession of “drums, horns, or other loud instruments” could yield similar punishments.

South Carolina’s drum ban was far from the first in the colonial Americas. Rather, as was the case with much legislation regarding slavery, it was taken from model legislation enacted in other colonies, particularly those in the Caribbean. The first comprehensive English slave code was enacted in Barbados in 1661, with a drum ban following in its 1688 code. The Barbados act explicitly restricted enslaved individuals from “using or keeping Drums, Horns, or any other loud Instruments,” language that is exactly paralleled by the South Carolina act’s restriction. This act was then passed in Georgia in 1770, and as a result enslaved Africans who knew nothing of the Stono Rebellion had their rights restricted in a response to it. As such, the practice of white supremacy was systematically codified through the use of model legislation and language that expressly sought to eradicate the musical expression of enslaved Africans for the purpose of protecting the institution of slavery. It is possible to hear

the drumming ban enacted in the 1740 South Carolina Negro Code not only as a reaction to a real threat—the use of drums to communicate information about rebellion—but a deliberate effort to consolidate the power of white male supremacy over enslaved Africans throughout the South.

Although South Carolina's prohibitions against the drumming of enslaved Africans were implemented in response to the Stono Rebellion, their impacts proved far more impactful. Prior to the 1740 South Carolina Negro Code's passage, music provided enslaved Africans valuable opportunities for individual and communal expression and for the establishment of collective solidarity in the wake of the unspeakable traumas associated with enslavement. Although they sang while working on the plantations, enslaved Africans were able to devote more of their time to music making on Sundays, when they could play drums and dance together. It was here that musical practices carried from Africa were likely recreated and modified to accommodate their new settings, creating an important lifeline to the familiar and the safe in an environment that was anything but.

The drumming ban enacted in the 1740 South Carolina Negro Code can be read not simply as an attempt to quell rebellion, but as an effort to deliberately erase opportunities for enslaved Africans to maintain their culture, a form of cultural genocide. Moreover, it simultaneously supplanted the sounds of African drumming with those of colonial drumming. As musicologist Bonnie Gordon has recently argued in relation to another colonial figure, “music and noise in [Thomas] Jefferson's world was bound up with that nation-building project, which incorporated racial difference as a complex but integral component.”

Such was also the case in South Carolina, where European colonists asserted their own sonic dominance through the use of military drums. Historian Larry E. Ivers, for instance, has noted the importance of music to colonial South Carolinians and indicates that the “musical instruments [they used] included


violins, flutes, fifes, and drums.” Moreover, Ivers notes that South Carolina militia companies were typically outfitted with “a drummer, fifty white privates, and fifty black and Indian slave privates.” To put it more clearly, colonized peoples were conscripted to military service governed largely by the sounds of European colonial drums. As part of their colonial military duties, drummers were also stationed in colonial forts, as was the case with Fort King George, located in present-day Darien, Georgia, where a drummer was stationed beginning in September 1721. European colonists appear, as well, to have used drums as instruments of diplomacy in the South Carolina colony. In March 1726, for instance, tensions between the Creeks and the government of South Carolina came to a head when a group of Cherokees and Chickasaws attacked Cusseta, a Creek town in present-day Alabama, while carrying a British drum and flag that had been a gift from acting South Carolina governor Arthur Middleton in 1723. Additionally, even after slave drumming prohibitions were in effect, enslaved people were permitted to play the drum in service to the military, as was noted in a French account of a 1742 English effort to enlist men into the militia. Clearly, the law permitted the sonic dominance of colonial militarism over the musical expression of enslaved individuals.

Gordon also notes the prevalence of other sonic tools to govern the lives of enslaved Africans, most notably Jefferson’s decision to use bells—commonly rung by slaves—to structure activities at Monticello, describing the bells as “sonic instruments of domination that compelled slaves into action.” So, too, were drums often used as a way to govern communal life in the region. Historian

29. Ivers, 20.
30. Ivers, 21–22. Ivers indicates that “Each company’s drummer had a snare drum, used to produce standard patterns of drumbeats that transmitted the commander’s orders to his men.” Moreover, “drums, colors, and half pikes were purchased from London suppliers.”
Peter Wood, for instance, surmises that, based on testimony from nineteenth-century Charleston resident D. E. Huger Smith, eighteenth-century enslaved blacks may have used drum signals to indicate the curfew for enslaved people in that city.\(^{35}\) Reports of the October 6, 1723 announcement of the repeal of the Charleston Government Act of 1722 indicate that time was regularly kept using drums in pre-Stono Charleston: “Provost Marshall William Loughton caused the governor’s proclamation [of the repeal] to be published as customary by the beat of drum at the twelfth hour, afterwards posting it on the watchhouse by the city waterfront.”\(^{36}\) Although these reports do not provide specific evidence of the presence of colonial drumming in the aftermath of the Stono Rebellion and the 1740 Negro Code, it is undoubtedly easy to connect Huger Smith’s nineteenth-century recollections with pre-Stono reports and to imagine a Charleston—and, in fact, a South Carolina, more generally—that was rife with the sounds of colonial drums, but that, after Stono, was bereft of African diasporic drumming.

The Limits of Resilience Narratives

Much scholarship on African diasporic music—particularly in the United States—focuses on the resilience of musical traditions and the musicians and communities that support them in the face of the physical and cultural violence emerging from colonialism, slavery, Jim Crow, mass incarceration, and the myriad other ways that white supremacy is inflicted on black bodies. Thus the ring shout and the spiritual are explained as logical outgrowths of prohibitions against the religious practices of enslaved Africans in the British colonies of North America, the blues as a framework for expressing the struggles of sharecropping (what one scholar has described as “slavery by another name”), and hip hop as a form of resistance to systemic poverty and government-supported efforts to create segregated neighborhoods through urban housing projects.\(^{37}\) Narratives of resistance and resilience are powerful ones for people


who have been marginalized by white supremacy. In providing historical contexts, they can provide models for people who are fighting against injustice in the present day. Yet, they can also be problematic because they can used unintentionally reproduce the very racist beliefs, practices, and structures that required resilience to begin with. As folklorist Dorothy Noyes has suggested, narratives of resilience frequently obscure the proximate cause of trauma, focusing on the ways that people recover from violence, disaster, and other events and failing to offer critical insight into their causes. Although resilience is often viewed as a positive attribute and a contributing factor to the short- and long-term survival of individuals and communities, then, it is necessary to consider the reasons that resilience was necessary in the first place. And, using the tools of restorative justice, it is also necessary to consider what actions might be taken to remedy the systemic injustices that have led to these traumas.

Notions of African American musical resilience in the British colonies of North America are intimately linked with white supremacy, not only through the brutal realities of the slave trade and the treatment of enslaved Africans in the colonies, but through the deliberate efforts to quash their music making. The decision to write a ban on the drumming practices of enslaved Africans in South Carolina in the Negro Code of 1740 was an obvious and deliberate act of retribution against enslaved persons who launched the Stono Rebellion in the previous year. As sociologist Barbara Ehrenreich has implied, such bans may have compounded the traumatic effects of enslavement, noting that, “if the oppressed gained nothing more from their ecstatic rituals and cults than a ‘psychic benefit,’ to use [sociologist Bryan] Wilson’s phrase, we must still concede that—to people who had lost their traditions, their land, and often


their freedom—a psychic benefit is no small thing.”

The 1740 Negro Code was, in no uncertain terms, an act of white supremacy at work. Slave drumming was replaced by colonial drumming. Although it was certainly not the most reprehensible aspect of the code, its symbolic violence made it one of the cruelest. In the nearly three centuries since the law’s passage, narratives of African American musical resilience have been powerful tools to unite African Americans and members of the African diaspora around a variety of significant political and social issues. But, by focusing principally on musical and cultural resilience in the music history classroom, it is easy to downplay the fundamental truth that white supremacy was the proximate reason that such resilience was necessary in the first place.

Unit Plan

To introduce students to the significance of the Stono Rebellion and 1740 South Carolina Negro Code, we propose a unit for the undergraduate music history survey course that explicitly links the musical expression of enslaved Africans to their lives in Africa and the Americas, the music of European settler-colonists to their lives in Europe and the Americas, and the music of indigenous peoples. Extending the repertorally inclusive models offered by proponents of multiculturalism in the music history classroom of the 1990s and 2000s, we engage educator Enid Lee’s observation that “multicultural education often has come to mean something that is quite superficial: the dances, the dress, the dialect, the dinners . . . without focusing on what those expressions of culture mean: the values, the power relationships that shape the culture,” and we heed her call for a model of “anti-racist education . . . [that] attempt[s] to look at—and change—those things in school and society that prevent some differences from being valued.” In so doing, we call attention to the ways that white supremacist attitudes have shaped musical life in the Americas and model a contextual, evaluative approach for the study of the music of slaves around


the year 1740. The unit we propose is based on the assumption of a thrice-weekly schedule with approximately fifty minutes per class meeting and a two-semester course sequence. Longer class sessions (say on a 75-minute Tuesday/Thursday schedule) or lengthier course sequences may prove to be more useful in engaging students in discussion, research, and other activities (see Figure 1).43

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CLASS SESSION</th>
<th>TOPIC</th>
<th>READING, LISTENING, AND/OR SCORE STUDY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| CLASS #2      | New Modes of Expression in European Instrumental Music: Empfundsamer Stil, Style Galant, Sturm und Drang | - Burkholder, *History of Western Music*, Ch. 20  
- *Norton Anthology of Western Music* [NAWM] 116, 117, 118, 119 |
| CLASS #3      | Opera in Transition: Comedy, Drama, and Reform             | - Burkholder, Ch. 21  
- *NAWM* 109, 110, 111, 113 |

43. In recognizing the importance of discussion to this work, we are especially influenced by bell hook’s observation that “conversation is the central location of pedagogy for the democratic educator.” bell hooks, *Teaching Community: A Pedagogy of Hope* (New York: Routledge, 2003), 44.
CLASS #4  CASE STUDY: Joseph Bologne, Chevalier de Saint-George

- Gabriel Banat, “Saint-Georges [Saint-Georges], Joseph Bologne, Chevalier de,” *Grove Music Online*.
- Bologne, *L’Amant anonyme*.

CLASS #5  Drumming Traditions of Indigenous Americans, Enslaved Africans, and European Settler-Colonists


CLASS #6  The Stono Rebellion, the 1740 South Carolina Negro Code, and Drumming in Colonial South Carolina


CLASS #7  The Ring Shout, Patting Juba, and the Musical Resilience of Enslaved Africans in the Americas

- *The McIntosh County Shouters* (Smithsonian Folkways FW04344, 1984), liner notes and recordings.

CLASS #8  Summative Exercise

FIGURE 1. Sample unit plan.

In this unit, the core issues typically addressed in a music history textbook and anthology are still very much present. Students are exposed to new approaches to instrumental composition at the beginning of the Classical period, the development of the sonata principle, and debates over the future of
opera. But these concepts are accompanied by a study of the lives and musical expressions of indigenous people and POC, including those with access to power and those with little recourse to fundamental human rights. Framed within the context of transatlantic exchange, students witness contemporaneous musical developments in West Africa, the Americas, and Europe, helping to avoid the all-too-common erasure of Black musical history.44 Instructors may also find it valuable to engage students in a variety of writing projects around this work, including more conventional assignments such as journals or research papers, as well as creative expression through poetry, songwriting, or other expressive media.45

Although we have presented a unit focusing on music of the eighteenth century, this approach could also be modified for any number of settings in the typical post-1750 undergraduate music history survey. For instance, a unit on the nineteenth century might take blackface minstrelsy as a primary focus, tracing its appropriation of the African-derived banjo and its use of racialized caricature through popular music (minstrel songs), vernacular culture (old-time music), and art music (in works such as Louis Moreau Gottschalk's The Banjo and in the persistent use of blackface in operatic productions).46 Such a unit could also engage meaningfully with changing notions of virtuosity by highlighting the case of Tom Wiggins (also known as "Blind Tom"), an enslaved man who was promoted as a keyboard virtuoso to the profit of slaveholder James Bethune; here, Wiggins could join Clara Schumann and Franz Liszt in productive discussions that touch not only on race and gender, but that draw on recent insights in disability studies, as well.47 Similarly, a unit on contemporary

topics might place Childish Gambino’s “This Is America” (2018) alongside Nina Simone’s “Mississippi Goddam” (1964) and Steven Stucky’s oratorio August 4, 1964 (2008) to explore artistic responses to the Civil Rights Movement and #BlackLivesMatter. 48

Although these examples certainly open up the potential for discussion of musical resilience, they also present opportunities for discussions of the forces that seem to necessitate these traditions of resistance, challenging us to consider a deeply contextual framing of these acts of resistance. Moreover, by insisting on the power of Black music (pace Floyd) in our classrooms, we can create opportunities to explore—and even privilege—Black musical aesthetics on their own terms. As musicologist William Cheng has argued, “When framed within narratives of overcoming, black music is seemingly never allowed just to be, but must always formidably, laboriously be against.” 49 As such, we present a pedagogical approach that affirms Black music’s right “just to be” as well as its power to resist the violence of white supremacy.

Conclusions

In her book *In the Wake: On Blackness and Being*, Sharpe offers an ecological metaphor for understanding the immediate and long-term impacts of the transatlantic slave trade in the U.S., suggesting that what might appear to be isolated incidents of racism are actually manifestations of climatic processes:

> In the United States, slavery is imagined as a singular event even as it changed over time and even as its duration expands into supposed emancipation and beyond. But slavery was not singular; it was, rather, a singularity—a weather event or phenomenon likely to occur around a particular time, or date or set of circumstances. Emancipation did not make free Black life free; it continues to hold us in that singularity. The brutality was not singular; it was the singularity of antiblackness. . . . In what I am calling the weather, antiblackness is as pervasive as climate. The weather necessitates


changeability and improvisation; it is the atmospheric condition of time and place; it produces new ecologies.  

Resilience, then, is a by-product of antiblackness, a by-product of the transatlantic slave trade. And at the core of this antiblackness is a fundamental belief in white supremacy, a white supremacy that is also intimately bound with toxic masculinity. To recognize cultural resilience, then, is to at least implicitly acknowledge that white supremacy and toxic masculinity have long exerted structural influences in North America—and in North American schools of music and music history classrooms. Furthermore, as Loren Kajikawa has recently argued, for instance, “with few exceptions, the music of black Americans has been lumped into the nonserious category [in North American university music programs], and popular music, which throughout much of the twentieth century has been influenced directly or indirectly by the musical contributions of African Americans, is the main ‘other’ against which classical music defines itself.”

Reparative work, we argue, requires not only an acknowledgement of these efforts to marginalize the expression of Black Americans and a concerted effort to create more inclusive curricula by diversifying our playlists, but deliberate and systematic efforts to highlight the ways that white supremacy functions in schools of music and to engage in meaningful action toward dismantling structural racism in our classroom and beyond.

Shifting the narrative in our music history classes toward white supremacy does not, however, push aside narratives of resistance and resilience. To do so would itself be an act of erasure that would do violence to the remarkable history of persistence and resistance in African American music-making. Citing drumming bans as an example, Kofi Agawu has suggested that the resilience of enslaved people and their music might be a unifying factor in African and African diasporic music; he asks, “How might we explain African music’s resilience? . . . The potency of black music lies in responsible and unyielding guardianship; it suggests a principles and committed custodianship of a shared heritage.” Moreover, examples of resilience and resistance exert remarkably

50. Sharpe, In the Wake, 106.
52. We are, of course, profoundly aware of the problems that come with attempting to “dismantle the master’s house” using “the master’s tools,” but again we affirm hooks’s insistence on the classroom’s power to transform society. See Audre Lorde, “The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House,” in Sister Outsider: Essays and Speeches (Berkeley: Crossing Press, 1984), 110–114; bell hooks, Teaching to Transgress: Education as the Practice of Freedom (New York: Routledge, 1994).
powerful forces on efforts to build solidarity among marginalized communities and to historicize contemporary problems (in Sharpe’s conception, to bear witness to the climate while facing the weather), and resilience and resistance have undoubtedly shaped all forms of African American creative expression. Ethnomusicologist Ronald Radano, for instance, has argued that “Black music garners its strength and power from the integrity of a greater African-American [sic] culture forged under circumstances of enduring racial oppression. . . . Black music of real worth speaks with certitude and conviction of the rightness of blackness against the wrongness of white supremacy.” 54. Black lesbian feminist Omiseëke Natasha Tinsley has recently argued that such narratives are especially powerful for Black queer and trans* people, who often draw upon many narratives of resistance and resilience in their efforts to create spaces for themselves in contemporary society. 55. Put another way, narratives of African American cultural resilience and resistance have been and remain fundamentally important to the persistence of African Americans in a place that has always sought their subjugation, erasure, and, ultimately, death. As Janie Victoria Ward has argued:

There is a dialectic between resistance and resilience in that resistance fosters resilience. The resilient individual is able to negotiate hard times by resisting effectively, and that successful negotiation facilitates further resilience. Resistance in the black community and family provides a preventative psychosocial intervention that boosts hardiness and psychological resilience of black children. Optimal resisters are, in turn, resilient. That dialectic is an integral part of African American tradition. 56.

Or, to recall Alison Martin’s observations, “To be resilient is to affirm black humanity.” 57.

But just as we celebrate Black resistance and resilience, it is necessary for European Americans and their descendants to acknowledge that these narratives are directly tied to white supremacist and colonialist attitudes that contin-

ue to shape daily life in the United States and abroad. Here, we echo Michael Eric Dyson, who, in the foreword to Robin DiAngelo’s *White Fragility: Why It’s So Hard for White People to Talk about Race*, notes that “whiteness . . . has remained constant. . . . Whiteness is the unchanging variable.”

We believe that it is necessary to highlight the constancy of whiteness to counter white supremacist attitudes that implicitly undergird curricula in many departments and schools of music across the United States. If, as school of music administrator Brian Pertl has recently observed, we must engage cultural change deliberately and thoughtfully as faculty members, then the music history classroom can serve as an incubator for that cultural change by opening the floor for diverse perspectives and debates over core issues facing not only music students, but society at large.

Taking these issues into consideration, then, we suggest that music history instructors begin to consider how we might put narratives of African American musical resilience more deliberately into dialogue with the racist structures of white supremacy. In addition to deploying the tools that Thurman and Turner have offered to diversify our classrooms, such an approach might allow us to see both African American music making and musical representations of African Americans as part of a broader and more expansive history of racialized violence and efforts to be resilient in the face of trauma. This engagement with whiteness also allows us to begin having frank and often challenging conversations about the ways that whiteness continues to dominate life in music departments and schools of music. As a consequence, such a move may allow us to use our classrooms as a space to unpack the long history of white supremacy within academic music culture, decenter white musicking and recenter the voices of people of color, and perform vitally necessary anti-racist work. The approach outlined here has the potential to create opportunities for extended engagement with the ways that power and privilege have shaped the musical lives of everyone, from students and professors to orchestra audiences and people who never set foot in a university concert hall. It challenges everyone to interrogate the narratives that might be circulating in other aspects of life in a music department or school of music. And perhaps most importantly, it points to the very human agents who chose to oppress, to resist, and to be resilient. In so doing, we believe, this approach offers students the opportunity to connect with


their own agency to dismantle structures of oppression in their work during their studies and beyond.
Decolonizing “Intro to World Music?”

MICHAEL A. FIGUEROA

As the movement of people has increased in intensity over the past several decades, university classrooms have become more diverse, bringing students from around the world together in unprecedented proportions. Instructors cannot presume a single shared cultural knowledge or experience among all of their students, or even a real majority of them (if they should have made such an assumption in the first place). With this mobility has come a movement of global sounds; students are bombarded with music through flows of culture and technology that structure their lives and relationships. Students report unprecedented access to a global soundscape via video- and music-streaming services and social media platforms. K-pop, Southern American trap, Indonesian punk, and remixes and mashups of a multitude of global genres pump through white ear buds, intersecting with the sounds of urban bustle as they speed walk to campus.

As students enter the classroom with aesthetic sensibilities developed through this intensive contact with musical (and non-musical) sound, and with the world at their fingertips, one must ask, is the “Intro to World Music” survey course obsolete? Although students may not need such a class for exposure to global sounds, they need tools for thinking critically about difference, perhaps more than ever before. I argue that in an era of political crisis, coupled with the intensified cultural contact brought on by globalization and technological (post)modernity, instructors may use a rehabilitated “Intro to World Music” curricular framework as a means to engage students in decolonial praxis. The pedagogical approach I propose here focuses on conversations about self and other, resists Eurocentric thinking, and facilitates encounters with others in the context of experiential learning projects. The teaching strategies I share below may help students to move beyond the cultivation of oppositional or analogous thinking about culture (e.g., how “they” are different from or similar to “us”), toward relational thinking about cultural difference that is other-centered, rather than self-centered. Both the pedagogical approach and teaching strategies can be applied to any course on music in its social/historical context,
including the music history survey. Unfortunately, however, what I offer here is not a solution to the problem of colonization. As I will discuss at several points in the essay, I believe that the structural realities of twenty-first-century academic life relegate decolonization to the realm of the aspirational. What follows are my thoughts on why and how we should try anyway.

Setting the Terms of Engagement

My use of “decolonization” throughout this essay refers to techniques intended to break the shackles of colonial, imperial, and/or Eurocentric thinking about what music is, who makes it and listens to it, and how it functions in human societies. But defining decolonization in fixed terms or proscribing what it should look like for all people in all contexts is antithetical to the concept. Cultural studies scholars Catherine Walsh and Walter Mignolo do not “provide global answers” or “sketch global designs for liberation.” Instead, they define decoloniality in terms of relationality, that is:

the ways that different local histories and embodied conceptions and practices of decoloniality, including our own, can enter into conversations and build understandings that both cross geopolitical locations and colonial differences, and contest the totalizing claims and political-epistemic violence of modernity.1

The mere inclusion of “Intro to World Music” and more specialized area-studies courses by music-department curricula is not itself a form of decolonization; according to Alejandro Madrid this is “diversity understood as tokenism.” In his rejection of a tokenistic integration of Ibero-American music into the music history canon, Madrid writes: “it is about quotas and not about the challenging nature that diverse experiences may bring to the very structures music academia has taken for granted for decades.”2 Decoloniality, as Madrid and others understand it, fundamentally challenges the regimes of knowledge that thrive on exercises of epistemic power and reorients undergraduate music curricula toward an equitable view of who and what counts. Within the “Intro

to World Music” context, this involves a radical resistance to Eurocentric con-
ceptions of “the world” and “music” and a displacement of those conceptions
in order to embrace difference. This reconfiguration of the course requires
an explicit discussion about the power structures that exist in a symbiosis of
mutual enablement within those constructions.³

The work of decolonization goes far beyond diversifying a syllabus or flip-
ning a classroom. It is not a facile statement of progressive values; it is hard
work. Within the constraints of a Western university—with its curricular
requirements, heavy investment in Western civilization, institutionalized leg-
acies of slavery and colonialism, recent memories of exclusionary policy and
practice, and physical presence on settled indigenous land—this is easier said
than done. Decolonization, in other words, is beyond the capability of any indi-
vidual actor and requires a collective vision that currently eludes academia as
a whole. This claim might strike readers as pessimistic or cynical—and many
of us have cause to feel that way—but I see coming to terms with this reality
as an important first step toward recognizing one’s own agency within the sys-
tem. Anthropologist Nayantara Sheoran Appleton urges us to recognize our
limitations; we may do “anti-colonial, post-colonial, and de-colonial work in
the academy,” but we should not “make claims to a ‘decolonized programme,’
‘decolonized syllabus,’ or a ‘decolonized university.’” According to Appleton,
recognizing the entrenchment of colonization in the academy “allows you to
be honest—about who you/we are and how you/we are situated within certain
privileges.”⁴ So let’s be honest about the colonial structures inherent to “Intro
to World Music.”

The very concept of the course is highly ideological: the name suggests that
one discrete curricular unit can provide a sufficient introduction to the musical
diversity of the world’s cultures, in all places and times. To be clear, this is not a
characterization of how instructors actually teach the course today, but rather
an acknowledgement of the historical tokenization of “world music” within
music curricula. The existence of the course is redolent of past dominant stake-
holders’ begrudging inclusion of the non-European in the interest of promot-
ing an image of liberal multiculturalism while at the same time reinforcing the
primacy of European culture and institutions. Meanwhile, the “broad meth-
odological drift” in historical musicology and ethnomusicology has made—in

³. Edward Said long ago recognized the symbiosis between colonial power and cultural
⁴. Nayantara Sheoran Appleton, “Do Not ‘Decolonize’… If You Are Not Decolonizing:
Progressive Language and Planning Beyond a Hollow Academic Rebranding.” Critical Ethnic
do-not-decolonize-if-you-are-not-decolonizing-alternate-language-to-navigate-desires-for-progressive-academia-6y5sg.
theory—the curricular distinction between musicology’s sub-disciplines less self-evident than in the past.\(^5\) But as Georgina Born cautions,

Rapprochement will require cumulative expansion of the conceptual and theoretical frameworks within which music scholarship proceeds. It will require a commitment to certain arduous passages by which we might eventually arrive on new epistemological and even ontological terrain, backed by serious commitment to changing music pedagogies.\(^6\)

Even with the convergences of musicology’s sub-disciplines over the past three decades, there have been few major attempts at “worlding” music history in a way that renders obsolete the curricular separation of traditional musicological and ethnomusicological subjects that we continue to organize according to the logic of colonial-geographical partition (what Eric Wolf calls “Europe and the people without history”\(^7\)) rather than on, for example, the different methodologies or skillsets involved.\(^7\)

It is worth pointing out that the title of the “Intro to World Music” course itself is derived from one of the most precipitous moments when colonial thinking and the apparatus of global capitalism intersected. One result was the music industry’s invention of “world music” in the 1980s. As Timothy D. Taylor argues, “globalization’ and then multiculturalism, its domestic face in the (post)industrialized countries, are new incarnations of an older set of conceptions of difference, but…they entail a greater degree of the commodification of difference, as well as its consumption.”\(^8\) Herein lies the pedagogical predicament: How can curriculum designers and instructors be inclusive of difference in a way that actively disrupts its commodification at the axis of neo-colonial political and economic relations, both of which unavoidably inform student (and instructor) worldviews in a US-based classroom?

The classroom context itself inevitably affects how one begins to answer such a question. Although there are many different kinds of settings in which

---

survey courses such as “Intro to World Music” are taught, in this essay I focus on the large lecture format, as it is the context in which I developed the curricular insights and pedagogical techniques discussed below. Like other survey courses, often “Intro to World Music” involves “warehousing several hundred students in a lecture hall to be talked at by a distant professor on the stage. Then they are farmed out to ‘discussion sections’ to—theoretically—engage more actively with the material under the care of a graduate student.”9 At my institution, “Intro to World Music” is set up as a 180-student course, and weekly meetings consist of two 50-minute lecture sessions with the lead instructor (usually a full-time, tenured or tenure-track faculty member), plus a 50-minute recitation section, in which students break out into groups of twenty for small classroom teaching by a graduate teaching assistant. The size and organization of my class is in many ways beside the point; as historian Kevin Gannon writes in a recent essay for Chronicle Vitae, “It doesn’t matter if there are 20 or 200 students in a classroom; if the course design and dominant pedagogy are predicated on merely transferring chunks of content, then the class itself will be—to use a technical term—a dud.”11

Curricular changes to the survey—even those aimed at lofty, politically driven goals—should scale to a variety of classroom settings. But the large lecture format, which is a structural reality of the neoliberal university and its drive toward higher FTE numbers, is set up precisely for content delivery and not for the kind of radical re-organization and questioning demanded by a decolonial pedagogy. It therefore requires a special set of considerations to account for the forms of instructor-student engagement that are peculiar to the setting and, it must be said, that are bizarre in comparison to the dialogical nature of most other forms of human communication. In short, I ask: How can instructors work within a large lecture format to move beyond content delivery and toward a form of student engagement with course materials that actively resists the de-humanizing logics of both the classroom setting and the survey-oriented curriculum?

10. The course title at my institution is actually “Introduction to World Musics,” with “musics” in the plural form to indicate ethnomusicology’s embrace of a plurality of culturally formed notions of music in the world. This usage of “music” in the plural form has been paradigmatic since at least the publication of Alan Merriam’s The Anthropology of Music (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1964). In the body of the current essay, however, I use the more common “Intro to World Music” title, with “music” in the singular form, in order to avoid distracting from the general application of my findings for teaching such courses at other institutions.
Bearing in mind these observations about the course’s existential flaws within an endemically flawed academia, the structural limitations of the large lecture format, and the problems/opportunities presented by students’ potential access to many of the sounds and traditions normally included in the curriculum, I have identified three major, interconnected pedagogical challenges inherent to the “Intro to World Music” survey course:

1. Large lecture courses create specific pedagogical challenges related to both student interest and the physical setting of the classroom. Students who enroll in the “Intro to World Music” survey are not generally self-selecting based on an interest in the course material, except perhaps a general interest in music. Rather, the majority of students are enrolled in order to satisfy a general education or “diversity” requirement. Fulfilling a “diversity” requirement in a lecture-based environment with minimal dialogical process does not allow for a level of engagement that sufficiently prepares students (or instructors) for holding difficult conversations about cultural difference.

2. The course topic itself, although it provides music departments and students with “diversity credentials,” emanates from Eurocentric thought. Relatedly, student diversity presents a challenge in terms of mitigating cultural difference between student learners and musicians/traditions that compose the curriculum. It is not the case that all students are white, US-born, and Christian, and that all musics studied are created by brown and black people somewhere else, but this is the perception of many students entering the course.

3. In spite of their apparently rich listening experiences, students have a perceived lack of expertise and attendant lexicon to discuss musical sound or cultural phenomena; they often profess an ignorance of “music theory” and the “correct” language for producing insightful analyses. In cases where music majors or other student musicians have prior formal training, it is usually in “Western” music, and this places them in a mindset for analogous thinking (e.g., using concepts applicable to Western music) rather than a challenging engagement with the music of others on the terms of others.

In light of these challenges, it is clear that the large-lecture classroom environment—with its logic of herding masses of students for capitalist efficiency in an institutional context where European epistemologies masquerade as universals—is not set up for successful decolonial work.
Decolonizing “Intro to World Music?”

Modeling Representation in Curriculum Design

No amount of pedagogical innovation or instructional technology is capable of rehabilitating a fatally flawed curriculum design. I have had to re-examine how my own colonized thinking about music and its geographies has manifested in my organization of the “Intro to World Music” course. Should the course focus on discretely bounded, colonial produced geographies (“sub-Saharan Africa,” “the Middle East,” etc.) or break from the geographical mode entirely and attempt to capture the “soundscapes” of global, cultural flow?\(^\text{12}\)

One pitfall of the latter approach is that an overriding concept (such as “Music and Politics”) may obscure the distinctiveness of local histories and sounds discussed within the same unit. The geographical approach, however, runs the risk of reinforcing colonial conceptions of space and time while poorly attending to processes of cultural exchange ushered in by the age of globalization, or that pre-date modern globalization (e.g., the Silk Road).

To be sure, then, neither approach to organizing the curriculum is inherently de-, anti-, or post-colonial; indeed, the solution is not to be found in curriculum organization. Any curricular design requires conversations with the students that expressly identify potential problems inherent in a given approach. In other words, an early-semester discussion about the limitations of the very conception of the course can have great pedagogical value, as it undermines the idea of the curriculum being automatically authoritative. Without careful attention to pedagogy, both of my proposed organizational schemes can reinforce the very colonial narratives that I believe world music instructors are charged with disrupting. I have taught the course both ways and find that I prefer to embrace overarching concepts while attempting to mitigate some of the challenges presented by a lack of sustained contact with easily digestible (though problematic) cultural geography. Other instructors will find ways of mitigating the challenges presented by the geographical approach when they choose to organize their curriculum using that method.

I base the semester-long curriculum around bi-weekly, themed units. The topics and case studies vary year-to-year based on a number of variables, including past success with certain lessons, newly published scholarship, and

\(^{12}\) The formative work of the anthropologist Arjun Appadurai offers a conceptual (as opposed to geographical) framework for the study of music from a broad, global perspective. See *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996). For a textbook that approaches the curriculum in a similar way, see Kay Kaufman Shelemay, *Soundscapes: Exploring Music in a Changing World*, 3rd ed. (New York: W. W. Norton, 2013). Although I feel this is a very well conceived textbook, I no longer require the purchase of expensive textbooks due to the economic diversity of my institution’s students.
current events. Recent iterations of the course have included the following units: “Locating Music” (space, performing contexts, globalization), “Music’s Materials” (theoretical building blocks [e.g., rhythm, mode], music and/as material culture), “Sound and the Sacred” (ritual, liturgy, theological debates), “Music and Politics” (protest, ecocriticism, postcolonialism), and “Music and Identity” (race, gender, intersectionality). There are many other units that one could plug in to this structure, such as “Music and the Body” (disability studies, embodiment, entrainment). The point of structuring the semester this way is to privilege a conceptual approach but still allow for more than a fleeting exposure to music via repetition and recall; for instance, students will encounter and then return to a certain tradition, such as Shona mbira music, in the context of multiple course units (“Music’s Materials,” “Sound and the Sacred,” and “Music and Politics”). Dispensing with the pretense of “coverage” has been incredibly liberating for me, as it has freed me to focus on topics that motivate me as a scholar and instructor, and that I feel have staying power for the students’ intellectual development after the semester’s end.

I draw the reading materials for these units from peer-reviewed articles from journals such as *Ethnomusicology* and *Ethnomusicology Forum* and excerpts from monographs and edited volumes based on their relevance and accessibility for mixed-level undergraduate readers. Although a few of these materials are classics of the ethnomusicological canon, such as Paul Berliner’s *The Soul of Mbira*, the majority of readings come from the past decade.13 Committing to a focus on recently published materials not only keeps me up-to-date on the latest scholarship, it allows me to include new scholarship from authors who identify as women, queer, black, indigenous, and people of color. It allows the students to access contemporary, cutting edge scholarly research, even in an “intro” course.

As an example, Meredith Schweig’s 2016 article, “‘Young Soldiers, One Day We Will Change Taiwan’: Masculinity Politics in the Taiwan Rap Scene,” is an effective resource in the “Music and Identity” unit of the course.14 Schweig’s study serves as an excellent primer for students learning about music as a locus for gender performance, masculinity politics, homosociality, and the association of gender and genre, all while focusing on the specific context of twentieth- and twenty-first-century Taiwan. It is written in accessible language that clearly articulates relationships between musical practice (and style) and social history; thus, students are not left guessing why the extramusical


context is relevant to their understanding of hip-hop, and vice versa. The reading even introduces broader ethnomusicological concepts, such as Mark Slobin’s “micromusics,” and gives the students the opportunity to talk about the globalization of a musical tradition that emerged from a very specific US context with which the majority of them are already familiar. In short, there is a lot that one can do with such a reading.

In planning the biweekly units, I try to include a variety of cultural settings, musical styles, and traditions, in relation to the topic. By way of example, the unit on “Music and Politics” from the latest iteration of the course highlighted multiple political/politicized uses of music. The unit is mapped out below:

- In preparation for the first day, we read an excerpt from David McDonald's 2013 book, *My Voice Is My Weapon*, related to Palestinian hip hop and the poetics of resistance. Students arrive already conversant on issues related to the Israeli-Palestinian crisis and the region's multi-faith religious soundscape after an introduction to it during the prior "Sound and the Sacred" unit. Engaging with McDonald's ethnographic writing, an assortment of music videos, and televised interviews with musicians, we discuss the specifics of how Palestinians use music to express political traumas and grievances. We also cross-examine the widespread association of hip hop with political resistance, discuss the routes of hip hop's globalization (and the media forms that enable that process), and assess how people localize global musics in order to satisfy their own social and/or political needs.

- On the second day we study how climate activists in Japan mobilized a local musical practice for political purposes, while broadcasting that message to global audiences. After reading Marié Abe’s 2016 article, "Sounding Against Nuclear Power in Post-3.11 Japan," we learn about *chindon-ya*, a practice of musical advertisement dating to the nineteenth century. Twenty-first century practitioners of chindon-ya politicized their musical instruments, sounds, and costuming for sound demonstrations protesting the Japanese government in the wake of the Fukushima disaster in March 2011. In thinking about music at the axis of the global and local, we make contrasts between the Palestinian and Japanese examples—not by drawing false equivalences for the sake of comparison—but rather by drawing attention to the historical and political specificities of the respective contexts.

- On day three we turn toward cultural politics in India, specifically investigating how intergenerational discourses are affected by the circulation of anti-colonial and anti-capitalist ideologies. Jayson Beaster-Jones's 2009 article

“Evergreens to Remixes”\textsuperscript{18} provides an introduction to Hindi film song and the Bollywood film industry, with its unique distributions of artistic labor. It also inspires a review of the aesthetics and nuts-and-bolts of remix, broadly conceived, all the while grappling with Indian commentators’ notions of musical originality, nostalgia, and anti-colonial politics.

• The “Music and Politics” unit ends with Suzanne Cusick’s important 2006 article, “Music as Torture / Music as Weapon.”\textsuperscript{19} Not only do we discuss the specific case of the US military use of music for the purpose of torturing prisoners of war, but also the agency of US soldiers in implementing this violence.\textsuperscript{20} To conclude, we discuss how the study of music—or, if you like, musical expertise—might create special opportunities to speak truth to power in the age in which we live.

Inside the “Lecture” Hall

My remit as instructor of this large-enrollment course is to lecture, but I try to break out of that mode of communication whenever possible. For my part, I try to connect students to the course material through not only “delivering” information about music traditions from around the world, but also by opening up a large-group conversation about the nature of the research involved (e.g., ethnographic fieldwork) and about how music scholars represent culture, often the culture of others, in their scholarship. In lecture, in other words, I see my role as facilitating a meta-level conversation about how we come to know the very material we are studying.

During parts of lecture, students spend some time as listeners—both to my voice as lecturer and to the various musical examples I have prepared for the day. But during much of the time, students are speaking. Often, after a few minutes spent introducing the topic for the day, I will pose a discussion question to the students that requires them to break into discussion in various configurations (two, three, or four to a group, or groupings with people they haven’t met yet). These prompts are always clearly projected so that students can continually refer to the prompts during discussion. For example, during


\textsuperscript{20} This discussion is shaped by J. Martin Daughtry’s book-length study, \textit{Listening to War: Sound, Music, Trauma, and Survival in Wartime Iraq} (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015).
a class dedicated to the Black Pacific in the “Music and Identity” unit, I begin class with the following prompt: “Turn to a neighbor and discuss the following question: What is race?” I intentionally leave the opening question broad in order to solicit the greatest variety of responses when I ask students to come together to share their definitions. After collecting five or six responses, I share some scholars’ published attempts to define this nebulous concept or else reconfigure it. One such example is philosopher Adam Hochman’s definition of racialization as “the process through which racialized groups, rather than ‘races,’ are formed.” The conversation thus moves from ontological givens to thinking about power and process.

I follow this with another discussion prompt: “Turn to a different neighbor and discuss the following question: Can you think of any examples where music was involved in the process of racializing a group of people?” Responses here range from the students’ pre-existing knowledge of Anglo-American pop to recollections of music discussed earlier in the semester where a racializing presence was palpable but not the main conversation topic. For example, a student might bring up Carolyn Ramzy’s work on Coptic liturgy that we discussed during the “Sound and the Sacred” unit several weeks prior. This discussion about race is geared toward thinking about the meaning of blackness at the intersection of music, nationalism, and colonialism, priming the pump for a spirited discussion of Gabriel Solis’s essay “The Black Pacific: Music and Racialization in Papua New Guinea and Australia.” I add to the discussion an assortment of other scholarly theories (including Paul Gilroy’s “Black Atlantic” framework and Antonio Gramsci’s “subaltern” term), and several musical examples emanating from Australian aboriginal spaces, such as Yothu Yindi’s “Treaty” (1991) and Local Knowledge’s “Blackfellas” (2005).

Even though students often enter the classroom with considerable musical experience as listeners (and sometimes as performers and creators), they are often too intimidated to engage with the music of “other” cultures because of either a perceived lack of technical vocabulary or a fear of being insensitive or awkward. To remedy this, during lectures and recitation sections, members of the instruction team lead group listening assignments that empower students

---

to think through their sonic experiences in the space of the classroom, in order to bring their own soundworlds into contact with the apparently distant soundworlds and lifeways of the people that we study in the curriculum—all the while using analogy and comparison to develop a critical lexicon for talking about sound and culture. I encourage students to use their own pre-existing vocabulary to engage with the material, often through think-pair-share exercises that present low-stakes opportunities for students to “talk it out” before sharing their insights with the group. What emerges is essentially a vernacular music theory that pushes students to use their own words to discuss what they hear; when appropriate, we support them with terminology and contextual information on which to build the conversation. Students do the great majority of talking during these moments. For the “Blackfellas” analysis, they typically focus on the meaning of lyrics vis-à-vis its colonial context, on elements of song production, and on the music video, most especially the non-verbal communicative gestures and dance choreography.

This is where critical engagement begins, not ends. As stated above, one of the main pedagogical goals of the course is to move beyond analogical thinking about difference. Minimizing sound anxiety through the above exercise gives students firmer ground on which to explore complex topics about sociocultural phenomena, many of which may seem distant from their own backgrounds or experiences. To some extent, this approaches what Sonia Seeman describes as “embodied pedagogy”: “a second level of teaching that is necessary for the students’ experience of far-near juxtaposition in such a way that they engage with a higher level of understanding.” An embodied pedagogy can function “as an effective means for conveying what music is and what music does.”

When students develop tools to articulate their aural experience, theoretical relations between music and globalization, identity, race, gender, and politics become more than hypothetical constructs. Instead of simply taking the instructor at their word, students learn to appreciate music’s meaningfulness through close attention to the processes of contextualization (e.g., religious worship, politics, gender norms) and decontextualization (e.g., globalization, commodification) that make their own musical experiences possible. This is especially important when dealing with controversial subjects, where political and ideological frameworks meet with an attention to human experience and practice. Critical listening and critical thinking thus become mutually constitutive. At the very end of the “Black Pacific” class, I leave students with a reflection question: “As you leave the class, consider the ways that your own racial identity and/

or racialized person is bound up with structures of power and circulations of culture (including music).” Such an exercise can be a powerful one for students, especially white students, who may not have considered their identity in racialized terms or reflected on the role of music or other cultural forms in their beliefs about race.

Sometimes, a highly effective way of bridging such the divide between listening and thinking is to bring in examples of local music making to demonstrate the effects of globalization and migration on the local cultural landscape of students’ home area. I also ask students to volunteer their own skills for class demonstrations. As Deborah Bradley sagely points out, “Where music education fails to help students make musical connections to their lives outside school, many infer that they are simply ‘not musical,’ or that their areas of musical interest lack value.” This often creates a sense of “musical inferiority” that according to Bradley, “mirrors the internalized sense of inferiority that results when indigenous cultures are denigrated in colonialist systems of education.”

One student, who had studied the Chinese pipa privately, performed for her fellow students and held a question-and-answer session afterward that brought home many of the issues that had seemed abstract to the other students prior to that class day. Moments of direct exposure to “world musics” act as what Seeman describes as “a conscious and conscientious shifting between far and near experiences.” These types of activities empower students for whom such traditions are familiar signifiers of home a chance to speak for themselves and to take pride in (or to take issue with!) how they are represented in the curriculum, thus taking representational authority away from the instructor and placing it in the hands of students. I have noted from course evaluations, and from one-on-one conversations with students during office hours, that this is all too rare at my institution, and I suspect at many others, too.

In order to model this approach of colonized or oppressed subjects taking charge of their own representation, I offer up my own experience as a person of color and descendent of immigrants during lectures to illustrate concepts introduced in the course units, explicitly drawing on my own families’ migrations to the US from Syria and Puerto Rico. For example, when explaining the difference between “push” and “pull” migration factors and diasporic identity, I discuss the economic migration of my mother’s family out of Syria to contrast with the current refugee crisis stemming from the ongoing Syrian Civil War.

27. The pipa is a four-stringed, plucked, short-necked lute.
In discussions of racial politics and whiteness, I bring into the conversation my Puerto Rican grandmother’s attempts to negotiate life in her host society as an adult migrant, providing rich detail about the role of Puerto Rican cultural practices in my childhood and adult self-actualization. *Salsa* music, *telemovelas*, and *arroz con gandules* represent for the students examples of cultural continuity across the point of migration. On the other hand, my Puerto Rican father’s affinity for the Beatles and his activities as an amateur rock musician complicate the picture for them and demonstrate patterns of diasporic adaptation. These narratives allow me to illustrate the personal stakes of the ethnomusicological concepts introduced in the curriculum. Ideally, they also help students reflect on how those concepts might inform their own worldviews. Like the musical demonstrations described above, such experiences provide opportunities for students to have a transformational learning experience about what it is like to be different.

Perhaps the most important pedagogical tool for integrating decolonial ideas into the “Intro to World Music” classroom is highlighting the central methodology employed in ethnomusicological research: ethnographic fieldwork. In discussions of readings, I draw students’ attention to passages of interview material and ethnographic accounts of the researcher’s experiences in the field. For example, in the case of the Schweig article on Taiwanese rap discussed above, students learn to read a musician’s statements about gender and genre against the grain. This metacognitive approach allows them to discuss the role of differing gender concepts and relations, both in carrying out fieldwork and in representing musical experience through writing, building toward a critique of knowledge production within ethnomusicology.

In order to bring home these critiques of representation and knowledge production, I spend at least one day per semester lecturing on my own research. For instance, when I present on the religious soundscape of Jerusalem, I not only share my field recordings, videos, and photographs, but I talk about the process of collecting and creating them in the field. I focus especially on ethical issues, such as requesting permission to record when appropriate or how such materials are framed in terms of their capacity for cultural representation (e.g., “What isn’t in frame or within earshot here?”). I also stress the importance of building relationships with research subjects, who in the classroom context I refer to as my “teachers,” in order to acknowledge the intellectual labor performed by “informants” in the context of human-subject research. Discussing my own research gives a fuller portrait of musical life in the world than does simple content delivery that focuses too closely on musical objects. More importantly, however, foregrounding the politics involved in producing such knowledge prepares students to do the decolonial work that a better world would demand of them.
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Experiential Learning, Multimodality, and Empowerment

I have found that integrating experiential learning (EL) theory into course assignments can heighten the decolonial potential of the curricular and pedagogical issues described above. Educational theorist David A. Kolb describes EL theory as “a dynamic view of learning based on a learning cycle driven by the resolution of the dual dialectics of action/reflection and experience/abstraction.”

Scholars who have paired action and reflection in their classrooms include Amanda Black and Andrea Bohlman, who have written on their use of “soundwalks” on a campus fraught with toxic racial politics. They suggest that “care-oriented and site-specific ‘sonic meditations’… have the potential to reposition listening as a collective exercise in the music (history) classroom—and thus as an activity fundamentally linked with community and collective action.”

Other scholars, such as Kate Galloway, have focused on creative outputs as processes that foster students’ critical reflection. Here, I build on these arguments and related pedagogical techniques by sharing some of the strategies I have developed for integrating EL into my own teaching in the “Intro to World Music” classroom, specifically through teaching the theory and practice of ethnography. Although ethnographic fieldwork can sometimes resemble a colonial methodology—traditionally, Western researchers have traveled elsewhere to learn from the “natives,” sometimes even in service to a colonial administration—in the context of the classroom, it can be reframed to highlight the decolonial potential of the course: as a way of holding space for musicians to speak for themselves and to explore the iterative relations between action/reflection and experience/abstraction. In particular, the experience/abstraction relation gets to the heart of representational politics when students experiment


31. Kate Galloway describes how she uses tools and methods drawn from the digital humanities in order to transform the classroom into a “makerspace.” As she argues, “By working with environmental sound and music directly and creatively, students learn how technologies and participatory approaches can be used to convey narratives and social activism, illustrating the importance of embodied knowledge to musicological scholarship.” Galloway, “Making and Learning with Environmental Sound: Maker Culture, Ecomusicology, and the Digital Humanities in Music History Pedagogy,” this *Journal* 8, no. 1 (2017), 48.
with multiple modalities for representing their experiences (textually and non-textually), as I will discuss below.

I augment the content of the course with experiential learning assignments that culminate in multimodal projects that replace some traditional forms of evaluation, such as traditional essays and exams. These assignments challenge students to engage critically with the material and reflect on the politics of learning together. Multimodality refers to allowing for research outputs that utilize multiple forms of communicating ideas, rather than upholding the supremacy of text. As Ioana Literat et al. argue, “multimodal research is valuable because of its potential for more comprehensive and inclusive inquiries, analyses, and representations that can be socially, culturally and politically transformative” and because it can “facilitate wider and more meaningful participation in the research processes.” Such acts of inclusion hold the greatest decolonial potential for both curriculum and pedagogy.

Anthropologist Julius Bautista argues “for a pedagogic dialogism that channels how anthropologists handle the discursive politics of ethnographic practice such that meaningful learning occurs when students ‘struggle’ with the mutually awkward, some-times uncomfortable effort to recognize the agency of the people that they encounter in the course of EL-based curricular programs.” To this end, I not only talk about ethnography during lectures, but I actually require them to engage in the “struggle” Bautista describes by assigning ethnographic research projects conducted in the region surrounding campus. In recent iterations of the course, I have assigned three such projects, each carried out in collaborative groups and with a unique topic or output. Students typically begin with a general prompt, such as “In groups of five, attend, observe, and/or participate in any musical performance relating to the genres, practices, traditions, styles, and/or topics discussed in class. Take notes and collaborate to jointly author a 3–4-page ethnographic sketch based on your jottings.” Students are empowered to take charge of forming research teams, selecting field sites, and making contact with people with whom they might speak. In other words, the primary goal of the project is for students to experiment with methodology. Subsequent assignments become more specific, with specific research questions

guiding the project. For one assignment, for example, I ask students to attend a religious service, site, or event within a community of which a majority of the group are not members and write a 3–4-page ethnographic description of how sound functions within that setting. For this project, the primary aim is for students to think about how they represent a sacred or sensitive cultural domain in their production of knowledge. One reason for requiring written essays as the final outputs for such projects is to get students thinking about the process of producing the ethnomusicological research that we read throughout the semester while preparing them for the multimedia project they produce at the end of term.

This is the point at which Seeman’s “embodied pedagogy” and Bautista’s “pedagogy of discomfort” converge, and classroom discussions form a feedback loop with students’ external experiences. They start to think about music beyond a text to be analyzed in class and instead as a product of human intellectual and creative labor that is embedded in social life. But the ethnographies also serve the mission of the course in that they force students to confront the dynamics of knowledge production itself. Working in collaborative teams creates opportunities for students to engage in metacognition about writing in a different way than they would if producing a single-authored paper and, more to the point, they engage in a metacognitive consideration of how musical experience is represented in writing. This engagement in metacognition about the creation of knowledge serves the decolonial ends of the course.

Written essays are only one form of cultural representation with which students may experiment in the context of “Intro to World Music.” Multimodal learning projects can draw on the ethos of ethnographic research while decoupling it from the technology of writing (traditionally defined) and associating it with other narrative media technologies with which students may already be familiar, such as film, podcasting, photo essay, mix tape, and other formats. Film is a multimedia format that allows for parallel thinking about visual and sonic domains of representation and, therefore, encourages multimodal learning in the “Intro to World Music” classroom. To this end, for their culminating project students conceive and create a short ethnographic film connected to a specific course topic.

Students collaborate in groups of five to create a short ethnographic film documenting an aspect of the sound world of the Triangle region (Chapel Hill and surrounding towns). Groups develop the project during recitation meetings leading up to the execution of the project. Some past groups have

35. Under extenuating circumstances, in which this assignment may present some students with undue anxiety (for a variety of reasons), I have chosen to arrange for alternative ethnographic assignments that do not specify a religious musical setting.
captured the soundscape of an area of town, documented a single musical event from multiple vantage points, and conducted interviews with musicians who participate in a local scene, group, or religious community. Each project carries with it a different approach to creating narratives about music as an ethnographic subject. Students must secure permission (signed releases) from people who serve as documentary subjects. The films end up being approximately five minutes in length, edited together from a much greater amount of raw footage.

Naturally, rolling out such a project in a large class has involved some logistical challenges. In addition to spending time to develop a project concept drawn from the content of the course, students also must acquire (free of charge through our institution) the necessary software, become trained in using the software through workshops scheduled at the library during their recitation times, check out cameras and microphones, and meet in groups outside of class to film and edit the video. It is a very time- and resource-intensive project that presents the instructors (TAs included) with all kinds of potential headaches with regard to logistics and group dynamics, but the political and pedagogical value of the project trumps the professional inconveniences involved.

The technical quality of the films vary according to student ability and how thoroughly they absorbed the technical training, but across the board such projects have tended to produce truly thoughtful engagement with the politics of representation that serve as a course focal point. At the end of the course, I require students to reflect on those politics, and the relation between action and reflection, in a two-page essay on their experience making the film, focusing on how this project may (or may not) have enhanced their knowledge of musical ethnography, cultural representation, and the topical subjects we discuss throughout the semester. These responses have generally supported the idea that multimodal learning assignments allow students to think more creatively and more critically about broader discussions around methodology and cultural representation than do traditional academic assignments. The ethnographic study of music and experimentation with modes of narration can help students to theorize about cultural encounters and allow for a discussion about how colonial (or anti- or de- or post-colonial) politics are embedded in the very labor of learning about human culture. Thinking critically about cultural difference through thoughtful engagement with musical traditions and issues from around the world helps students to develop skills that can transfer to their lives beyond the class. Such work represents a signal contribution of academic music studies to the development of ethical citizens.
Conclusion

Is the “Intro to World Music” survey course still relevant? The answer depends on how one teaches it. I remain conflicted about the overall curricular model and feel ambivalent about whether or not the course should be part of current music-department curricula. In principle, I feel that its inclusion has historically been a blatant act of tokenism. In the past the goal has been to “expose” students in a one-semester class to all of the world’s musics from all places and times, in all languages, and of all genres and modes (art/pop/traditional). All the while, a much larger share of departmental resources support specialized teaching of a limited repertoire of music from Western, Central, (occasionally) Eastern Europe, and to some extent North America. “Intro to World Music” seems to be a classic example of inclusion without equity as departments reap the optical benefits of their global music offerings without having to offer the non-European a real foothold in their curricula.

All of that said, I would not support simply doing away with “Intro to World Music” without a plan in place to overhaul the whole music curriculum and thereby achieve greater equity among world traditions across the board. This includes rethinking how we teach music history and analysis. In place of truly aspirational macro-level curricular and institutional decolonization, perhaps micro-level curricular and pedagogical choices that create opportunities for thinking about decoloniality will have to suffice. By establishing a conceptually oriented curricular structure that creates opportunities for repeated encounters with the music of others, framed by pointed discussions about the context and content of music making, and by integrating EL and multimodal learning outputs, any course—but perhaps especially “Intro to World Music”—can create possibilities for students to develop an openness to relationality and radical self-evaluation that could be the foundation of a decolonized world.
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When I consider innovating my classroom pedagogy, two concerns come to mind straight away. First, I am given pause by the overwhelming amount of time and energy required to redesign an existing course or curriculum. Second, I ponder the potential success or failure of the new activity or content. Will all of the time and energy spent result in improved student learning outcomes, or will it all be for naught?

James Lang’s *Small Teaching: Everyday Lessons from the Science of Learning* and *Make It Stick: The Science of Successful Learning* by Peter C. Brown, Henry Roediger III, and Mark A. McDaniel confront these paralyzing considerations head on. Written in accessible prose and employing engaging narratives, these two books work in tandem to explain straightforward strategies for increased learning without wasted time and effort on the part of the instructor. Clearly developed with practicality in mind, both books offer concrete examples of activities to complement lesson plans. Moreover, the content is presented with an eye toward efficiency that will appeal to university instructors who have little time to spare. Additionally, both volumes call readily upon cognitive psychology, the study of how the mind works and how people perceive, remember, and think, to demonstrate the proven didactic benefits of the strategies presented. Both books effectively summarize and communicate the methods and results of cognitive science research and establish clear connections between research-based evidence and common pedagogical goals.
The robust organizational structure that shapes each book makes the content accessible and easy to reference. Lang employs a consistent organization in each chapter, which makes the book easy to follow and to consult when seeking to implement one of his strategies. After introducing each key “Small Teaching” concept, the author summarizes significant studies supporting the success of the pedagogical technique. In the second half of each chapter Lang describes specific models for incorporating the teaching concept in the classroom and distills the central principles of each exercise to provide more conceptual guidance for implementing the activity in a variety of instructional contexts. Brown, Roediger, and McDaniel are particularly resourceful, using strategies they promote in the book, namely interleaving and the spaced repetition of ideas, to organize their volume. The recurring repetitions of their key ideas and interleaved exploration of different yet related ideas throughout the book contributes to a cohesive arrangement of the content, which is distilled in a section titled “The Takeaway” at the end of each chapter.

The authors of both books work to dispel prevailing assumptions regarding learning and pedagogy. The authors of *Make It Stick* address mistakes students often make when trying to learn, and they argue against many of the principal notions found in theory, lore, and intuition surrounding studying strategies. They claim that we are often poor judges of both what we know and how we learn well, and argue that the common practices of revisiting book content, reviewing notes, highlighting and underlining while reading, and massed practice (studying a single topic for long, uninterrupted sessions) are simply ineffective. In lieu of the prevailing wisdom, they provide evidence-based suggestions for mastering learning processes.

Each studying technique in *Make It Stick* emphasizes the necessary effort required to actually learn something. Their first two chapters focus on practicing retrieval, asserting the established benefits of low-stakes testing and self-quizzing accompanied by corrective feedback. In the following chapter the authors emphasize the importance of taking frequent breaks from material (spacing) and alternating the practice of various topics or skills (interleaving). In the fourth and fifth chapters they encourage learners to embrace difficulty, demonstrating the benefit of effortful learning and the specious idea that there is such a thing as “errorless learning.” Challenging students to confront illusions of knowing by advocating frequent self-testing and peer instruction forces students to move away from relying on their intuition and encourages them instead to engage what Daniel Kahneman describes as “System 2,” the slower functioning, analytical brain.

In Chapter 6 the authors debunk the common understanding of different learning styles and instead present cognitive tendencies that result in stronger learning outcomes according to empirical research. These include a growth
mindset, the understanding that both one’s abilities and one’s knowledge are malleable and not fixed, structure building, and rule-based—as opposed to example-based—learning; all are strategies that favor establishing frameworks over memorizing particular examples or case studies. A growth mindset is central to the following chapter, in which the authors present research supporting the benefit of knowing that students can improve their learning and expand their intelligence through deliberate practice. The final chapter provides specific learning tips for students, lifelong learners, and teachers, as well as activities may be easily integrated to improve student learning outcomes.

In *Small Teaching* James Lang challenges the assumption that pedagogical innovation necessitates a total redesign of a lesson plan or curriculum and argues for careful consideration of how students actively engage with material in the classroom. Lang describes three types of innovations throughout the book: brief (5–10 minute) classroom or online teaching activities, one-time class interventions, and small modifications in course design or communication with students that can enhance your pedagogy.

Lang organizes his interventions according to three crucial areas of instruction: learning, understanding, and motivation, directly referencing *Make It Stick* and its cognitive concepts. For example, in his opening section on helping students attain knowledge (Chapter 1–3), he talks about both practicing retrieval and interleaving the teaching and practice of related ideas or skills. Additionally, he presents research supporting the benefit of prediction. Even if one’s estimation is incorrect, the act of speculating inspires easier recall, as long as incorrect suppositions are resolved swiftly.

To help students build understanding, Chapters 4–6 explain activities that will force students to engage actively with material and establish connections across the content. He advises against instituting specific associations for students, instead asking them to build their own conceptual frameworks relating the various ideas presented in class, an idea that resonates with the concept of structure building and rule learning described in *Make It Stick*. Furthermore Lang suggests using valuable class time for students to practice exercising their understanding and the necessary skills to succeed on assessments. Finally, he describes the many benefits of “self explaining” and suggests students elucidate their reasoning by thinking out loud or engaging in the process of peer teaching.

The final section of the book (Chapters 7–9) focuses on student motivation. While Lang acknowledges that some may argue that making students eager to learn is not necessarily the instructor’s job, research shows that a teacher’s attitude in the classroom can go a long way in encouraging successful learning outcomes. Lang describes the importance of getting to know your students, communicating your investment in their learning process, and exercising empathy and compassion in your interactions with pupils. The growth mindset, a central
framework in *Make It Stick*, is likewise at the forefront of this section. Lang makes suggestions regarding assignment design, assessment strategies, and feedback techniques to promote the growth mindset among students. Empathy also plays a role, as he encourages instructors to open up to students about their own growth as an academic or pedagogue. Lang concludes by encouraging instructors to consistently develop their own pedagogical methods. While it is all too easy to become lackadaisical about teaching, especially in courses that are taught semester after semester, Lang’s *Small Teaching* provides simple strategies for regularly implementing pedagogical innovations into individual class sessions.

Both of these books are valuable teaching resources. *Make It Stick* provides essential knowledge and understanding of cognitive processes that can help students determine how best to learn and study for assessments. Taking time to make these cognitive processes explicit might occupy valuable content time, but students will develop skills they can and will use both in their other classes and beyond. Making those ideas more concrete by offering realistic, hands-on applications, *Small Teaching* incorporates many of the strategies described in *Make It Stick* into straightforward pedagogical techniques for direct classroom implementation.

Kimberly Beck Hieb  
West Texas A&M University

Problem-based learning (PBL) is becoming a widely-used pedagogical technique in higher education settings. The principal goal of PBL activities is to encourage students to use course knowledge to come up with solutions to real-world problems. PBL was originally invented to teach medical students how to solve problems that might come up in their careers, but more recently other disciplines, including those in the arts and humanities, have begun to adopt it. Many college instructors find that PBL improves student learning because it makes the course material applicable to students’ careers and helps their critical thinking and research skills. PBL use has come relatively slowly to the music classroom, however. Four articles have been published on the use of PBL in music, but Problem-Based Learning in the College Music Classroom—a collection of essays edited by Natalie Sarrazin—is the first book on the subject.¹ The collection aims to help college music faculty understand PBL, and the authors of each essay (who come from multiple music subdisciplines) illustrate how they use PBL in their own classrooms. The goal of the book is to inspire other music faculty to use PBL.

Sarrazin begins the book by differentiating between problem-based learning and project-based learning, which are often confused with one another. According to her description of the book on its back cover, “PBL is

---

an effective, student centered approach in which students learn higher-order thinking skills and integrative strategies by solving real world challenges.” She notes that one of the biggest misconceptions about PBL in music classrooms is that there are no high stakes problems to solve. Of the four published studies on PBL in music, Sarrazin points out that only three of them truly represent PBL; the other is project-based. This confusion between problem-based learning and project-based learning is another main issue among faculty, because those who do think that they are doing PBL in their classes often are doing project-based activities. This book not only serves to differentiate the two but also provides useful ideas for creating and adapting PBL activities in different music courses.

The book is usefully divided into four parts, making it easy to find techniques one needs. There is overlap between the sections, however, so the book would best be read cover-to-cover. Part 1, music history and appreciation, contains three essays. In the first, John Tomerson discusses how best to use PBL in the music history class as an adjunct, confronting the challenges that contingent faculty face when abandoning the lecture for a more interactive lesson. Tomerson addresses the specific issues that contingent faculty face (e.g. the need to overcome student resistance, fears about how faculty colleagues and administrators might view PBL techniques, concerns that using these techniques might endanger reappointment) and gives suggestions for how these issues might be overcome. The second essay, by Margaret Leenhouts, and third essay, by Rodney Garrison, focus specifically on PBL in music appreciation courses. These two essays discuss how to engage non-major students in PBL with problems that do not require extensive musical knowledge, such as cultivating a local orchestra’s concert season and compiling the program book for it, including deciding on pieces, writing program notes, and creating advertisements.

Part 2, which focuses on ethnomusicology, contains three essays. The first two, by Gavin Webb and Tiffany Nicely, respectively, discuss the use of PBL in African music classes. Although the essays form a nice complement to one another, the fact that they focus on a single geographic region is a limitation. The third essay of Part 2, by Julie E. Hunter, is broader in that it covers both an African music course and a World Music Cultures course, but it actually illustrates the use of what might be best described as project-based learning. Since Sarrazin is so careful in the introduction to differentiate project-based learning from PBL, Hunter’s focus makes her essay an odd fit for the collection. Taken together, therefore, this section is the weakest of the book.

Despite the African focus of Webb’s and Nicely’s essays, however, the techniques that they present could be modified to any geographic region. Webb’s PBL project has students function as a kind of public relations consultant for countries in Africa, in which they study media depictions of these countries and help to rebrand them in order to correct misrepresentations. Nicely discusses
the use of PBL in an online ethnomusicology class that focuses on Sub-Saharan Africa. Because the course is online, she addresses the challenges that classes in virtual spaces face in PBL. Hunter’s essay focuses on the aspect of group learning in PBL and how it is employed for students who are seeking to make music engaging and meaningful for others.

The third part of the book discusses the underuse of PBL in music and movement with two essays by Scott Horsington and Tamara Wilcox. Horsington’s contribution presents best practices for the use of PBL in introduction to music classes that incorporate a study of kinesics, while Wilcox’s essay can easily be seen as overlapping with those in Part 1 in that it talks about how to use PBL and movement in the music appreciation class. Horsington takes the non-verbal communication of chamber musicians as a starting point for encouraging students to explore the ways that musicians communicate with one another while playing. Wilcox has students use movement as part of their PBL projects in order to help them find their own musical voices.

The final section concerns the use of PBL in music theory and education, with essays by Natalie Sarrazin, Tracy S. Wanamaker, and Rodney Garrison. Like Hunter, Sarrazin discusses project-based learning in the context of music education. Her essay narrates how her course worked in tandem with her university’s early childhood education center for the students’ project. Wanamaker has an interesting take on PBL, using it for both classroom management and curricular issues. She employs PBL for her teacher education class on special education and has students use it to understand how to fulfill New York State mandates on teaching students with disabilities. Garrison’s second contribution to this volume shows how PBL can be used in the first semester of the aural skills sequence. He uses PBL for two purposes: to have students argue for the need for music literacy, and to help them understand how best to teach aural skills to others using skills acquired in class.

The book closes with one more chapter by Sarrazin that lays out best practices for using PBL. She begins the chapter by reviewing the history of PBL and its advantages. She closes the chapter with best practices and methods for employing PBL specifically in music classes, while reviewing what the authors of the essays did in their applications.

Despite the minor issues with the essays of Part 2, *Problem-Based Learning in the College Music Classroom* is a welcome addition to the music history pedagogy literature. Because music history courses are rarely taught in a vacuum, each of the essays in this book is valuable for the music historian. The volume does not address the use of PBL in other music settings, such as
ensembles, some such studies do exist. Hopefully, this will be the first of many books on PBL in music to emerge in the near future. I recommend that anyone interested in employing PBL in their classrooms read this book.

Reba A. Wissner
Montclair State University


Last fall I presented a conundrum to the freshmen in my introduction to music studies class. Handing them three different printed versions of the same piece of music, I asked them which was best. They stared at the scores for a few minutes before one finally asked, “Dr. Granade, what do you mean by ‘best?’” That student’s innocent and perfectly reasonable question sparked a long discussion on information literacy among the students and is the animating question behind A-R Editions newest volume in the Music Library Association Technical Reports Series. Titled Information Literacy in Music: An Instructor’s Companion and edited by three music librarians (Beth Christensen, Erin Conor, and Marian Ritter) this volume attempts to be, as its back cover proudly proclaims, “a practical guide to information literacy instruction for busy librarians and music faculty.” In the lines that follow, I want to dig into two claims in that short sentence and see if they accurately describe the finished product: that this is a “practical guide” and that it is geared for “busy librarians and music faculty.” Following that discussion, I’ll provide a few practical concluding thoughts of my own on how you might incorporate this resource into your own teaching.

A Practical Guide

When I first received the request to review Information Literacy in Music, I expected the book to be something along the lines of either Laurie Sampsel’s excellent Music Research: A Handbook, which we use at UMKC in our graduate bibliography courses as an introduction to a constellation of music resources, or Gregg Geary, Laura Snyder, Kathleen Abromeit, and Deborah Ann Campana’s Music Library Instruction, which covers the main issues in training modern
music students in resource management.\(^1\) What I found instead was a collection of assignments currently in use at a range of North American institutions of higher education.\(^2\) The subtitle “Companion” here is apt, as this book is not meant to be used in a classroom setting for training future pedagogues; instead, it is intended as a shelf reference for new and seasoned teachers, from which they can grab a new idea for infusing information literacy concepts into their classes. As the editors note in their introduction: “This book can be used by librarians and music faculty seeking quick, clear answers to the many obstacles their students may encounter in locating, evaluating, and using information.” In other words, don’t bother trying to read this book cover to cover as the dizzying array of approaches and topics will leave you unable to assimilate the treasures that lie within.

In order for a collection of assignments to be effective, useful, or even “practical,” a teacher must be able quickly to find the solution to those obstacles their students are encountering. To solve that issue, the editors provide three avenues into the collection:

1. The Table of Contents: The first thing a reader encounters upon opening up the book is the table of contents, here roughly grouped according to the primary music teaching areas found in North American institutions. The thirteen areas are Applied Music, Ethnomusicology, Interdisciplinary, Introduction to Research and Writing, Jazz, Music Business, Music History, Music Education, Music Therapy, Music Theory and Composition, Popular Music, Special Collections and Sheet Music, and Studying Music Abroad. The number of assignments detailed in each section betrays the focus of the book’s editors and authors. Music History receives the most examples by far, with eleven of the book’s thirty-nine assignments falling into this category, almost one-third of the book’s contents. Applied Music is second in the list, with six assignments devoted to its area. Jazz, Music Business, Music Education, and Music Theory and Composition each feature only one assignment in their area, and the others all contain between two and four assignments each.

2. Assignments Categorized by Learning Outcome: After the acknowledgments and the introduction comes a page that lists twenty of the thirty-nine assignments according to the learning outcome associated with them. Those outcomes are “Develop a Research Question,” “Develop Metacognitive Abilities,” “Engage with Sources,” “Evaluate Score Editions,” “Evaluate Sources,” and “Search Strategically.” “Engaging with Sources” contains the most assignments at four, while “Develop Metacognitive Abilities” features only one. The remaining outcomes contain two or three assignments.

2. All of the institutions represented are in the United States and Canada but for one: Doshisha University in Kyoto City, Japan.
Assignments Categorized by Instruction Scenario: The final indexing of *Information Literacy in Music*’s contents divides thirty of the thirty-nine assignments according to the teaching strategies each employs. Those strategies include “Active Learning,” “Peer Learning,” Scaffolded Assignments,” “Teaching with Wikipedia,” “Working with Music Reference Sources,” and “Working with Primary Sources.” “Active Learning” features thirteen of the assignments, the largest grouping of any of these categories at almost half of the indexed assignments, while “Teaching with Wikipedia” contains the fewest, with only two examples.

Unfortunately, even though the editors claim that this system is a “simple, easy-to-navigate format,” it does present difficulties to the reader wanting to quickly dip into the book’s shallow end and find a solution to a vexing classroom problem in information literacy. The two tools that categorize assignments by learning outcome and teaching strategy leave out nineteen and nine assignments respectively. As a result, you must use all three tools if you want to find the full range of assignments available. The editors are also not transparent in how they decided upon the learning outcomes and teaching strategies represented and how they grouped the assignments under these titles.

For an example of the practical difficulties a reader might encounter, consider Patricia Puckett Sasser’s useful and insightful assignment “Envisioning Research: Information Literacy for Study Away.” Sasser is addressing the difficulties of teaching information literacy to a group of students studying for a semester in Arezzo, Italy, who will be physically away from the resources available at their home institution of Furman University. The assignment presents a scaffolded process to pick a topic, develop a thesis, and find resources leading to writing a music history research paper. In the table of contents Sasser’s assignment is located under the “Studying Music Abroad” section, but this is an assignment for a music history classroom and could be useful to faculty teaching an early music history course. Unfortunately, faculty only perusing the “Music History” section will miss it completely. Similarly, the assignment appears under the “Develop a Research Question” outcome but is missing from the teaching strategy list even though it is a scaffolded assignment. There are many opportunities to miss Sasser’s wisdom since it is tucked away as the penultimate assignment in the book, and the tools available do not equally index all the available assignments.

Busy Librarians and Music Faculty

Once a reader finds an assignment, the second claim, that *Information Literacy in Music* is tailor-made for “busy librarians and music faculty,”
becomes a relevant question. Thankfully, as an answer to this question I can give an unequivocal and resounding “yes!” Unlike James A. Davis’s collection *The Music History Classroom* and C. Matthew Balensuela’s edited volume *The Norton Guide to Teaching Music History*, this companion does not offer ruminations on how and why we teach. Those two recent collections feature longer essays with overarching principles that take time to digest and then apply to your own teaching. *Information Literacy in Music*, on the other hand, offers little on the “why” of an assignment and focuses instead on the “how.” Let’s look at one example of an assignment I am planning on adapting for my own teaching.

Kathleen DeLaurenti’s “Critical Approaches to Information Literacy and Authentic Assessment Using Wikipedia” addresses head-on the propensity of students to Google a topic and focus their energy on the first hit, usually an article from Wikipedia. In an interdisciplinary course called “Pink Noise: Women Making Electronic Music,” librarian DeLaurenti partnered with instructor Christopher DeLaurenti to craft an assignment where the students created or edited a Wikipedia article about a female electronic music composer. She presents the assignment’s learning outcomes, describes the assessment procedures, details a few of the hiccups and triumphs during its implementation, and then provides the full text of the assignment through a weblink and an overview of what the students accomplished week-by-week. Over the span of six pages DeLaurenti presents a fully realized assignment ready to import into another class, complete with milestones for the students and syllabus language for the teacher. Her particular assignment is much larger than the one I wish to make but is already serving as a guide to my own version. For a busy faculty member attempting to manage several courses each semester, this kind of no-nonsense advice is a lifesaver, particularly in the area of information literacy, where many readers of this *Journal*, like myself, might feel a desperate need for assignments but a hesitation as to how to go about designing one.

Want to help your students learn how to evaluate printed scores of music? Or create an effective annotated bibliography? Or use primary sources in a local archive? Or research an opera role? Those and thirty-five other scenarios are detailed in *Information Literacy in Music: An Instructor’s Companion*. While there are some issues in finding the exact assignment you need, once you arrive at its place in the collection, you will discover a practical guide to incorporating information literacy into your busy course schedule. Christensen, Conor, and

---

Ritter’s book is truly a companion to music faculty, and it has already found a place on my personal reference shelf.

S. Andrew Granade
University of Missouri-Kansas City