

Book Review/Essay

COLLEGE MUSIC CURRICULA FOR A NEW CENTURY

Robin Moore, editor and co-author

Ed Sarath

University of Michigan

October 2018

College Music Curricula for a New Century (CMCNC) is a highly informative collection of essays that furthers the music studies visioning conversation following the release of the College Music Society (CMS) Manifesto.¹ As lead author of the Manifesto, I am happy to see that this document continues to spur dialogue several years after its publication. I also find myself increasingly interested in the aspects of the document that catch attention in different constituencies and those facets that tend to elude consideration. With responses to date from groups of colleagues in Music Theory, Band, and now—via CMCNC—reflections from Ethnomusicology, the fact that several of the Manifesto’s key principles have yet to be significantly addressed by either supporters or detractors among those groups suggests that important exchange remains to be had. As I elaborate below, the Manifesto’s transcultural diversity framework, which differs significantly from prevailing multicultural approaches to the topic, is a primary example of a potential new frontier.

It is also important to acknowledge that CMCNC stands on its own in the reform literature, meaning that, even if the Manifesto had never appeared, the CMCNC volume represents an important contribution in its own right to change efforts. The fact that several CMCNC authors have been involved in, and/or cite innovative work that was initiated long before the CMS convened the Task Force that produced the Manifesto underscores this point. On this account, Mark Dewitt’s statement in his chapter on initiatives involving oral traditions at a range of institutions could not be more poignant:

Clearly, some schools did not need a College Music Society Task Force to tell them that they needed to diversify the curriculum, and some have done it with little fanfare.(p.96)

Still, I believe Deborah Bradley’s assessment of the limited extent of progress in overall music studies reform, despite over a half-century of efforts, more accurately reflects the bigger picture—or more aptly, crisis—in the field. “That the CMS task force has now issued a call for curricular change sixteen years after Vision 20/20,” among a long series of events and initiatives predicated on music studies reform that might be traced back to the 1967 Tanglewood symposium, “illustrates the continuing lack of substantive changes in music education curricula.”(p.207)

I have devoted considerable attention to this issue in my recent writing and view the shift from prevailing multicultural approaches to diversity to a transcultural model as a key new

¹ *College Music Curricula for a New Century*, Robin Moore, ed. (Oxford, 2017). The CMS Manifesto is found in *Redesigning Music Studies in an Age of Change*, Ed Sarath, David Myers, Patricia Campbell (Routledge 2016)

vista in change deliberations.² As I discuss below, the transcultural turn opens up paradigmatically new modes of understanding and strategies for not only the social justice imperative but artistic, pedagogical and research terrain as well. I thus examine *College Music Curricula for a New Century*—which, consistent with most reform visioning to date, is constrained by a multicultural orientation—through a transcultural lens.

Although my critique of CMCNC on this account is sharp at times (and laudatory at others), my emphasis is on the points at which CMCNC broaches openings, and/or imposes unexamined obstacles, to transcultural horizons. If there is any credence to Bradley's above assessment (which I believe is self-evident), then nothing short of wholesale commitment to new kinds of critical and self-critical inquiry will suffice to break the gridlock. Therefore, when I assert that multiculturalism may actually impede the diversity quest and needs to be rejected as vigorously as monoculturalism, it is because I believe music studies change discourse—as much as the field at large—is in need of a wake-up call of unprecedented urgency. I hope the following thoughts are taken with this constructive intention in mind.

PART I

DISTINGUISHING BETWEEN MULTICULTURAL AND TRANSCULTURAL FRAMEWORKS

To begin with the most general principles and then proceed to the particular:

Central to multiculturalism is a view of the musical landscape as an array of discrete cultural compartments that are to be encountered one by one in aspirations to develop an adequate diversity awareness. Ethnomusicology lecture and seminar classes and music teacher education coursework that aim to give prospective public school teachers grounding in culturally diverse practices are two prominent multicultural formats.

Transculturalism shares multicultural aspirations to develop a pluralistic awareness, but shifts the locus of engagement and understanding to the creative processes and corresponding identity formation by which musical artists develop deep and intimate connections to the outer musical world. The central pulse of musical reality from a transcultural vantage point is thus located not in discrete, language-bound cultural compartments, a perspective that is reified in the multicultural academy, but rather in realms of creative experience, and often a resultant body of work, that transcends language and category. As I elaborate below, the Contemporary Improviser Composer Performer (CICP) identity that prevailed in earlier times in European classical music and which has made its return through jazz and its global offshoots, is a primary transcultural vehicle. One need look no further for exemplars than the past decade or so of MacArthur fellows in music, including Tyshawn Sorey, Vijay Iyer, Regina Carter, George Lewis, Steve Coleman and Anthony Braxton, with ever expanding peer constituencies, whose creative expression often defy categorization, increasingly legion in contemporary musical practice.

It is important to emphasize that the CICP identity shift differs fundamentally from typical reform strategies that approach improvisation and composition as curricular add-ons, or occasional activities. The CICP identity represents a wholesale transformation in sense of musical being, where these foundational modes of creativity, which enhance creativity

² See my book *Black Music Matters* (Rowman and Littlefield, 2018), where I characterize my model as “integral transcultural” in order to differentiate it from other uses of the term “transcultural” and delineate over two dozen distinguishing parameters between multicultural and transcultural frameworks.

throughout the entire spectrum of musical engagement and inquiry, becomes the basis for an entirely new musical worldview. Often confined to a horizontal, curricular assembly line—the more traditions encountered, the better, so the thinking goes—or what has been called a musical smorgasborg, the multicultural approach leaves important questions unaddressed about depth of engagement, let alone the negative impact of what has been called “tokenism.” These questions are addressed in the transcultural paradigm through its vertical penetration to underlying strata of creative awareness that are the basis for unprecedented exploration, achievement, collaboration and understanding. Moreover, once this interior relationship is enlivened through the lens of even a single new tradition, it can motivate a lifetime of further exploration and growth.³

A key transcultural premise, however, is that creative grounding in a primary musical tradition is key to the broader explorations and achievement. A look at the jazz CICIP model as exemplary of this point, followed by examination of how this has eluded multicultural approaches, sheds further light on the significance of the transcultural turn to music studies visioning in general, and CMCNC in particular.

Jazz, epistemology and ethnology: an essential interaction

To begin with an assertion that may seem counterintuitive from a multicultural standpoint:

A jazz-based music studies paradigm has the capacity to provide music students in America with foundational skills and understanding that promote a scope of musical navigation—as well as integration, rigor, achievement, critical and self-critical vitality, self-organizing integrity, and transformative impact within that scope—that far exceeds what is typically advanced, let alone imagined, in multicultural discourse.

Why is this counterintuitive from a multicultural vantage point? Because it smacks of privileging a single genre against the ostensibly egalitarian embrace of all music that underpins multicultural ideology.

The problem with this ideology is that it is so caught up in an ethnological thrust that it has lost sight of the even more foundational epistemological imperative that is central to artistic development and ethnological aspirations (that seek to move beyond the diversity assembly line/smorgasborg syndrome). This has given rise to a self-perpetuating cycle in which language-bound misconceptions and attachments undermine capacities to coherently apprehend the nature of musical reality. A primary symptom is the exclusive ontological status given to labels—with the word ‘jazz’ a primary casualty. Whereas from a multicultural vantage point, jazz is construed as one among an infinitude of genres that appear on the musical horizons, the same word from a transcultural vantage point designates a site in which the CICIP identity that prevailed in earlier times in European classical music has made its return, now in a more globally informed manner, and is key to 21st century navigation.

By flipping the ontological switch to epistemology, entirely new modes of critical and self-critical interrogation as well as principles and practices come into view.

³ This is not to be conflated with Mantle Hood’s notion of bi-musicality, which is a multicultural notion, as are its multimusicality derivatives.

Here is where what I call the “systematic improvisatory development continuum,” among the most important principles in the Manifesto, yet one that is typically overlooked, looms large in the discussion. This continuum includes multiple improvisatory and compositional languages, virtuosic performance skills, rigorous aural, embodied and analytical grounding in contemporary rhythmic, melodic, and harmonic practices, and wide-ranging conceptual inquiry that spans cultural, aesthetic, historical, cognitive and transpersonal/spiritual dimensions (the latter is also approached through contemplative methodologies). Prominent within the rhythmic realm is what Jeff Pressing has called “Black Atlantic Rhythm,”⁴ a heading he coined to emphasize the ubiquitous nature of rhythmic languages that originated and evolved in African, panAfrican and African American cultures in global musical life. Any curricular discourse that aspires toward even a modicum of diversity richness that does not emphasize, early on and often, the coupling of rigorous and varied improvisatory expertise with this kind of rhythmic grounding as the basis for a new musicianship core is fundamentally flawed.

I also delineate in my writings a new paradigm of jazz studies that is more aptly described as “jazz writ large” in its identification of select openings from conventional tonal and modal jazz that extend into the broader musical ocean.⁵

Most important is that inherent in America’s quintessential contribution to world are untold treasures to harnessed by 21st century musicians, and that this has eluded the change conversation. An important axiom comes into view that serves as a powerful guide to that conversation invoking a transcultural turn:

The extent to which one can fathom the music-culture relationship in a new tradition is directly predicated on the extent to which one has established a creativity-based relationship, hence the CICP identity, within one’s primary tradition.

In my view, this raises the bar when it comes to the above questions about levels of achievement. No matter how extraordinary the instructor expertise, pedagogical sophistication, student testimony (“this class changed my life...”); until the CICP identity shift—which, again, is not to be conflated with additive approaches to improvisation, composition, and diverse musical encounter—is invoked, prevailing multicultural discourse will be unable to convincingly argue for results much beyond a distanced fascination with the exotic when it comes to

⁴ See Jeff Pressing, “Black Atlantic Rhythm: Its Computational and Transcultural Foundations,” *Music Perception*, 19/3, 2002, 285-310. Also, Ed Sarath, *ibid.* Here I might mention that when Moore in his CMCNC Introduction mentions my interest in “repertoires of the Black Atlantic,” he does not quite capture the primary point—that involving the broader global implications and applicability of black rhythmic and improvisatory grounding.

⁵ This further differentiates transcultural and multicultural models. In other words, creative musicians whose work traverses diverse cultural and other boundaries typically forge syncretic relationships with traditions as the basis for further, and possibly more formal study and engagement. Multiculturalism neglects this principle in its predilection for traditions as discrete entities, or at least in its ambivalence to creative identity. To provide some examples of a jazz/global paradigm: Use of the drone, inspired by Hindustani music, as a connection to/from modal jazz; generalized principles from mid-Eastern or Carnatic rhythmic practices (e.g. rhythmic solfege) that similarly connect to/from jazz time feels; and nonsyntactic improvisation from free jazz as a connecting thread to textural/timbral environments in Asian music.

diversity/social justice progress. This, in my view, not only underscores the incompleteness of the multicultural model, also it's the way it may undermine the very diversity/social justice enterprise that is the driving force for much of the change community..

Here I might add that the multicultural framework not only falls short of articulating an adequate artistic identity that it aims toward, but it also falls short in coming to terms with the limitations of the musical identity of the vast majority of the students that comprise its coursework. In other words, expanding a prevailing monocultural orientation into a globally robust worldview is a massive undertaking and needs to be recognized as such. The first step is to place front and center the epistemic crisis that besets the prevailing orientation. The moment improvisation began to fade from common practice in the European classical tradition was the moment any music studies paradigm predicated on that lineage would be rendered dysfunctional when it came to healthy, coevolutionary relationships with the rest of the musical world. Think about it: We are asking students who primarily identify as interpretive performers, even in environments with the broadest slate of curricular embellishments, to invoke foundational transformations along creative, intellectual, cultural, aesthetic, cognitive, and transpersonal/spiritual lines. And when we factor in the somatic/physical dimension, along which deeply entrenched ways of even holding the instrument may be considered yet another manifestation of what Bradley calls “musical whiteness,” the obstacles become even more formidable. I advance the notion of “embodied musical racism” in hopes of bringing attention to the enormity of this and the broader range of challenges.

I propose that 70% of the diversity/social justice imperative be viewed not in terms of engaging students with new musical cultures but establishing a self-transcending, creative identity—with corresponding rigorous and broad foundations—among students in their own musical culture (which, again, would include select global gateways that extend syncretically therefrom, as opposed to being juxtaposed in relationship thereto). The remaining 30% of the curriculum would involve culture-specific engagement. This would yield a radically new, and in my view, revitalized place for European classical music, commentary on the role of which is remarkably scant and vague (beyond rejection of Euroclassical hegemony) in CMCNC and broader multicultural visioning.

A jazz-based/global paradigm could, in a single stroke, ground American musicians in the music of their own culture, provide tools for unprecedented kind of excursions and development, and also address these all-important latter artistic and social justice issues. Some attention to why this has eluded multicultural discourse, including CMCNC, is thus in order.

Multicultural aversion to black music

Having encountered strong resistance—including from ethnomusicologists — to the idea of jazz having a foundational place in 21st century music curricula,⁶ I have devoted considerable attention to the reasons for this reaction, and also to its musical and social justice ramifications, and will provide but the briefest synopsis here.

⁶ The CMS Task Force was no exception, although it is important to recognize that an ethnomusicologist on the team inserted the following statement in the prefacing remarks: “Jazz, often overlooked, has much to offer 21st century musicians.”

The absence (or at least highly marginalized status) of the jazz CACP voice in the visioning conversation is my starting point. From this extends a litany of further obstacles, including the additive approaches to improvising and composing and piecemeal notions of integration noted above, impaired critical and self-critical vitality (I argue that inability to probe beyond superficial readings of labels, such as ‘jazz’, is a primary indicator of multicultural paradigm-blindness), and what is perhaps the most startling and challenging concern for change advocates—lingering racialized biases that are harbored even amid the most ardent claims of commitment to social justice. I am continually astonished at the extent to which the rendering invisible of seminal contributions of African Americans to American and global culture, a common theme in contemporary racism discourse, is so dramatically evident in the music studies reform conversation. This is particularly striking at a moment in overall society at which black-white racial dynamics have never been more charged nor complicated, and when the diversity flag has never flown higher in music studies visioning. I characterize this as symptomatic of a “diversity gloss,” where amid robust pro-diversity/social justice rhetoric, slogans and rallying cries, important if not flagrant transgressions elude recognition. What I call “lingering aversion to musical blackness” is a primary example.

One need not look far for ways in which CMCNC succumbs to these very patterns. The word ‘jazz,’ which appears sporadically in the collection, is entirely absent in the index, and the heading ‘African American’ only appears three times.⁷ While CMCNC in numerous instances emphasizes the importance of popular music in the curriculum, it fails to acknowledge the African American roots of much popular music (certainly in the West, but even across the globe). I might note that this is a recurring pattern in popular music discourse. Moreover, while several CMCNC chapters (e.g. DeWitt, Talty, Pedroza, and Tenzer) make strong cases for embracing regional cultures in the curriculum, not once does CMCNC take what is but a small, yet enormously impactful, step of arguing similarly for America’s black music foundations, central to regional cultures in huge areas of the nation if not central to a national identity, to occupy an important place in the curriculum.

Therefore, even from a multicultural standpoint and its ethnological emphasis, these represent egregious shortcomings, which from an epistemological perspective are revealed to be even more shortsighted. For now, key artistic and pedagogical principles are omitted from visioning and thus any practical application and benefits. These patterns support my argument that multiculturalism is more aptly understood as a reaction to the prevailing monocultural paradigm than as a viable paradigm unto itself, and—inasmuch as the oppressed often take on tendencies of the oppressor—perpetuates hegemonic tendencies that are inherited from the very model it seeks to counter. As I commonly tell my graduate students, “anything multiculturalism can do, transculturalism can do better—and without the hegemonic side-effects.” Whether one accepts my further argument that monoculturalism, for all its problems, even exhibits greater aesthetic-pedagogical coherence than multiculturalism, or my transcultural formulation as the next wave in diversity and music studies discourse, I believe it is clear—to once again invoke Bradley’s assessment of the longstanding impasse in the field—that something needs to give in the change conversation.

⁷ I realize one cannot judge a book by its index, but . . . I might add that the word ‘improvisation,’ reflecting multicultural epistemic ambivalence, is also not indexed.

I characterize CMCNC as a leading-edge multicultural document with hopes for this broader transcultural transition in mind.

APPLICATION TO CMCNC

I use three closely intertwined lenses, stemming from the above discussion, to develop my critique.

Epistemology: creativity, identity, self-organizing/student-driven development, rigor, and integration.

Ethnology: local community, regional, national and global cultural horizons; and aesthetics.

Social justice: racial, ethnic, gender, sexual identity, class and other considerations, with a focus in the present discussion on race.

While each lens opens up to the others, I believe the three apertures serve as effective gateways to apprehend central facets of the CMCNC collection from a transcultural vantage point.

Epistemology

Transcultural openings

Promising transcultural apertures along the epistemological line appear in a number of CMCNC chapters. These include Brian Pertl's "Reshaping Undergraduate Music Education in Turbulent Times Through Cultural Rather Than Curricular Change," Sonia Tamar Seeman's "Embodied Music Pedagogy: Techniques for Exploring Why and How Music Matters," Michael Tenzer's "In Honor of What We Cannot Groove to Yet," Justin Patch's "The Case for Pop Ensembles in the Curriculum: Amateurism, Leadership, Civics and Lifelong Learners", and Paul Klemperer's "Making a Living, Making a Life: Balancing Art, Commerce, and Community as a Professional Musician." I examine these openings and also points at which the commentary stops short of a more complete transcultural vision.

Brian Pertl points us in a transcultural direction in three important ways as he shares inroads being made and attempted at Lawrence Conservatory, where he is Dean. First is his delineation of the need for musicians to develop a broader skill set than their predecessors. Second is his commentary on an expanded improvisatory scope. Third is his emphasis on cultural change as foundational to curricular change.

He could not be more vivid on the first account:

Our world today requires a daunting array of skills that go well beyond exceptional technique and musicality. We need musicians who can act, dance, play multiple instruments, and sing. We need collaborators, improvisers, entrepreneurs, marketers and impresarios. We need graduates who are comfortable playing in multiple styles.(p34)

Whether or not one accepts the full scope of Pertl's viewpoint (e.g. I wonder—do musicians really need to act and dance?), the point is amply clear, exciting and challenging—music studies need to expand its horizons. The challenge, of course, is how to operationalize the expanded scope in a way that circumvents the assembly line syndrome.

Pertl's delineation of a broad improvisatory continuum that includes jazz, various 'world music' approaches, and a stylistically open framework that is at the heart of his institution's innovations in this area points toward a transcultural solution. As does his articulation of Lawrence's aim to "radically extend the very definition of Core Musicianship" and how "the newer initiatives intersect with and extend from the core" (p.37), which directly reflect the vertical unfolding principle. This, in my view, may be the most extraordinary moment in CMCNC in that it may represent the deepest penetration into the realm of epistemology as the basis for ethnological diversity, and thus provide a transcultural gateway.

I believe a next key step, however, would involve a clear delineation of the improvisatory roots of the entire spectrum, and how this perspective gives rise to the CICP (however one wishes to describe the creative foundations of 21st century navigators) skill set and the broader blossoming inherent in the systematic improvisatory development continuum.

To underscore this point, I will speak from my personal experience as a jazz CICP who collaborates with musicians from many different cultures, [most notably in a recent performance with South Indian musicians that was particularly vivid in its elucidation of the topic. This was some of the most challenging music—particularly in its technical and rhythmic aspects—that I have ever played. Yet my rigorous grounding not only in improvisation (of multiple sorts), but African American rhythmic languages and modal-tonal practices enabled me to not only hold my own (albeit just barely), but meet my cross-cultural collaborators more than half-way—meaning that I had to fit into music they had created for this particular tour.

I have found the same to be true in interactions with musicians from Korea, Brazil, the Mid East, South Africa, Iceland, Scandinavia and elsewhere. The ramifications of transcultural, jazz-rich foundations for a 21st century core curriculum could not be more direct.

And this curricular reform could both inform and be shaped by Pertl's notion of cultural change (pertaining to institutional culture in this context). While I applaud Pertl's argument that significant things might be accomplished within existing curricula with adequate cultural transformation, I also agree with his acknowledgement of the place of curricular change in the broader shift. Moreover, the creativity identity shift that I am talking about may be seen as the personalized manifestation of overarching culture. We need to establish a culture in our schools and field of CICPs who aspire toward meaningful and high level excursions and collaborations, and we also need rigorous curricular models that specify essential tools (I view Lawrence to be at the forefront of this conversation).

"But wait," the multiculturalist might object, "is this not the imposing of a single pathway at a time when we need to open up an infinitude of pathways for students?"

To which the transculturalist might offer a two-fold reply. First, the deeper the creative roots, the more students will be empowered to forge their own pathways. Improvisation is being recognized as key to expert practice in fields as disparate as medicine, business, engineering, architecture, psychology, activism and sports, and the time has come to place it as

foundational in music study (!). Students can decide the extent to which they wish to develop their improvisatory and other kinds of creativity.

Second is even more important in my view. If we are talking diversity/social justice as more than a politically correct smoke screen, then the time has come to move beyond mere academic competency, and the musical smorgasborg syndrome that pervades much of ethnomusicology and music education, and ground this all-important commitment in the deepest artistic, pedagogical and social justice principles imaginable. This means providing musicians and music teachers with rigorous CICP foundations, which for musicians in the West means the jazz *writ large*/global framework.

Michael Tenzer's chapter, in its foregrounding of the art of transcription as a powerful musicianship tool, makes a notably important contribution when it comes to the rigorous skill development that is essential to this artistry. In putting forth a powerful argument for the many dimensions of musicianship that are enhanced in transcription work—not only the marriage of ear, hand and grounding in a culture (I return to this below), but the fact that this largely is a self-driven activity—Tenzer lays important groundwork for enlivening self-driven capacities as key to addressing the challenges of expanded scope. “Sharpen the skills for it (transcription), and it becomes an autodidactic reflex.” (p.175); the importance of this wisdom in terms of fathoming vertical topographies within the overarching pedagogical morass cannot be overstated. A culture and curriculum—linking back to my response to Pertl—in which transcription is part and parcel of skill development is essential to transcultural 21st century musical navigation and understanding and I found myself hoping to see more attention in this direction in CMCNC. I also found myself hoping, from the use of the word ‘groove’ in Tenzer's title, to see more commentary on rhythmic development given its seminal place in the 21st century musicianship spectrum.

I believe these ideas pose important ramifications for Sonia Tamar Seeman's compelling work in “embodied pedagogy.” Whereas Pertl nicely delineates a broad external creative scope, Seeman delineates a powerful epistemic spectrum for classroom pedagogy. She defines ‘embodiment’ not just in somatic terms, but as

a range of reflective as well as motoric exercises in the classroom, including in-class minute papers, think-pair-share exercises, structured debates, performance of rhythmic and melodic patterns, modeling real-life high stakes events such as court trials, or brokering peace negotiation through music, Socratic conversations, and the like. (p.185)

Again, however, commentary falls short of the creative identity shift by which these strategies take on even greater meaning and more directly connect to real-world musical navigation. While there is no denying that conventional students who have not invoked the creative identity shift will benefit from Seeman's approach, aspiring CICPs will not only take these benefits into innovative musical excursions but may well inspire instructors to unearth even further parameters of embodied pedagogy.

These principles also pose ramifications for Seeman's important assertion of the need to “de-exoticize that which is far, and hold at a distance that which is near.” (p. 201). There is no

more powerful means for de-exoticization, nor for penetrating deep beyond the surface of the familiar, than the enlivenment of interior, creativity-based connections to the outer musical world. The self-transcending jazz CICIP framework would not only fulfill this requisite, but also reveal the significance of black music when it comes to much of the 'near' in the West, and not insignificant portions of the global 'far.'

Paul Klemperer's essay is another of the rare instances where CMCNC broaches the vertical blossoming of a broader skill set from creative, improvisatory foundations. While much of Klemperer's focus is on the relationship of artistry and practical business/entrepreneurship skills, the principle is clear enough to suggest broader application. It is not surprising, moreover, that Klemperer speaks from largely a jazz orientation, in which, as I have argued, these principles are inherent, even if his emphasis is more on how musicians within that realm address the challenges of balancing artistic and entrepreneurial dimensions than the potential for these principles to serve as a model for the field at large.

An important moment in Klemperer's chapter links with the key theme of self-driven development broached in Pertl's, Tenzer's, Patch's and Seeman's chapters. He quotes a colleague who admonishes against the "misconception" held by "students and teachers" that any educational system "can give a student absolutely everything he (sic) will need to succeed. In the best case, the student has learned to teach himself, as the culture and musical requirements continue to morph." (p.228) Although this, of course, is nothing new, the conversation needs to place front and center enlivenment of auto-didactic capacities through diverse, and richly contoured, epistemological systems such as the jazz CICIP. Misguided multicultural concerns about 'privileging,' which are at once musically and pedagogically flawed, need to be replaced by transcultural identification of key topographies in the 21st century musical landscape.

Justin Patch plants seeds for commentary in this direction when he unites self-driven/student-centered development with critical thinking, an epistemically rich transcultural coupling. Delineating an impressive array of examples of popular music studies, Patch emphasizes popular music as a format that exemplifies the "inverted classroom" (p.124) where typical hierarchies by which knowledge is disseminated from instructor to student can be reversed, thereby empowering students as "lifelong learners" (p.120). He brings "metacognition" (p.124) into the discussion as closely intertwined with the cultivation of self-pedagogical independence in musical development.

While mention of creativity is fairly prominent in Patch's discussion, I believe the CICIP framework and its constituent topographies (systematic improvisation continuum) could give further shape to the important arguments of the chapter. The establishment of a CICIP voice provides a new paradigm for critical thinking, where rich epistemic foundations make possible self-critical vitality that is the basis for critically fathoming exterior ideas, models, and practices. Here I paraphrase my earlier comment involving the importance of creativity-based, self-cultural grounding to fathoming the music-culture relationship in other cultures: The extent to which one is able to critically examine another musical culture (or artistic/aesthetic/pedagogical paradigm) is directly predicated on the extent to which one critically reflects on the evolution of the personal creative voice (which is a subset of one's own musical culture).

Consistent with CMCNC and much multicultural commentary, there is more argumentation for the need to cultivate independent learners than elucidation of how this might happen, as well as its specific parameters. Also consistent with broader patterns is the lack of significant acknowledgement of the African American roots of much popular music in the West, a point I take up further below.

Ethnology: local and broader cultural engagement, race, ethnicity, aesthetics

Three internal CMCNC contradictions

A look at three internal contradictions in *College Music Curricula for a New Century* underscores its multicultural orientation when it comes to ethnology.

First is the “self-cultural grounding contradiction,” where CMCNC on one hand stresses the need for bridging divides between music schools and local and regional cultures, yet falls short when it comes to emphasizing the need for American music students to be grounded in the African American roots of American music.

Second is the “canonicity contradiction,” having to do with the misleading distinction between canonical and non-canonical traditions, and conflicting definitions thereof, that, however inadvertently, reify the prominence of European classical music in curricular visioning.

Third is the “aesthetic contradiction,” whereby CMCNC at times calls for an expanded notion of aesthetic, and at others succumbs to a tendency that has taken hold in Music Education circles to confine the notion of aesthetic to European classical music.

Self-cultural grounding contradiction

I begin with a return to Michael Tenzer’s compelling chapter, which nonetheless contains one of the most puzzling moments in CMCNC. On one hand, he does not mince words when it comes to the importance of musicians gaining grounding in a primary musical culture. “A student grounded in no tradition,” he asserts, “is an awful thing to contemplate” (p177); and then later, “A rootless musician is useless.” (p187)

Yet nowhere does Tenzer articulate what the roots might consist of for 21st century musicians in America. Nor, with the scattered exceptions noted above, does CMCNC. Nor does Tenzer nor any other CMCNC author acknowledge this lapse. Talk about self-cultural denial, or perhaps amnesia—it is difficult to imagine a more vivid example of multicultural flatling of the ethnological scope that rivals its parallel approach to the epistemic scope. And while Tenzer qualifies his musing about what a curricular landscape might look like without a cultural center as a kind of “thought experiment (that) would destabilize the sovereignty of any particular tradition” (p177), I would suggest that for a significant portion of change visioning in not only CMCNC, as well as broader ethnomusicology and music education circles, this is more than a thought experiment—it is a guiding musical/aesthetic/pedagogical precept that eludes critical interrogation. While no institution has made sufficient inroads to operationalize this notion (I agree with Tenzer—‘an awful thing to contemplate’ if he is true to his words), it raises questions that are eerily reminiscent of those surrounding the outer edges of artificial intelligence—AI-plus and beyond—involving machines that are thinking, feeling, sexual, spiritual and self-replicating. The point is not to categorically exclude any of these possibilities as evolutionarily progressive, but to identify parallel urgencies for future technologies to be

grounded in a more complete inquiry into the psycho/somatic/spiritual nature of the human being, and musical futures to be grounded in a more complete inquiry into the nature of musical artistry and its inextricable relationship to (one's own) culture.

In other of my writings, I place front and center a question that likely arises from my above commentary: How to exactly identify what tradition qualifies as primary in a country as vast and varied as 21st century America? Is there really a cultural core to American music that warrants occupying a central place in the curriculum in all music schools in America?

I answer the question with a model that accommodates a wide range of responses, yet also recognizes African American music as the seminal contribution of our nation to world culture, and also—as I have argued above—as an unmatched source of tools for broader navigation and collaboration. In short, one can identify virtually any culture as primary, but if one also wishes to render music studies exemplary of 21st century cultural pluralism, then it is necessary to flip the ontological switch from ethnological and disciplinary compartments to epistemological tools for traversing wide-ranging boundaries. At which point jazz CICIP grounding assumes central stage in any curricular deliberations, yet can coexist with any other cultural identity.

This principle sheds light on further CMCNC chapters that deal with self-cultural grounding and thus that form of ethnological topography which suggests alignment with transcultural principles. Failure to recognize the jazz CICIP framework as a second ethnological topography, which comes into focus for some through the lens of epistemology, and as key to broader excursions supports my assessment of an abiding multicultural orientation in the CMCNC collection.

In Mark DeWitt's fine chapter titled "Training in Local Oral Traditions: Analysis of Postsecondary Music Programs in North America," we not only learn of important inroads of this kind at over two dozen institutions, but also encounter a range of key issues, including juries, upholding integrity of traditions, tensions between conventional and new (for the academy) ensembles in terms of curricular hierarchies, differences in levels of achievement in (after Solis) "realization ensembles" (those that serve as formats for performance of music familiar to student participants) and "experience ensembles" (those offering students encounters with new musical traditions). Although the questions of what constitutes a cultural center beyond regional affiliation, or how cultures might be rendered self-transcending gateways to broader horizons, are not addressed, the chapter takes us right to the edge of this kind of inquiry. I believe the idea of jazz CICIP foundations for music students in America would work wonderfully with the programs that Dewitt reports on.

Jack Talty, in his essay titled "Noncanonical Pedagogies for Noncanonical Musics: Observations on Selected Programs in Folk, Traditional, World, and Popular Musics," broaches similar issues and terrain. However, inasmuch as Talty's focus is on initiatives at Western European institutions, questions about self-cultural grounding and what constitutes a national musical identity naturally take different form. However, I believe the principles remain the same, and also that a strong case might be made that jazz CICIP foundations would benefit musicians who wish to engage in broader excursions throughout the West. I view Talty's analysis of tensions between traditionalist and innovative approaches as particularly instructive. As he points out,

these tensions—which he reminds us are nothing new by citing jazz’s forays into American music schools—are evident in programs in Irish music at his own institution, traditional Finnish music at the Sibelius Academy in Helsinki, and elsewhere. His important assertion that these tensions can be reconciled through the establishment of a “critical and creative environment” and at the same time “rigorous and detailed study of diverse aspects of music cultures” (p.105) is clearly grounded in his own deep musical practice and reflection.

Ludim Pedroza’s chapter, “Latin Music Studies at Texas State University: The Undergraduate Minor in Mariachi and Its Implications for Expansive Curricula in Mainstream Institutions of the United States,” continues the conversation on community connections and grounding in local cultures through a powerfully engaging account of how she and other colleagues have navigated the contours of music studies curricular politics to establish Latin American music studies as an important Texas State University degree pathway. Aside from the self-cultural grounding principle, several further moments stand out in terms of their ramifications for transcultural topographies.

One involves the fact that students in the Latin Music Curriculum who are gaining teaching certificates must take a significant number of classes besides the traditional music teacher education classes. This wide range of requirements (most likely not the ideal scenario for Latin American music colleagues) calls for enlivenment of vertical principles in the learning model, for which I have argued the jazz CICP is ideal as a means for extending deep into the roots of creativity and thereby harnessing the synergistic relationships inherent in the systematic improvisatory development continuum (which extends to all areas of study).

Second is her portrayal of how a colleague in voice has integrated mariachi into existing studio instruction. This is very much aligned with Brian Pertl’s notion of changing the culture as foundation to curricular reform. A jazz CICP culture would enhance these efforts. Third is when she mentions, however much in passing, an improvisatory spectrum within the range of mariachi approaches that includes both highly canonic strategies that are improvisation-averse, and also experimental strategies. With both of these working in tandem, mariachi can be rendered a self-transcending gateway to broader musical terrain. Although, consistent with DeWitt’s, Talty’s and other commentary in the CMCNC, tensions exist within the mariachi community about this range of approaches, a jazz CICP culture would promote fluid exchange, and also illuminate the synergistic benefits to be gained from conservative and exploratory engagement as part of a unified system.

Canonicity contradiction

Pedroza also engages briefly a contradiction in the notion of canonicity that pervades CMCNC. Whereas in the volume the “phrase *canonical repertoire*” refers precisely to works in the European classical tradition, she confides “I find it necessary to define . . . canonization in relation to a broader set of genres and tendencies.” (p.137)

Inasmuch as several chapters in CMCNC also deal with traditions with strong canons (jazz, Irish music, folk music, etc), which in any case is reflective of the musical world we live in, I find the general approach of CMCNC to distinguish between European and Non European traditions as, respectively, canonic and non-canonic, to be highly problematic. Not only does it obscure the all-important tensions between traditional and innovative approaches within a

given repertory, it also assigns to European classical repertory a kind of global prominence that is disproportionate when compared to the vast infinitude of humanity's musical achievements. To be sure, the greatness of the body of European masterworks is beyond debate. But in the context of the rich reservoirs of works across the planet, not to mention creative practices that blur boundaries across traditions, Europe is but a blip on the screen.

I will shortly consider the use of the heading "art music" to reference European classical music as another example of semantic hegemony that reifies the centrality of Europe.

Aesthetic contradiction

The transcultural framework illuminates a curious controversy within music studies when it comes to aesthetics. On one hand is the exclusive association in Music Education circles of aesthetics with European classical repertory, even if the object-mediated aesthetic connection is typically invoked to reject the monocultural centrality of that tradition. In other words, the European classical tradition [in] this view is not but one among many aesthetic models, it is *the* aesthetic model. Other traditions are what are called praxial models, where the emphasis is more on processes and culturally-embedded criteria for musical meaning. Therefore, to reject the hegemony of European classical music is to reject the very idea of "music education as aesthetic education." (p.211) Particularly prominent in an organization called May Day Group, which ironically lays claim to a strong social justice commitment, is a lack of talk about black music aesthetics, indigenous aesthetics, feminist aesthetics and so on even amid powerful commentary about the richness and importance of these and a range of other areas for music studies, pedagogy and research.

Elsewhere, I challenge this viewpoint and argue that it actually succumbs to serious hegemony of its own by, on one hand, reifying Eurocentrism by ascribing to that culture sole aesthetic proprietorship, and on the other, by denying the actual voices of musicians and thinkers in these other cultures who think of their art in aesthetic terms. That Bradley (Chapter ----) subscribes to the prevailing aesthetic viewpoint is particularly confounding given the strong anti-racist thrust in her writing.⁸

While I analyze this as yet another multicultural pattern, it is important to note that ethnomusicology does not have this problem and I would imagine most ethnomusicologists would be as startled as I was upon confronting it. Indeed, we find mention elsewhere in CMCNC by Moore *et al* of a "hybrid aesthetics" (p.261)—central to which is creative participation of all genres and moving across genre boundaries—as articulated by Parti and Westerlund. This is directly in line with my notion of a transcultural (or integral) aesthetics and directly contradicts the above aesthetic conception held by many Music Education colleagues.

The importance of this issue cannot be overstated: If today's musicians and music teachers, no matter how diverse their practical skill set, do not develop deep conversance with diverse aesthetic paradigms, any social justice aspirations are dashed. "Music education cannot become more socially just," writes Bradley, "until it becomes more inclusive of . . . diversity of musics, peoples, voices, values, and more." I, for the life of me, cannot fathom why she and her

⁸ I am not oblivious to the long and complicated history behind the prevailing aesthetic conception and insistence, among progressives, on only using the term in the context of European classical music. Having encountered this first-hand in May Day Group circles, I address this in a forthcoming essay.

Music Education colleagues could not describe this in terms of the embrace of multiple aesthetic paradigms.

Popular music as hegemonic barometer

CMCNC strongly advocates inclusion of popular music studies in the curricular and cultural frameworks of the 21st century music programs. However, consistent with much multicultural discourse on popular music, the African American roots of most popular music in the West remain unacknowledged. This is a significant oversight from a transcultural standpoint because it perpetuates a division between popular music and jazz, obfuscates their shared roots in the black music wave—of enormous scope—in the contemporary musical ocean, and thus precludes harnessing the tools of the jazz CACP in popular music curricula. Pervasive failure in the conversation to acknowledge the significant forays jazz musicians have made into popular music terrain since (at least) the 1970s, which have resulted in extraordinary innovations, represents, at once, historical, artistic, pedagogical, aesthetic, and social lapses of enormous proportions. Were this crisis to be rectified, popular music studies could shift from yet another multicultural destination for which reform advocates try to find space, to a transcultural pillar that is perhaps unequalled in its capacities to transform the entire music studies paradigm.

My third primary lens—following epistemic and ethnological lenses—is social justice. Although important social justice ramifications appear above, further issues warrant identification.

Social justice

While social justice commitment is among CMCNC's five guiding principles and pervades much of its commentary, the volume succumbs to three significant social justice transgressions.

First is most elusive from a multicultural vantage point because it stems from unexamined multicultural assumptions. As I explain above, these assumptions result in failure to identify important epistemological and ethnological topographies in the musical world around us, and failure to articulate clear aims and achievement criteria that go beyond successful completion of academic coursework. Here it may be instructive to identify a pattern in CMCNC that I believe is consistent with multicultural tendencies in overall change discourse. CMCNC chapters that deal with specific traditions (e.g. Talty, Pedroza, DeWitt), fulfill the self-cultural grounding requisite, and more adequately address concerns about achievement than does overall CMCNC commentary that aims toward broadening the curriculum and culture of the field. Concerns remain unaddressed in the latter about a musical smorgasbord masquerading as genuine artistic development. Moreover, is not failure to articulate achievement parameters, issues of rigor and overall aims (beyond presumed academic competency via successful completion of coursework) essentially declaring that music outside of European classical music is not important enough to warrant these kinds of considerations? At which point, might not what is easily dismissed in progressive circles as politically-incorrect resistance to change among hard-headed conservatives be, in fact, seen as more substantively grounded in artistic, pedagogical, and I would even say—social justice—principles than typical change advocacy?

Hegemonic use of language

Second involves hegemonic use of language, which represents a different kind of multicultural lapse—one that involves unexamined patterns of thinking and speech that perpetuate the very colonialist, racialized biases that reform advocates ostensibly proclaim commitment to counter.

Primary examples include use of the headings “art music,” “Western art music,” or even more problematically, “Western music,” to refer exclusively to European classical music. Is jazz not art, nor of the West? What about innumerable other genres throughout Europe and the Americas? I have written extensively about the denigrating impact of this kind of raciolinguistic practice, which while not evident in all CMCNC chapters, is prevalent in enough of them to warrant attention and concern.

To the argument I regularly encounter (including among many ethnomusicologists) that this represents, at worst, nothing more than a semantic quirk that might be reasonably forgiven, I reply with comparisons to broader social justice conversations, in which language is regarded as powerful in perpetuating negative stereotypes. I also reply with questions about how faculty that insist on this practice might justify it to their students. I regard arguments for continued use of the terminology as strikingly reminiscent of those that proclaim the Confederate flag, or even what most regard as racially offensive terminology, need not be taken as symbols of racism, or that the KKK and other white supremacist groups are not racist organizations.

I realize these comparisons may seem harsh, particularly given that the practice to which I refer does not appear to involve explicit denigration of a given kind of music, but simply involves reference to a single culture (Europe) through a particular heading (‘art music’, or ‘Western art/music’). However, I would argue that not only does failure to recognize the practice as problematic underscore the depth of its racialized impact and roots, but that—in fact—it represents a degree of racist denigration and exclusion that is even more pernicious than that of overtly racist (or other hegemonic—as in misogynist or homophobic) terminology. Why? Because without actually identifying the music that is excluded (which pertains to most of the music across the globe), what is conveyed is that the exclusion and denigration are so self-evident that—unlike the use of the n-word or b-word which specify the respective racist and sexist objects of denigration—they *do not even require direct articulation*.

Unfortunately, this practice is clearly discernible in a number of CMCNC essays, and when coupled with the less commonly recognized epistemic shortcomings of multiculturalism noted above, it underscores the broader pathologies that are inherent in monocultural and multicultural frameworks. I would also urge colleagues in music who see no harm in these linguistic practices to engage the topic with colleagues from other areas on their campuses where critical interrogation of language from a social justice standpoint, and examination of the psycho-linguistic-racial dynamics of words, are particularly robust. Here is where guidance from broader social justice discourse may be particularly instructive, and where it is important for change agents to recognize the need for intensive self-critical interrogation—meaning introspection into the litany of discriminatory patterns all individuals have inherited from their social environments—as an important requisite to external activism. The above hegemonic use of terminology is but one example of how music studies change discourse has yet to

significantly critique itself in this way. I believe the time has come to place this issue front and center in visioning conversations.

Aversion to musical blackness

Closely related is CMCNC's abject failure, even as the social justice banner flies high, to engage the pre-eminent social justice issue of our times—black-white racial dynamics—and the extraordinary musical ramifications thereof. The closest the volume comes is Deborah Bradley's powerful chapter, *In the Shadows of Mozart*, which offers a compelling critique of "musical whiteness" as the prevailing cultural ideology. However, neither she nor other authors take what I believe is the inevitable next step of dealing with "musical blackness." The overall impact is to further exacerbate the prominent theme noted earlier in contemporary conversations on race in America—the rendering invisible of contributions of African American culture, which by any reasonable reckoning are nothing short of massive on both national and global scales and need to be recognized as such. On this account, I would suggest that Bradley's advocacy of a music teacher education/ethnomusicology alliance in hopes of realizing "the types of change that both fields claim to value" (p 212) would be even more fruitful if grounded in a Music Education/Jazz (writ large, with global connections) alliance. To be sure, if the diversity/social justice commitment does not take hold in how we train public school music teachers, the whole music studies enterprise can only be considered a sham. However, and here the epistemology/ethnology link is of paramount importance, if the multicultural framework is ever to give way to the transcultural, music teacher education must be grounded in the most robust source of corresponding skills and understanding. I believe a Music Education/Jazz alliance could quickly yield powerful results that would transform the entire field, including the classical performance model.

Miscellaneous points

It is interesting to note how little commentary is found in CMCNC and multicultural literature overall on the place of European classical music in the reformed curriculum and on how it interacts with other genres (and vice versa.) If anything, one can only presume it to be among the multitude that comprises the expanded assembly line. Furthermore, much mention of the genre casts it as a colonialist regime against which music schools need to make whatever inroads they can. In the transcultural model I advance, European classical music not only represents an important topography for musicians in the West, but it co-evolves in dynamic relationship with other musics. I elaborate in a recent book on a number of intersections between European classical and jazz/black music and suggest this to be a key nexus for new frontiers in the change conversation.

CMCNC proposed curricular models

CMCNC advances four curricular frameworks as possible models that institutions might embrace in the future.

Not only do these fall short of transcultural principles, in significant ways they run counter to important terrain articulated by CMCNC authors. For example, Pertl's arguments for redefining core musicianship are only marginally evident in the proposed models (one of which essentially depends upon a conventional core.). Also, CMCNC important argument for regional

cultural engagement are not significantly reflected in the curricular plans. Therefore, without even taking into account my more expansive thoughts on artistry and social justice, I believe the conversation about curricular design is truly in its infancy and needs to reflect foundationally new principles than guide the CMCNC approach. CMCNC, however, is to be applauded for its attempts in this direction.

Closing thoughts

I have spent considerable time with *College Music Curricula for a New Century* and would not take back one minute of this investment. The more I immersed myself in the volume, the more deeply impressed I was at the sheer expertise of the authors and their richly woven perspectives. I also gained much in terms of ideas and inspiration for my own teaching. Therefore, while I have devoted the bulk of my inquiry into the shortcomings of CMCNC's multicultural orientation, it is important to emphasize that the transcultural does not reject wholesale the totality of multicultural practices and approaches. What is rejected is a kind of overarching ideology that has taken on a life of its own, and—much like an exotic plant in a biological ecosystem—crowds out sunlight or excessively absorbs nutrients from the soil that impedes the health of the whole. My assessment that multiculturalism is more aptly characterized as a reaction to the prevailing monoculturalism than a viable paradigm in itself, and is thus unsustainable as a guide to the next evolutionary horizons in music studies, does not mean the framework is entirely bereft of valuable ideas and practices.

Nonetheless, reiteration and expansion of an earlier point is also in order: The moment when improvisation began to recede from common practice in the European classical tradition was the moment any curricular models based on that tradition would be doomed to not only the worst kind of epistemological pathology, but ethnological pathology as well, not to mention seriously impaired critical and self-critical, self-organizing, self-transcending and other capacities. While that characterization of the prevailing monoculturalism may be self-evident, the time has come to recognize that it applies as well to the multicultural offshoot of that colonialist platform, and that it is time for new guiding principles to transform the hidden hegemony, which in some ways may be ever more pernicious than that which is overt, into viable and extraordinary evolutionary avenues.

Therefore, while I fully realize the dangers inherent in identifying a one-size-fits-all multicultural ideology as the culprit, I believe the criteria I have laid out—central to which are the epistemological and ethnological topographies that are embodied in the jazz CACP—warrant this characterization. Argumentation for diversity and social justice that falls short of including these topographies, even advanced under the guise of transcultural, intercultural or some other alternative to multicultural, remains confined to the multicultural within my transcultural model. As noted earlier, no matter how elaborate the pedagogical or analytical system being advanced, the absence of clear articulation of epistemological and ethnological contours will leave key questions of achievement, rigor, and assessment unanswered, and any such approach to an expanded music studies paradigm will be prone to the impossibilities of the curricular assembly line/smorgasborg syndrome and perpetuate the view that music outside of the European classical tradition simply does not matter as much.

I will soon announce the formation of the *Alliance for the Transformation of Musical Academe* (ATMA) which will address these and many other questions in its call for foundationally new kinds of dialogue and action steps in music studies visioning. ATMA will place front and center dialogue about race, black music as not only cultural anchor, but also global gateway (including as an avenue for unprecedented penetration into European classical music), the relationship of music and music studies paradigms to environmental sustainability issues (mono and multiculturalism inhibit sustainability) and peace, and spirituality/consciousness (ATMA translates from Sanskrit roughly as “soul”). While ATMA will not tiptoe around the pathologies that plague monocultural and multicultural ideologies, or those that will inevitably crop up in its own transcultural platform, it will also advance a music and music education-based transformative vision for the world that may—in its optimism and account of arts-based revolution in creativity and consciousness—be unlike anything seen in the history of the field.

I hope the field of ethnomusicology will be well-represented among the cohort of ATMA colleagues that is committed to the challenging, if at times intense, yet deeply rewarding work inherent in this level of leadership commitment.