

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOLS OF MUSIC
2006 Annual Meeting

Future of Art Music: Advocacy that Works

Constance Bumgarner Gee ©
Vanderbilt University

My assignment today is to speak on the future of *art music* and on advocacy that works — advocacy, I surmise, for the fiscal support, practice, and study of *art music*. That is my assignment. I found it on a tape in the glove compartment of a red Maserati that showed up in our driveway one evening about a month ago. A voice on the tape said, “Good evening, Jim. Your mission, should you choose to accept it, is to address the National Association of Schools of Music on the subject of the future of *art music*. Furthermore, you must inform your audience about advocacy that works. As always, should you be caught or killed we will disavow any knowledge of your actions. This tape will self-destruct in 5 seconds. Good luck, Jim.” (All the while this mysterious music was playing on the car stereo but I wasn’t sure if it was *art music* or not.)

I felt really bad because clearly the assignment was meant for “Jim,” someone obviously much more capable than myself; someone who must have known what *art music* was. Was it code I thought? Code for NOT-rap-rock’n’roll-heavy-metal music, or perhaps it meant classical-jazz-some-blues-as-long-as-it’s-not-too-raunchy music? Or maybe it was art *and* music, and someone had left out the ampersand? Bewildered I stepped out of the car and walked back toward the house — and not a moment too soon. Just as I reached the top of the porch stairs the Maserati exploded! I’m not kidding! It just went “KABOOM” and fiery red Maserati pieces rained down on our azaleas burning some of them to a crisp. Now I felt really, really bad because 1) that is such a waste of a red Maserati; 2) I had worked darn hard on those azaleas; and 3) now this Jim guy was never going to get this important assignment. What would this National Association of Schools of Music do now? I immediately went into my office and logged onto Wikipedia but couldn’t find a thing about *art music*.

The next morning, after a troubled night’s sleep, I went to get our newspaper. When I opened the front door I couldn’t believe my eyes. There was no Maserati debris in sight and all of the azaleas were in perfect condition; well, not perfect, but they looked exactly like they had the prior evening before being burnt crispy. I thought surely I was losing my mind when I noticed a brown manila envelope tucked into the boxwood, just slipped right inside between the branches. I looked around to see if anyone was watching, bent down to pick up the newspaper, then carefully pulled the envelope out of the boxwood and, in one graceful motion, slid it inside the fold of the newspaper and retreated into the house. I hurried into my office, closed the door, gingerly unclasped the envelope (considering the fate of the red Maserati) and peered inside. There was a paper. Holding my breath, I slowly drew it out of the envelope. It looked to be about 25 pages in length and was titled “Creating A Positive Future for *Art Music*.” “AhHa!” I whispered breathlessly, I’m not crazy! All that stuff really did happen last night! And so I read the paper and I realized the critical nature of the assignment, and I knew I could not let Jim and the National Association of Schools of Music down. I would consider the future of *art music* (always typed in italics I learned) and I would accept the even greater and more dangerous challenge of positing “advocacy that works.” So here I am. I’m sorry I’m not Jim. I’m certain he could do this better, but I’m going to do my best.

VALUING MUSIC ON ITS OWN TERMS

Art music as I’m certain you all know is sort of like “art” — an imperfect utterance that falls pitifully short of delineating all that it connotes. (I think that’s why it was always typed in italics by whoever wrote that paper. She or he was acknowledging its inadequacy and, most likely, its vulnerability to satire

and other forms of rhetorical attack, but needed a term that was more specific than “music” which is so all encompassing as to cease being much use within a policy discussion.) The term, *art music*, indicates rather than defines. Two of the primary indicators of when something musical might be thought of as *art music* are: 1) when music is “designated and treated as *art* by musicians on the basis of what it achieves in terms of music” not in terms of its commercial, sociological, economic, or political benefits or uses; and 2) whether or not it has been able to speak to listeners across time. Thus, a particular piece or genre of music that is long lived and loved and/or is valued on its own terms would, according to those mysterious associates of Jim, merit the descriptor *art music*.

Just as I thought, I thought. It is code for classical-jazz-some-blues-as-long-as-it’s-not-too-raunchy music. But as I pondered further the indicators of longevity and valuing on its own terms, I realized the first qualifier, “whether or not it has been able to speak to listeners across time,” just might, well maybe, allow for the inclusion of John Lee Hooker’s “Sally Mae” and Johnny Cash’s “Walk the Line,” as well as Bruckner’s 7th. Longevity for a work of art is most certainly a relative concept — 20 generations is truly awesome but 2 or 3 generations ain’t so bad either.

I had to ruminate a bit more, however, on the notion of valuing a piece of music *as* music. Harold Best, a former president of NASM and writer for *Arts Education Policy Review*, often speaks of the differences among the abilities to think *on behalf of* music (advocacy), to think *about* music (all kinds of knowledge about), and think *in* music (what musicians or musically educated people are or should be able to do). All are important, but they are not the same. I might as well tell you right now that I certainly can’t think *in* music and I don’t really know all that much *about* music. Well I know what I like – and I like a lot of it from classical to country to delta blues, R&B and jazz to rock’n’roll, world and new age, and lord knows *how I love Motown* (Marvin Gaye is a Saint in Heaven). I do, however, understand visual art as visual art, so will try to get to the essence of music in some measure via my understandings of the essence of visual art. Now I know this way in is fraught with danger — music and visual arts are hugely different disciplines in many ways, a few of which I will explore briefly later on — but after watching a red Maserati explode in my driveway, well, I think I can look danger in the face.

In a related speech last month to the National Association of Schools of Art and Design, I said that valuing the arts on their own terms means to ascribe the worth of a specific art form or work of art in terms of its intrinsic qualities. Intrinsic qualities of visual works of art are the sensorial, intellectual, and emotional stimuli derived from images and compositions of arranged lines, colors, textures, shapes, and forms or, in the case of, let’s say, *Ceci n’est pas une pipe*, the coupling of words and images. Thus, to value the visual arts on their own terms means to place great worth on the sensations, knowledge, experience, meaning, and observational and manual skills — in short, ways of feeling, thinking, and doing – that emerge from contemplation of and response to such stimuli. With regard to the musical arts, I venture to say (with significant counsel from a classically trained composer friend of mine) that intrinsic qualities of musical works are the sensorial, intellectual, and emotional stimuli and response derived from arrangements of sounds and rhythms (and I would add *words* here, although he did not), and the forms of these arrangements combined with the psychological use of time, and of sound and silence in time. Thus, to value music on its own terms means to place great worth on the components and structures intrinsic to music making, on the ability to think and act in musical terms, on the creation and recreation of music itself.

From Valuing to Justifying to Advocating

Since I just confessed to you that I can’t think in music and don’t know all that much about music, other than liking and listening to a lot of different kinds of music — from *art music* to most definitely not-*art music* — what am I able to bring to this esteemed gathering of the highly musical? Well, for years I have been paying close attention to what various groups of people say *on behalf of* the arts and, in particular, what they *promise* on behalf of *arts education*. That is, I am keenly interested in how and why

support to sustain the practice and study of the arts is organized and conducted. I have been struck repeatedly — like a gong by a hammer at high noon — how very far removed what is *said* about why it is important to have students K–university practice and study the arts is from why students and their teachers actually *want* to learn and teach about the arts.

So over the next 40 minutes I want to talk to you about the possible pro- and consequences of how we and how others justify support for arts education in general, and music education specifically, on the public’s understanding of the purposes and merits of art and music, or in this particular space and place, *art music* education. I will need to make some distinctions between the more private act of justifying and the public act of advocating because as the size of the target market increases — and thus the range of promised benefits — so do the risks of inflation, confusion, cynicism, and loss of credibility. I will offer examples of some of the other ways music is valued — other than for its intrinsic qualities — and describe (briefly!) the political and socio-economic context driving the ascendancy of the extrinsic over the intrinsic. And then, I promise, I will reluctantly get around to suggesting “advocacy that works” as per my assigned mission, although I must tell you up front that the entire notion of having to spend time and money on advocating — or rather let’s call it what it is, *marketing* — the importance of *art music*, art dance, art theatre or art art for life and learning exasperates me. Valuing the arts on their own terms is good enough for me and, I would bet, good enough for you too. But the irritating reality is that it doesn’t seem to be good enough for a lot of other people, some who either have to present our case to those who hold the purse strings or who themselves hold the purse strings. Like it or not, most of us have come to realize that simply leveling with university presidents, school boards, grant makers, and politicians about the main reason we care about the arts, or in your case, *art music* — that is, personal sustenance and satisfaction — may not be the savviest marketing approach. Thus (sigh), let us begin our journey into Advocacyland where things just get “curiouser and curiouser.”

Ways of Valuing: A Primer

Most of us involved in arts programming and arts education K–university think and talk about the arts as they affect a) the individual as a person, b) the individual as a contributing member of society, and c) the human community. Valuing the arts on their own merits, that is, for the sensorial, intellectual, and emotional nourishment derived from deep engagement with an art form is, I believe, the most fundamental and genuine way we *think* about the affects of art or music or dance or theatre on the individual, ourselves first and foremost.

As music school presidents and deans, chairs of music departments, even as humble music or musicology faculty, you also think a lot about how the practice and study of music contributes to your students’ ability to engage more deeply, broadly, and insightfully in the world around them. This line of thinking leads us to the impact of the arts on b) the individual as a contributing member of society and c) the human community. We in the arts link closely emotional, intellectual, and, yes, *spiritual* growth with an individual’s capacities to “contribute to society,” by way of acting as a responsible, industrious, *and empathetic* person both privately and in the public realm. The empathetic part is of particular note as we reason that gaining insight into the belief systems, values, and biases of one’s own and other cultures opens hearts and minds, breaks down barriers, and encourages self-reflection, out of which comes greater understanding of and, thus, respect for others. Naturally we think engagement with an art form assists with the development of such attributes and dispositions because, well, look what it did for us.

But we can’t let it rest there because generally speaking we’re a philosophical and, dare I say, liberal lot and we like to ruminate on HUMANITY writ large. Thus, because we still want to practice our art — but also want to Save The World — we leap courageously across the divide between that which an art-mindful individual can affect to the aggregate effect of all the world’s art-mindful individuals on c) the human community. This is not a cynical observation. Although, it may be somewhat humorous when one considers the progression of our thinking in the clear light of day, or rather, under the harsh

fluorescent lights of a hotel ballroom qua conference hall. I sincerely think we earnestly make this equation because, as we read about and at times experience the abundant chaos, cruelty, and ignorance in the world around us and compare it with the humanistic pleasures and relative sanity of an art-centered life, we believe — not unlike the reasonably religious — that if everyone or most everyone (some people are just hopeless) partook of the body Art (or *Art Music*), the world would be a much better place and there would be fewer Wal-Marts and more smart boutiques to boot (even better more smart boot boutiques!). “Come on people now, smile on your brother, everybody get together, try to love one another right now.”

These relatively straightforward, or at least genuine, ways of thinking about what art means to us personally and could mean to others (if they’d only listen) begin to get more circuitous when we find ourselves in the position of having to justify our arts programs and why we do what we do. And it seems we have to do that a lot.

The Need to Justify

Unfortunately, those of us who consider ourselves arts educators (and I do hope as music college presidents, music deans, and department chairs you proudly claim that nomenclature) are subject to the same what’s in what’s out machinations as the rest of the education community, except even more so. This is especially true if one is part of the K–12 enterprise, whether as a middle school music teacher or as a university professor who prepares aspiring middle school music teachers, although things are fast heating up for general university arts programming with federally-sponsored demands for standardized testing and tuition cost controls. While math teachers may be required to annually justify their budgetary expenditures, it is doubtful (almost unthinkable!) that they would have to justify why their subject area merits being included in the school curricula. That’s because math is in; of course it’s always been in but these days it’s *really* in. I guess that’s because math is so *not* in with many young people that they resist learning much about it even though officials now require teachers to force it into their gullets foie gras style. On the other hand, the arts are out, have always been out, or at least have never really been in, even though they *are* in with many students. (The fact that the arts are in with students and they have been known to cheerfully participate in arts programs after school and during summer vacation — unlike math — is actually not helpful to our perpetual efforts to keep the arts and arts teachers in the public schools. But I will speak briefly about that later on.) Thus, in order to survive and prosper, it is deemed necessary to attach to and align with what is in, which most often translates into that which is causing the most public angst and alarm.

Terrorism and national security aside for the moment, what societal concerns ought our schools and universities address and amend? And in what ways do we as professionals with a vested interest in the arts justify our work and programs in relation to such issues? Cultural historian Jacques Barzun (2002) states (rather quaintly I think) the single purpose of schools is “to remove ignorance.” Ignorance affects all manner of public undertakings but, unfortunately, is not a particularly pressing societal concern unless its removal is directed specifically toward the attainment of a “good job.” The Commission on the Future of Higher Education and Education Secretary Margaret Spellings are most concerned with the reported inability of colleges and universities to “turn out students qualified to compete in the global economy” (*The New York Times*, 11 August 2006). Societal concerns for the next generation boil down to one goal – the development of young people into responsible adults who can get and hold onto a job. Of course, we also want them to be healthy, cheerful, and kind. We want that for them for many reasons not the least being that we recognize those attributes as important pre-conditions and dispositions for gainful employment.

What knowledge, skills, and attributes (in addition to healthiness, cheerfulness, and kindness) are needed to become and remain gainfully employed? At a minimum, one needs to be literate and numerate, get along with others, able to take directions and execute orders. As one moves up the

employment ladder, from laborer to professional, from employee to employer, from job to career, emphases placed on basic reading and math skills and on working well within a group shift toward the need for independent and critical thinking, creative problem solving, management skills, and self-motivation. Even so, the Commission on the Future of Higher Education reports that many students who have earned degrees “have not actually mastered the reading, writing and thinking skills we expect of college graduates” (*The New York Times*, 11 August 2006).

How do we justify our arts programs and practice in relation to such needs and expectations? Generally speaking, we have been much more adept and at ease relating arts study and experience to desired changes in attitude and behavior (e.g., self-esteem, working collaboratively, self-motivation), and to the achievement of advanced but ambiguous capacities (e.g., critical thinking, creative problem solving) than to the attainment of specific on-the-job knowledge and skills (e.g., literacy and numeracy). Over the past decade, however, the high profiles of various studies asserting that learning in the arts improves reading, writing, and math skills has altered substantially the character of our justifications apropos to our contributions to the preparation of the next generation of responsible, employable, successful adults. Ultimately, we have become savvier to the ways and demands of the world as our intensely competitive, market-drenched society continually ups the ante for more product, promise, and proof. We recognize that justification is defensive and reactive while advocacy is offensive and proactive. Justifying is a position; advocating, like marketing, is a strategy.

“A” is for Art! “A” is for Achievement!

And “A” is for advocacy. Advocacy strategies for greater public and political support of school-based, after-school, and “non-school” arts education, experience, exposure programming and for the arts and community organizations that offer such programming focus primarily on three battlefronts. The first is spiritual and moral development, including emotional maturation. An increasingly critical second front is arts education’s ability to contribute to brain and skill development. The improvement of one’s self-esteem and self-image linked directly to greater mental and physical well-being is the third major battle line. My own personal shorthand for this advocacy trinity strategy of Spirit, Mind, and Body is the “YMCA Approach.”

Advocacy statements in support of our first front, spiritual and moral development, take this form:

- Arts learning experiences help students to better know themselves and to better relate to and communicate with those around them.
- Arts education fosters tolerance of and appreciation for cultural and ethnic diversity.
- Arts education improves children’s attitudes toward school.
- In-school and community-based arts programming improves self-esteem, curbs delinquent behavior, teaches discipline, and helps students to better perform academically.

Now I want to say right up front that you music people have it all over us visual arts types with regard to the sheer quantity and force of your marketing. You have Funky Winkerbean and role model band director Mr. D. We get Garfield. I have advised my visual arts colleagues, however, that if we could get the same level of support from art supply businesses that y’all receive from musical instrument merchants we might be able to catch up. Unfortunately for us, there is no visual arts equivalent to the National Association of Music Merchants (NAMM) and American Music Conference (AMC) — both card carrying affiliates of MENC: The National Association for Music Education. The truth of it is that you music people tend to work and play well with others (you have to!) while we visual arts types run with scissors, and usually not the blunt, plastic kind. Your student bands play the Star-Spangled Banner; our student artists burn it — or worse.

Speaking of which, I must congratulate MENC on a singularly brilliant advocacy campaign for school music programs via patriotism (e.g., national identity, cohesiveness, and self-esteem, good citizenship, and better, more wholesome attitudes) — the National Anthem Project. With Laura Bush as its honorary chairperson and close to 200 sponsors to date (including Jeep, NAMM, ASCAP, the Girl Scouts, Walt Disney Company, Mrs. America, 18 “All-Star” states [11 red, 7 blue], and 122 “All-Star” cities), the National Anthem Project aims “to show the nation the importance of the Star-Spangled Banner and preserving music in our schools.” Apparently a 2004 Harris Poll (those people will poll anything) reported 2 out of 3 Americans don’t know the words to the Star-Spangled Banner and 40% can’t identify its title. MENC knows wherein the problem lies: “[P]art of the problem is that too many school music programs are being cut, and that’s where kids learn the national anthem.” I suspect the Star-Spangled Banner would not qualify as *art music* but no matter...

Actual advocacy statements addressing our second front, brain and skill development, make these claims:

- Students with high levels of arts participation outperform “arts-poor” students on virtually every academic performance measure.
- Students who study or participate in the arts score higher on standardized tests.
- Music study improves math scores and spatial skills; reading skills are enhanced by arts learning, particularly through theatre and the visual arts.
- Arts education stimulates creativity, builds communications skills, promotes teamwork, and engenders love of learning in all subject areas.
- Arts education teaches critical thinking and higher order thinking skills, providing a competitive edge for getting a job in the future.

“Workforce readiness,” economic development, and maintaining our global competitiveness — big, tall issues tied explicitly to national security — loom large over advocacy statements attesting to the arts’ bottom line value for our workforce in-training and nation at large. In this manner the study of an art form is justified for its alleged ability to improve skills in more job-important school subjects. There is tremendous pressure on all of education across the disciplines to produce in the workforce in-training skill set arena. (I am pleased to report that Americans for the Arts is all over the economic development thing like white on rice. Providing solid evidence of the connection between art and industry, the executive director of Americans for the Arts along with a famous artist got to ring the closing bell for the NASDAQ stock exchange on 29 October 2005 in honor of National Arts and Humanities Month. I do hope the market was up that day???)

Since Sputnik and the advent of the more math, more science era in public education (this is all the Russian’s fault!), arts educators and researchers have sought evidence of knowledge and skill transfer between arts learning and academics. Five decades and 11,467 articles, books, conference presentations, and sundry unpublished papers later, Harvard Project Zero researchers, Ellen Winner and Lois Hetland, headed up a massive research effort (the Reviewing Education and the Arts Project or “REAP”) to ascertain the validity of wide-ranging claims that arts study, experience, or exposure lead to various forms of academic improvement. Their resulting report, *The Arts and Academic Achievement: What the Evidence Shows* (2000), concluded that “reliable causal links” between arts study and improved academic achievement could be found in three areas only: 1) listening to music and spatial-temporal reasoning; 2) learning to play music and spatial reasoning; and 3) drama (enacting texts) and verbal skills. The effects of the first area, listening to music and spatial-temporal reasoning, lasted a few hours at most but was heralded loud and far as the “Mozart Effect.” Winner and Hetland (2001) cautioned strongly against justifying the arts instrumentally as “a dangerous (and peculiarly American) practice” (5).

The REAP report made a lot of people angry and unhappy, most notably the research contributors to and publishers of the 1999 federal government advocacy document, *Champions of Change*. *Champions* championed the “proven” effects of all manner of arts encounters on increased academic performance. Defenders of this stance have continued to recycle and reassert the data presented in *Champions*, most often in the form of government-funded advocacy publications presented as research studies. *Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic and Social Development* (2002) published in direct response to the REAP report is one of many such “advo-search” studies. Gradually, however, their strategy has shifted from tying arts learning *per se* to higher math and reading scores to proclaiming the positive and substantial effects of “arts integrated programming” on learning both in “the basics” and the arts, although none of the largest and most lauded arts integrated programs have actually assessed arts learning (Rabin and Redmond, 2004). Another strategic decision by arts transfer/arts integration advocates has been to focus the good news of academic and social benefits on low-income, disadvantaged, urban and rural at-risk students. The word is that those students actually benefit more from arts integrated programs than do regular students. In this way two of our most worrisome problems related to education and, ultimately, the economy are perceived as being addressed: 1) poor math and reading test scores and 2) the poor prospects of poor children. Clever.

Music education advocates have had a heyday with this cause and I must acknowledge grudgingly that there does seem to be a genuine connection between learning to play music and math skills. Guess it’s all those quarter, eighth, sixteenth notes and rests, quavers, semiquavers, demisemiquavers, hemidemisemiquavers, syncopated rhythms, inverted mordents... let’s face it, to play music you’ve got to be able to count! And I know that’s the real reason you were all drawn to music in the first place — to beef up your math skills. Alright, so we visual artists are a little jealous. We haven’t yet figured out how knowing the color wheel helps with anything of real life importance, home decorating aside, but we’re working on it. But noooo, you music people can’t let it rest with simple math superiority; you have to bring med school — Medical School! — and Einstein into it. “Music majors are... more successful med school applicants,” advertises the American Music Conference. Lucky for Albert E. he didn’t try to get into med school as math, physics, and biochemistry majors are reportedly at a major disadvantage when music majors are in the running. Nevertheless, the American Music Conference’s music education advocate’s “toolkit” is called the Einstein Kit. (Apparently he played violin or viola; it’s hard to tell from the drawing.) The rallying cry is: Music Makes You Smarter! Incorporated in 2001, The Baby Einstein Company, a subsidiary of Disney, has recently expanded into the pre-school years with its franchise, the “Little Einsteins,” featuring Leo the conductor, Annie the singer/songwriter, Quincy the musical instrument virtuoso, June the gig organizer, and Rocket who is basically a flying Swiss army knife. (You can see for yourselves that I am not making this up!) A parent testimonial praising the Little Einsteins reads: “Little Einsteins is a no brainer for us...because we were sold on the Baby Einstein products.” A “no brainer,” hmmm...

Just so you know, we have our infantile icon too. Baby Van Gogh serves as the spokesperson for Baby Einstein's franchise in the visual arts. Of course your icon is smarter than our icon and, I might add, better adjusted too.

Advocacy statements promising action on our third front, mental and physical well-being, frequently focus more on adults than students, with the significant exception of “underserved youth” and “at-risk” students of all ages. American Music Conference spotlights wellness through music making as a major part of its advocacy efforts. Its Music Research webpage offers links to numerous “scientific findings” that making music provides “measurable improvements in human well-being.” A headline sampling of such studies are: “Music Therapy Increases Serum Melatonin Levels in Patients With Alzheimer’s Disease,” “Group Drumming Boosts Cancer-Killer Cells,” and my favorite, “Recreational Music Program Shows Potential to Combat Nursing Shortage” (American Music Conference, 2006). (Just so you know that music hasn’t cornered the market on curative powers, the American Art Therapy Association website links to a news report that visual art also fights Alzheimer’s” [Lazo, 2006.]) The

National Association of Music Merchants asserts that *making* music (on the musical instruments its members sell) makes you healthier and increases your longevity, while Hospital Audiences, Inc. (1996) — which sells programs and performances to hospitals — insists that simply being a part of an arts audience has a “beneficial impact on health and wellness”(1).

The larger message is that art soothes us, helps us to “get in touch” with and express our “inner feelings.” Adherents of mind/body medicine believe that repression of emotion is not only detrimental psychologically but contributes to or even causes physical disease. The acknowledgement and release of emotion, especially within the safe confines of a support group, is believed to have a positive impact on one’s mental and physical health. Arts advocates posit that being able to creatively and effectively express oneself leads to a sense of “empowerment,” a decidedly positive feeling that results in a healthier mental state, greater self-awareness, and improved self-image. Thus, we feel better about ourselves and more empathetic toward others, dispositions that make us happier and help us to live not only fuller but longer lives. In this respect, art is valued for providing “creative outlets” for self-expression (i.e., the release and communication of emotion and ideas) — an emotionally, mentally, and physically beneficial pursuit.

Along these same lines is the promotion of art as a means of conflict resolution. The National Endowment for the Arts and The Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (2002) collaborated in the publication of *The Art in Peacemaking: A Guide to Integrating Conflict Resolution Education Into Youth Arts Programs*. (The College Art Association has requested that they write a sequel: *The Art in Peacemaking: A Guide to Integrating Conflict Resolution Education Into University Art Departments*.) The introduction explains that “the fundamental values of the art making experience: trust, risk-taking, respect for process, principled critique, and pride in a finished product... [lead students to] experience positive motivation, intense self-discipline, confidence, and perseverance”(6).

The belief that music can serve therapeutic ends vis-à-vis behavioral modification has been around for a very long time — “Music has Charms to sooth a savage Breast” and all that. I happened across a reference in Jacques Barzun’s book *Music in American Life* (1956) to a gathering of 250 music therapy experts in New York in October 1954. The topic of the conference was “how musical training can aid mentally deficient children (and children with emotional problems, including juvenile delinquents) by giving them self-confidence.” Barzun quotes *The New York Times*:

We seem to be standing on the threshold of a great development of all the arts as agents of therapy. Of them all...music seems perhaps the most personal form of expression, communicating meaning and feeling without need of speech or explanation.

A year earlier, Barzun noted, *The International Musician* had published a scholarly survey titled “Music — a Panacea” that reported: “[M]ore and more, in homes, in hospitals, in mental institutions, music is being used to heal both the mind and body of the sick.” The journal considered this news to be of great importance to its readership, especially those who were members of the musician’s union (83).

We have come full circle back to spiritual and moral development for the good of the individual and society. Spirit, Mind, and Body.

AND NOW, A WORD FROM OUR “SPONSOR”

The most high profile arts advocacy campaign of all is conducted at the federal level by the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA), Americans for the Arts, the Arts Education Partnership, and President’s Committee on the Arts and Humanities. With regard to arts education, or rather, the more all-encompassing and less school-associated term, “arts learning experiences,” those agencies and organizations work together as one. They co-sponsor studies (such as *Champions for Change* and *Critical Links*), co-publish reports on those studies, and reference, reinforce, and recycle continuously

one another's programs and "research findings" throughout their printed materials and conjoined electronic media. For several reasons, a key one being the defense and promotion of the NEA, this group has made it their collaborative mission to speak on behalf of arts education/arts participation pre natal-life and they have had some admirable successes. Their participation in field-wide efforts to include the arts as core subjects in Goals 2000 legislation is deserving of praise. Yet, they relentlessly market a message that must be noted in the context of our topic of valuing the arts. This message, served up as the "central finding" in their aptly titled report, *Gaining the Arts Advantage* (1999) is that the involvement of the non-profit arts world — specifically, community arts organizations and individual artists — is "the single most critical factor" in the determination of whether or not school arts programs are able to successfully deliver the goods as advocated (9).

You might discern that some members of the K–12 arts education community, particularly those most concerned with the preparation and ongoing support of highly capable K–12 arts teachers, view that much acclaimed "research finding" as, well, a bit self-serving since it is the non-profit arts world that comprises the constituency of the NEA and its spawn, state and community arts agencies. In fact much of the federal arts bureaucracy's campaigning and grant making dispenses with schools altogether focusing instead on "arts learning experiences" delivered by local arts groups and artists in after-school and summer programs and in community venues throughout the year. Advocacy promoting such non-school arts programs frequently and purposefully blurs the distinction between in-depth study of the arts and arts exposure experiences. Some ascribe this way of valuing arts education as a means of placating political opponents of government arts subsidies whilst providing public funding for arts groups and employment opportunities for artists. Admittedly, that may be an ungenerous way of characterizing the motivations of others within our greater arts family.¹ But it does serve as a ready example of the reality that when we advocate for the arts we are not just encouraging support for the arts in general, although often that is the way it sounds, we seek support for specific policies and programs in which we have a vested interest. We (and they) seek political vantage and the credit, influence, and funding that is to be had by gaining that vantage.

So where are we? I've spoken about the many ways we think about and speak about why music and art and *art music* matter to us as individuals and as a society. I hope I have illustrated amply how our valuing of an art form morphs, sometimes radically, from the intrinsic to the extrinsic when we step out of our studios and into the public thoroughfare. I have described, perhaps *ad nauseam*, the various ungainly shapes these ascribed values assume. I have also spoken about the socioeconomic concerns and political pressures that often drive our and others justifications of the arts. But what does all this matter to us and to the general public? What does it mean for the future of the arts and arts education in general, and for *art music* specifically, when the reasons *we* most value and practice an art form differ so greatly from the reasons we give others for why *they* should value and support that art form?

THE TREACHERY OF IMAGES

Rene Magritte's painting, *La trahison des images* (*The treachery of images*), is a painting not a pipe, a very realistic image of the object but not the object itself. Images can be treacherous in that there may be little connection between an object and what represents it, in fact, the representation may obscure or hide the true reality of the thing itself. To a very real extent that is what happens when we justify the study and support of the arts in extrinsic terms — we obscure the true reality, the intrinsic qualities of the thing, art, itself. Ever changing marketing messages of art's omnipotent curative powers and, consequently, of the duties and capabilities of arts educators and artists confounds and disappoints more than they enlighten and convince.

The idea of "integrating" the arts with other subjects such as math, science, and reading has been around, well, at least since the Sputnik spasm. Its recently renewed vitality springs directly from the angst and self-esteem issues generated among arts education advocates by the Goals 2000 legislation,

a.k.a. No Child Left Behind. MENC's Legislative Memo reported that last month (3 October 2006) Secretary Spellings was the guest on National Public Radio's (NPR) "Talk of the Nation." A caller asked her to discuss the cuts to arts programs that have been occurring with alarming frequency since the enactment of NCLB. (A recent survey by the Center for Education Policy estimates that a fifth of the nation's school districts have reduced "somewhat or to a great extent" instructional time for music and art [2005].)² Spellings responded:

Clearly, those are very important programs, and in fact No Child Left Behind specifically says that the creative arts are affirmatively part of an education curriculum. Obviously, it's not one of the things that's measured as part of No Child Left Behind. You know, it does trouble me when I hear people say, well, because of No Child Left Behind, we've had to eliminate art or music. ...Smart administrators — and I talk to a lot of them — are learning that, you know, having engagement in art and music helps math and creative problem solving, teamwork, and so forth. [N]ow they're saying hey, if we want enhanced math scores, having our music program thriving is a good way to do that (MENC, 2006).

Hey I say! I say hey! Art is here to save the day! Art will pay but it's OK. The goal is math and I say yeah!

But let there be no mistake. Music integration for math's sake calls for a seismic shift of the content and mission of music instruction. It also has the capacity to rend the field itself as many of the more outspoken arts integration advocates (generally those with a stake in a specific program) pit the most certainly not new concept of arts integration against "stand alone," "conventional" (their terms) art and music instruction. They fail to acknowledge the difficult work and impressive advances made in the development of arts curriculum and pedagogy over the past three decades. Instead, they describe their philosophy and methods as if those long-evolving ideas and hard-won advances originated with their programs, touting the best of what has been accomplished as their own, defining their opponent's practice in terms of what is left over. And all too often arts integration advocates argue for visiting artists (or "teaching artists") as an "imperative" factor for successful arts integration programs. K-12 art and music specialists are useful as residency coordinators if they are mentioned at all.³

As you well know, it demands deep knowledge of a subject to present it wholly, that is, from various perspectives embedded in practice and historical, socio-political, and, in the case of art and music, aesthetic context. To teach comprehensively and connectively is a challenging task even if one's focus remains primarily within the extended musical arts field. Add the purposes and demands of "integrated arts" into the more-is-more mix and our opportunities for dilettantism and dissolution multiply. The projected image of mega-purposed music education negates the importance and vitiates the essence of music itself.

It is so damn ironic. In our quest to make what we do and love intrinsic to something else — to Goals 2000-style education, to economics, to behavior modification, to health and happiness — we risk gutting out its very life force. Yet we are caught in a double bind. Are we, as they say, damned if we do and damned if we don't? In this marketing mad world, how do we cope and can we ever hope to prosper with all the competing interests, restraints of time and money, and the unrelenting political and economic pressure to be and do more, more, more?

It is time (past time, I can tell by looking at your faces) that I cut to the chase, get to the point, stop dilly-dallying around, and get to my (or rather Jim's) assigned mission: to speak on the future of *art music* and on advocacy that works. Or, more precisely, on creating the conditions that will build a more stable future for *art music* and on the kind of advocacy that cultivates such an environment.

Truth (and Consequences) in Advertising

In his essay, “Art Education in a World of Cross-purposes,” Sam Hope (2004) provides visual arts educators a useful framework by which to rethink and, if need be, recreate our field. His framework is useful, I believe, for music educators K–university as well. Hope encourages us to attend foremost to issues impacting the health and survival of the field, posing the principal question: “How well does the field delineate, and then protect, those things that are essential to its survival?” All other policy and programmatic decisions are subsequent to the variables affecting survival and health. Hope lists “several things that the field must have in order to exist,” the first being “a definition of content and purpose sufficient to distinguish art (or music) education from other fields.” We must answer the question: “What is unique about what we do and the content for which we are responsible?” For policymakers, the public, and ourselves we must be able to answer the question: “Why are the unique things we do worthwhile?” (97-98) The answers to those questions must then guide us in how we prepare new professionals, and in the weighing of teaching priorities and resource allocations. We must make decisions about curriculum balance and methodological approaches, issues of quality and quantity upon which the health of the field hinges. The answers to those questions should also guide us in the creation of our advocacy statements and campaigns.

It is ironic that designers — the masters of perceptual manipulation and image making — are so much more straightforward in defining the value of design and delineating what design is and is not than the rest of the art world is at communicating the value of art (forget about what art or *art music* is and is not!). AIGA (2006a), the professional association of design, has published a series of succinct booklets for designers and clients in response to “urgent requests” from its members “to help them speak to external audiences about their roles as designers and the value of great design.”

A Client’s Guide to Design: How to Get the Most Out of the Process (2001) begins by informing the prospective client:

The fundamental premise here is that anything worth doing is worth doing well, but if it’s to be done well, it must first be valued. Design — good design — is not cheap. You would be better served to spend your money on something else if you don’t place a high value on what it can achieve. There’s a view in Buddhism that there’s no “good” karma and no “bad” karma, there’s just karma. The same *can’t* be said for design (4).

Although design “often has the properties of good looks,” the tutorial continues, design is not style but rather “the underlying structure of communicating — the idea, not merely the surface qualities”(6). The message is *design is a way of thinking*.

Now I know that statement resonates with all of you because music is also a way of thinking. I know that everyone here today (myself excluded) knows how to think and act in musical terms and that you place the highest value on that ability.

Designers have seen and heard it all; they are the experts, the creators of desire. It is instructive to see how they choose to market what matters most to them — in the most straight-out, heck, *courageous* manner possible. To stand right up and declare “good design is not cheap” and must be valued, and you’d best “spend your money on something else if you don’t place a high value on what it can achieve.” In short, we know who we are and what we’re worth! And (Oh! Be still my heart!) *there is good design and bad design!* What chutzpah! My goodness, wouldn’t it be liberating to talk like that about our art and music programs?! To say music is important to study because, like design, it is a world-altering way of thinking and doing and living. That attaining real knowledge of music is not easy; in fact, it is as demanding intellectually as science and mathematics but real knowledge and understanding of music *can* be had and is worth having because owning the capacity to engage deeply the sensorial, intellectual, and emotional stimuli of great works of music — *art music* — is profoundly humanizing, heart and mind

expanding. And, by the way, there is excellent music instruction and weak, watered-down stuff that's not worth much of anything, and if you don't place a high value on the world knowledge that grows out of actually knowing something about music then you'd best spend your money on... oops!

What am I saying? Sorry, I got carried away. We in the arts can't talk that way. For all our intramural bravado at faculty meetings and NASM conferences, that's dangerous stuff. The inconvenient truth (thank you, AI) is that we are not strong enough to throw down the gauntlet. Such fortitude would come with 1) enough people — a critical mass — who see clearly and value highly the interconnectedness of the arts to daily living, thinking, and doing; and 2) a hefty majority of arts educators K–university who have the will and capacity to clearly and inspirationally make those connections within the classroom and in every day commerce.

Advocacy that Works (Or How to Game the System)

Honestly, it's difficult to tell when advocacy/marketing does or doesn't work. Corporations with deeper pockets than most of us can imagine spend hundreds of millions annually on advertising and on trying to figure out what works and what doesn't. Advertising executives know that much of the money spent will have little if any yield. We simply do not have that luxury. So what can we do?

Stanford University professor of art and art education Elliot Eisner talks about “education to make a living and education to make a life.” Linking the arts to academic achievement — no matter how tenuously — is about education to make a living. While making a living is certainly important, I would venture to say that making a life is more so. Pragmatists will note that it takes means to make a life. Idealists might counter that without a tender passion, the embrace of life's warm roundness, means beyond basic needs can quickly become meaningless. Those of us who make our living by teaching others about art — and by “art” I mean all the arts — must tend the tender passion by attending to the interconnectedness of our particular art form with the sensate human experience of the world around us and, when natural, with other domains of learning. We must do this because the connections between art and life are genuine and because both art and life are made richer through the recognition and celebration of these connections. This is a matter of survival because those connections are intrinsic to art's meaning and experience.

We must also attend to these connections because of intense political pressure to find ways of linking arts programming to learning in other subjects and to socio-behavioral objectives. Those areas of connectivity are matters of health — or if taken too far, malady — because those connections are largely extrinsic to art's meaning and experience. Connectivity to social welfare programming and integration with other school subjects demands political vigilance and careful portioning to keep the scales from tipping so far as to spill art (and *art music*) onto the floor. Or as Barzun quips in paraphrasing composer and educator, Randall Thompson: “[L]aunch a plausible slogan and you can never catch up with the harm it does (1956, p. 113).

My proposition to you is to *subvert the system*. Let us *within reason* whisper what they need to hear but strongly and steadily beat the drum for the intrinsic qualities and contributions of music study and practice. At the same time we must do more than talk; we must hone ever more precisely and expressively our communication of the genuine overlays of art, *art music*, and life so that we might build that critical mass of the art and music educated we so acutely need. By all means let us make and cultivate connectivity among the various arts and humanities disciplines but let us keep central deep learning in the subject area for which we are responsible. It is not isolation we seek but intellectual coherency and the capacity to help our students K–university to think and act artfully — musically, visually, kinetically. This then is advocacy that will work — advocacy planted squarely and unabashedly in the real deal.

But it will not happen overnight. Many of you might have read Jim Collins' book *Good to Great* (2001). His flywheel analogy serves us well as we think about creating the conditions in which *art music* will prosper. First, we need to get the huge, heavy flywheel moving toward the first, second, third, hundredth rotation. Pushing in a consistent direction, we keep it rotating, rotating:

Then, at some point—breakthrough! The momentum of the thing kicks in your favor, hurling the flywheel forward, turn after turn...whoosh!... its own heavy weight working for you. You're pushing no harder than during the first rotation, but the flywheel goes faster and faster. Each turn of the flywheel builds upon work done earlier, compounding your investment of effort. ...The huge heavy disk flies forward, with almost unstoppable momentum (164-165).

Note that it is *consistency of effort and direction* that gives the flywheel its momentum. Pushing the flywheel in one direction, then stopping it and pushing it in another direction in search of "a miracle moment or new savior" builds no momentum but leads instead to "the doom loop" (178). So get ready for the long haul. Tap into that impressive patience and perseverance you exhibit becoming concert ready.

Core values? Check. Core purpose? Check. Marketing message? Check. Delivery system? Double check! As I noted with envy at the beginning of this speech such a long, long time ago (you'll receive 3 credit hours for this session), the music community already has an impressive support and delivery system in place. If you have not already done so, you ought to look at the NAMM, AMC, and MENC websites. The advocacy network for music education K–university is well constructed and far-reaching — perhaps a little *too* far reaching in terms of core values and marketing messages. Yet those organizations live and die for the music community. They are alert and responsive.

And then, look to yourselves and to the millions of people young and elder who you teach and with whom you work in schools, universities, church choirs, and concert halls. Those people are wide open to the message that what matters most in music is music. They are your critical mass. Think of how the flywheel will spin when every general music teacher, every choral and school assemble director, every private music instructor, every one of you is able to articulate the passion and fullness of music in life and a life of music.

Obviously we do not control the marketing of the arts' importance to education — far from it. For too long we have allowed others to speak for us, in particular, publicly-funded professional arts advocates who habitually and deliberately conflate the outcomes of arts exposure with sustained study of an art form and who systematically dismiss the role of K–12 arts teachers in school-based arts instruction. Although we have not been engaged in the formation of the media message to the extent we ought to be, it is important to remember that we own a big chunk of the arts education real estate and, consequently, have power *and responsibility*. One of our responsibilities as university researchers is to pay careful attention to the way advocates use our research findings. We are the authors of the studies that are used and sometimes misused in the packaging of funding- and influence-seeking arts advocacy campaigns. When we allow our work to be cited in service of the treacherous image that art does not merit being valued or studied on its own terms — we aid and abet in our own demise. When we remain silent while arts advocacy groups champion the contributions of non-profit arts institutions, artists, and after-school programming above and beyond the contributions of school-based arts instruction and arts teachers, we are complicit in eroding art's footing in our public schools. It is critical that we get these matters of justification and matters of values right so we don't end up propagating views — some very well-intentioned — that ultimately undermine the significance of the arts in the education scheme of things, a consequence we've come all too close to in our efforts to save the arts and *art music*.

This is not an impossible mission. (You had known that was coming!) It will be arduous and extensive. It will require consistency of effort and direction. But it is not impossible.

Divining the Future of Art Music

“Music knows it is and always will be one of those things that life just won’t quit,” sings Stevie Wonder. But what about “*art music*” — is it a thing that life just won’t quit? You already know the answer to that and so does Stevie:

Here are some of music’s pioneers that time will not allow us to forget. For there’s Basie, Miller, Satchmo, and the king of all Sir Duke. And with a voice like Ella’s ringing out, there’s no way a band can lose.

Fifty years ago *art music* — yes, the term “art music” was used even then — didn’t include jazz. But it does now. *Art music* has a forever future in one form or another.

Did you read about the huge sensation Johann Pachelbel’s Canon in D Major has been making on YouTube? A video of “Funtwo,” a self-taught 23-year old Korean guitarist, playing a rock version of Pachelbel’s Canon written by “JerryC,” a 24-year old Taiwanese guitarist, had received 7.35 million views in late August (*New York Times*, 27 August 2006). Hundreds of guitarists have tried their hand at JerryC’s “Canon Rock” but can’t match Funtwo’s virtuosity and soul. Thousands of viewers post comparisons of JerryC’s and Funtwo’s Canon videos. (I must say they both are way cool and I say “respect” to JerryC since he wrote the rendition, but Funtwo’s the baddest in my opinion.) Thousands of accomplished and would-be musicians are learning from one another by watching one another’s online videos; they are learning by closely studying one another’s technique — precisely the same way Baroque musicians learned to play Bach, composer Peter Robles pointed out in an interview with *The New York Times*. And just like in the 1600s, many of the self-taught don’t know how to read standard music notation. Online tablature to the rescue. Yup, no doubt about it, *art music* and its practice will change and it will stay the same.

It is wonderful that young musicians and music fans are coming to *art music* from directions unimaginable 15 years ago. Yet that neither means that more people currently *know* more about *art music* nor ensures that *art music* will have a stronger base of support in 20 or 40 years. Schools and universities still afford advocates of *art music* their best opportunity for influence, influence of the next generation of professional musicians and of non-musicians, music lovers like myself. Technical mastery among musicians may be better than ever, perhaps even more widespread than ever, but there is genuine need among many musicians and certainly among the rest of us for deeper conceptual and contextual understanding. Musician educators such as all of you are the primary enablers of connoisseurship and *art music* demands connoisseurship.

Every dimension of the music education enterprise is connected. It is the university that prepares K–12 music specialists, private music instructors, professors of instrumental and vocal music, musicologists — educators all. It is the university that provides a home for those who conduct research on teaching and learning about music. It is in college that many students first experience music as part of the general liberal arts curriculum and, if captured emotionally and intellectually, will comprise the next generation of concert attendees, symphony orchestra patrons, *art music* supporters. It is within the institutes of higher education that you represent that the next generation of music professionals is being cultivated. Music majors and non-music majors come to you more or much less prepared depending on the music education they have received pre-college. We are all in this together whether one is an elementary music teacher or university music professor, music college president or dean. Thus, *I implore you* to attend to the quality of your music teacher preparation programs. *Excellent music education K–university is the advocacy that works best of all.*

Almost two centuries ago, Lowell Mason, big-time hymnist, co-founder of the Boston Academy of Music, and the person responsible for the first music instruction in the nation’s public schools wrote:

Music is almost the only branch of education aside from divine truth whose direct tendency is to cultivate the feelings. Our systems of education generally proceed too much on the principle that we are merely intellectual beings. ...Hence we often find the most learned the least agreeable (Barzun, 1956, p. 116).

The priorities of our systems of education haven't changed much since the early 1800s but neither have we humans. We want the emotional impact, the intensity of feeling that music gives us. Funtwo fan, Kevin Daniel Allen says: "I love it when they take music from classical composers and turn it into highly emotional rock tunes. Truly amazing!"

If you genuinely care about the future of *art music* don't sell out for a cheap seat in the Goals 2000 arena. Make certain that Kevin Daniel Allen finds the highly emotional in the *original* work of the classical composers themselves. Give us the voluptuousness of "Eroica," the subversive thrill of *Don Giovanni*, the aphrodisia of *La Bohème*. I personally desire the libidinous temptations of *Der Rosenkavalier* as described by H.L. Mencken:

No woman who hears it is ever the same again. She may remain within the law, but her thoughts are wayward henceforth. Into her ear the sirens have poured their abominable song. She has been beset by witches. There is a sinister glitter in her eye (360-361).

Bewitch us. Seduce us. Inflammate our passions – tender and vigorous. Lead us to the secret places where feelings abide, like for instance, *art music*. It is from there we will begin to unravel the intellectual mysteries of the components and structures intrinsic to music making; it is from there we will cultivate the abilities to think and act in music. We will comprehend and we will value the study of music on its own terms. Just help us to "feel it all over, people!"

Notes

1. The National Endowment for the Arts' publication, *American Canvas* (1997) spells it out: K–12 arts education offers an “escape route” for a fiscally cornered nonprofit arts community by providing “immediate payoffs in the form of work for artists and art organizations” (49). Arts education policy researchers have reported on the blatant self-interest of NEA educational policies and funding practices since the late 1960s. *Instant Art, Instant Culture: The Unspoken Policy for American Schools* (Chapman, 1982) provided an early in-depth analysis of the federal government’s systematic “de-schooling” of arts education.
2. Social studies and science are fairing worse than art and music according to a December 2004 survey conducted by the Center on Education Policy. In order to make more instructional time for reading/language arts and/or math, 27% of the districts report reducing time “somewhat or to a great extent” for social studies; 22% have reduced time for science.
3. *Putting the Arts in the Picture* (Rabin and Redmond, 2004), a report advocating the integration of the arts with other school subjects and community artists as the linchpin in successful arts integration programming, provides examples throughout its text of the decades-old strategic practice of dismissing the contributions or ignoring the role of K–12 arts teachers.

References

- American Institute of Graphic Arts. 2001. *A Client's Guide to Design: How to Get the Most Out of the Process*. American Institute of Graphic Arts. <http://www.aiga.org/content.cfm/aiganame>, 15 August 2006(a).
- American Institute of Graphic Arts. http://www.aiga.org/content.cfm/why_design, 15 August 2006(b).
- American Institute of Graphic Arts. Why do you design? (undated).
- American Institute of Graphic Arts. What every business needs. (undated).
- American Music Conference, <http://www.amc-music.org/musicmaking/wellness.htm>, 8 August 2006.
- American Music Conference, http://www.amc-music.org/research_briefs.htm, 8 August 2006.
- Arts Education Partnership. 2002. *Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Academic and Social Development*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Barzun, Jacques. 1956. *Music in American Life*, Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company. Inc.
- _____. 2002. *What Is a School?* Hudson Institute, Inc., p. 1.
- Center on Education Policy, “NCLB: Narrowing the Curriculum?” NCLB Policy Brief, July 2005.
- Collins, Jim. 2001. *Good to Great*, New York, NY: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Hetland, Lois and Winner, Ellen. 2001. The Arts and Academic Achievement: What the Evidence Shows. *Arts Education Policy Review*, 102 (3): 5.
- Hope, Samuel. 2004. Art Education in a World of Cross-purposes. In *Handbook of Research and Policy in art Education*, eds. Elliot Eisner and Michael Day, . Mahwah, NJ: The National Art Education Association and Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 93-113.
- Hospital Audiences, Inc. 1996. *Live Arts Experiences: Their Impact on Health and Wellness*.
- Larson, Gary. 1997. *American Canvas*. Washington, DC: National Endowment for the Arts.
- Lazo, Alejandro, “Art fights Alzheimer’s,” *Newsday.com, Newsday, Inc.*, 16 July 2006.
- Mencken, H.L. 1926. Music and Sin. In *Words on Music*, ed. Jack Sullivan. 1990. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- MENC: The National Association for Music Education. “MEMC Legislative Memo,” <http://www.menc.org/information/legislationpolicy/memo/oct06/2006>.
- National Endowment for the Arts, et al. 2002. *The Art in Peacemaking: A Guide to Integrating Conflict Resolution Education Into Youth Arts Programs*.
- The New York Times*, “Federal Panel Hammers Out Report on Recommendations to Shake Up Higher Education,” 11 August 2006, p. A12.
- The New York Times*, “Web Guitar Wizard Revealed at Last,” 27 August 2006, Arts & Leisure, pp. 1&28.
- President’s Committee on the Arts and the Humanities and the Arts Education Partnership. 1996. *Champions of Change*. Washington, DC: Author.
- President’s Committee on the Arts and the Humanities & the National Assembly of Local Arts Agencies. 1999. *Gaining the Arts Advantage: Lessons from School Districts That Value Arts Education*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Rabin, Nick and Redmond, Robin, ed. 2004. *Putting the Arts in the Picture: Reframing Education in the 21st Century*, Columbia College Chicago, 158-159.