

---

Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository

---

12-12-2023 12:30 PM

# A Comparative Analysis of the Early Twentieth-Century Music Appreciation and Community Music Movements in the United States

Andrew J. Blimke, *Western University*

Supervisor: Abrams-Ansari, Emily, *The University of Western Ontario*

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in Music

© Andrew J. Blimke 2023

Follow this and additional works at: <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd>



Part of the [Musicology Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Blimke, Andrew J., "A Comparative Analysis of the Early Twentieth-Century Music Appreciation and Community Music Movements in the United States" (2023). *Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository*. 9849.

<https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/9849>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Scholarship@Western. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository by an authorized administrator of Scholarship@Western. For more information, please contact [wlsadmin@uwo.ca](mailto:wlsadmin@uwo.ca).

## Abstract

The music appreciation and community music movements sought to popularize, democratize, and socialize art music. While technology made it possible for anyone to listen to art music, its full aesthetic and social benefits seemed accessible only to those with talent and education in performance. Music appreciation proponents claimed that teaching active listening made it possible for the less talented, and those who needed to be taught to prefer art music to have a full musical-aesthetic experience without any training in self-performance. Community music proponents argued that music's full benefits came from music making and worked to find ways to prove to Americans that talent was not a barrier, and that everyone not only *could* sing, and make music, but *wanted* to do so. Examining this debate about the nature of the musical experience challenges perceptions of the early twentieth-century classical music community as purveyors of a homogeneous musical-social tradition.

**Keywords:** Music appreciation, community music, social music, music reform, sacralization, taste, cultural uplift, good music, serious music, listening, active listener, United States, musical Americanism, Arthur Farwell, Peter W. Dykema, Frances Elliot Clark, music supervisors, M.T.N.A., Theodore Thomas, aesthetics, social movement, music education.

## Summary for Lay Audience

In the first half of the twentieth century, many in the United States believed that the aesthetic and social benefits of Western Classical Music should no longer be a privilege of the few, but rather should be made accessible to all. Though the phonograph, player piano, and radio now made it possible for anyone to listen to classical music, many Americans still chose to listen popular music instead, and in so doing, deprived themselves of classical music's purported benefits. Yet, even for many of those who chose to use technology to listen to classical music, music's full benefits still seemed inaccessible and monopolized by a small body of talented music makers capable of composing and performing at the highest levels. Offering a solution, music appreciation movement proponents claimed that by teaching people to listen to music in the "right" way, their lessons made it possible for the less talented, and those who needed to be taught to prefer classical over popular music to have a full musical experience without "wasting" their time on challenging piano and music theory lessons. At the same time, community music movement proponents argued that too much listening divorced from self-performance was dangerous because music's full benefits came from the act of music making. These practitioners set out to find ways to prove to Americans that talent was no barrier to music making, and that every one of them not only *could* sing, and make music, but *wanted* to do so. Under the surface of these two movements was a debate not just about what people are capable of learning, but about what constituted the "best" musical experience, and what it meant to be a full participant in the classical music community. Examining this debate challenges perceptions of the early twentieth-century classical music community as purveyors of a timeless, and unchanging musical tradition.

## Acknowledgements

Thank you to my supervisor, Dr. Emily Abrams-Ansari for her support, advice, and inspiring words. You so often had just the right thing to say at just the right time to keep me going. Your brilliant musical Americanism course was what initially led me to Arthur Farwell and the community music movement and the insight you offered the class into your own writing process was an immeasurable gift.

Thank you also to my second reader, Dr. Adam Patrick Bell for your willingness to help, your editing, and your spot-on research suggestions.

To my parents, Paul, and Leslie Blimke, thank you for your love, care, and support. You taught me what it means to make music in community, and how to work towards making that community more vibrant and caring.

To my brother and roommate Simeon and to Karla my love, I would not have been able to finish this thesis without both of you. You two helped me get “down the mountain.” I will be forever grateful, and I am so excited to go on adventures with you two that don’t involve this thesis!

To Matthew and Linda, Brendan and Melveena, Signe and all the family, friends, colleagues, and teachers that have helped me along the way. Thank you!

This thesis was funded in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

## Table of Contents

Abstract .....	i
Summary for Lay Audience .....	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
Introduction .....	1
Music Reform .....	5
Literature Review .....	8
Methodology and Scope .....	21
Chapter Outlines .....	23
Chapter 1.....	26
The Music Appreciation Movement: Making Listening an “Active” Occupation .....	26
Percy A. Scholes, “Music Appreciation: Its History and Technics” .....	31
J. Lawrence Erb: “Musical Appreciation” .....	40
Edith M. Rhetts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America” .....	48
Music Appreciation as an Educational and Musical-Aesthetic Aim .....	51
Music Appreciation as an Aesthetic Theory and Social Technology .....	54
Percy A. Scholes, the “Lausanne Resolution” and the Active Listener .....	58
Conclusion.....	62
Chapter 2.....	67
The Community Music Movement and the Brotherhood of Art .....	67
Music Supervisors National Conference 1913 .....	71
The Community Music Idea .....	86
Community Singing .....	91
Chapter 3.....	97
The Music Appreciation Movement and the Community Music Movement .....	97
Comparing the Movements .....	97
How the Proponents Related to Each Other.....	104
Music Reformers, or Allies in the Cause of Good Music? .....	109
Conclusion.....	112
Bibliography .....	114
Curriculum Vitae .....	122

## Introduction

Whether in literature, music or art, the mass of individuals will always be consumers rather than producers. The creation of the beautiful and skill in its manifestation belong to the realm of specialization. Art is social only as it contributes to the happiness of society rather than of an esoteric cult, and democratic only where opportunity to acquire it is open to all who have more than common ability. It is only when aesthetic education seeks appreciation rather than skill and manifests itself in tasteful selection rather than artistic production that the fine arts can become part of a culture that is social and democratic because it is not only open to all, but possible for all and required of all.<sup>1</sup>

--A. Duncan Yocum, "Appreciation of Music, Literature and Art as a Social Aim." 1916.

Perhaps the inexplicable pathos that mingled with the emotions of beauty and joy came from the very thing---that they had long carried in their hearts uncomprehended [*sic*] dreams of a life realized in forms of order, of rhythm, of beauty and joy, of brotherhood, and here in some mysterious way they had suddenly found themselves in a world where the dream had come true; here the dream was outside of themselves, shared by all, instead of being carried lonely within . . . And best of all, they had not *bought* the thing that had touched them so deeply and given them such great *joy*—they had *made* it.<sup>2</sup>

--Arthur Farwell, "Community Music Drama." 1914.

During the first half of the twentieth century, art music lovers, music professionals and music educators in the United States began to seek a definitive answer to the question of how to make art music more popular, democratic, and of better use to the social body. Pioneering efforts to popularize art music amongst the American masses had of course been ongoing for decades. The most notable example of these early efforts was that of Theodore Thomas, who in 1849 toured the United States for the first time: travelling like an itinerant preacher, alone and on

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Duncan Yocum, "Appreciation of Music, Literature and Art as a Social Aim," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 67 (1916): 12, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1013483>.

<sup>2</sup> Arthur Farwell, "Community Music Drama: Will Our Country People in Time Help Us to Develop the Real American Theater?," in *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist and Other Essays on American Music*, ed. Thomas Stoner (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1995), 229, <http://archive.org/details/wanderjahreofrev0000farw>.

horseback, with a violin and pistol in his bag, and an eagerness to use both.<sup>3</sup> In 1869, Thomas's "missionary work" reached a new phase as he led the orchestra he founded, conducted, and managed on its first traverse of a route that would come to be known as the Thomas Highway, or the "great musical highway of America."<sup>4</sup> According to his wife, Rose Fay Thomas, when Thomas began this "laborious task of a lifetime," "the word 'symphony' was a synonym for 'bore,' and it repelled rather than attracted an audience."<sup>5</sup> Over the years though, Thomas and his orchestra had taught the people of the United States to "know and love the master-works of musical literature, and to differentiate between music the art, and music the amusement."<sup>6</sup> Thomas' firm belief was that all that was necessary to make symphonic music popular was to make it familiar.<sup>7</sup> His method, as described by the music education historian Edward Bailey Birge in 1937, was to "give the people not what they wanted but what they could understand, with standards gradually rising as his audiences grew in appreciation."<sup>8</sup>

Thomas was the archetype of what could be called the self-appointed, self-made, musical savior. A mix between missionary and entrepreneur, the musical savior was a lover of "serious" (art) music who, refusing to accept musical conditions as they were, made it their figurative and literal business to remake the world around them. Though Thomas had done more than any other person to spread art music culture in the United States, by the time of his death in 1905, there was still a widespread sense that the United States was not sufficiently

---

<sup>3</sup> Rose Thomas Fay, *Memoirs Of Theodore Thomas*, 1911, 8, <http://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.214056>.

<sup>4</sup> Fay, *Memoirs Of Theodore Thomas*, 51–53; Joseph Horowitz, "'Sermons in Tones': Sacralization as a Theme in American Classical Music," *American Music* 16, no. 3 (1998): 314, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3052639>.

<sup>5</sup> Fay, *Memoirs Of Theodore Thomas*, 61.

<sup>6</sup> Fay, *Memoirs Of Theodore Thomas*, 53, 61.

<sup>7</sup> Edward Bailey Birge, *History of Public School Music in The United States*, new and augmented ed. (Philadelphia: Oliver Ditson, 1937), 151–52, <http://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.226767>.

<sup>8</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 151.

musical.<sup>9</sup> The fact that even Thomas' unmatched musical evangelism had not sufficiently changed the makeup of musical culture in the United States, begged the question for the next generation of self-appointed musical saviors that perhaps what was needed was not simply more money and effort devoted to the cause of popularizing art music, but an entirely new approach utilizing modern methods. After all, simply gifting the masses with art music had not only failed to fully popularize it, that method had done very little to democratize art music—that is, make art music something the people truly possessed and exercised control over, and had done absolutely nothing to socialize art music—that is, ensure that all of art music's aesthetic, moral, spiritual, and practical benefits were utilized by the people. A new approach, it was hoped, would not only have a better chance at popularizing art music but could be designed from the ground up to address these modern concerns.

This thesis examines two parallel early twentieth-century musical-social movements, the music appreciation movement, and the community music movement, both of which laid claim to being the best way to popularize, democratize, and socialize art music in the United States. The music appreciation movement was said to have begun in the United States in 1888 with the publishing of the first music appreciation textbook, W.S.B. Mathews', *How to Understand Music*.<sup>10</sup> While the proliferation of self-study textbooks for adults was one of the most prominent manifestations of the movement, music appreciation teaching took many forms, including radio and eventually television lectures, music appreciation records, pre-concert talks,

---

<sup>9</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 151; J. Lawrence Erb, "Musical Appreciation," *The Musical Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (1925): 1–7, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738382>; Thomas Whitney Surette, *Music and Life: A Study of the Relations between Ourselves and Music* (Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1917), xii, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/007673399>.

<sup>10</sup> Percy A. Scholes, *Music Appreciation: Its History and Technics* (New York: M. Witmark & Sons, 1935), <http://archive.org/details/musicappreciatio000unse>, 10-11



program notes, music memory contests, and even for-credit elementary, secondary, and college level classes. What separated music appreciation from other music education and music outreach efforts was that it taught people that they could learn to enjoy and receive all of art music's many benefits simply by learning to think about and listen to art music in the "right" way.

The beginnings of community music movement efforts can also be traced to the late 1880's though these activities would not coalesce into a unified national community music movement until roughly 1913. Community music movement activities were even more varied than those of the music appreciation movement. Community music could mean providing free or subsidized music lessons, encouraging music making in the home, making school and church music contribute to broader community life, the production of pageants, community singing, supporting amateur bands, orchestras, and choirs, and even free municipally funded outdoor concerts by professional musicians. The important thing was that the community itself was doing something to make music happen, because it was the "doing together" that community music movement proponents believed unlocked music's full value. Though the community music movement embraced many different kinds of musical activity, it was community singing—that is the organized "spontaneous" and "informal" singing by large and disparate groups of untrained people, that most fully embodied the ideology of the movement.

While the music appreciation movement, and community music movement have been studied separately in the past, this thesis is the first work to fully acknowledge and examine the interplay between these two movements. When historical social movements that revolve around creating social change are studied, there is often a tendency to include everything about

the movement that diverges from mainstream culture into an analysis of the movement's overarching nature and purpose.<sup>11</sup> Looking at the music appreciation movement and community music movement side by side has forced me to distinguish between non-mainstream activities and beliefs that were shared by proponents of both movements, non-mainstream activities and beliefs that were unique to each movement and the established ideological, social and institutional structures that the proponents of each movement wished to change. In this thesis, I argue that it is the divergent, rather than shared features of the music appreciation movement and community music movement that truly define them. I argue that the two movements were not just alternate methods for bringing about the same or a similar set of reform minded goals, but rather that their proponents taught conflicting understandings of the ideal musical-aesthetic experience, organized the relationship between composer, performer and listener in fundamentally different ways, and attempted to redistribute power and influence within the art music community along lines that would further promote their own understanding of the nature of music and democracy.

## Music Reform

Though this thesis is primarily focused on demonstrating the differences between the reform project of the music appreciation movement and the reform project of the community music movement, another critical question running throughout it is how best to understand the collection of goals and beliefs that music appreciation movement and community music

---

<sup>11</sup> "Social Movement | Definition, Types, Theories, & Facts | Britannica," accessed November 9, 2023, <https://www.britannica.com/topic/social-movement>.

movement proponents held in common. Turning to the literature, one of the few works to provide a framework for understanding the commonalities between the two movements is Gavin James Campbell's "A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear': Music and Social Reform in America, 1900-1925." While Campbell's paper deals with many activities that took place under the music appreciation movement and community music movement banners, "A Higher Mission" never actually acknowledges the existence of either movement. Instead, Campbell's discussion is framed around a group that he dubs the "music reformers" —a loose coalition steeped in art music culture and progressivism, who "united to argue that what they called 'good music' imparted tangible moral and mental benefits to the listener and performer."<sup>12</sup>

Progressivism, in the words of Campbell, "provided an ideological framework for music reformers to articulate their anxieties and ambitions," and music reform goals meshed so well with the larger progressive movement, and "views shared by a host of other white, middle-class socially concerned Americans," that the activities of the music reformers became widely known and celebrated by reformers even outside of music and music education circles.<sup>13</sup> According to Campbell, "the belief that music had the power to reform society was not new"; however, most of the older organizations designed to make "good music universally available" were "funded and directed by wealthy philanthropists" and had become "symbols of elite power" that were seen as excluding the lower classes.<sup>14</sup> Describing music reform as a middle-class effort to end

---

<sup>12</sup> Gavin James Campbell, "'A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear': Music and Social Reform in America, 1900-1925," *The Musical Quarterly* 84, no. 2 (2000): 260–61, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/742567>.

<sup>13</sup> Campbell, "A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear," 261.

<sup>14</sup> Campbell, "A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear," 262.

the “upper-class monopoly on access to good music,” Campbell explained that part of what animated music reform efforts was a belief that the wealthy were not just depriving the poor of the benefits that “good” music could bring, but leaving them vulnerable to exploitation by the purveyors of commercial music.<sup>15</sup> According to Campbell, music reformers believed that “good” music created ““desirable emotional states”” that lead to an orderly, stable, and cohesive society, while “bad” music such as ragtime, jazz and other forms of commercial street music had disordered rhythms and sensuous melodies that degraded people’s “moral, bodily and mental self-control” and lead to a disordered society.<sup>16</sup> Filled with a genuine desire to help the downtrodden and make music in the United States more democratic, yet clearly blinded by their racism, and cultural and aesthetic biases, music reformers, in Campbell’s words, “crafted an ideology of music that validated” their own white middle-class values, while defining “democracy as the equal opportunity to share” these values.<sup>17</sup>

Though Campbell paints with a broad brush, the music reformers he describes bear a striking resemblance to many of the real historical figures who promoted the music appreciation movement, and community music movement, as well as those who promoted the social settlement and pageant movements discussed later in this thesis. Unfortunately, because Campbell does not acknowledge that music reformers identified themselves with, organized and conceptualized their activities around these named movements, “A Higher Mission” creates the impression of a far more unified music reform movement than actually existed. This issue becomes significant when Campbell describes music reformers as “insisting that listening to

---

<sup>15</sup> Campbell, “A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear,” 264.

<sup>16</sup> Campbell, “A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear,” 263–65.

<sup>17</sup> Campbell, “A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear,” 274–75.

music required intellectual engagement” —a stance that this thesis will show was held by music appreciation movement proponents but not community music movement proponents.<sup>18</sup> Rather than amalgamating music reform activities into one movement as Campbell does, in this thesis, I argue that music reformers, operating under the banners of the music appreciation movement and community music movement promulgated two different ideologies of music in order to validated two different understandings of what a universalized version of white middle-class culture should look like.

Since music reform is a modern rather than historical term, I have chosen to modify the concept slightly to aid my own analysis. In this thesis, I use music reform as a way to talk about beliefs that music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents shared that separated them from the musical establishment, but yet were also so widely held that they reveal little about the essential nature of these movements. Some of these, like a belief in the necessity of developing the public’s musical taste and the power of “good’ music to aid social reform and the Americanization of the racialized other were part of Campbell’s original music reform framework. Other beliefs, like devotion to the cause of “good” music, a general affinity for musical Americanism, and a desire to create conditions suitable for the rise of the “great American composer” I have added to the music reform framework myself.

## Literature Review

While Campbell’s music reform framework is unique, he is certainly not the only researcher to discuss the relationship between progressivism and music. Though an older paper,

---

<sup>18</sup> Campbell, “A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear,” 276.

Thomas W. Miller's 1966, "The Influence of Progressivism on Music Education, 1917-1947" still provides an excellent overview of the impact of progressivism on music education in the United States. Miller describes progressive music education as having both liberal and conservative philosophical tendencies, though he states that these two camps were unified by a commitment to pragmatism and to the "application of the subject to life after school."<sup>19</sup> According to Miller, the science of education movement brought the individuality of the student to the forefront. For liberals this led to the child-centered school and the idea that in order to develop their individuality, all children needed to "experience in some manner the actual process of creation," but for conservatives who maintained that adult performance standards should apply even to children, Miller explained that individuality implied that there were "children of lesser ability who would not profit from a musical education and, therefore, could be excluded from further education in music based upon performance in a given test."<sup>20</sup>

Miller goes on to state that social reconstructionists' concern with "social, political, and economic democracy in and through education" forced a synthesis of these two positions.<sup>21</sup> According to Miller "the social reconstructionist reasoned that music education, if it was to offer something of value to all the children of all the people, could do no better than to create in each child an abiding love for and an appreciation of music."<sup>22</sup> For conservatives, this meant that the listening lessons of music appreciation, (with what I would add was their promise of accessibility for all regardless of talent) became essential, while "liberal progressives continually

---

<sup>19</sup> Thomas W. Miller, "The Influence of Progressivism on Music Education, 1917-1947," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 14, no. 1 (1966): 8, 9, 13, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3343928>.

<sup>20</sup> Miller, "The Influence of Progressivism on Music Education, 1917-1947," 9–10, 13.

<sup>21</sup> Miller, "The Influence of Progressivism on Music Education, 1917-1947," 10.

<sup>22</sup> Miller, "The Influence of Progressivism on Music Education, 1917-1947," 11.

called attention to the necessity of a totality of musical experience to produce a lasting appreciation of music.”<sup>23</sup> Miller’s account ends with the statement that progressive music education was spared the fractionalization faced by progressive education more generally, due to the Music Educators National Conference, (MSNC at the time), providing a venue for liberal and conservative music educators to meet and blend their ideas into a “near unanimity of opinion on the objectives” of music education in the schools.<sup>24</sup>

Also covering progressivism and music education, but with a specific focus on the Country Life Movement, is William R. Lee’s 1997 article “Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925.” Lee outlines how the concerns of rural and urban progressive reformers alike were tied to the great migration of people from the countryside to the cities spurred by industrial expansion.<sup>25</sup> According to Lee, progressive reformers believed that the anonymity and the soul-crushing monotony of factory life that greeted young people and the poor when they arrived in urban centers created a feeling called “Gemeinschaft grouse”—or disconnection from normal community life.<sup>26</sup> Lee writes that rural reformers believed this feeling of disconnection damaged the hollowed out communities of those who stayed behind as much as the individuals who left for the cities, and that just like their urban counterparts, rural reformers saw “good” music as a

---

<sup>23</sup> Miller, “The Influence of Progressivism on Music Education, 1917-1947,” 11.

<sup>24</sup> Miller, “The Influence of Progressivism on Music Education, 1917-1947,” 12–13; “NAfME History - NAFME,” [nafme.org](https://nafme.org), accessed November 12, 2023, <https://nafme.org/about/nafme-history/>. Founded in 1907, the Music Supervisors’ National Conference (MSNC) was changed to Music Educators National Conference (MENC) in 1934. In 2011, MENC became the National Association for Music Education (NAfME).

<sup>25</sup> William R. Lee, “Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925,” *Journal of Research in Music Education* 45, no. 2 (1997): 308–9, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345589>.

<sup>26</sup> Lee, “Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925,” 309.

way to create a feeling of community, or sympathy, that could serve as the basis for social regeneration.<sup>27</sup>

Unlike Campbell, Lee refers to the community music movement by name, explaining that the movement's emphasis on self-sufficiency and mass teaching techniques matched perfectly with the ideology and needs of the Country Life Movement. Lee even connects the involvement of music educators with the community music movement to the efforts of Country Life proponents, though he notes that rural concerns were almost immediately made subservient to the broader goals of the community music movement.<sup>28</sup> Although rural reformers, primarily used community music techniques, they did not limit themselves to a single method, and Lee details how rural reformers also used music appreciation records to stimulate communal interest in "good" music.<sup>29</sup>

Other relevant works on music and progressivism include Derek Vaillant's 2003, *Sounds of Reform: Progressivism and Music in Chicago, 1873-1935*, which provides an excellent look at the general landscape of musical progressivism in the United States including a chapter on musical progressivism at the Hull House Settlement, and Jeremy Kopkas' 2011 dissertation, "Soundings: Musical Aesthetics in Music Education Discourse from 1907 to 1958" which argues that early twentieth-century music education discourse was not solely dominated by utilitarian concerns, and that musical aesthetic theories played a guiding role in music education

---

<sup>27</sup> Lee, "Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925," 309.

<sup>28</sup> Lee, "Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925," 310.

<sup>29</sup> Lee, "Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925," 311, 313.



practice.<sup>30</sup> A resident of Chicago with personal connections to the leadership of the settlement movement in that city, the philosopher and educator John Dewey played an important role in shaping progressive educational thought.<sup>31</sup> Paul Woodford's 2005, *Democracy and music education: liberalism, ethics, and the politics of practice*, offers an in depth exploration of Dewey's "democratic community of cooperative inquirers" that bears such a striking resemblance to the community music movement's conception of community.<sup>32</sup>

The social settlement movement was central both to development of progressivism in general, and to the development of the community music movement in particular. Widely available primary sources on the settlement movement include Jane Adams' 1909, *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets*, and 1910, *Twenty Years at Hull House*.<sup>33</sup> As the settlement movement was deeply influenced by William Morris and the arts and crafts movement, *The Craftsman* magazine championed by Gustav Stickley and Irene Sargent is also an important primary source on settlement thought.<sup>34</sup> The expansive body of secondary literature dealing with the settlement movement and its relationship to music and cultural pedagogy includes Mina Julia Carson's 1990, *Settlement Folk: Social thought and the American Settlement Movement, 1885-1930*, Shannon Louise Green's 1998, *"Art for life's sake": Music schools and activities in United*

---

<sup>30</sup> Derek Vaillant, *Sounds of Reform: Progressivism and Music in Chicago, 1873-1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003), <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/west/detail.action?docID=3039457>; Jeremy Kopkas, "Soundings: Musical Aesthetics in Music Education Discourse from 1907 to 1958," ed. Deron Boyles, 2011.

<sup>31</sup> Vaillant, *Sounds of Reform*, 106–7.

<sup>32</sup> Paul Woodford, *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice*, Counterpoints: Music and Education (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005), 5.

<sup>33</sup> Jane Addams, *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets*, 1972 University of Illinois Press reprint (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909), [http://archive.org/details/spiritofyouthcit0000adda\\_l5f5](http://archive.org/details/spiritofyouthcit0000adda_l5f5); Jane Addams, *Twenty Years at Hull-House, with Autobiographical Notes* (New York : Macmillan Co., 1910), <http://archive.org/details/twentyyearsathul00addaooft>.

<sup>34</sup> "The Craftsman (183 Issues) - UWDC - UW-Madison Libraries," accessed November 13, 2023, <https://search.library.wisc.edu/digital/AQ5VII6GNL36H78T>; Vaillant, *Sounds of Reform*, 99.

*States social settlements, 1892—1942*, Deanna L. Yerichuk's 2015 dissertation, "Discursive Formations of Community Music and the Production of Canadian Citizens in Toronto's Settlement Movement, 1900s-1930s," Graham Cassano, Rima Lunin Schultz, and Jessica Payette's 2018, *Eleanor Smith's Hull House songs: the music of protest and hope in Jane Addams's Chicago* and Roger Mantie's 2022, *Music, leisure, education: historical and philosophical perspectives*.<sup>35</sup> Though all of the works listed are excellent, Yerichuk and Mantie's studies in particular are worth highlighting. Yerichuk describes settlement music teaching practices as producing "musical hierarchies" that in turn "produced and were produced by social hierarchies."<sup>36</sup> Yerichuk explains that "Western European Art Music (WEAM), cast as good music, did not simply construct a binary, but produced an exalted music that in turn ordered 'other' musics."<sup>37</sup> According to Yerichuk, "good" music served to establish and normalize "truths about the rightness of two orders that reinforced each other: a musical order in which WEAM

---

<sup>35</sup> Mina Julia Carson, *Settlement Folk: Social Thought and the American Settlement Movement, 1885-1930* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), <http://archive.org/details/settlementfolkso0000cars>; Shannon Louise Green, "'Art for Life's Sake': Music Schools and Activities in United States Social Settlements, 1892--1942" (Ph.D., Wisconsin, The University of Wisconsin - Madison, 1998), <http://www.proquest.com/docview/304456468/abstract/E63CD1D0AB544225PQ/1>; Deanna L. Yerichuk, "Discursive Formations of Community Music and the Production of Canadian Citizens in Toronto's Settlement Movement, 1900s-1930s" (Ph.D., Canada -- Ontario, CA, University of Toronto (Canada), 2015), <https://www.proquest.com/docview/1767782365/abstract/53D2E1A84FB14AD1PQ/1>; Graham Cassano, Rima Lunin Schultz, and Jessica Payette, *Eleanor Smith's Hull House Songs: The Music of Protest and Hope in Jane Addams's Chicago*, Studies in Critical Social Sciences 131 (Boston: BRILL, 2018); Roger Mantie, *Music, Leisure, Education: Historical and Philosophical Perspectives*, Oxford Scholarship Online (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2022).

<sup>36</sup> Yerichuk, "Discursive Formations of Community Music and the Production of Canadian Citizens in Toronto's Settlement Movement, 1900s-1930s," 24.

<sup>37</sup> Yerichuk, "Discursive Formations of Community Music and the Production of Canadian Citizens in Toronto's Settlement Movement, 1900s-1930s," 24.

was cast as the highest form of music and a social order in which Anglo-Celtic Protestant subjects were cast as the most evolved form of citizen.”<sup>38</sup>

Mantie’s book, which draws extensively on all of the settlement movement literature I mentioned, is noteworthy because it bridges the gap between scholarship on the settlement movement’s involvement with music instruction and amateur performance and the field of leisure studies engagement with recreational music making in the first half of the twentieth century. Mantie discusses how settlement workers tackled the question of whether music lessons should serve social goals and be offered to all, or serve musical goals, and only be offered to the talented few who could fulfill professional standards, writing that the desire of settlement music leaders to maintain “nothing less than the highest standards in art music” was consistently in conflict with the desire of settlement leaders to have the “broadest reach and impact” possible.<sup>39</sup> According to Mantie, this tension between “musical excellence” and “inclusiveness” in the settlement house movement was temporarily resolved by the designation of “specialized houses” that offered subsidized conservatory instruction and “general houses” that offered what was by the 1920’s revered to as “Social Music.”<sup>40</sup> Mantie describes the idea of social music as envisioned within the settlement movement giving rise to the early twentieth-century community music movement.<sup>41</sup> Mantie then explains that in 1937 the fundamental tension between those who saw music as a form of participatory recreation and those who wanted to advance professional musical standards lead to the departure of independent

---

<sup>38</sup> Yerichuk, “Discursive Formations of Community Music and the Production of Canadian Citizens in Toronto’s Settlement Movement, 1900s-1930s,” 25.

<sup>39</sup> Mantie, *Music, Leisure, Education*, 65–66, 69.

<sup>40</sup> Mantie, *Music, Leisure, Education*, 69–70.

<sup>41</sup> Mantie, *Music, Leisure, Education*, 70–71.

community music schools from the larger settlement movement and the creation of the National Guild of Community Music Schools.<sup>42</sup> Though community music was in their name, Mantie notes that independent community music schools like the Curits Institute of Music held views that were entirely opposite from the ethic of the community music movement.<sup>43</sup>

Although my thesis mostly approaches the community music movement by way of the settlement movement, pageant movement and the MSNC, the playground movement and the National Recreation Association also played a continuous role in community music movement activities.<sup>44</sup> *The Playground* magazine published by the Playground and Recreation Association of America, regularly featured articles by community music movement leaders like Farwell and Dykema, and Playground and Recreation Association maintained a Bureau of Community music for many years.<sup>45</sup> The National Recreation Association was particularly involved with the community music movement in the last thirty years of the movement, commissioning Augustus D. Zanzig to conduct a national survey of community music making that was published as *Music in American life, present & future*, as well as the *Singing America, song and chorus book*.<sup>46</sup> For a definitive examination of community music movement activities from the perspective of leisure

---

<sup>42</sup> Mantie, *Music, Leisure, Education*, 72.

<sup>43</sup> Mantie, *Music, Leisure, Education*, 70, 74.

<sup>44</sup> Mantie, *Music, Leisure, Education*, 71.

<sup>45</sup> Playground Association of America and Playground and Recreation Association of America, *The Playground* (Cooperstown New York: Executive Committee of the Playground Association of America, 1917), <http://archive.org/details/playground11playrich>; Augustus D. Zanzig, "A National Music Study," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 15, no. 2 (1928): 29–35, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3382517>.

<sup>46</sup> Augustus D. Zanzig, *Music in American Life, Present & Future* (London: Oxford university press, 1932), <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001454776>; Augustus D. Zanzig, *Singing America, Song and Chorus Book* (Boston, C. C. Birchard & company, 1941), <http://archive.org/details/singingamericaso00zanz>.

studies, see Andy Krikun's 2017, "Perilous Blessing of Leisure": Music and Leisure in the United States, 1890–1945 published in *The Oxford Handbook of Music Making and Leisure*.<sup>47</sup>

Though only small sections of Joseph Horowitz' 1987, *Understanding Toscanini: How He Became an American Culture-God and Helped Create a New Audience for Old Music*, discuss music appreciation, and Lawrence W. Levine's 1990, *Highbrow/lowbrow: the Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*, does not mention the movement at all, these two works form the theoretical foundations of contemporary scholarship on the music appreciation movement. Both books present the ongoing sacralization of Western European Art Music and the development of a hierarchical distinction between music deemed "popular" and music deemed "classical" as processes that reached their peak in the United States in the last decade of the nineteenth century and the first fifty years of the twentieth. According to Levine, the process of "sacralization increased the distance between amateur and professional," when in contrast, "the blurring of that distinction had been one of the characteristics of music in America for much of the nineteenth century."<sup>48</sup> Furthermore, sacralization rendered the tradition of *Hausmusik*, musical "vandalism" and made audiences that had formerly felt a right to participate by audibly expressing their feelings during performances, silent and passive.<sup>49</sup> Calling Toscanini the "high priest of the music appreciation movement of the thirties and forties," Horowitz zeros in on music appreciation itself as a tool of sacralization, explaining how the movement not only

---

<sup>47</sup> Andy Krikun, "Perilous Blessing of Leisure," ed. Roger Mantie and Gareth Dylan Smith, vol. 1, *The Oxford Handbook of Music Making and Leisure* (Oxford University Press, 2017), <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190244705.013.10>.

<sup>48</sup> Lawrence W. Levine, *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*, 1st Harvard University Press pbk. ed., *The William E. Massey, Sr. Lectures in the History of American Civilization 1986* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1990), 139.

<sup>49</sup> Levine, *Highbrow/Lowbrow*, 26, 140, 189–91.

taught a canon of masterpieces, and fidelity to the musical text, but also mythologized praxis in order to rationalize its removal from the home.<sup>50</sup> Though the audience for Western European Art Music in the United States expanded dramatically between the world wars, at least in part due to the popularization efforts of the music appreciation movement, Horowitz writes that “it would be misleading to suggest that great music’s aura of exclusivity was negated . . . Rather, to partake in great music’s exclusivity was made a democratic privilege.”<sup>51</sup> In other words, music appreciation offered a democratic justification for the continuation of musical hierarchy.

Horowitz discusses music appreciation throughout *Understanding Toscanini*, yet it is never his central focus. Dedicated studies on the music appreciation movement include Julia Chybowski’s 2008 dissertation, “Developing American taste: A cultural history of the early twentieth-century music appreciation movement,” and 2017 article, “Selling Musical Taste in Early Twentieth-Century America: Frances E. Clark and the Business of Music Appreciation,” as well as Rebecca Bennet’s 2009 dissertation, “The anxiety of appreciation: Virgil Thomson wrestles with a ‘racket,’” and her 2012 article, “Debating music “appreciation” outside the American classroom, 1930-1950.”<sup>52</sup> Bennet’s discussion and contextualization of Virgil Thompson and Theodor W. Adorno’s separate critiques of the music appreciation movement

---

<sup>50</sup> Joseph Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini: How He Became an American Culture-God and Helped Create a New Audience for Old Music* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf: Distributed by Random House, 1987), 3, 220, [http://archive.org/details/understandingtos0000horo\\_n0w8](http://archive.org/details/understandingtos0000horo_n0w8).

<sup>51</sup> Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini*, 202.

<sup>52</sup> Julia Chybowski, “Developing American Taste: A Cultural History of the Early Twentieth-Century Music Appreciation Movement” (PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2008); Julia Chybowski, “Selling Musical Taste in Early Twentieth-Century America: Frances E. Clark and the Business of Music Appreciation,” *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 38, no. 2 (April 1, 2017): 104–27, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536600616684969>; Rebecca Bennett, “The Anxiety of Appreciation: Virgil Thomson Wrestles with a ‘Racket’” (PhD diss., ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2009); Rebecca Bennett, “Debating Music ‘Appreciation’ Outside the American Classroom, 1930-1950.,” *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 33, no. 2 (2012): 128.

was quite helpful to me in the initial planning of this thesis, though as I engaged with the writing process my focus shifted to the earlier years of the movement, and outside of the range of Bennet's work. If there is one source that I engage with more in this thesis than Campbell's "A Higher Mission" it is Chybowski's dissertation. Seeing music appreciation as primarily a project of sacralization, Chybowski argues that the "unified purpose of music appreciation" was the "maintenance of cultural hierarchy by defining musical types through social stratification."<sup>53</sup> In other words, the music appreciation movement taught people in the United States how to differentiate between "high" and "low" types of music as a way to maintain the supremacy of the art music tradition. Worth mentioning for the nuance it adds to our understanding of the music appreciation movement's cultural pedagogy is Jacob Hardesty's 2011 article, "Canonic constructions in early 20th century music appreciation classes," in which Hardesty reconciles how public-school teachers included a greatly expanded body of folk music in their music appreciation classes even as they engaged in the sacralization of Western European Art Music.<sup>54</sup>

Unlike the music appreciation movement which has been the subject of a great deal of analytical exploration, the literature on the community music movement is mostly descriptive in nature and revolves around the writings and activities of one figure—Arthur Farwell. Works on Farwell with extended treatments of the community music movement include, Evelyn Davis Culbertson's 1987 article, "Arthur Farwell's Early Efforts on Behalf of American Music, 1889-1921," as well as 1992 biography, *He heard America singing: Arthur Farwell, composer and*

---

<sup>53</sup> Chybowski, "Developing American Taste," 243.

<sup>54</sup> Jacob Hardesty, "Canonic Constructions in Early 20th Century Music Appreciation Classes," *American Educational History Journal* 38, no. 1–2 (2011): 289.

*crusading music educator*.<sup>55</sup> Thomas Stoner's 1991, "The New Gospel of Music": Arthur Farwell's Vision of Democratic Music in America," also provides a wealth of information on Farwell's conception of the community music idea. Stoner's 1995 collection of Farwell writings, *Wanderjahre of a revolutionist and other essays on American music*, is an invaluable aid to research on the community music movement as this work provides access to a number of Farwell's *Musical America* articles that are otherwise inaccessible.<sup>56</sup> While "The New Gospel" touches on Farwell's involvement with the Song and Light Festival, Jonathan Massey' 2006, *Organic Architecture and Direct Democracy: Claude Bragdon's Festivals of Song and Light*, and Alden Snell's 2011, "Arthur Farwell's New York City 'Song and Light Festival'," provide a more in depth treatment. No truly comprehensive history of the community music movement exists, though there is a section of a chapter in Esther M. Morgan-Ellis' 2018, *Everybody Sing!: Community Singing in the American Picture Palace*, that chronicles more of the movement's history than any other single work.<sup>57</sup> Morgan-Ellis' article, "Warren Kimsey and Community Singing at Camp Gordon, 1917–1918" is also useful for its exploration of how the community music movement and community music leaders were seamlessly integrated into American preparations for the Great War. Finally, there is Lee Higgins 2012, *Community Music: In Theory and In Practice*. As part of his attempt to define the modern field of community music practice,

---

<sup>55</sup> Evelyn Davis Culbertson, "Arthur Farwell's Early Efforts on Behalf of American Music, 1889-1921," *American Music* 5, no. 2 (1987): 156–75, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3052160>; Evelyn Davis Culbertson, *He Heard America Singing: Arthur Farwell, Composer, and Crusading Music Educator*, vol. 9, Composers of North America No. 9 (Metuchen, N.J: Scarecrow Press, 1992).

<sup>56</sup> Thomas Stoner, "'The New Gospel of Music': Arthur Farwell's Vision of Democratic Music in America," *American Music* 9, no. 2 (1991): 183–208, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3051816>; Arthur Farwell, *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist and Other Essays on American Music*, ed. Thomas Stoner (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1995), <http://archive.org/details/wanderjahreofrev0000farw>.

<sup>57</sup> Esther M. Morgan-Ellis, *Everybody Sing!: Community Singing in the American Picture Palace* (Athens, UNITED STATES: University of Georgia Press, 2018), 59, <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/west/detail.action?docID=5150843>.



Higgins provides a historical account of the early twentieth-century community music movement's McCarthy period demise, as well as an account of how the ideology of the historical movement differs from community music beliefs today.<sup>58</sup>

As Derek Vaillant notes, both the social settlement movement and community singing, “posited an ideal of democratic harmony in which people of color, most notably African Americans, were excluded from participation.”<sup>59</sup> In many cases this led to the black community creating their own settlement houses as chronicled by Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn in her 1993, *Black Neighbors: Race and the Limits of Reform in the American Settlement House Movement, 1890-1945*.<sup>60</sup> Literature dealing with race and the music appreciation and community music movements includes Ruth Iana Gustafson's 2005, dissertation, “Merry throngs and street gangs: The fabrication of whiteness and the worthy citizen in early vocal instruction and music appreciation, 1830–1930,” and Juanita Karpf's 2011 articles, “Get the Pageant Habit: E. Azalia Hackley's Festivals and Pageants during the First World War Years, 1914–1918” and “For their musical uplift: Emma Azalia Hackley and voice culture in African American communities.”<sup>61</sup> For a

---

<sup>58</sup> Lee Higgins, *Community Music: In Theory and In Practice* (Oxford University Press, 2012), 20, <http://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199777839.001.0001/acprof-9780199777839-chapter-001>.

<sup>59</sup> Vaillant, *Sounds of Reform*, 95, 169; Mantie, *Music, Leisure, Education*, 62.

<sup>60</sup> Elisabeth Lasch-Quinn, *Black Neighbors: Race and the Limits of Reform in the American Settlement House Movement, 1890-1945*, vol. 1 (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993), <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.civil/bkngh0001&i=1>.

<sup>61</sup> Ruth Iana Gustafson, “Merry Throngs and Street Gangs: The Fabrication of Whiteness and the Worthy Citizen in Early Vocal Instruction and Music Appreciation, 1830–1930” (Ph.D., United States -- Wisconsin, The University of Wisconsin - Madison, 2005), <https://www.proquest.com/docview/305385399/abstract/E53D4119A89D41B0PQ/1>; Juanita Karpf, “Get the Pageant Habit: E. Azalia Hackley's Festivals and Pageants during the First World War Years, 1914–1918,” *Popular Music and Society* 34, no. 5 (2011): 517–56, <https://doi.org/10.1080/03007766.2010.521441>; Juanita Karpf, “For Their Musical Uplift: Emma Azalia Hackley and Voice Culture in African American Communities,” *International Journal of Community Music* 4, no. 3 (November 2011): 237–56, [https://doi.org/10.1386/ijcm.4.3.237\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/ijcm.4.3.237_1).

fully contextualized look at the music scene in Chicago see Amy Absher's 2014, *The Black Musician and the White City: Race and Music in Chicago, 1900-1967*.<sup>62</sup>

The music appreciation movement was intimately connected with the development and marketing of the phonograph, and radio. The expansive body of literature on music reproduction technology and the music appreciation movement includes Constance Sanders' 1990 dissertation, "A history of radio in music education in the United States, with emphasis on the activities of music educators and on certain radio music series designed for elementary and secondary school use," Mark Katz', 1998, article, "Making America More Musical through the Phonograph, 1900-1930," Colin Symes', 2004 book, *Setting the record straight: a material history of classical recording*, Shawn Vancour's 2009, "Popularizing the classics: radio's role in the American music appreciation movement, 1922–1934," and Brian Gregory's 2013 dissertation, "Educated ears: Studies on listening in American education, 1900–1945."<sup>63</sup>

## Methodology and Scope

In researching this thesis, I examined a wide variety of American and British textual sources published between 1888, the year W.S.B. Matthews' published his *How to Understand*

---

<sup>62</sup> Amy Absher, *The Black Musician and the White City: Race and Music in Chicago, 1900-1967* (Ann Arbor, UNITED STATES: University of Michigan Press, 2014), <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/west/detail.action?docID=3570550>.

<sup>63</sup> Constance Sanders, "A History of Radio in Music Education in the United States, with Emphasis on the Activities of Music Educators and on Certain Radio Music Series Designed for Elementary and Secondary School Use," 1990; Mark Katz, "Making America More Musical through the Phonograph, 1900-1930," *American Music* 16, no. 4 (1998): 448–76, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3052289>; Colin Symes, *Setting the Record Straight: A Material History of Classical Recording*, Music/Culture (Middletown, Conn: Wesleyan University Press, 2004); Shawn Vancour, "Popularizing the Classics: Radio's Role in the American Music Appreciation Movement, 1922—34," *Media, Culture & Society* 31, no. 2 (2009): 289–307, <https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443708100319>; Brian Gregory, "Educated Ears: Studies on Listening in American Education, 1900–1945" (ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2013), <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1430907093/?pq-origsite=primo>.

*Music* and 1958, the year the Music Educators National Conference's Commission on Music in the Community published its final report.<sup>64</sup> I first oriented myself to the music, and music education discourse of each decade by reading articles of a general nature, in *The Musical Times*, *The Musical Quarterly*, *Etude Magazine*, *Current Opinion* and *The American Magazine of Art* before making a more specific search for articles on the music appreciation and community music movements in these same periodicals. I also looked for articles on the community music movement in *The New York Times*, *New-York Tribune*, and *Los Angeles Times*. I read all of the readily available music appreciation books (pedagogical material) as well as community music manuals from the period. I also conducted a thorough reading of the *Music Supervisors' Journal*, the *Yearbook of the Music Supervisors' National Conference*, *The Proceedings of the Music Teachers National Association Conference*, and *The Playground* for any references to music appreciation and community music.

For inclusion in this thesis, I chose to focus on music appreciation authors who attempted to outline some kind of history of their own movement, as my interest was not just in understanding what music appreciation movement proponents believed about music, but how they wanted others to think about the development of their movement. What my thesis does not cover is music appreciation practice, and how this diverged from the way music appreciation movement proponents presented their movement. When discussing the community music movement, I chose to focus on Peter W. Dykema, and Arthur Farwell, and Harry Barnhart, both because they were some of the movement's most prominent early figures

---

<sup>64</sup> Marie McCarthy, "Creating a Framework for Music Making and Leisure", in *The Oxford Handbook of Music Making and Leisure* ed. Roger Mantie and Gareth Dylan Smith, vol. 1 (Oxford University Press, 2017), <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190244705.013.13>. 9

and because of their pre-community music movement involvement with pageants and settlements. Since none of these figures were involved with community bands, my thesis mostly side-steps what was for many high-school music educators an important aspect of the community music movement. I have also left out any discussion of the community music movement's involvement with war time singing simply due to space constraints.<sup>65</sup> The chronological range of this thesis has also been narrowed to the first half of both movements, with the latest primary source referenced being from the mid 1930's.

## Chapter Outlines

In the first chapter of this thesis, I argue that the music appreciation movement's unique project of reform was the establishment of a new understanding of listening in which the non-performing, "intelligent," and appreciative art music listener, on the basis of their ability to experience the richest musical aesthetic phenomenon possible, was seen as a full, active, and irreplaceable participant in the art music community. I describe the idealized musical-aesthetic experience that music appreciation proponents promoted as a balanced intellectual and emotional appreciation of the music itself. While I acknowledge that music appreciation movement efforts aided broader music reform goals like musical nationalism, social and cultural uplift, the development of discriminatory taste, the maintenance of musical-cultural hierarchy and the popularization of "good" music, I contend that the music appreciation movement

---

<sup>65</sup> Esther M. Morgan-Ellis, "Warren Kimsey and Community Singing at Camp Gordon, 1917–1918," *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 39, no. 2 (April 1, 2018): 171–94, <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536600616677995>; E. Christina Chang, "The Singing Program of World War I: The Crusade for a Singing Army," *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 23, no. 1 (2001): 19–45, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40215234>.

contributed to music reform goals in a way that promoted the movement's understanding of the nature of the musical artform and the role of the listener and the performer in the musical community over other viewpoints. Based on the music appreciation movement's attempts to reorder the relationships between composer, performer, listener, and musical object, I argue that the music appreciation movement should be thought of not just as a pedagogy, social movement, and ideology but as an artworld organizing aesthetic theory. Additionally, I outline how the music appreciation movement functioned as a type of social technology that worked alongside the machine technology of music reproduction to render self-performance optional rather than essential to full participation in the art music community.

In the second chapter, I describe how community music movement proponents measured the value of music based on its ability to serve the needs of the people and how this led to an increased focus on music's practical social impacts, a concerted push to ensure that "good" music reached everyone, and an interest in ensuring that the "good" music they promoted actually served people's aesthetic and expressive needs. While community music movement proponents were by and large progressive reformers, and generally shared what Campbell would call music reform goals, I argued that what distinguished community music movement proponents from other progressive reformers was that they saw "socialized music" as the best way to advance their own, primarily musical-aesthetic aims. I contend that like the music appreciation movement, the community music movement was not just a social movement, and pedagogy but rather an art-world organizing aesthetic theory. I argue that community music movement proponents reorganized the relationship between listener, performer, and composer in order to suit the movement's aesthetic goals and I describe the

idealized musical-aesthetic experience that community music movement proponents promoted as an emotional and spiritual experience that involved an awareness of the beauty to be found both directly in the music and in the gathering together of a body of people in unified artistic effort and expression.

In the final chapter of this thesis, I compare the two movements and how their proponents interacted with each other. I argue that the lack of open debate between their proponents was due to a combination of the community music movement's propensity for syncretism, and the belief of many music appreciation movement proponents that performance-based popularization efforts were inherently limited, and thus posed no challenge to the spread of their movement. I end this thesis by re-examining Campbell's music reform framework and offering the cause of "good" music as an alternative lens for understanding the relationship between the two movements.

# Chapter 1

## The Music Appreciation Movement: Making Listening an “Active” Occupation

In the first half of the twentieth century, music appreciation was understood to refer to the intended outcome of all amateur musical activity, a newly developed pedagogical approach designed to train listeners rather than performers and the name of a powerful progressive movement seeking to use this pedagogy to advance a program of rapid social, educational, and artistic change. While music appreciation continues to be taught today, and, pedagogically and ideologically speaking, a great deal of music appreciation material remains true to its early twentieth-century roots, music appreciation’s role within society has shifted.<sup>66</sup> No longer part of a progressive social movement, music appreciation persists as a legacy academic and cultural institution as well as a consumer product that is popularly perceived as high-value (or at least high-brow), authoritative, and uncontroversial, but which many musicologists recognize as conserving a narrow version of the art music tradition, and which those who identify as progressive educators today often critique for its continued maintenance of cultural, racial, and gender hierarchies.<sup>67</sup>

The perception of music appreciation as an established cultural force or common-sense cultural institution seems to have been pervasive enough in the 2000’s to have impacted

---

<sup>66</sup> Chybowski, “Developing American Taste,” 1–2, 243, 252–53; Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 1.

<sup>67</sup> Rebecca M. Rinsema, “De-Sacralizing the European: Music Appreciation (Then) and Music Listening (Now),” *Music Education Research* 20, no. 4 (September 2018): 484–85, <https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2018.1433146>. Rinsema explains that although explicit references to the “stylistic hierarchy” were replaced by a focus on the “engagement hierarchy of music listening” in music appreciation books of the 60’s and 70’s, the sacralization of art music listening practices continues to surreptitiously maintain the stylistic hierarchy. As will be seen later in this thesis, I argue that teaching a specific form of engagement was actually a central aim of the music appreciation movement from the beginning, and that the community music movement represented a contemporaneous art music alternative to this form of engagement.

scholarly awareness that early twentieth-century music appreciation efforts had actually been part of a self-described social movement. For instance, in Gavin James Campbell's, "A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear': Music and Social Reform in America, 1900-1925," Campbell omits even a passing reference to music appreciation as a named movement, opting to retrospectively amalgamate activities that took place under the banners of the music appreciation movement, community music movement, and other groups into one broad "music reform" movement.<sup>68</sup> Furthermore, when Julia Chybowski discusses music appreciation as a social movement and ideology in her dissertation, "Developing American Taste: A Cultural History of the Early Twentieth-Century Music Appreciation Movement," the fact that "similar tropes and discourses" bound music appreciation proponents "together in common cause" is presented as a new discovery that allows scholars to view music appreciation proponents as part of a movement with "grander ambitions" than just the pedagogical.<sup>69</sup>

To claim that early twentieth-century music appreciation proponents were merely bound together by "similar tropes and discourses" is to drastically understate both the cohesiveness of the movement and the intentionality of its construction. While music appreciation's mass popularity and profitability did attract some music appreciation teachers with little interest in the movement's broader aims, many more music appreciation proponents were consciously engaged with music appreciation as an organized social movement. Leading music appreciation proponents proudly proclaimed the rise of the music appreciation

---

<sup>68</sup> Campbell, "A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear." 260.

<sup>69</sup> Chybowski, "Developing American Taste," 4-5, 27. "To view music appreciation as ideology is to understand it not only as a cultural movement and a sacralization process, but also a set of beliefs and discursive patterns that have become ingrained in American culture as 'common sense.'"



movement in the most prominent publications of the day and wrote extensively about their movement's pedagogical, social, artistic, and political goals. Indeed, music appreciation proponents were so successful at defining and promoting their movement that, even outside of art music circles, music appreciation was widely recognized as a progressive movement addressing modern social concerns.<sup>70</sup> Furthermore, the fact that music appreciation movement proponents constructed their named movement in parallel with, and fully conscious of other organized music reform efforts, like the highly popular community music movement, suggests that music appreciation movement proponents saw their movement as offering something distinct from these other efforts.<sup>71</sup> Far from being a loose collection of tropes and discourses, the early twentieth-century music appreciation movement was a well-defined and deliberate attempt to realize a project of reform that was both aligned with, and distinct from the broader music reform movement. That many today see music appreciation as a timeless, common-sense part of the art music tradition rather than an emerging model of participation that must be justified and defended is a testament to the movement's overwhelming success at establishing its listener-centered approach as not just a permissible way to participate in the art music tradition, but a respectable, stand-alone pathway for becoming a full-fledged member of the art music community.

---

<sup>70</sup> Yocum, "Appreciation of Music, Literature and Art," 4, 8, 12. "The social movement is furthering democracy in culture."; Harold Saxe Tuttle, "Appreciation as a Test of Social Progress," *The Journal of Educational Sociology* 4, no. 3 (1930): 141–42, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2961117>; Agnes Moore Fryberger, "Music Appreciation as Related to the Curriculum," *The Journal of Education* 93, no. 25 (2335) (1921): 699–700, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42830977>.

<sup>71</sup> Karl Gehrkins and Peter W. Dykema, "Three Forthcoming Discussions. Things for You to Think over and to Do," *Music Supervisors' Bulletin* 1, no. 4 (1915): 18–20, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3382214>. Community music and music appreciation both in their general sense and as specific movements and pedagogies were a topic of discussion amongst music supervisors for several decades, often being included on the same conference program.

In this chapter, I seek to identify what early twentieth-century music appreciation movement proponents understood to be their unique or distinctive project of reform within the context of the broader music reform movement. I begin by examining three contemporary accounts, or histories of the music appreciation movement: one written by Percy A. Scholes in 1935, and the others by J. Lawrence Erb and Edith M. Rhetts, in 1925 and 1921 respectively. I outline how these accounts describe the music appreciation movement as advocating for the deliberate, as opposed to incidental training of a body of “intelligent” and appreciative art music listeners through a process that involved listening to musical examples drawn from masterpieces and short verbal explanations instead of engaging in self-performance and other forms of technical study. I show how music appreciation movement proponents like Scholes, Erb and Rhetts articulated a new understanding of listening as an autonomous form of art music participation and how they presented the music appreciation movement as teaching the most essential or “real” part of the musical artform: the perception and enjoyment of the beauty to be found in the music itself. I describe how the music appreciation movement’s deliberate and direct training of listeners transformed “intelligent” and appreciative listening from a skill and personal quality that could only be gained through traditional forms of study and participation in the art music community, into both the introductory and primary act of musical participation for the masses.

After examining these accounts of the music appreciation movement, I take a brief look at the appreciation idea itself, drawing on the work of contemporary historian of music education Edward Bailey Birge to explain how, in the first half of the twentieth century, appreciation had become the central thrust of music education in the United States. I explain

how the music appreciation movement turned the appreciation idea into a type of “social technology” that worked in tandem with the “machine technology” of music reproduction to reassert the idea of performers as inconspicuous servants, rather than a body of middle-class peers creating and sharing the best musical-aesthetic experience available.<sup>72</sup> I then return to Scholes to examine his redrafting of the Lausanne Resolution on music appreciation and discuss how the core tenants of the music appreciation movement differed from the legacy beliefs of the musical and educational establishments at the time and how the concept of the “active” listener, as detailed by Scholes and others, neatly encapsulated the ideology of the movement. I describe how the “active” listener participated in the art music community by listening to the right music in the right way, rather than by engaging in more traditional forms of participation like self-performance. I argue that the music appreciation movement’s creation, legitimization, and promotion of the non-performing “active” art music listener, or contributive art music consumer, was both a means of reorganizing power within the art music tradition along lines beneficial to the movement’s continued expansion and the ultimate goal of the movement itself. Outlining the centrality of the “active” listener to the movement, I describe how music appreciation movement proponents like Scholes valued the artistic contributions of “intelligent” and appreciative listeners more than the “middleman” performer, because it was the skilled

---

<sup>72</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 152; Jon Frederickson, “Technology and Music Performance in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 20, no. 2 (1989): 193–220, <https://doi.org/10.2307/836729>.

listener that received or consummated the musical message created by composers, and that made the music truly come alive.<sup>73</sup>

Of note before I begin is the fact that I make no significant distinction in this chapter between music appreciation's function in the elementary, secondary, and post-secondary classroom and music appreciation's function as adult continuing education, or edutainment. The music appreciation movement proponents that I am examining all saw music appreciation efforts as working towards the same social and artistic transformations and fulfilling the same duty to the public good. I have chosen to follow their lead in blurring the lines between the schoolhouse, the concert hall, and the home.

### Percy A. Scholes, "Music Appreciation: Its History and Technics"

The most expansive early twentieth-century account of music appreciation as a self-described movement comes from Percy A. Scholes' 1935 *Music Appreciation: Its History and Technics*. In *Music Appreciation*, Scholes outlines a history of "the movement for the Training of Listeners called the Musical Appreciation Movement," that offers a vigorous and systematic defense of this movement against its detractors and provides a detailed how-to-guide and philosophy of practice for new teachers.<sup>74</sup> According to Scholes, the music appreciation movement had existed for more than a quarter of century on both sides of the Atlantic by the date of his writing. Scholes noted with disappointment however, that British conservatism had

---

<sup>73</sup> Percy A. Scholes, *Music Appreciation: Its History and Technics*, ed. Will Earhart (New York: M. Witmark & Sons, 1935), 143–48, <http://archive.org/details/musicappreciatio0000unse>. Published as *The Child and the Masterpiece* in the United Kingdom.

<sup>74</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 24.

led to a less rapid embrace of the music appreciation idea by musicians and educators in his nation than in the United States and that much of *Music Appreciation* was devoted to the task of convincing a resistant British art music establishment to adopt more of an American approach to the teaching of musical appreciation.<sup>75</sup> Although Scholes was a British expatriate living in Switzerland, his extensive knowledge of, and correspondence with, leading music appreciation figures in the United States and the enthusiastic reception of *Music Appreciation* by American readers ensured Scholes' place as an important contributor to music appreciation discourse in the United States.<sup>76</sup> Scholes' gift was an encyclopedic mind, and *Music Appreciation* is an impressive synthesis of decades of American and international music appreciation discourse that provides a unique window into how music appreciation movement proponents conceptualized their movement.<sup>77</sup>

While Scholes' proto history of the music appreciation movement or music appreciation "idea" begins in the 1700's, with annotated concert programs, Scholes traces the modern roots of the music appreciation movement to the American W.S.B. Matthews' 1888 *How to Understand Music*—a claim supported by the equally pioneering American music appreciation proponent Francis E. Clark, as well as the respected historian of American music education,

---

<sup>75</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 23. While the British musical establishment may have been slow to embrace the music appreciation movement, it was a topic that received prolonged public debate in prominent British music periodicals like *The Musical Times*. References to a music appreciation movement in *The Musical Times* can be found as early as 1912.; H. V. Spanner, "'Why This Sneer?,'" *The Musical Times* 72, no. 1062 (1931): 736–736, <https://doi.org/10.2307/916172>; "The Musician's Bookshelf," *The Musical Times* 63, no. 955 (1922): 632–39, <https://doi.org/10.2307/912223>; "England as a Musical Country," *The Musical Times* 53, no. 836 (1912): 658–59, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/906792>.

<sup>76</sup> Bennett, "The Anxiety of Appreciation," 18–19. Bennet and Chybowski both reference Scholes in their accounts of music appreciation in the United States.

<sup>77</sup> "Scholes, Percy A(Lfred)," Grove Music Online, accessed November 16, 2023, <https://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/grovemusic/display/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000025033>. Scholes published the *Oxford Companion to Music* in 1938.

Edward Bailey Birge.<sup>78</sup> According to Clark and Scholes, what made *How to Understand Music* the first example of modern music appreciation was Matthews' discovery that "music should be heard" and his desire to "lead the student to a consciousness of music as MUSIC, and not merely playing, singing or theory."<sup>79</sup> Though they noted that, unlike later music appreciation works, *How to Understand Music* was designed with the "mature and serious" piano pupil rather than a general (non-performing) audience in mind, Clark and Scholes still recognized Matthews' use of musical examples drawn from "master-works" to teach "the art of hearing and following coherent musical discourse" and "a consciousness of the inherent relation between music and feeling" as an early attempt at liberating music from the "aristocratic" bonds of technical study and performance and into the new domain of listening or appreciative study.<sup>80</sup>

In the preface to *How to Understand Music* cited by Clark and Scholes, W.S.B. Matthews expresses a number of concepts that would become standard components of the music appreciation movement going forward. Matthews' idea that proper listening involved both an intellectual following and an emotional feeling of the musical message was a concept that music appreciation movement proponents would make one of the central pillars of their movement, though as the movement developed, this idea would come to be expressed first as "intelligent" and appreciative listening and then as "active" listening. Another theme of *How to Understand Music* that later music appreciation movement proponents would consistently echo was the idea that music appreciation taught "music as MUSIC," or in other words, that music

---

<sup>78</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 4, 10–12, 17–18, 26; Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 210.

<sup>79</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 11.

<sup>80</sup> W. S. B. (William Smythe Babcock) Mathews, *How to Understand Music*, 5th ed. (Philadelphia: Theodore Presser, 1888), 5–6, <http://archive.org/details/howtounderstandm01mathuoft>; Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 10–11, 69.

appreciation had condensed the study of music down to the “real” thing: listening to the music itself.<sup>81</sup> While critics would come to accuse music appreciationists of teaching only the surface features of the art form, the music appreciation movement proponents that I discuss in this chapter countered these criticisms by arguing that it was actually technical and performance-based music lessons that taught superficialities and restricted students to a narrow understanding of music.<sup>82</sup>

The way Matthews paired the development of “musical feeling” and an understanding of “music as Music” with the cultivation of discriminatory taste would also become a standard feature of music appreciation movement discourse. Matthews states that he uses art music masterpieces in *How to Understand Music* both because he wants to cultivate his students’ taste by introducing them to the “best parts of musical literature” and because these masterpieces provided the “only complete and authoritative illustrations” of the relationship between “music and feeling.”<sup>83</sup> What is important to note here is that discriminatory taste and aesthetic perception were taught simultaneously not just because it was efficient and desirable to do so, but because the two aims were understood to be mutually contingent. Developing a true taste for masterpieces required the ability to “fully” experience and love them and

---

<sup>81</sup> Frances Elliott Clark, “Music Appreciation: Leaven or Garnish,” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 14, no. 2 (1927): 31, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3382714>; Percy A. Scholes, *Musical Appreciation in Schools* (Oxford University Press, 1953), 10–11, <http://archive.org/details/musicalappreciat0000perc>.

<sup>82</sup> Virgil Thomson, *The State of Music* (New York: William Morrow, 1939), 121–31, <http://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.86852>; Scholes, *Musical Appreciation*, 149; Edith M. Rhettts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America,” in *Papers and Proceedings of the Music Teachers’ National Association*, ed. Karl W. Gherkens, Studies in Musical Education History and Aesthetics Sixteenth Series (Forty-Third Annual Meeting, Detroit: Music Teachers’ National Association, 1922), 114, <http://archive.org/details/volumeproceedin00assogoog>. Music appreciation, according to Thomson, “transmits no firm knowledge and describes no real practice.”

<sup>83</sup> Matthews, *How to Understand Music*, 5.

developing the expert aesthetic perception needed to experience the greatest musical enjoyment possible required a hearty desire to seek out the depth and challenge of art music masterpieces for practice.<sup>84</sup>

What Matthews' *How to Understand Music* reveals is that in even the earliest accepted music appreciation text, music appreciation was presented as having dual aims: the teaching of discriminatory taste, and the establishment of a universal belief in the practice of "intelligent," and appreciative listening as the best way to interact with the "music itself." While Chybowsky's scholarship on the music appreciation movement focuses exclusively on the former goal, presenting the "unified purpose" of the movement as the maintenance of "musical-cultural hierarchy" and the continued sacralization of a canon of historical European art music masterpieces through the teaching of discriminatory taste, in this chapter I focus on the latter: describing the music appreciation movement as a project that worked to reform, or redefine the role of the listener in the art music community.<sup>85</sup> Taking this approach serves to counterbalance Chybowsky's accurate, though lopsided analysis, and provides a better foundation for my comparative analysis of the music appreciation and community music movements in the final chapter of this thesis.

The campaign to transform popular and professional beliefs about listening was the far more unique and revolutionary of the music appreciation movement's two projects. All lovers of serious music in the United States, and especially those involved in music reform efforts, had a

---

<sup>84</sup> Vancour, "Popularizing the Classics: Radio's Role in the American Music Appreciation Movement, 1922—34," 291. Vancour discusses the relationship between new modes of aesthetic engagement privileging a "close listening" and canon formation.

<sup>85</sup> Chybowsky, "Developing American Taste," 24, 231.



shared interest in maintaining the musical-cultural supremacy of art music by conditioning the tastes of their fellow Americans.<sup>86</sup> What set music appreciation movement proponents apart from their peers was their insistence that this aim could be accomplished by listening lessons alone—a stance that stood in stark contrast to that of the other major named music reform movement, the community music movement, whose proponents preached the necessity of participatory, or “active” music making.<sup>87</sup>

Unlike later music appreciation books, that were designed to be used with the player-piano, records, or the radio, *How to Understand Music* was published before the widespread adoption of music reproduction technology. Matthews’ expectation was that the musical examples printed in *How to Understand Music* would be “played or sung to the pupils” and, in the event that these examples proved too difficult, Matthews writes that “it is safe to conclude that if there is no one to play any part of them, there will be no one to understand them, and the lesson may be postponed.”<sup>88</sup> Even though *How to Understand Music* represented a viable prototype for the development of “intelligent” and appreciative listening without a pupil having to personally engage in music making, in this earliest example of music appreciation, it is clear that expert “listener-knowledge” was still intimately bound to expert “performer-knowledge” in the mind of its author.<sup>89</sup> It would take the tumultuous technological transformations of the turn

---

<sup>86</sup> Yerichuk, “Discursive Formations of Community Music and the Production of Canadian Citizens in Toronto’s Settlement Movement, 1900s-1930s,” 24–25; Campbell, “A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear,” 266.

<sup>87</sup> Arthur Farwell, “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America,” in *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist and Other Essays on American Music*, ed. Thomas Stoner (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1995), 209–10, <http://archive.org/details/wanderjahreofrev0000farw> First appeared in *Musical America* 14, (October 14, 1911), 137-38; “The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution,” *The Musical Quarterly* 13, no. 1 (1927): 98, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738558>; Thomas Tapper, *The Education of the Music Teacher* (Philadelphia, Theodore Presser co., 1914), 111–12, 181–82, <http://archive.org/details/educationofmusic00tappri>.

<sup>88</sup> Mathews, *How to Understand Music*, 6.

<sup>89</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 7. I borrow Scholes’ phraseology here.

of the twentieth century and the multi-generational efforts of music appreciation movement proponents like Clark, Rhett, Erb and Scholes to bring about a world in which expert listening could be spoken of as an artistic endeavor completely autonomous from self-performance.

In light of the centrality of music reproduction technology to the early twentieth-century music appreciation movement, it is revealing to note that Scholes expressed a wish that the music appreciation “campaign” had begun in earnest twenty years earlier than it did, thereby allowing the movement to have set up a more “effective defense against . . . the competing interests” of modern life.<sup>90</sup> While music reproduction technology was indispensable to the music appreciation movement, available sources show that music appreciation movement proponents like Scholes understood the creation of non-performing “intelligent” and appreciative listeners as something that was at least conceptually if not pragmatically possible, and desirable in the pre-recording technology era.

Returning to a close reading of *Music Appreciation: its History and Technics*, Scholes opens his defense of the music appreciation movement by proclaiming that in the case of music appreciation it is “the former state of things, not the present attempt to change them that should first be questioned.”<sup>91</sup> According to Scholes, while the musical artform had progressed over centuries from what a single human voice can produce to the complex notational, tonal, and social inter-weavings of the modern orchestra being heard everywhere via records and broadcasting, music education had remained stagnant: restricting “potential future music-lovers” to a familiarity with the single line they could sing with their own voice, or to the single

---

<sup>90</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 91–92.

<sup>91</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 37–38.

tone colour of the piano or another instrument.<sup>92</sup> Because technological progress had now made it possible for anyone to listen to orchestral music anywhere, Scholes writes that schools should focus less on the teaching of self-performance and more on preparing students for the modern “demands of after-school life” by teaching “the most widespread musical activity of all, that of the Listener.”<sup>93</sup>

By constructing a narrative in which the pinnacle of musical progress (listening to a modern professional orchestra in a concert hall or on the radio) was as far removed from amateur self-performance as possible, Scholes’ worked to undermine what he identified as two commonly held beliefs standing in direct opposition to the development of a proper understanding of the role of the art music listener. The first belief was that only self-performance represented true musical life. The second was that it was impossible to understand and appreciate music without first learning how to make it for oneself.<sup>94</sup> To the first point, Scholes simply argues that music was composed not for the singer or player, but for the listener. To the second point, Scholes states that, in his experience, many radio listeners, even without the benefit of a class in music appreciation, had become, through repeated listening, “more genuinely musical, than many a professional pianist, violinist, or vocalist.”<sup>95</sup> What is more, Scholes points out that mere technical proficiency with an instrument is no guarantee that one has sufficiently developed both a love of music and the ability to listen, since piano pupils and piano virtuosi alike daily demonstrate “how much playing is possible with how little listening.”<sup>96</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 37–38.

<sup>93</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 37-38.

<sup>94</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 143–45.

<sup>95</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 145, 149, 151–52.

<sup>96</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 145, 149, 151–53.

Though Scholes insists that he harbored no secret desire to eliminate lessons in self-performance, and that music appreciationists like him believed the ideal position of any human towards the musical artform was the dual position of performer and listener, Scholes' rhetoric in *Music Appreciation* makes it clear that he thought that the value of performance had become inflated.<sup>97</sup> Scholes believed that listening was—if not always, certainly in the modern era—the more essential of the two musical activities since the availability of high quality recordings had eliminated the need to humor “bad” performers in order to hear “good” music.<sup>98</sup> According to Scholes, performers needed to be put back in their place, and reminded that at the time the great classics were composed, they were the servants of composers “writing for the ‘passive’ enjoyment of princes and their courts” and not for the “‘active’ enjoyment of performers.”<sup>99</sup> Even when it came to the education of the listener, Scholes states that music professionals trained in the old performance based system, though desirable, were not indispensable and that lessons in attentive, “intelligent,” and appreciative listening could be taught equally well, if not occasionally better, by enthusiastic school staff using phonographs.<sup>100</sup> Gone indeed were the days of *How to Understand Music* when, if there was no one to perform the music, one could assume that there was also no one to understand and enjoy it.

---

<sup>97</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 74, 91, 145, 151–52.

<sup>98</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 91, 145, 151–52.

<sup>99</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 153. Passive and active are in quotes here because Scholes is mocking critics who view all listening as passive and non-contributive to musical life and all music making as active and contributive to musical life. Scholes argues that the solution to passive listening is not active performance, but active listening.

<sup>100</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 142–53, 247, 367–368, Will Earhart, American Editor's Preface. X.

## J. Lawrence Erb: “Musical Appreciation”

Scholes was not the only music appreciation movement proponent to expressly identify music appreciation as a social movement, outline the history of its development, and detail its project of reform. In 1925, four-time former Music Teachers’ National Association president, J. Lawrence Erb, wrote an article titled “Musical Appreciation” in the premier American music periodical, *The Musical Quarterly*, about the exciting “movement for the teaching . . . of musical appreciation,” that taught an “intelligent understanding of the music” as well as “the cultivation of an ever-developing taste for the best.”<sup>101</sup> In addition to cultivating “intelligent” and appreciative listening and taste, Erb suggests that the music appreciation movement might aid the popularization of “good” music and the advancement of musical nationalism and bring about cultural uplift. According to Erb, the music appreciation movement had the potential to make the United States a “nation of music-lovers” and produce the “Great American Composer.”<sup>102</sup> Even if the movement never succeeded in these tasks, Erb reassured his reader, there was still no “project more stimulating to the ambitious musician than that of contributing to the general musical uplift of our people.”<sup>103</sup>

Erb, like the vast majority of music appreciation proponents, was also to use Campbell’s terminology, a music reformer, and the above statement shows Erb drawing upon the ideological touchstones of music reform to promote and justify the music appreciation movement. Though the cause of popularizing “good” music, musical nationalism, and cultural and social uplift all figure prominently in music appreciation movement discourse as the

---

<sup>101</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 6–7.

<sup>102</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 7.

<sup>103</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 7.

intended results of music appreciation efforts, I cover these ideas as minimally as possible in this chapter.<sup>104</sup> This is both because Chybowski, and Bennet have already written extensively about the music appreciation movement's involvement with these goals, and because I locate the cause of popularizing "good" music, and the desire to bring about musical Americanism, and cultural and social uplift as the shared aims of the wider movement for music reform rather than the defining characteristics of the music appreciation movement itself.<sup>105</sup> While the purpose of this first chapter is to identify the music appreciation movement's unique project of reform, and the purpose of the second chapter is to do the same for the community music movement, the third and final chapter of this thesis will offer a comparative analysis of both of these named movements that contextualizes them within the broader push for music reform.

One thing that Erb does in "Musical Appreciation" that many music appreciation movement proponents failed to do was disambiguate between the old, broad understanding of musical appreciation, and the new, specific definition of the term. Erb writes that all study, performance, and hearing of music are "intended to lead to its proper appreciation; and that. . . such recognition as music has enjoyed has come almost exclusively in the past through these means," while today, music appreciation often refers to the "deliberate study *about* music,

---

<sup>104</sup> Douglas Sloan, "Cultural Uplift and Social Reform in Nineteenth-Century Urban America," *History of Education Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (1979): 361, 363, 366, <https://doi.org/10.2307/367651>. Cultural uplift is faith in moral, and educational persuasion for social ends. It is purifying, restraining and transformative. In contrast, I would describe the cause of "good" music as musical evangelism that primarily serves as a form of musicking, or inclusion granting participation.

<sup>105</sup> Chybowski, "Developing American Taste," 229, 234–35, 243. Chybowski argues that most music appreciation authors were unable to fully embrace musical Americanism, and the popularization of "good" music because of their competing commitment to the process of sacralization and canonization of historical European art music. Chybowski describes the "unified purpose of music appreciation to be the maintenance of cultural hierarchy by defining musical types through social stratification." While all music reformers engaged in the sacralization of European art music to some extent, overall, community music movement proponents were far more interested in musical Americanism than their music appreciation movement counterparts.

through the spoken word, and the musical illustration. . . without any definite demands upon the student in line of performance.”<sup>106</sup> While music appreciation was still understood to be the intended outcome of the traditional forms of art music participation, it could now also refer to the name of a pedagogy that offered a way to bypass what many middle-class lovers of serious music had come to consider the heart of all art music participation: self-performance.<sup>107</sup> Rather than replacing the old meaning of the word completely, the new meaning of music appreciation blended with the old in music appreciation discourse, helping to create an inflated sense of the movement’s age and widespread acceptance and generating a layer of ambiguity and historical forgetting that softened the revolutionary bite of the movement’s push to make “active” listening a legitimate, stand-alone form of art music participation.

Adding more layers of meaning to an already ambiguous term, the music appreciation movement proponents that I examine in this chapter used “appreciation” in a number of other specific ways as well. Most commonly used as a simple synonym for enjoying, liking, and loving art music, the appreciation of music was also used to refer to musical perception or “sensitivity,” since music appreciation movement proponents believed that the enjoyment of art music depended entirely on one’s ability to properly perceive or receive it.<sup>108</sup> Appreciation was also used in a more limited perceptual sense to refer to the “feeling” portion of the balanced intellectual and emotional listening experience that music appreciation proponents promoted. When used in this way, music appreciation proponents typically paired the phrase “‘intelligent’

---

<sup>106</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 1.

<sup>107</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 1.

<sup>108</sup> Arthur Hinton, “The Gift of Musical Appreciation,” *The Musical Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (1915): 560, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738065>.

and appreciative listening” with a separate reference to the cultivation of discriminatory taste to delineate that the development of taste, though connected to “intelligent” and “appreciative” musical perception, was distinct from it.<sup>109</sup> Such disambiguation was necessary both because music appreciation movement proponents frequently used phrases like “an appreciation for the best” or “true appreciation” in a casual and imprecise manner to talk about discriminatory musical taste and because musical appreciation, as used in its oldest and broadest sense as the goal of all art music participation or cultivation, was a term that contained strong elements of discriminatory taste within it.<sup>110</sup>

While having “good” taste merely required the ability to discern (by observing either social or musical cues) what was considered good quality music (classical) from what was considered low quality music (popular) and the ability to display a convincing preference for the former over the latter, the appreciation of music was more involved.<sup>111</sup> Musical appreciation described an interaction with the musical artwork where its proper recognition and valuation stemmed from a musical-aesthetic experience or perceptual response commensurate with the work’s (assigned) quality. The proper appreciation or *recognition, valuation and experiencing of* music was then meant to generate a practical or contributive response that went beyond the display of musical preference and into the realm of pursuit, duty, and devotion.<sup>112</sup> To fully

---

<sup>109</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 15–16, 199. Scholes believed that only “intelligent,” and appreciative listening, not taste, could be taught directly.

<sup>110</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 6.

<sup>111</sup> Chybowski, “Developing American Taste,” 230.

<sup>112</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 32–34, 148–51; Edward Bailey Birge et al., “What Is “Music Appreciation?: A Symposium,” *Music Educators Journal* 22, no. 4 (1936): 15–17, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3384673>. See Scholes for a discussion of the ambiguity of the term, and some alternatives. The second Scholes passage is an example of the contributive response musical appreciation was supposed to generate. See Birge et al. for a more comprehensive disambiguation of the term music appreciation.



appreciate art music was to respond appropriately to its stimulus by becoming a devoted lover of “serious” music.<sup>113</sup> What I argue throughout this chapter is that the defining project of the music appreciation movement was to transform listening from a way of experiencing music, into a legitimate stand-alone “act” of art music participation or devotion.

After disambiguating terms, Erb’s article continues with a condensed history of music appreciation, wherein he presents the music appreciation movement as both the most recent entry in a long tradition of attempts to popularize “good” music and as a measured and pragmatic response to modern conditions. Erb states that the beginnings of popularization efforts lie in “the dim past” and that although much energy and money had been “expended in the cause of good music . . . only a very small proportion of the population of this country has shown more than the slightest interest in music of the better type.”<sup>114</sup> According to Erb, modern developments like improved wealth, physical comfort, communication (transportation), and the rise of mechanical music had recently transformed the musical ambivalence of the United States into a “[general] interest in music which has stimulated musicians and educators to devise means of making this interest intelligent and *appreciative*, to the end that it might contribute to the upbuilding of all serious musical enterprises, and that it might add something worth-while to the culture of those exposed to its influence.”<sup>115</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 148–51; Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini*, 121. “An occasion when music lovers in all walks of life assembled to hear Mr. Toscanini’s interpretations and do homage with him to the genius of Beethoven.”

<sup>114</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 1; Sloan, “Cultural Uplift and Social Reform,” 366; Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 151; Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini*, 27–28. Popularization could take the form of cultural uplift projects by mid nineteenth century philanthropists like Sloan details, or promoters of the cause of “good” music like Theodore Thomas and the German choral societies.

<sup>115</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 2.

Although Erb presents the music appreciation movement as rooted in what he identifies as the traditional impulse to popularize “serious” music and make a responsible contribution to the development of the artform, he also describes music appreciationists as willing to pursue new methods and consolidate the study of music down to its essentials in order to meet the changing needs of the masses. According to Erb the “conscious and deliberate study of Musical Appreciation” evolved from university level classes of “no particular interest to the general public” into a “new manner of approach” designed for the masses, where “form became secondary; substance was primary” and “a wide variety of music, not nearly all of it ‘classical’” was out of necessity promoted.<sup>116</sup> Though the use of non-classical music was not as prominent a part of music appreciation teaching as Erb implies, his account is an accurate portrayal of how music appreciation movement proponents typically outlined their priorities. The teaching of form and even discriminatory taste was secondary to the teaching of the perception of musical beauty, or the “meaning and message” of the aural product itself, because it was the enjoyment or experiencing of beauty that music appreciation movement proponents believed would lead to the popularization of art music.<sup>117</sup>

Erb describes the traditional approach to art music participation as involving musical performance, technical knowledge, high standards, and discipline. Ignoring the existence of

---

<sup>116</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 2–3; Campbell, “A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear,” 266.

<sup>117</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 3, 5; Chybowski, “Developing American Taste,” 229. While many music appreciation movement proponents spoke about music appreciation in much the same way as Erb, how music appreciation was promoted and how it was practiced often differed. In extant music appreciation material, discrimination between “high” and “low” or “classical” and “popular” music, biographical information about composers, descriptions of the instruments of the orchestra, and even the teaching of form, were often prioritized over attempts at teaching aesthetic perception. Chybowski’s description of the “unified purpose” of music appreciation as being “the maintenance of cultural hierarchy by defining musical types through social stratification,” is an accurate description of practice, just not of how music appreciation proponents thought of their movement.

amateur self-performance completely, Erb names the traditional approach the “professional viewpoint,” and contrasts it with the potential of the music appreciation movement to popularize art music. According to Erb, any attempts in this day and age to use “the methods and standards of the professional musician” to “bring about a general appreciation of music” were all “doomed to failure, since the professional viewpoint” had been the only one present during the many generations when serious music had “failed to fulfill its mission as a democratic art.”<sup>118</sup> Clarifying this statement, Erb writes that it was not professionalism *per se* which had “killed popular interest in [serious] music” but rather “the *disciplinary* features, so necessary for the attainment of professional standards.” In contrast to the professional approach, Erb argued that the music appreciation movement was perfectly suited to the popularization of art music, because popular appreciation was based not on “performing ability but upon the ability to *enjoy*.” According to Erb, if the “musical appreciation enthusiasts” had their way, they would simply ensure that the masses learned to “enjoy intelligently.”<sup>119</sup>

The “intelligent” and “appreciative” listening that music appreciation proponents like Erb sought was a musical-aesthetic experience dependent on a balanced blend of knowledge, intellect, and emotion. While all three elements were important, in Erb’s view, it was the latter that took precedence. Erb writes that as useful as a “rudimentary knowledge of theory and form” was in clarifying the meaning of music, if one had to choose, it was better to have “no technical knowledge” but an “abiding love and enthusiasm for the music itself, than an intellectual concept from which beauty has fled.”<sup>120</sup> Again we see that it is neither the teaching

---

<sup>118</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 3–4.

<sup>119</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 4.

<sup>120</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 7.

of form, nor taste, but teaching people to perceive and feel the beauty in the “music itself” that Erb presents as the most critical task of the music appreciation movement.

According to Erb, the key factor in developing “intelligent” appreciation was the repeated hearing of first-class performances of carefully selected works prefaced by information that clarified the meaning of the music and that stimulated the listener’s interest.<sup>121</sup> Though short explanations and anecdotes were helpful, “*talking about music*” could not “take the place of hearing it.”<sup>122</sup> Erb describes repeated educational performances by the highest-class of musician as not a realistic prospect even for the fabulously wealthy: making the phonograph and the player-piano essential tools for developing intelligent appreciation.<sup>123</sup> From the way Erb describes the necessity of repeated listening for proper appreciation and the impossibility of repeated listening without music reproduction technology, one is certainly left wondering if during all those years when serious music had “failed to fulfill its mission as a democratic art” it had even fulfilled its promise as an aristocratic one.<sup>124</sup> What Erb does not discuss as an option for repeated hearing in *Musical Appreciation* is amateur or self-performance. Though he lists the “*disciplinary features*” necessary to achieve professional performance standards as hindering the popular appreciation of music, in his account of the music appreciation movement the idea of relaxing performance standards in an attempt to popularize serious music through amateur performance is not entertained. The music appreciation movement that Erb describes may have been willing to choose “substance” over theory, and even bend canonic

---

<sup>121</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 6.

<sup>122</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 5.

<sup>123</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 5–6.

<sup>124</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 3–4.

standards to teach “intelligent” appreciation, but repeated listening to the “best” performances available was considered essential to developing a true appreciation of music.<sup>125</sup>

### Edith M. Rhetts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America”

Another account of the music appreciation movement’s history and aims comes from Edith M. Rhetts 1921 Music Teacher’s National Association Convention address entitled, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America.” Explaining the origins of the music appreciation movement, Rhetts states that it had commonly been believed that it was necessary to practice singing or playing music in order to enjoy it properly.<sup>126</sup> According to Rhetts, this had led to the musical education of everyone but the talented to be neglected and those deemed unmusical had “been allowed to go through life with a beautiful room in [themselves] entirely closed.”<sup>127</sup> Recently, however, it had been discovered that “people can be taught to appreciate music by the direct process of listening to it” and music appreciation classes had been created to help people develop the “capacity to perceive and to intelligently enjoy good music.”<sup>128</sup> Rhetts writes that along with the discovery that people could learn to appreciate (art) music by listening to it came the realization that “to limit a child's acquaintance to the music he himself can produce is cruelly to narrow his outlook” and that just as schools had a duty to teach not

---

<sup>125</sup> J. Lawrence Erb, “Music for a Better Community,” *The Musical Quarterly* 12, no. 3 (1926): 441, 446–47, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738249>. What is particularly noteworthy about Erb’s exclusion of amateur or self-performance from his account of the music appreciation movement is that he discusses the idea of de-professionalizing performance in an article on community music published a mere seventeen months later. Erb was almost certainly aware of community music ideas when he published “Musical Appreciation” and was simply conveying what he believed was an accurate portrayal of music appreciation movement beliefs.

<sup>126</sup> Rhetts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America,” 112.

<sup>127</sup> Rhetts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America,” 113.

<sup>128</sup> Rhetts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America,” 112–13.

just reading and writing, but English literature, they had a duty to teach (art) music literature.<sup>129</sup>

In Rhetts' assessment, school music teaching had failed to bring the child in "touch" with "masterpieces" and though instrumental practice, singing and occasional concert attendance were important and should not be neglected, they were insufficient for this task since a child needed to "hear the melodies of a master beautifully rendered" repeatedly in order to make them their own.<sup>130</sup> Thankfully, music reproduction technology and record company-sponsored music appreciation curricula had been developed just in time to meet these newly discovered needs, and now, according to Rhetts, music was being "released from the haunts of the few and spread over the country [United States] as never before until today we stand at the beginning of an entirely new epoch with regard to the possibilities of teaching music literature to the masses."<sup>131</sup>

Rhetts' account of the music appreciation movement contains many of the same themes as Scholes and Erb's later histories. Rhetts presents the defining feature of the music appreciation movement as the discovery that people could be taught how to have a "proper" or "full" musical-aesthetic experience without first having to learn to sing or play an instrument. Rhetts also goes to great lengths to present the music appreciation movement as not a threat to performance-based lessons, while simultaneously problematizing a reliance on self-performance as a universal entry point into the art music tradition. Rhetts is also enthusiastic about the use of music reproduction technology as a way to make music teaching more like the

---

<sup>129</sup> Rhetts, "The Development of Music Appreciation in America," 114.

<sup>130</sup> Rhetts, "The Development of Music Appreciation in America," 114–15.

<sup>131</sup> Rhetts, "The Development of Music Appreciation in America," 115.

teaching of English literature by enabling students to be repeatedly exposed to art music masterpieces beyond their own ability to perform and thereby gain an appreciation of them.

Though careful to avoid diminishing the role of the private music and voice teacher, and to assure teachers that the promotion of music appreciation was in their own best interests, Rhetts, like the other music appreciation movement proponents I have examined in this chapter, presented the music appreciation movement as teaching the most “permanent” or “real” part of the musical artform: the perception and enjoyment of beauty. In her 1921 address, Rhetts encouraged her audience of piano and vocal teachers to look beyond the “scaffolding” of performance technique to the “structure in all its beauty” which is music itself.<sup>132</sup> Elaborating on this idea further and enjoining music teachers in the United States to support the music appreciation movement, Rhetts states:

The extension of music appreciation in America has done and will do much for the music teachers and it needs your sympathy . . . After all, art is the most permanent thing in this changing material world. There are thousands of people in your vicinity who say, "I can't sing, and I want to sing; I can't paint, and I want to paint; I can't play, and I want to play; but above all things I know that I am a living soul, and I have a right to understand and to enjoy the beautiful." Whatever is beautiful, as God lives, is permanent.<sup>133</sup>

What is significant about this statement is that despite Rhetts' attempt to connect the music appreciation movement to the professional and social concerns of M.T.N.A. teachers by highlighting the great mass of people who cannot make art or music but wish to do so, it is not the knowledge and satisfaction of making music or art, but the understanding and enjoyment of the beautiful that Rhetts proclaims as a human right. At a conference where the President's

---

<sup>132</sup> Rhetts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America,” 112.

<sup>133</sup> Rhetts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America,” 120.

address warned against the trend, influenced by music reproduction technology and other modern developments, toward “letting others do for us, instead of doing for ourselves,” Rhetts presentation of the music appreciation movement provided a powerful rationale for treating appreciative listening not as a passive entertainment but as an essential form of “doing.”<sup>134</sup>

### Music Appreciation as an Educational and Musical-Aesthetic Aim

In promoting their movement, music appreciation advocates offered arguments for why anyone could learn to appreciate “good” music, how it was possible to develop musical appreciation through listening lessons rather than only through lessons in self-performance, how all of this could be done on a mass scale, and why music professionals had an artistic, democratic, and social duty to expand access to art music in this way. The idea of appreciation as the aim of music education, however, was rarely debated or defended in music appreciation discourse simply because it had already been established as a fundamental educational principle before the bulk of music appreciation movement discourse was written.

As the contemporary historian of music education Edward Bailey Birge chronicled in his 1937 *History of Public School Music in the United States*, between roughly 1895-1910, the child-study movement pioneered the idea of appreciation as the chief aim of music education, as well as education in general. Birge writes that the child study movement discovered “knowledge comes not by being poured in but by doing desirable things which are motivated by the child’s

---

<sup>134</sup> Music Teachers’ National Association, in *Papers and Proceedings of the Music Teachers’ National Association*, ed. Karl W. Gherkens, Studies in Musical Education History and Aesthetics Sixteenth Series (Forty-Third Annual Meeting, Detroit: Music Teachers’ National Association, 1922), 4, 13, <http://archive.org/details/volumeproceedin00assogoog>. The conference also had a standing committee on community music.



intrinsic interest.”<sup>135</sup> In the field of music education, this focus on the child’s interests motivated a push to reestablish enthusiastic and enjoyable song singing, rather than academically rigorous note reading classes as the basis of school music instruction.<sup>136</sup> According to Birge, while the goal of teaching note reading was to prepare the child to access future musical treasures, the child-study movement saw song singing as teaching every child to “appreciate and take pleasure in music, not in a vague and indefinite future, but here and now.”<sup>137</sup> Furthermore, Birge states that as music education continued to advance in “the direction of values more and more clearly musical,” educators came to understand both note reading and song singing as merely a means of achieving the “real aim—a joy in music as music—for which there seems no more fitting term than the general word appreciation.”<sup>138</sup> According to Birge, the music educator of the twentieth century, who could now employ any number of methods to teach musical appreciation including song singing, school bands, orchestras, and the listening lessons called music appreciation, was finally building their “teaching procedure upon purely musical foundations, upon that quality of music, namely, beauty of tone, which it shares with no other subject.”<sup>139</sup>

From Birge’s account we see that to uphold appreciation as the aim of art music education was to ensure that students had access to both the enjoyable educational experience that child-study movement proponents sought and the euphoric encounter with the musical

---

<sup>135</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 164; A. E. Winship, “Appreciation of Appreciation,” *Music Supervisors’ Bulletin* 1, no. 2 (1914): 16, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3382222>. “There is no appropriation without appreciation. Knowledge has no power until it is appreciated and appropriated.”

<sup>136</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 152, 160, 163–65, 209–14, 251–53.

<sup>137</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 163.

<sup>138</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 163–64.

<sup>139</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 164.

object that the lovers of serious music idealized.<sup>140</sup> For early twentieth-century lovers of serious music in the United States, appreciation was also a “musical” value in another sense. An evangelistic drive to convert the uninterested and those who only expressed an interest in art music when it was accompanied by ballyhoo to a passionate and sincere love of serious music had long been a fixture of the art music tradition in the United States.<sup>141</sup> In fact, devotion to the cause of popularizing “good” music through tactful exposure and instruction was arguably as much a signifier that someone was a lover of serious music as their ability to display a taste for the “best.”<sup>142</sup> To make appreciation the aim of art music education, then, was for many art music lovers simply a continuation of the long term trend of centering art music “evangelism” and the musical-aesthetic “conversion” experience as essential components of the art music tradition in the United States.

With appreciation as their aim, music educators became untethered from, in Erb’s words, the “sacred formulae” that had guided their profession and became free to experiment with new methods.<sup>143</sup> As they sought to leave behind unproductive forms of teaching and advance their practice along “values more and more clearly musical,” music educators used the lens of appreciation to question what constituted the most essential elements of the musical art and what was merely a means to an end.<sup>144</sup> While their exploration of the essence of music was

---

<sup>140</sup> Hinton, “The Gift of Musical Appreciation,” 566–67. The ideal musical experience was a “passionate intellectuality,” but it was better to feel too much than nothing at all, and both intellectual and emotional perception were meant to lead to a sense of enjoyment or satisfaction.

<sup>141</sup> Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini*, 27. “more than an esteemed profession, music was for them a holy cause. Barnum and the ballyhoosers aspired to reach all who could be amazed; the Germans aspired to teach all who could be converted.”

<sup>142</sup> Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini*, 27.

<sup>143</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 3.

<sup>144</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 2–3; Jere T. Humphreys, “The Child-Study Movement and Public School Music Education,” *Journal of Research in Music Education* 33, no. 2 (1985): 81, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3344728>.

motivated by pedagogical concerns, Birge's account itself is an example of how music educators in the first half of the twentieth century, mingled their far from rigorous aesthetic and pedagogical theorizing together in a mutually constitutive matrix.

## Music Appreciation as an Aesthetic Theory and Social Technology

The music appreciation movement represented one answer to the question of what was truly essential in music and what was superfluous in light of both the appreciation principle and music appreciation movement proponents' collective musical-aesthetic beliefs. In its organizing of the relationship between performer, audience, and musical object according to both rational principles (pedagogical) and centralized artistic goals (the appreciation of the beautiful), the music appreciation movement functioned as much like an artworld organizing aesthetic theory in the vein of Wagner's *Gesamtkunstwerk*, or the idea of the composer as specialist, first described by Milton Babbitt and later expanded upon by a variety of interpreters, as it did a pedagogy or social movement.<sup>145</sup>

Like other progressive minded music educators and music reformers more broadly, music appreciation movement proponents sought not just that their pupils would enjoy music, but that their pupils' enjoyment would be as fully *musical* as possible. Since art music's unique

---

Concern that the means had become the ends in education was a foundational principle of the child-study movement.

<sup>145</sup> Frederickson, "Technology and Music Performance," 194; Richard Wagner, *Das Kunstwerk der Zukunft*. (Leipzig: O. Wigand, 1850); Milton Babbitt, "Who Cares if You Listen?," *High Fidelity* 8, no. 2 (Feb 1958): 38–40, 126–127 *The Collected Essays of Milton Babbitt* (Princeton University Press, 2003), 48, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb06304.0001.001>; Robert Morris, "What Milton Babbitt Enabled," *Music Theory Spectrum* 34, no. 1 (2012): 19–21, <https://doi.org/10.1525/mts.2012.34.1.19>; Brian Harker, "Milton Babbitt Encounters Academia (and Vice Versa)," *American Music* 26, no. 3 (September 22, 2008): 336–78, <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?p=AONE&sw=w&issn=07344392&v=2.1&it=r&id=GALE%7CA402050760&sid=googleScholar&linkaccess=abs>.

quality was understood to be its “beauty of tone,” music appreciation movement proponents deemed listening, whether as a performer-listener or as an auditor, to be essential. Listening to “good” music, however, did not automatically produce “full” or “proper” musical-aesthetic enjoyment, and indeed in many cases produced no enjoyment at all.<sup>146</sup> This itself was not a new discovery and there was broad agreement amongst the lovers of serious music that both exposure to “good” music and some type of musical training was necessary for the full enjoyment of “good” music. What music appreciation movement proponents said their movement demonstrated was that people could be taught how to listen not just indirectly through lessons in self-performance, art music theory and occasional concert attendance but “directly” through listening lessons.<sup>147</sup> Though music appreciation movement proponents were not seeking to abolish the teaching of musical performance, their rhetoric presented listening lessons not merely as more effective at reaching the masses than lessons in self-performance, but more essentially *musical*. Mirroring the child-study movement’s critiques of the recitation method, music appreciation movement proponents contended that far more performance pupils learned to play music than to actually listen to, understand and enjoy what they and others played.<sup>148</sup> Furthermore, many students of performance abandoned their studies because they found no enjoyment in them.<sup>149</sup> Listening lessons, on the other hand, dispensed with superficialities to teach the real thing in a friendly and enjoyable manner, with less chance of confusing the means with the ends of musical study.

---

<sup>146</sup> Hinton, “The Gift of Musical Appreciation,” 560–63.

<sup>147</sup> Will Earhart, American Editor’s Preface, x. Scholes, *Music Appreciation*.

<sup>148</sup> Humphreys, “The Child-Study Movement and Public School Music Education,” 81; Will Earhart, American Editor’s Preface, x. Scholes, *Music Appreciation*.

<sup>149</sup> Hinton, “The Gift of Musical Appreciation,” 561.

Another way to conceptualize the music appreciation movement's musical-social impact is to think of it as a social technology that functioned in tandem with the machine technology of music reproduction to facilitate the untethering of the individual from art music performance.<sup>150</sup> Music reproduction technology enabled both the cultivated and the un-cultivated to hear art music with unprecedented frequency, without the need for self-performance or close contact with living performers. What this mechanical innovation was unable to do on its own, however, was to turn the uncultivated listener into a lover of serious music who was fully accepted as such by the art music community.<sup>151</sup> It was not the phonograph, player piano or radio but rather the music appreciation lessons promoted by the music appreciation movement that rendered self-performance optional rather than essential for full participation in the art music community.<sup>152</sup> Thus, Thomas Whitney Surette could write in 1917 that although it was not possible to "be musical vicariously," being musical did "not necessarily lie in performing music,"

---

<sup>150</sup> Frederickson, "Technology and Music Performance," 193. I apply Frederickson's framework to music appreciation.

<sup>151</sup> Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini*, 27–28; Surette, *Music and Life*, xii–xv; J. Lawrence Erb, "Musical Education in the United States--Some Observations," *The Musical Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (1924): 100–101, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738259>. In order to become a true lover of "serious" music, one needed not just to listen to art music, but to listen to, and enjoy it for the right reasons. To be drawn to art music because of ballyhoo—a mixture of celebrity, virtuosity, and marketing, was not the same thing as in Thomas Whitney Surette's words, viewing music as having "a life of its own, self-contained, self-expressive, and complete," attending concerts to hear "a great man" speak, and allowing music to become not one's "diversion" but one's "salvation." See Erb for a contemporary discussion of ballyhoo.

<sup>152</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 149; Arthur Loesser, *Men, Women, and Pianos* (Dover Publications, 1990), [http://archive.org/details/menwomenpianos00loes\\_0](http://archive.org/details/menwomenpianos00loes_0). The idea of "playing and singing being *the thing*" and essential for full participation was an ideal of the highly educated middle-class lover of "serious" music. The wealthy of course always had patronage and musical philanthropy as a means of inclusion granting participation and members of the middle class that lacked a musical education of their own could participate in a similar way by providing their children with music lessons.

but rather was “a *state* of being which every individual who can hear is entitled by nature to attain to in a greater or less degree.”<sup>153</sup>

By liberating art music enculturation, initiation and devotion from its dependence on self-performance, the social technology of music appreciation enabled the mechanical technology of music reproduction to complete its abstraction of the individual from the art music performance.<sup>154</sup> The most striking effect of this abstraction was the reassertion of the idea of the performer as an inconspicuous servant, rather than as a member of a body of middle-class peers creating and sharing the best musical-aesthetic experience they could achieve.<sup>155</sup> Another effect of the abstraction of the individual from performance was the need for a separate body of non-performing and therefore non-abstractable listeners. After all, music reproduction technology could “perform,” but it could not be said to “listen” in the same way as the old performer-listener. In music appreciation movement discourse, then, the democratic, mutually constitutive body of serious music lovers was reconstituted as a body of appreciative listeners, while the chosen few whose natural talent enabled them to be professional performers were sidelined as an esoteric cult whose aristocratic tendencies must be sublimated into reverent and inconspicuous service to the non-performing listener and the musical object.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> Surette, *Music and Life*, xiii.

<sup>154</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 32–34. I use the word “initiation” because it is one of the alternate terms for music appreciation classes that Scholes finds acceptable.

<sup>155</sup> Frederickson, “Technology and Music Performance,” 196; Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 153; Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini*, 27; H. Earle Johnson, “The Germania Musical Society,” *The Musical Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (1953): 75–93, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/740035>. The core of serious music lovers in the United States were German immigrants who performed together in community groups. The best of these performers also formed the ranks of professional orchestras in the United States.

<sup>156</sup> Yocum, “Appreciation of Music, Literature and Art,” 1–3; Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 153.

## Percy A. Scholes, the “Lausanne Resolution” and the Active Listener

Percy A. Scholes’ personal redrafting of the 1931 “Lausanne Resolution” on music appreciation, which he had published in both *The Musical Times* and as an appendix of *Music Appreciation: its History and Technics*, provides a definitive summary of Scholes’ priorities for the music appreciation movement, as well as a clear example of how, despite the general consensus that the aim of musical study was an appreciation of “good’ music and the development of taste, the central tenants of the music appreciation movement differed from the legacy beliefs of the musical and educational establishments at the time.<sup>157</sup> The original “Lausanne Resolution,” as approved by the second Anglo-American Music Education Conference, identified the aims of music appreciation as “(a) the development of a high degree of sensitiveness to the medium of the art, and (b) an intensive and critical study of representative masterpieces.” According to the conference, these two aims implied “the ability to hear music on its own terms, and not in terms of association with other experiences; and secondly, an insight into all those factors which constitute style.” All of this was said to be primarily within the scope of the secondary school “aural training class,” which itself should be seen not in “opposition to training in vocal and instrumental performance” but as “an essential complement of all such training.” Furthermore, the opinion of the conference was that “the best use of mechanically reproduced music in teaching” was in preparing for, or recalling actual concert experiences, and that “the most adequately equipped teacher of Appreciation . . . is the

---

<sup>157</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 365–68; “The Wider View of Appreciation,” *The Musical Times* 74, no. 1080 (1933): 131–34, <https://doi.org/10.2307/918079>.

one who is himself a competent performer.”<sup>158</sup> The “Lausanne Resolution,” while not an explicit condemnation of the music appreciation movement, was clearly an attempt to corral the teaching of music appreciation back into the fold of art music establishment orthodoxy.<sup>159</sup> The appreciation of music was only to be taught by professional musicians through more traditional means that placed a strong emphasis on self-performance, concert attendance, familiarity with masterpieces, and the belief in music as an autonomous art. Music reproduction technology, which was so central to the music appreciation movement, was to be used in the classroom only to reinforce traditional enculturation practices. The impact of music reproduction technology on musical life outside of the classroom was left unacknowledged. Highlighting what was missing from the resolution, Scholes writes that the draftees were so obsessed with the idea that appreciation should be taught in the school only through aural training that they forgot to include any thought towards the biographical and historical details that gave their own listening most of its significance and imagining that all pupils had the opportunity to attend concerts and that all schools were as well equipped and funded as those they worked at, they went on to pass a resolution, “every word of which could have been written before broadcasting was thought of.”<sup>160</sup>

Barring their agreement that the development of “taste” and a familiarity with art music masterpieces were among the desired learning outcomes of musical appreciation, the

---

<sup>158</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 365–66; Scholes, “The Wider View of Appreciation,” 133. Scholes states that the word “most” was added later to soften the declaration.

<sup>159</sup> A. Forbes Milne, “Musical Appreciation in the Early School Years,” *The Musical Times* 72, no. 1066 (1931): 1101–3, <https://doi.org/10.2307/915842>. One of the authors of the resolution would later go on to make its implicit condemnation of Scholes’ music appreciation movement explicit.

<sup>160</sup> Scholes, “The Wider View of Appreciation,” 133–34.



“Lausanne Resolution” and Scholes’ unauthorized re-write proscribed completely different approaches to its teaching. Significantly, Scholes’ resolution explicitly separated the study of listening from the study of performance. Scholes’ draft reads: the general term “music appreciation” includes “whatever brings to the notice of the pupils [both elementary and secondary], the listening side of the art, as distinct from the side of performance.”<sup>161</sup> While the “Lausanne Resolution” equated musical appreciation with aural skills and proscribed an “intensive” study or vivisection of masterpieces, Scholes’s resolution states that the “educational claims” of music appreciation were the same as the newest courses in English Literature that made “opportunities for actual acquaintance with literary masterpieces, under such direction” that is likely to lead to increased understanding and the growth of taste.<sup>162</sup> The educational goal of music appreciation was not a finely tuned ear developed through analytical listening, but rather an “actual acquaintance” or experience with intact masterpieces.<sup>163</sup> Scholes’ resolution goes on to state that a wide variety of methods could be used to teach music appreciation, but the “essential is that *attention* should be secured” so that “the pupils should come to look upon the listening to music not as a passive but as an active occupation.”<sup>164</sup> Addressing the “Lausanne Resolution” draftees’ concern that the music appreciation movement taught students to think of all music in terms of external associations, Scholes’ draft states that, while much music permits and even encourages pictorial or narrative associations, it is important for music appreciation teachers “not to lay stress upon it to the neglect of the

---

<sup>161</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 367.

<sup>162</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 367; “The Wider View of Appreciation,” 133.

<sup>163</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 367.

<sup>164</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 367.

structural side of the art, which is what, in general, offers the greatest impediment to the ‘following’ of the music by the hearer.”<sup>165</sup> What Scholes draft resolution shows is that the listening lessons of music appreciation were not the listening lessons of the aural skills class. While Scholes equates the educational aims of music appreciation with that of English Literature, he also goes on to list its more purely musical aims.<sup>166</sup> Scholes described the unique aims of music appreciation as the removal of impediments to attentive or “active” listening and the teaching of a new understanding of listening in which the attentive, non-performing listener was understood, just like the non-composing performer and the non-performing composer, as an “active” participant in the art music community.

For Scholes, the conference (which he notes was only attended by a small delegation of educators from the United States) revealed that too few music professionals in Britain had adopted enough of an “ordinary, clear-minded view of Musical Appreciation” to enable the “Musical Appreciation movement to exercise that influence upon the general musical interests and tastes of the country that the advent of Broadcasting . . . makes so desirable.”<sup>167</sup> Now that everyone could listen to any type of music at will, Scholes, like Erb, believed that deliberately limiting the enculturation of new art music participants to the old performance based methods of cultivation (which had only ever been able to reach a small minority) only served to perpetuate an “aristocracy of art.”<sup>168</sup> In contrast to the Lausanne Resolution’s rather naïve sidelining of music reproduction technology, Scholes’ draft states that the application of the

---

<sup>165</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 367.

<sup>166</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 367.

<sup>167</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 368.

<sup>168</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 69, 245; Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 3.

music appreciation principle is an “urgent educational duty” brought into focus by the rapid spread of radio and phonograph listening. The draft encourages educational authorities to see music appreciation textbooks and a carefully curated phonograph collection as standard classroom equipment that will enable those with without the training of a professional musicians to step into the gap to meet the unprecedented need for instruction in music listening.<sup>169</sup>

## Conclusion

The Lausanne delegates attempted realignment of the music appreciation movement with what were understood as traditional enculturation practices, Scholes counterstatements, and the subsequent multi-year debate in *The Musical Times* about hearing vs. doing all show that the music appreciation movement had developed a divergent understanding of the nature, and role of the listener in the art music tradition.<sup>170</sup> Many late nineteenth and early twentieth-century lovers of serious music understood the process by which an uninitiated or uneducated listener came to be accepted by the community as an “intelligent” listener and a devoted lover of the art as necessarily involving sustained active participation in the art music community through things like curricular and extracurricular music and singing lessons, amateur and professional music making, concert attendance, music journalism, music club membership, patronage and the general promotion of “serious” music in ones’ community. Though it was not actually necessary for everyone (especially the wealthy) to engage in self-performance in order

---

<sup>169</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 367–68.

<sup>170</sup> Ernest Fowles, “Musical Appreciation,” *The Musical Times* 72, no. 1063 (1931): 829–30, <https://doi.org/10.2307/915609>; Scholes, “The Wider View of Appreciation.” The controversy was featured in a series of articles and letters from Set.1931, until Feb. 1933.

to become lovers of serious music, the ideal devoted lover of music was still envisioned as someone who had gained an intimate understanding of art music through close contact with performance and performers. The important thing was that the prospective lover of “serious” music exerted themselves in ways that offered them both the practical skills and familiarity with art music repertoire necessary to listen with “intelligent” appreciation and acceptance by their peers as a discerning and contributing member of the art music community. Additionally, since the community of serious music lovers was to a certain extent mutually constitutive, acceptance as an “intelligent” and devoted lover of serious music conferred a limited degree of influence over which people and what music should be included or excluded from that community.

Music appreciation movement proponents like Scholes, Erb, and Rhetts understood themselves to be devoted lovers of music, with a rightful say in who and what was included in their community. What they sought, however, was not just to add new participants but to create a new pathway for participation in the art music community that was viable for the modern masses. Through teaching and advocacy, music appreciation movement proponents sought to have their pupils, and the larger art music community come to understand “intelligent” and appreciative listening as not just a skill and personal quality that could be gained through traditional forms of active participation in musical life, but as an acceptable form of inclusion granting “active” participation in its own right. To this end, music appreciation movement proponents created a new art music constituent, the autonomous, non-performing, non-composing listener, who was meant to stand alongside the non-performing composer and the non-composing performer as a contributing and foundational member of the art music community.

I contend that the creation and normalization of the non-performing, non-producing “active” listener as a full-fledged art music constituent was central to the music appreciation movement’s revolutionary project and that their attempt to create a nation or nations of “active” listeners served as both a means of reorganizing power within the art music tradition along lines beneficial to the music appreciation movement’s continued expansion and as the ultimate goal of the movement itself. While Chybowski describes the music appreciation movement as an attempt to *maintain* the musical-cultural hierarchy, and music appreciation movement proponents described their project as the “democratization” of “good” music, I argue that what was actually taking place was more akin to an attempted populist takeover of the art music tradition. By redefining participation-contingent acceptance in the art music tradition as something instantly accessible to “anyone” willing to take their lessons and follow their guidance on how to listen, music appreciation proponents encouraged and facilitated a rapid expansion of the community of enfranchised art music listeners, established music appreciation proponents as the art music tradition’s primary gatekeepers, and ensured that the majority of newly enfranchised art music constituents would owe a degree of sympathy to their initiators, their fellow “active” listeners, and to the music appreciation movement’s general ideological perspective.<sup>171</sup> In other words, each new “active” listener that the music appreciation movement enfranchised represented another member of the art music community who would be willing to help legitimize music appreciation and “active” or “intelligent” listening as the new default form of musicking. Furthermore, if the music appreciation movement was ever able to create a nation of “active” listeners, this body of “intelligent” listeners would be

---

<sup>171</sup> “Anyone” of course does not really mean everyone as racial barriers were still at play.

able to demand that only the “best” music be composed and performed, with what counted as the “best” being largely determined by the proponents and teachers of music appreciation.

More than just a tool for growing the movement, music appreciation proponents believed that “active” listening was a critical, but previously neglected aspect of the musical artform. Proponents like Scholes understood music as requiring the participation of three constituents: the composer, the performer, and the listener. While some in the art music establishment argued that “real musical life” required personal participation in music making (performance), Scholes argued that composition, performance, and listening were all creative acts and therefore all valid forms of participation.<sup>172</sup> Scholes even suggests that the listener may be more important than the middle-man performer, writing that “music is an ear-art, not a finger- and-voice art” and that composers wrote to convey their feelings to the listener, not the performer.<sup>173</sup> According to Scholes, just as performers achieved varying degrees of success in working to conveying the composer’s intentions, so too did listeners achieve varying degrees of success in working to receive the musical message that was conveyed. The interest of the music appreciator, just like the teacher of performance, was in ensuring that their pupil succeeded in this task.<sup>174</sup>

Though he acknowledged that good performers also listened while they performed, Scholes argued that the “well-equipped and sensitive listener” sitting a proper distance away from the performance was in the better position (both literally and figuratively) to hear the

---

<sup>172</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 143–44, 145–46.

<sup>173</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 145.

<sup>174</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 147.

music as a whole rather than in part.<sup>175</sup> I argue that for Scholes and the larger music appreciation movement the “active” or “intelligent” and appreciative listener’s ability to receive the full effects of the modern orchestra represented the pinnacle of musical evolution. Unlike the performer, who conveyed the composer’s message but only experienced it in part and was too distracted by the pleasure of “doing” to fully appreciate the pleasure of hearing, or the passive listener, who heard music but did not have anything like what art music gatekeepers deemed an appropriate aesthetic response, the experienced “active” listener, according to music appreciation proponents like Scholes, was capable of hearing the music, accurately recreating it in their mind and deriving pleasure from the music itself, rather than externalities.<sup>176</sup> For music appreciation proponents, the “active” listener, aided by the high standards of modern performance, achieved an aesthetic experience that made the composer’s music become more alive than it had ever been before.<sup>177</sup> The vision or promise of the music appreciation movement then was not just the democratization of access to the art music community, but the simultaneous realization and democratization of what music appreciation movement proponents considered world history’s ultimate musical aesthetic experience.

---

<sup>175</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 147–48.

<sup>176</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 148–49.

<sup>177</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 147–48.

## Chapter 2

### The Community Music Movement and the Brotherhood of Art

In September 1914, Supervisor of Music in Schools, Thaddeus P. Giddings from Minneapolis reported to the *Music Supervisors' Bulletin* with frustration that due to construction delays “We ain't done nothin' this summer here in the line of community music.” However, looking forward to the completion of the town of Anoka’s new nine-hundred seat public amphitheater that was being built at his urging, Giddings wrote that “when this is completed, we will have a lot of things. We will have moving pictures as the foundation of the entertainments and there will be light operas and plays, Pageants and band concerts. At all of these functions the crowd will sing. We will throw the words on the screen, and I will beat time with a fishpole while the band toots.”<sup>178</sup> Also featured in the community music section of the September, 1914 volume of the *Music Supervisors' Bulletin* was Edgar B. Gordon’s preliminary plan for an upcoming season of community music and drama in Windfield Kansas that would feature choral, orchestral and dramatic performances by public school students and adult amateurs and culminate in an outdoor presentation by “several hundred public school children” of *The Pageant of Patriots* by Constance D'Arcy Mackay.<sup>179</sup> Gordon details how an important feature of the overarching “plan for the development of community music” in Windfield was

---

<sup>178</sup> “Community Music,” *Music Supervisors' Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (1914): 28–30, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3382232>; Margaret George, “Windego Park Auditorium,” in *SAH ARCHIPEDIA*, ed. Gabrielle Esperdy and Karen Kingsley, (Charlottesville: UVaP: Society of Architectural Historians, July 17, 2018), <https://sah-archipedia.org/buildings/MN-01-003-0054>. Formerly known as the Eastman Stadium, the Windego Park Auditorium still stands in Anoka Minnesota but fell into disuse after 1928 when Giddings was no longer available to organize community music.

<sup>179</sup> “Community Music,” 30.



providing all public school students in the fifth and sixth grade who wished it the opportunity to learn orchestral instruments: a practice that was noteworthy at the time.<sup>180</sup>

The inclusion of these two reports in the *Music Supervisors' Bulletin* without comment was indicative of the rapidly growing interest of public school music supervisors in community music that had been fanned into flames at the *Music Supervisors' National Conference* (MSNC) of April 1913.<sup>181</sup> While many of the elements that would come to make up the early twentieth-century American community music movement had existed in embryonic form for decades, the 1913 MSNC meeting brought music supervisors from across the United States into contact with representatives from all of these different streams. As a result of this meeting, community music became a standard feature of future MSNC meetings, and an ever-growing number of music supervisors took it upon themselves to promote and coordinate community music activities in their own towns and cities. While the early twentieth-century American community music movement was much bigger than just the MSNC, the MSNC's network of national leaders played a critical role in facilitating the movement's rapid expansion. An entire section of this

---

<sup>180</sup> "Community Music," 30; Anthony L. Barresi, "Edgar B. Gordon: A Pioneer in Media Music Education," *Journal of Research in Music Education* 35, no. 4 (1987): 262, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345078>; Paul Stoeving, "A New Mission for the Violin," *Music Supervisors' Bulletin* 1, no. 4 (1915): 24–28, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3382216>; Edgar B. Gordon, "What Music Did for Winfield," *The Playground*, May 1917, <http://archive.org/details/playground11playrich>. The town of Winfield had won a child welfare prize the previous year, due in part to what was at the time a ground-breaking program of arts integration. Orchestral instruments were understood as distinct from band instruments.

<sup>181</sup> Music Supervisors' National Conference, in *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors' National Conference* (Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913), <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>; Music Supervisors' National Conference, in *Journal of Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors' National Conference* (Minneapolis Minnesota: The Conference, 1914), <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008699614>. Papers at the April 1914 meeting revolved around appreciation, efficiency, and scientific management. Superficially, it would appear that the community music idea went into hibernation after 1913. However, in addition to the short report of the Committee on Community Songs (103-106), the 1914 meeting was held in Minneapolis and the supervisors spent a great deal of time visiting schools and learning from Giddings' community music efforts.

chapter will be devoted to MSNC involvement with the community music movement because their interactions with the movement provide such a useful window into its development.

It is safe to say that community music in the sense of non-professionals making music together, or music that is a unique expression of a particular community has existed throughout history. Community music as an intervention between a leader and participants, however, is a more recent phenomenon.<sup>182</sup> Of the various interventionist forms of community music that have existed throughout the years, readers are likely to be most familiar with the current international field of community music that developed out of the 1960's and 1970's countercultural movement in the United Kingdom.<sup>183</sup> As shown by my opening account, this chapter deals with the much earlier community music movement active during the 1910's through 1950's in the United States. Though the early twentieth-century American community music movement bears some superficial similarities to community music today, its promotion of "good" music, Americanization, and social control, mark it as a separate phenomenon, from the current multicultural and decolonial community music movement.<sup>184</sup>

In this chapter I outline the roots of the early twentieth-century American community music movement, as well as seek to identify what community music movement proponents understood to be their unique project of reform. I begin my discussion by examining four papers given at the 1913 MSNC meeting that planted the seeds for music supervisor support of a nation-wide community music movement. The first two papers I discuss, "Music and the Social

---

<sup>182</sup> Higgins, *Community Music*, 4.

<sup>183</sup> Higgins, *Community Music*, 22–24.

<sup>184</sup> Higgins, *Community Music*, 22–24.

Problems” by Lucy K. Cole and “The Effect of the Festival and Pageant Revival on the Teaching of Music” by Peter W. Dykema, reveal the lines of connection between the MSNC and the musical-social movements out of which the community music movement developed. The third paper I examine, “The Sociological Value of Music” by George Mather Forbes, shows that the MSNC was beginning to question what it would mean to truly socialize art music. The final paper I discuss, “Normal School Problems” by Frank A. Beach, was the challenge that directly spurred the MSNC to involve themselves as an organization in the burgeoning community music movement.<sup>185</sup>

I then examine how two of the most prominent community music movement proponents, Peter Dykema and Arthur Farwell, described the community music idea as measuring the value of music according to how well it served the practical, spiritual, and aesthetic needs of the people. I explain how the community music movement used syncretism to appropriate rather than oppose competing movements and how musical Americanism and a desire to reform art music “culture” played a role in the movement. I end this chapter by discussing the core of the community music movement—community singing—outlining what

---

<sup>185</sup> Lucy K. Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” in *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors’ National Conference* (Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913), 26–31, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>; George Mather Forbes, “Sociological Value of Music,” in *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors’ National Conference* (Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913), 32–34, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>; Frank A. Beach, “Normal School Problems,” in *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors’ National Conference* (Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913), 57–60, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>; Peter W. Dykema, “The Effect of the Festival and Pageant Revival on the Teaching of Music,” in *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors’ National Conference* (Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913), 64–71, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>.

this phase of the community music movement reveals about the type of musical-aesthetic experience community music movement proponents idealized and promoted.

Although music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents both promoted an appreciation of “good” music, I argue that the type of musical-aesthetic experience or musical appreciation that music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents wanted people to experience was in no way the same. In Chapter 1 of this thesis, I described the music appreciation movement as promoting a balanced intellectual and emotional appreciation of the music itself. In contrast, in this chapter I argue that the type of appreciation the community music movement promoted was primarily emotional and involved an appreciation of both musical and extra-musical features. In chapter 1, I also presented the music appreciation movement as an art-world organizing aesthetic theory seeking to establish the non-music making listener as a full-fledged art music participant, the professionalized performer as a paid servant, and the composer as genius. In this chapter, however, I argue that the community music movement was a different type of art-world organizing aesthetic theory—one that deliberately blurred the boundaries between composer, performer, and listener, and turned the community into the “artist.”

### Music Supervisors National Conference 1913

In “Music and the Social Problems,” Lucy K. Cole, Supervisor of Music in Seattle Washington, identified the most important social problem of her day not as immigration, labour relations, or the spread of bad hygiene and vice, but rather as “the retaining of the interests of

the people in the hands of the people.”<sup>186</sup> In Cole’s account, the modern home had long since ceased to be the center of both industrial and recreational education, with industrial education passing into the stewardship of publicly funded and publicly minded educators, and recreational education being ceded to “private commercial interests.”<sup>187</sup> While Cole believed that public education had succeeded in serving the public good, she argued that the commercialization of recreation had had only negative effects, and needed to be taken back into the “hands of the people” by making training for leisure part of public education.<sup>188</sup>

One of the most vital areas of recreation to be transferred back to the people was music.<sup>189</sup> In Cole’s understanding, poor morals among the young were the result of “emotional life” gone wrong. “Good” music and drama, as the “universal mediums of emotional expression,” could fix delinquency by leading the youth away from destructive forms of emotional expression and into the “higher emotional life.”<sup>190</sup> Hearing and reading music, while beneficial in their own right, were not enough. In Cole’s opinion, actual performance was needed because it was “the desire to *express* the surging, throbbing, new emotional life which must be satisfied.”<sup>191</sup> Furthermore, the danger of the ever-increasing ubiquity of mechanical

---

<sup>186</sup> Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” 26; Patricia Costa Kim, “Making Music Their Own: School Music, Community, and Standards of Excellence in Seattle, 1885-1975,” *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 21, no. 2 (2000): 165–66, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40215216>; “Catalogue of the University of Washington for 1913-1914 and Announcements for 1914-1915” (Frank M. Lamborn Public Printer, Seattle Washington, 1914), 202; “Music Discussions at the N.E.A.,” *Music Supervisors’ Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (1914): 28, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3382230>. See Patricia Costa Kim for info on Cole’s Career in Seattle. Cole was part of the Faculty of Education at the University of Washington when she gave her address at the MSNC and was elected President of the music department of the N.E.A. for the year 1915.

<sup>187</sup> Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” 26.

<sup>188</sup> Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” 26.

<sup>189</sup> Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” 26.

<sup>190</sup> Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” 27.

<sup>191</sup> Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” 27.

music was that it might bring about a “*surfeit* of listening” and rob the youth of their desire to study performance as a healthy outlet for “higher” emotional expression.<sup>192</sup> Without this outlet, the young person was liable to be exploited by saloons and dance halls who used the “lowest” type of ragtime, musical blackface (Cole uses a racial epitaph), and “suggestive music” to ensnare customers.<sup>193</sup>

According to Cole, partial models for how to bring music back into the hands of the people included the new movement for class violin instruction that had begun in Maidstone, England, in America’s own music school settlements, and in “municipally controlled music in New York and other Eastern Cities,” all of which worked towards the “musical education and uplift of the common people.”<sup>194</sup> Explaining the limitations of each of these models, Cole argued that what was needed was for music educators and philanthropists to unite in a concerted national effort to provide more education in musical leisure, and more opportunities for the participation of labourers and non-professional musicians in “people’s choruses,” bands, orchestras, festivals, and pageants.<sup>195</sup> Since the United States was in “danger of having too much listening,” what was most important, according to Cole, was that there be “more actual performances on the part of the people.”<sup>196</sup>

The theories that Cole presented to the Music Supervisors’ Conference about the relationship between social problems, music, drama, and arts education were not her own

---

<sup>192</sup> Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” 28.

<sup>193</sup> Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” 29.

<sup>194</sup> Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” 28–31.

<sup>195</sup> Cole, “Music and the Social Problems,” 30–31.

<sup>196</sup> Music Supervisors’ National Conference, 1913, 39; John Philip Sousa, “The Menace of Mechanical Music.,” 1906. Cole’s ideas on mechanical music echo those of Sousa.

creation, but rather a faithful recapitulation of the main points of Jane Addams' 1909 *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets* and of social settlement movement discourse more broadly.<sup>197</sup> A founding leader of the social settlement movement in the United States, Adams wrote *The Spirit of Youth* out of her decades of experience with settlement work and settlement discourse. Adams basic premise was that the young person, like "artists who are themselves endowed with immortal youth," had a fundamental need to assert that they were individuals with a wholly unique "contribution to make to the world."<sup>198</sup> The spirit of youth, was the spirit of progress and change that was destined to forever remake and renew the world. Ever searching for an "adequate means of expression for their most precious message," Addams believed that youth would be pulled toward misadventure and vice unless benevolent authorities gave them the opportunity to participate in all forms of wholesome recreation—the most powerful and neglected of which was music.<sup>199</sup>

Influenced by John Ruskin, Ralph Waldo Emerson, Matthew Arnold, William Morris and his arts-and-crafts movement, the "little theater" movement, and the educational theories of John Dewey, the middle-class residents of US social settlements had been finding ways to provide their working-class, mostly immigrant neighbours with opportunities to participate in the actual making of music, art, and drama from the movement's beginnings in the 1890's.<sup>200</sup> Providing opportunities for the working class to express themselves through cultured forms of artistic production was important to settlement workers not just because this type of recreation

---

<sup>197</sup> Addams, *The Spirit of Youth*.

<sup>198</sup> Addams, *The Spirit of Youth*, 108–9.

<sup>199</sup> Addams, *The Spirit of Youth*, 9, 18, 20.

<sup>200</sup> Carson, *Settlement Folk*, 106, 115–16; Cassano, Schultz, and Payette, *Eleanor Smith's Hull House Songs*, 223; Green, "Art for Life's Sake," 10.

served as a powerful alternative to delinquency and vice, and had been a familiar part of their own middle-class upbringing, but because they believed art production was an antidote to the stultifying, soul-destroying monotony of industrialized labour.

In Addams' telling, "the youth whose ancestors have been rough-working and hard-playing peasants" needed activity that went beyond the "expenditure of nervous energy" demanded by factory work.<sup>201</sup> Since the labouring youth could no longer find self-expression through craftsmanship during their working hours, and modernity and dislocation had alienated them from their folk-arts, settlement workers like Addams believed that labourers needed to be gifted with the ability to engage in the non-economic production of middle-class music, drama, and art in order to be fully self-actualized individuals.<sup>202</sup> Addams explained that, without this outlet, the youth would internalize the message of their urban industrial environment and become an adult labourer incapable of "independent action," whose "life has been given a twist towards idleness and futility."<sup>203</sup> According to Addams, the ever lurking threat to middle-class reformers and the urban poor alike was a "scepticism of life's value."<sup>204</sup> The purpose of art was to serve as an antidote to this skepticism by preserving "in permanent and beautiful form those emotions and solaces" that made life more cheerful, kind, heroic and comprehensible, and which lifted "the mind of the worker from the harshness and loneliness of his task," and freed him from isolation by "connecting him with what has gone before."<sup>205</sup> In other words, the function of art was to preserve and teach a moral, social, historical and romantic basis for hope.

---

<sup>201</sup> Addams, *The Spirit of Youth*, 107–8.

<sup>202</sup> Addams, *The Spirit of Youth*, 107–35. These ideas are worked out in specific relation to youth in the chapter "The Spirit of Youth and Industry."

<sup>203</sup> Addams, *The Spirit of Youth*, 111–12.

<sup>204</sup> Addams, *The Spirit of Youth*, 103.

<sup>205</sup> Addams, *The Spirit of Youth*, 101.



One of the main purposes of the social settlement movement was the development of new progressive leaders and new methods of bringing about social reform. Living in close physical proximity to the working poor was meant to enable a two-way exchange wherein middle-class settlement house residents shared what they believed were their cultural and educational advantages with the poor, while their working-class neighbours helped them better understand social problems by sharing the day-to-day realities of their lives. Though settlement residents clearly lead this exchange, by enthusiastically embracing some of the interventionist projects that were directed at them and steadfastly ignoring others, their working-class neighbours also exerted a small degree of influence on settlement programs, and in turn, upon the broad collection of progressive reformers who followed the settlement movement as an exemplar.<sup>206</sup>

The settlement movement demonstrated to progressive reformers that music was a highly effective medium of social intervention. Working-class families seemed to enjoy attending the casual house concerts put on in the evenings by settlement residents, music teachers, and music students. Furthermore, even highly impoverished immigrant families were often willing to scrounge up the money to pay the subsidized fee required to send their children

---

<sup>206</sup> Vaillant, *Sounds of Reform*, 94–95; Mantie, *Music, Leisure, Education*, 62; Cassano, Schultz, and Payette, *Eleanor Smith's Hull House Songs*, 213–15; Addams, *The Spirit of Youth*, 101–2; Edith C. Westcott, "Nationalization of Community Music," *The Journal of Education* 89, no. 11 (2221) (1919): 291–291, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42827367>. Addams writes: "Were American cities really eager for municipal art, they would cherish as genuine beginnings the tarentella danced so interminably at Italian weddings; the primitive Greek pipe played throughout the long summer nights; the Bohemian theaters crowded with eager Slavophiles; the Hungarian musicians strolling from street to street; the fervid oratory of the young Russian preaching social righteousness in the open square." As Westcott shows, this dynamic also played a part in the community music movement--"the need of the hour is for the community song book . . . which shall contain . . . not the songs we like best to sing, but the songs which, left to themselves, the Italian, or Russian, or Scandinavian, or Pole will sing."

to weekly music lessons.<sup>207</sup> In the eyes of settlement leadership music was doubly beneficial. First, it helped settlement residents build the longstanding relationships with their working-class neighbours that were necessary to conduct other forms of social work. Secondly, learning to make music in the art music tradition “Americanized” and “uplifted” students and their families by giving them a first taste of middle-class leisure that would cause them to further aspire towards middle-class tastes, values, and behaviours.<sup>208</sup>

The social settlement movement and the more specialized music school settlements that Cole mentioned in her address to the Music Supervisors’ National Conference were two of the emerging community music movement’s direct progenitors. It is important to note, however, that the settlement movement also formed the template for progressive reform more broadly. Furthermore, due to the example of the settlement movement, progressive reformers of all types were predisposed to see music as a natural part of social reform efforts even if they themselves had little interest in music.<sup>209</sup> When the community music movement eventually emerged, its proponents were not unique in seeing music as a tool of social reform. Rather, what I would argue distinguished community music movement proponents from settlement residents and other progressive reformers was that they saw “socialized music” as the best way to advance their own, primarily musical-aesthetic aims and that they constructed their own art-

---

<sup>207</sup> Thomas Tapper, “Music and East Side Children: The Story of a Novel Social Settlement,” *Outlook (1893-1924)* (New York, United States: American Periodicals Series III, February 22, 1908), <https://www.proquest.com/docview/136625056/abstract/BDDA59B4F5AD4F25PQ/1>.

<sup>208</sup> Campbell, “A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear,” 269; Vaillant, *Sounds of Reform*, 93.

<sup>209</sup> Campbell, “A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear,” 260–61.

world organizing aesthetic theories to articulate, justify and promote this new understanding of music.<sup>210</sup>

Cole's address was well received by the Music Supervisors' National Conference with the President of the MSNC remarking that she thought it was "the duty of every supervisor of music to have a musical settlement in her own town."<sup>211</sup> Further demonstrating the connection between the settlement movement and the community music movement's MSNC beginnings, Eleanor Smith, the head of the music school at Jane Addams Hull House Settlement in Chicago had been scheduled to speak at the 1913 conference alongside Cole but was absent due to illness.<sup>212</sup> Additionally, the lines of connection between social settlements, music school settlements, and the community music movement extend beyond the MSNC, with many of the most prominent community music movement proponents like Arthur Farwell and Thomas Tapper being involved in the leadership of individual music school settlements, both prior to and sometimes concurrent with their broader community music movement advocacy.<sup>213</sup> Even Jane Addams herself looked for something greater to be birthed out of the settlement movement, writing in 1909 that Americans were "only beginning to understand what might be done through the festival, the street procession, the band of marching musicians, orchestral music in public squares or parks" and the "magic power they all possess to formulate . . . companionship and solidarity."<sup>214</sup>

---

<sup>210</sup> Peter W. Dykema, "The Spread of the Community Music Idea," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 67 (1916): 218, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1013509>.

<sup>211</sup> Music Supervisors' National Conference, 1913, 10.

<sup>212</sup> Music Supervisors' National Conference, 1913, 10.

<sup>213</sup> Tapper, "Music and East Side Children"; Mantie, *Music, Leisure, Education*, 67–68.

<sup>214</sup> Addams, *The Spirit of Youth*, 98.

While the settlement movement provided the developing community music movement with a significant degree of ideological and leadership depth, community music movement proponents derived their interest in large scale community events, boosterism, and immediate action from the craze for historical pageants that had recently swept the United States.<sup>215</sup> Beginning in England in 1905 as an outgrowth of the arts and crafts movement, the modern pageant involved the participation of an entire town in the organization, production and performance of a grand historical drama in which “the place is the hero and the development of the community the plot.”<sup>216</sup> All pageants utilized music as an aid to spectacle, though some pageants were essentially dramatic, while others found their artistic unity primarily through music.<sup>217</sup> Because it was the first pageant that was directly inspired by those in England, the American Pageant Association recognized the 1908 *Pageant of Education* in Boston as the official beginning of pageantry in the United States; however, it is important to note that the Grove Plays of the Bohemian Club of San Francisco, represented a separate stream of modern pageantry that predated these other examples by a number of years.<sup>218</sup>

According to William Chancey Langdon, the head of the American Pageant Association, through the pageant movement, “Americans were declaring themselves no longer content to receive their art . . . from the hands of others, but will themselves, every one, be artists and

---

<sup>215</sup> President of the American Pageant Association, William Chauncey Langdon, “AMERICA, LIKE ENGLAND, HAS BECOME PAGEANT MAD: Thousands of Dollars Will Be Spent This Year in Giving Picturesque Dramas of Which the Place Is the Hero and the Development of the Community the Plot.,” June 15, 1913, sec. Magazine Section Part Five, <https://www.proquest.com/hnpnewyorktimes/docview/97393509/abstract/8F19ED8B790249D9PQ/1>.

<sup>216</sup> Langdon, “AMERICA, LIKE ENGLAND, HAS BECOME PAGEANT MAD”; David Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990).

<sup>217</sup> Langdon, “AMERICA, LIKE ENGLAND, HAS BECOME PAGEANT MAD.”

<sup>218</sup> Langdon, “AMERICA, LIKE ENGLAND, HAS BECOME PAGEANT MAD”; Glassberg, *American Historical Pageantry*; Dykema, “The Effect of the Festival and Pageant Revival on the Teaching of Music,” 65.

voice their own supremacy over circumstances and fate.”<sup>219</sup> While the guidance of a professional artist could be helpful, in Langdon’s view, pageantry was first and foremost a citizen’s art form. If they wished to be “forgiven” their elitism and allowed to participate, the professional artist needed to become a citizen again—to humble themselves and participate in the actual life of the community they wished to serve.<sup>220</sup>

A founding member of the American Pageant Association’s board of directors and a prominent member of the MSNC, Peter Dykema’s paper to the 1913 MSNC meeting, “The Effect of the Festival and Pageant Revival on the Teaching of Music” encouraged music supervisors to embrace the pageant movement despite the added labour it would cause them. The educational benefits of pageant participation that Dykema listed were numerous, but the central thrust of his argument was that since children were born with a play instinct that was essentially dramatic, school pageants enabled teaching that was in better alignment with the true nature of the child. Expressing the child-study viewpoint, Dykema stated that instead of attempting to educate a child by forcing knowledge into them, the teacher should try to cause what was already in the child to bloom. Arguing that the education system needed to be transformed “until the child is more and more producing original material,” Dykema explained that while schools were good at turning out people who knew things, they were poor at producing students who could do things, and even worse at producing students who could start new things.<sup>221</sup> The pageant movement on the other hand, demanded “original song expression” from students and since “those things are most prominent in our lives which we do ourselves,

---

<sup>219</sup> Langdon, “AMERICA, LIKE ENGLAND, HAS BECOME PAGEANT MAD.”

<sup>220</sup> Langdon, “AMERICA, LIKE ENGLAND, HAS BECOME PAGEANT MAD.”

<sup>221</sup> Dykema, “The Effect of the Festival and Pageant Revival on the Teaching of Music,” 67.

which we produce ourselves” engaging in original song expression would lead students to make music, drama and art, a vital part of their adult lives.<sup>222</sup>

Dykema argued that there were also artistic reasons why music supervisors should support the pageant movement. First, pageantry provided an incentive for American composers to create new music that reflected American life. Pageant music could also be used as the basis for new American symphonies, and the pageant movement itself had the potential to bring about a “great series of American Music dramas” that would do for the United States what Wagner did for Germany.<sup>223</sup> Secondly, according to Dykema, the great artistic power of the pageant lay in the fact that it was a “social product,” not just in its use of amateur actors, but in the way it made the audience a part of the play by making them sympathetic to the action throughout, and having them sing periodically.”<sup>224</sup> This represented a new artistic ideal that stood in direct contrast to the way serious music was presented in the concert hall and hinted at the possibility of creating a more democratic, yet still “serious” musical artform.

The practical, ideological, and eventual leadership overlap between the pageant movement and the community music movement was such that, as the community music movement developed, community music movement proponents tended to talk about the pageant as merely one type of community music activity, rather than as its own distinctive movement. Dykema, who was such a prominent ambassador for the American Pageant Association, would become one of the leading figures in the community music movement, chairing the MSNC Committee on Community Songs, publishing numerous articles about

---

<sup>222</sup> Dykema, “The Effect of the Festival and Pageant Revival on the Teaching of Music,” 68.

<sup>223</sup> Dykema, “The Effect of the Festival and Pageant Revival on the Teaching of Music,” 69.

<sup>224</sup> Dykema, “The Effect of the Festival and Pageant Revival on the Teaching of Music,” 68.

community music for both the MSNC and the Playground and Recreation Association of America, and speaking at the *National Conference on Community Music* held in New York City in May 1917.<sup>225</sup> Another founding executive of the American Pageant Association, and an important composer of pageant music, Arthur Farwell would go on to become one of the community music movement's most dedicated and prominent proponents, using his staff position in *Musical America* to spread the "new gospel" of community music, and organizing and composing music for community music movement events. Farwell, would also speak alongside Dykema at the 1917 *National Conference on Community Music*.<sup>226</sup>

In "The Sociological Value of Music," George Mather Forbes wrote that to socialize music, was to make it a common good "in which every human being may share to the fullest possible extent."<sup>227</sup> According to Forbes, the great question surrounding the socialization of music was to what extent creative and skilled artistic music making could become the "common possession of the whole community." Though Forbes was doubtful how far this aspect of music could be socialized, he explained that it was the duty of music supervisors, rather than philosophers like himself, to discover these limits. Once music production had been socialized to its greatest extent, Forbes suggested that music supervisors should turn their attention to music appreciation as a way to make the "musical genius" they had caused to be developed a "joy to the whole community." While Forbes believed that the ability to create music could only be partially socialized, he understood the appreciative side of the artform to be increasingly

---

<sup>225</sup> Playground Association of America, "Community Singing Conference," *The Playground*, September 1917, <http://archive.org/details/playground11playrich>.

<sup>226</sup> Playground Association of America, "Community Singing Conference," 302.

<sup>227</sup> Forbes, "Sociological Value of Music," 33.

accessible due to the growing ubiquity of mechanical reproduction and he believed that the universalization of appreciation would complete the socialization of music.<sup>228</sup>

Though he left open the possibility of expanding the circle of music makers or “musical genius,” Forbes made it clear that he believed the universalization of appreciation was the only true hope for music’s socialization. The contrast between Forbes’ and Cole and Dykema’s papers could hardly be greater. For Cole and Dykema, actual music making was a necessity because it provided the worker with a means of artistic expression in a world where craftsmanship had been banished from labour. While it is possible to see how teaching everyone appreciation might allow for the universal enjoyment of art music, Forbes’ understanding of appreciation involved “laying hold of the superior” and excluding the “inferior”—an attitude that would seem to discourage the universalizing of low skill, amateur artistic expression.

Unfortunately, the discussion that followed Forbes’ paper was not recorded so it is impossible to know how members reacted to it, and whether or not they recognized the difference between Forbes’ appreciative approach to music and an understanding of music based on arts and crafts and settlement movement values. A possible hint about the paper’s reception lies in the fact that Dykema listed Forbes paper alongside other papers from the 1913 MSNC meeting in his 1917 *National Conference on Community Music* account of the MSNC’s involvement with the community music movement. This brief mention, however, may have

---

<sup>228</sup> Forbes, “Sociological Value of Music,” 34.



simply been Dykema acknowledging Forbes' paper as the source of his own penchant for describing the community music movement as "socialized music."<sup>229</sup>

The central thrust of Frank A. Beach's "Normal School Problems" was that music supervisors should open their eyes to the millions of rural children "who have no music in the home that is inspired through the schools" and extend their music reform efforts beyond the urban areas that had dominated their attention.<sup>230</sup> Beach's interest in rural problems was informed by his own missional efforts in rural areas, the country life movement and the writings of the chairman of the Commission on Country Life, Liberty Hyde Bailey, who warned that "the music spirit seems to be dying out in the country" and "the habit of self expression in song and music" needed to be encouraged.<sup>231</sup>

Because rural reformers contended with massive distances and huge population sizes, one of the distinguishing features of the country life movement was its proponents' willingness to use every outreach tool available to them rather than committing to any one method for ideological reasons. The two main interventions that Beach suggested in his paper were the sending of normal school students and other qualified musicians into rural areas to conduct "practical singing societies" and the mailing out of travelling music appreciation courses whose "sole aim was the interesting of people in good music."<sup>232</sup> Method was secondary: what was

---

<sup>229</sup> Peter W. Dykema, "The Relation of Schools and Colleges to Community Music," *The Playground*, September 1917, 306, <http://archive.org/details/playground11playrich>; Dykema, "The Spread of the Community Music Idea," 218.

<sup>230</sup> Beach, "Normal School Problems," 57.

<sup>231</sup> Beach, "Normal School Problems," 58.

<sup>232</sup> Beach, "Normal School Problems," 59.

most important was that all possible forces be combined to advance what Beach called “the cause of good music.”<sup>233</sup>

The MSNC response to Beach’s paper was to form a Committee on Community Songs under the chairmanship of Peter W. Dykema, whose task would be to immediately create a list of songs they believed could be taught to everyone in the United States.<sup>234</sup> What was hoped was that a shared body of songs would facilitate spontaneous community singing across the nation.<sup>235</sup> Because the Committee on Community Songs was formed as a direct response to Beach’s call to action, both William R. Lee in “Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925” and Esther Morgan-Ellis in *Everybody Sing!: Community Singing in the American Picture Palace* describe Beach’s paper as the catalyst for MSNC involvement in the community music movement.<sup>236</sup> Unfortunately, in their historiographies of the community music movement, neither Lee nor Morgan-Ellis discuss the other seminal papers given at the 1913 MSNC meeting—making the fact that Beach’s rural concerns were immediately swallowed up into the larger push for a national community music movement appear like an abrupt redirection rather than a natural synthesis of the main ideas discussed at the conference.<sup>237</sup>

The four papers I have examined provide a window into the different streams of ideology and practice that birthed the community music movement. From the settlement and pageant movements came a belief that extracting the greatest social value from “serious” music meant having as many people as possible engage in music making as a form of artistic

---

<sup>233</sup> Beach, “Normal School Problems,” 60.

<sup>234</sup> Lee, “Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925,” 310; Morgan-Ellis, *Everybody Sing!*, 64.

<sup>235</sup> Dykema, “The Relation of Schools and Colleges to Community Music,” 306.

<sup>236</sup> Lee, “Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925,” 315–16; Morgan-Ellis, *Everybody Sing!*, 64.

<sup>237</sup> Lee, “Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925,” 310; Morgan-Ellis, *Everybody Sing!*, 64.

expression. While the settlement movement encouraged music making on a more individual level by providing subsidized music lesson, and opportunities for students to perform in salon-style concerts, the pageant movement taught by doing, engaging entire communities in the production of their own musical-dramatic event. Forbes' and Beach's papers show that MSNC members were being called on to do something for the cause of "good" music that would reach more Americans than the settlement and pageant movements had as of yet. Most people agreed that "good" music should be made the possession of all, yet many also had doubts about whether everyone could actually become music makers. The community music movement would emerge as a platform by which to extend the benefits of music making to every American, with community music movement proponents confidently declaring that their methods enabled everyone to join in the music making. Yet a persisting legacy of its connection to the country life movement and the MSNC would be its proponents' willingness to see every means of advancing "good" music as potentially beneficial to their community music efforts.

### The Community Music Idea

In his 1916 article "The Spread of the Community Music Idea" Peter Dykema explained that although the term community music had been in vogue the past three years, it is "not so much the designation of a new thing as a new point of view."<sup>238</sup> According to Dykema, community music "may employ any of the older . . . manifestations of music and musical endeavor, and by means of the new spirit transform them to suit its own purposes."<sup>239</sup> Earlier in

---

<sup>238</sup> Dykema, "The Spread of the Community Music Idea," 218.

<sup>239</sup> Dykema, "The Spread of the Community Music Idea," 218.

this chapter I described the settlement movement and the pageant movement as the community music movement's progenitors. What should be clarified is that settlement and pageant movement activity continued throughout the heyday of the community music movement. While some of these latter-day pageants and settlements had a tangible connection to the community music movement, many did not. Regardless of how connected they actually were, community music movement proponents did exactly as Dykema described, and transformed settlement and pageant activity to suit their own purposes (the promotion of community music) by rhetorically enfolding them into their own movement. This approach was typical of how community music movement proponents treated other movements and musical activities. Instead of giving their movement definite boundaries and attempting to enforce a new orthodoxy, community music movement proponents employed syncretism as a strategy for growth. The great advantage of this was that it allowed community music movement proponents to point to almost any activity that increased access to "good" music as proof of the community music movement's rapid and triumphalist growth. The downside of this approach, ideological drift, does not seem to have been a major concern for community music movement proponents, many of whom considered their movement to be an organic and somewhat inevitable development in the evolution of democratic music.<sup>240</sup>

Dykema defined community music as "socialized music; music, to use Lincoln's phrase, for the people, of the people, and by the people" and he described the central principle of the

---

<sup>240</sup> Farwell, "The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution," 98; "CLUBS UNITE FOR COMMUNITY MUSIC: ORGANIC BODY TO SUPERVISE PROJECT HERE; Plans Made at Federation Meeting to Systematize Various Efforts Under One General Head, with Music Centers in Various Sections of the City.," *Los Angeles Times (1886-1922)*, May 8, 1917, <http://www.proquest.com/docview/160447732/abstract/74F52D5E16C447B7PQ/1>. The article goes on to state that "Music is something so free that nobody can get a corner on it."

community music movement as the measuring of “all musical endeavors by the standard of usefulness for the great social body.”<sup>241</sup> Efforts to provide music “for the people” included things like low-priced municipal concerts, lectures on music, the ever-increasing availability of mechanical music, and piano-player and phonograph lending libraries. Music “of the people” on the other hand included all forms of group and individual musical activity that was amateur in nature but yet still required entering into “the serious study of music.”<sup>242</sup> Music “by the people” meant informal or community singing by large groups. According to Dykema, if the community music movement had “developed a new form” it was in relation to community singing.<sup>243</sup> Though community singing had been used by “the revivalist, the militarist and the politician” in the past, the community music movement was for the first time, making community singing a “permanent social force.”<sup>244</sup> Rather than requiring music study, this most “characteristic” phase of the community music movement utilized the “natural love and command of music which everyone possesses and which, when rendered collectively by a large group, is surprisingly efficient, even with comparatively difficult music.”<sup>245</sup> For Dykema, the power of the group to “do things which are impossible for the individual” was not merely a theory but rather a fact that community singing leaders like the composer Arthur Farwell and the conductor Harry Barnhart had repeatedly demonstrated in their work.<sup>246</sup>

While Dykema took care to present himself as someone interested in describing how the community music movement functioned rather than proscribing his own vision for the

---

<sup>241</sup> Dykema, “The Spread of the Community Music Idea,” 218, 223.

<sup>242</sup> Dykema, “The Spread of the Community Music Idea,” 220–21.

<sup>243</sup> Dykema, “The Spread of the Community Music Idea,” 221.

<sup>244</sup> Dykema, “The Spread of the Community Music Idea,” 222.

<sup>245</sup> Dykema, “The Spread of the Community Music Idea,” 221–22.

<sup>246</sup> Dykema, “The Spread of the Community Music Idea,” 222.

movement, the composer Arthur Farwell styled himself as a prophet—proclaiming in his many essays on the community music movement, both what should, and what he believed would, inevitably come to pass. In his 1911 “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America,” Farwell described musical life in the United States as divided between a tiny cultivated musical aristocracy on the one hand and the great democratic masses who were “musically unregenerate” on the other.<sup>247</sup> According to Farwell, many thought that the way to remedy this situation was by educating or forcing “the people of America to accept the music of Europe.”<sup>248</sup> However, Farwell believed that the United States was “not to gain its great musical uplift by familiarizing the masses with music as it is.”<sup>249</sup> Instead, Farwell argued that the masses were waiting for a new type of musical event that would reflect their humanity by including them in all aspects of its production.<sup>250</sup> Farwell explained that through this new form of musical presentation, the American people would learn “what music means” in the “best possible way—by active participation.” Additionally, the American artist, who had been made into a historian of European music rather than a prophet of “creative musical evolution” would come into direct contact with the American people and begin to compose music for them which was “more broadly and deeply their own than anything which they already have.”<sup>251</sup> Farwell reasoned that the new “American” forms of music he spoke of would not completely replace the symphony and the opera as there would likely always need to exist a “standard of pure music, to show what the medium is capable of in the abstract.”<sup>252</sup> What was clear to Farwell,

---

<sup>247</sup> Farwell, “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America,” 204.

<sup>248</sup> Farwell, “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America,” 205.

<sup>249</sup> Farwell, “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America,” 205.

<sup>250</sup> Farwell, “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America,” 209.

<sup>251</sup> Farwell, “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America,” 207–10.

<sup>252</sup> Farwell, “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America,” 210.

however, was that the symphonic could “never be the great popular form in America” because that type of musical “culture” was practiced in such a conventional, cynical and self-conscious way that both the people and a sense of music’s larger spiritual purpose had been “banished from the Temple.”<sup>253</sup>

Farwell’s promotion of the community music movement was motivated not just by a desire to advance musical Americanism, but also by a more general belief that musical “culture” needed reform. In his 1927 “The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution,” Farwell describes the community music movement as a corrective movement “which has arisen spontaneously to fulfill the needs of the people in the present, as against a system which has utterly failed to fulfill them.”<sup>254</sup> According to Farwell, the community music movement had established the “chief principles” of a “new epoch”: “a new type of musical event of the people, with its doors open to all; the active participation of the people, and the restoration of the fundamental position of song” and had even begun to bring what Farwell believed was a necessary spiritual element back to music.<sup>255</sup> Farwell argued that the allyship of intangible music with tangible words through song and the “abandonment of the symphonic fetish” was essential because “in the present stage of human evolution there are too many people to whom abstract or pure music remains entirely meaningless.”<sup>256</sup> Farwell boldly declared that the future would see singing rather than abstract music become the fundamental form of musical participation.<sup>257</sup> For Farwell, the core of the community music movement was community singing.

---

<sup>253</sup> Farwell, “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America,” 209–10.

<sup>254</sup> Farwell, “The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution,” 98.

<sup>255</sup> Farwell, “The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution,” 98.

<sup>256</sup> Farwell, “The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution,” 97.

<sup>257</sup> Farwell, “The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution,” 97.

## Community Singing

On September 10<sup>th</sup>, 1916, a peculiar *New York Times* headline read, “Every One Sings at the Community Chorus: New Movement to Democratize Music Reaches a Climax in a Song and Light Festival to be Held in Central Park This Week.”<sup>258</sup> The article that followed detailed how the New York Community Chorus lead by Harry Barnhart, the “Billy Sunday of Music,” had just finished its first season of open air “sings” or rehearsals.<sup>259</sup> For those who had missed earlier notices in the *Times* inviting them to Barnhart’s afternoon rehearsals, the *Times* explained that what made Barnhart’s chorus different was that, throughout the year, everyone who passed by their rehearsal “without regard to race, creed, or previous condition of servitude to the art of music, was invited to sing with its members.”<sup>260</sup> Through his great charisma, unique pedagogical talent, and the natural power of the group, Barnhart turned this walk-in chorus into a respectable musical force ready to perform before thousands of New Yorker’s at Arthur Farwell and Claude Bragdon’s upcoming Song and Light Festival. In the words of the *Times*, Barnhart’s success “proved in a new manner the fact which is at the bottom of the musical art—that everybody can sing and wants to.”<sup>261</sup>

The *Times* article went to explain that Barnhart’s free chorus was an example of the new community music idea currently popular with the “high-brows” who “think a good deal about

---

<sup>258</sup> “Every One Sings at the Community Chorus: New Movement to Democratize Music Reaches a Climax in a Song and Light Festival to Be Held in Central Park This Week,” *New York Times*, September 10, 1916, sec. MAGAZINE SECTION, <https://www.proquest.com/docview/97855063/abstract/40ABA7677EFD44DBPQ/2>.

<sup>259</sup> “Every One Sings at the Community Chorus”; “Harry Barnhart, the Billy Sunday of Music,” *Current Opinion*, June 1917, 403, <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112045866081?urlappend=%3Bseq=7>.

<sup>260</sup> “Every One Sings at the Community Chorus”; “CONCERTS IN CENTRAL PARK: Community Chorus to Sing and Conway’s Band Play Today,” *New York Times*, June 18, 1916, <https://www.proquest.com/docview/97917813/abstract/17F9CEB829D343EDPQ/1>.

<sup>261</sup> “Every One Sings at the Community Chorus”; “Harry Barnhart, the Billy Sunday of Music,” 403.



tendencies and movements in the arts.” The motto of the new movement was “Music Must Be Democratized,” which the *Times* explained was a completely different idea than the other popular phrase “Music for the Masses,” as the “Music Must be Democratized” people despised “mere spectators” and their goal was to get the masses to make their own music rather than to provide them with music listening opportunities.<sup>262</sup> The *Times* also shared excerpts from the New York Community Chorus’ prospectus which described the choral society as a new movement “in closest accord with the foremost ideals and efforts of the time, social, recreational, political, musical and spiritual. All progressive movements meet and find new life in the Community Chorus.”<sup>263</sup> According to the New York Community Chorus prospectus, what the organization sought musically was a “musical ground that is high and at the same time common to all . . . a true people’s musical art.” As an organization, the New York Community Chorus promised to elevate “mass singing, commonly ragged and ineffective, to the plane of beauty and power” and to use the “living power of song to serve the ends of the people” rather than “using people to serve the ends of a traditional musical art.”

Just as Dykema outlined, community music movement proponents were measuring the value of all musical activity according to how well it served the needs of the people. The most visible consequence of this new way of thinking about music was an increased focus on music’s practical social impacts and more time and energy being spent on insuring that everyone had access to “good” music. Though the musical-aesthetic aspirations of the community music movement are perhaps less immediately apparent than the movement’s social and political

---

<sup>262</sup> “Every One Sings at the Community Chorus.”

<sup>263</sup> “Every One Sings at the Community Chorus.”

dimensions, community music movement proponents were just as concerned with ensuring that music served the people's aesthetic needs as their physical needs. Thus, in addition to their general promotion of "good" music, community music movement proponents sought to ensure that the masses had access to what community music movement proponents considered the best musical-aesthetic experience.

In a very limited way, community music movement proponents and music appreciation movement proponents sought the same thing: they both wanted as many people as possible to fully experience, value and love the beauty to be found in "good" music. However, the difference between the two movements quickly becomes apparent when we examine the specific musical-aesthetic experience they promoted. Music appreciation movement proponents taught a balanced intellectual and emotional experience, or "appreciation" of music, that stemmed from an informed, though non-technical understanding of music's meaning, message and established worth. Community music movement proponents, on the other hand, generally subscribed to something resembling the principle Farwell called "mass-appreciation."<sup>264</sup> According to Farwell, mass-appreciation was "the spontaneous response of the human mass to the substantive reality in all music . . . without previous education in musical appreciation." Farwell described this as "an intellectual process 'short-circuited' by a spiritual process," arguing that the ability of large groups to respond to music had nothing to do with

---

<sup>264</sup> Arthur Farwell, "The New Gospel of Music," in *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist and Other Essays on American Music*, ed. Thomas Stoner (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1995), 222, <http://archive.org/details/wanderjahreofrev0000farw>.

“analytical or other intellectual appreciation,” but was rather a part of the natural psychological and spiritual make up of humanity.<sup>265</sup>

For Farwell, as with most community music movement proponents, musical appreciation was primarily an emotional experience. Describing the aesthetic response generated by mass-appreciation, Farwell said that it “manifested itself in a spontaneous and glowing sense of *joy*, universally felt” and was a “reaction to sheer *beauty*.”<sup>266</sup> Of course, the beauty being reacted to was never purely musical even when the community music movement event in question was not heavily reliant on drama and song. The meaning and message of community music was artistic “brotherhood” or, in Farwell’s words, “a fusion of self with the great heart and soul of all mankind, and of God.”<sup>267</sup> Through community music, the community became the artist, allowing each individual, regardless of talent, to experience “all the inspiration and exaltation that the individual artist” had previously experienced alone, but with the added joy of collaboration.<sup>268</sup> In community music production, the “little talents of individuals, bound together in one common effort” formed the “genius of the people.”<sup>269</sup> This collaborative process raised the individual’s worth, Farwell said, as everyone’s contribution, no matter how small, formed an “indispensable part” of a great work of art.<sup>270</sup> To appreciate, or respond to community music, then, was to experience a profound sense of connection between oneself, one’s neighbour, and one’s community, as well as a new understanding of human worth.

---

<sup>265</sup> Farwell, “The New Gospel of Music,” 224.

<sup>266</sup> Farwell, “The New Gospel of Music,” 224.

<sup>267</sup> Farwell, “Community Music Drama,” 227, 230; Frieda van Emden, “Popular Singing in Central Park,” *The Art World* 2, no. 6 (1917): 528–30, <https://doi.org/10.2307/25588091>.

<sup>268</sup> Farwell, “Community Music Drama,” 231.

<sup>269</sup> Farwell, “Community Music Drama,” 231.

<sup>270</sup> Farwell, “Community Music Drama,” 231.

One particular moment at the Song and Light Festival in New York's Central Park stands out as the perfect example of the type of musical-aesthetic experience that the community music movement idealized and promoted. Positioned on a small island in the middle of a lake illuminated by Claude Bragdon's specially designed coloured lanterns, Harry Barnhart's chorus of thousands started to sing "Old Black Joe" and then suddenly stopped. All accounts agree that what happened next was the most profound moment of the whole festival. From across the shore, thousands upon thousands of unseen voices shook off their "inborn reticence" and forgetting themselves took up the chorus of "Old Black Joe" and "sang out unafraid."<sup>271</sup> For community music movement proponents, this was like the veil of the temple being ripped. For a brief moment, all distinctions between audience and performer disappeared. Whether the small group sang to the large, or the large group sang to the small, the aesthetic effect was the same, a joyful awareness of the "brotherhood of song."<sup>272</sup> This, according to one participant, was an "event in local musical history," yet it was not as though people in New York had not sung together before.<sup>273</sup> What was ground-breaking about the community music movement was that it had reordered the relationship between the listener, performer, and composer to suit its own musical-aesthetic purposes. The community music movement, like the music appreciation movement, was an art-world organizing aesthetic theory.

---

<sup>271</sup> van Emden, "Popular Singing in Central Park"; Culbertson, *He Heard America Singing*, 9:175–83; Alden Snell, "Arthur Farwell's New York City 'Song and Light Festival,'" *American Choral Review* 53, no. 2 (9/1/2011 2011): 2–13, <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=67089221&site=ehost-live>; Jonathan Massey, "Organic Architecture and Direct Democracy: Claude Bragdon's Festivals of Song and Light," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 65, no. 4 (2006): 578–613, <https://doi.org/10.2307/25068329>; Claude Bragdon, *More Lives than One*, 1938, <http://archive.org/details/morelivesthanone0000clau>; Stoner, "The New Gospel of Music," 195–96.

<sup>272</sup> van Emden, "Popular Singing in Central Park."

<sup>273</sup> van Emden, "Popular Singing in Central Park."

Of course, it must be noted that this moment of “brotherhood” was built on a black-face minstrel song, that while “humanizing” Black Americans rather than portraying them in vicious racist caricature, none-the-less perpetuated a romanticized, and nostalgic image of slave life.<sup>274</sup> Even a brief examination of extant community singing programs and song books shows that minstrel songs, many even sung in dialect, were almost always an important feature.<sup>275</sup> The community music movement, like the settlement and pageant movements that it sprang from did nothing to challenge the racial status quo and as Vaillant points out, community singing’s racial component “denigrated African American culture and participatory rights to civic engagement” and “taught participants, however circuitously, that white Americanism could bind them together across class and cultural divides.”<sup>276</sup> However, consciously or unconsciously, the community music movement’s “brotherhood” of art was dependent on the exclusion of Black Americans.

---

<sup>274</sup> Steven Saunders, “The Social Agenda of Stephen Foster’s Plantation Melodies,” *American Music* 30, no. 3 (September 22, 2012): 275–90, <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?p=AONE&sw=w&issn=07344392&v=2.1&it=r&id=GALE%7CA404495026&sid=googleScholar&linkaccess=abs>.

<sup>275</sup> Morgan-Ellis, *Everybody Sing!*, 65; Vaillant, *Sounds of Reform*, 170.

<sup>276</sup> Vaillant, *Sounds of Reform*, 169–70.

## Chapter 3

### The Music Appreciation Movement and the Community Music Movement

In this third and final chapter, I discuss the interplay between the music appreciation movement and the community music movement. I begin with a summary and comparison of both movements, and then proceed to examine how their proponents interacted with each other. I note the general lack of debate between music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents and connect this to the fundamental nature of both movements. I then look at the two movements through the lens of music reform one last time before closing with a reflection on how the music appreciation movement and community music movement enacted contrasting forms of musical-political community.

#### Comparing the Movements

Looking at the music appreciation movement and the community music movement together, it is clear that many of the same assumptions informed both movements. Music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents alike held to the premise that in a democratic society, “good” music, with its many social and aesthetic benefits, should be made more accessible to the masses.<sup>277</sup> Music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents also agreed that the failure of existing music education and art music popularization efforts to achieve breakthrough success proved that these efforts were either structurally inadequate, or that their practitioners were using them to covertly

---

<sup>277</sup> Campbell, “A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear,” 260; Yocum, “Appreciation of Music, Literature and Art,” 1; Tuttle, “Appreciation as a Test of Social Progress,” 140; Dykema, “The Spread of the Community Music Idea,” 223; Birge et al., “What Is “Music Appreciation?”

perpetuate a musical aristocracy.<sup>278</sup> Assessing why “good” music was not more popular, music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents agreed that while in the past many people had simply lacked opportunities to hear “good music,” the rise of mechanical reproduction had made it clear that the greater problem was a lack of widespread musical appreciation.<sup>279</sup>

According to music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents, people only sought out music that they already appreciated, and people only appreciated music which was in some way meaningful to them.<sup>280</sup> At issue was how to make “good” music mean something to people who had no interest in seeking it out. Part of this equation was simple enough to solve. As I outlined in previous chapters, music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents agreed that instead of waiting for people to seek out “good” music, they needed to find ways to bring “good” music to the people. What music appreciation and community music movement proponents differed on was the question of how exactly to make the “good” music that they brought to the masses actually mean something to them. The only thing that music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents could agree on in this regard was that new methods needed to be

---

<sup>278</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 3; Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 46–54, 68–69; Beach, “Normal School Problems”; Farwell, “The New Gospel of Music”; Farwell, “Community Music Drama”; Farwell, “The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution.”

<sup>279</sup> Erb, “Musical Education in the United States--Some Observations,” 98, 100; Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 3; Rhetts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America,” 117; Frances Elliott Clark, “They Have Ears to Hear and Hear Not,” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 13, no. 2 (1926): 3–11, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3382638>; Paul John Weaver, “Community Music and the Public Schools,” *The High School Journal* 4, no. 4 (1921): 82, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26290586>; Farwell, “The New Gospel of Music,” 224; Yocum, “Appreciation of Music, Literature and Art,” 2–3, 12.

<sup>280</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 3; Farwell, “The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution,” 97; Hinton, “The Gift of Musical Appreciation,” 560, 568.

tried, tested, and assessed based on the effects they had on students, rather than how well they fulfilled traditional expectations about music learning.<sup>281</sup>

How best to make “good” music mean something to the masses was both a pedagogical as well as a musical-aesthetic question. In the Anglo-speaking world there were serious doubts about whether everyone could be taught to understand and appreciate “good” music. Since a love of “good” music seemed to have always been restricted to the few, some believed that this was the natural state of things, and that only the elect possessed the mental and perceptual acumen to fully understand the “best” music.<sup>282</sup> Music appreciation movement proponents, however, pushed back against this theory, arguing that while not everyone could be taught to sing, play, or compose music successfully, everyone could learn to appreciate music with the right type of teaching.<sup>283</sup> Music appreciation movement proponents argued that the meaning and message of “good” music was universal and that although the musical-aesthetic opinions of those who did not understand and like “good” music could not be relied on, a lack of musical appreciation was not an inborn, or fixed trait.<sup>284</sup> If the language of “good” music had become an unknown tongue for the masses, it was not the fault of the music, nor the people, but of the

---

<sup>281</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 3–4; Peter W. Dykema, “Music in Community Life,” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 20, no. 4 (1934): 35, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3383818>; Erb, “Musical Education in the United States--Some Observations,” 105; Peter W. Dykema, “Music in a Democracy: The Spread of the Community Music Movement,” *The Journal of Education* 84, no. 4 (2090) (1916): 94–94, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42804774>.

<sup>282</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 85; Forbes, “Sociological Value of Music,” 32–33; Erb, “Musical Education in the United States--Some Observations,” 99. Describing and critiquing the old point of view, Erb writes: “if, having offered the Great Masters to the masses, the masses decline to receive them, then are The Elect absolved from further concern, and the masses,—well, they are the masses, and what can be expected of them!”

<sup>283</sup> Forbes, “Sociological Value of Music”; Jacob Kwalwasser, “Music Appreciation; Is It Vital?,” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 16, no. 4 (1930): 13–17, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3384043>.

<sup>284</sup> Yocum, “Appreciation of Music, Literature and Art,” 1; Hinton, “The Gift of Musical Appreciation,” 560–63, 568; Fryberger, “Music Appreciation as Related to the Curriculum,” 700; Anne Medley, “‘Musical Appreciation’ and the Common Listener,” *The Musical Times* 85, no. 1214 (1944): 105, <https://doi.org/10.2307/921459>.



musicians and educators who had failed to properly teach people to understand and enjoy “good” music.<sup>285</sup> Consequently, teachers of music appreciation put a great deal of effort into perfecting their lesson plans and ensuring that their presentations were charismatic and engaging.<sup>286</sup> In music appreciation movement pedagogy, success or failure was believed to be at least as much a product of the teacher’s ability as the innate ability of the students.<sup>287</sup> Curiously though, this only applied to appreciation and not to the teaching of performance, where it remained assumed that only a very few would possess the talent to succeed—thus necessitating the teaching of appreciation as a separate field of study.<sup>288</sup>

As I detailed in Chapter 1, the music appreciation movement taught that the meaning and message of music was to be found in a close reading of the music itself, and that musical appreciation manifested itself in a balanced intellectual and emotional musical-aesthetic experience. Though music appreciation texts frequently utilized historical and biographical anecdotes, I would argue that in addition to their ability to make appreciative study more entertaining, the pedagogical function of these anecdotes was to make the pupil feel closer to the musical work, and less attached to the performers playing in front of them or heard through their phonograph. Furthermore, music appreciation texts often encouraged pupils to direct much of their emotional energy towards a worshipful encounter with the musical work as well as a significant amount of their intellectual energy towards assessing, to the best of their limited

---

<sup>285</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation,” 3–4; Will Earhart, American Editor’s Preface, ix Scholes, *Music Appreciation*.

<sup>286</sup> Scholes, *Music Appreciation*, 119.

<sup>287</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 144. Birge talks about how the culminating influence of the Herbartian pedagogy “magnified the activities of the teacher” at the turn of the twentieth century and functioned alongside the child-study movement to produce the new music education.

<sup>288</sup> Kwalwasser, “Music Appreciation; Is It Vital?,” 17.

ability, the fidelity of the performance they were experiencing.<sup>289</sup> For music appreciation movement proponents then, music's meaning was fixed—bound to a score that was situated in a particular historical context.

Community music movement proponents believed that everyone could learn to make music, or at the very least, be intimately involved in the production of a great musical artform.<sup>290</sup> If the masses failed to connect with music's meaning, it was not merely because "good" music spoke a language that they did not understand, it was because the message being communicated held no interest for them.<sup>291</sup> Community music movement proponents argued that "good" music had become meaningless or irrelevant by dint of its message and that in order for the masses to appreciate "good" music, that type of music needed to be made to say something that would elicit a genuine musical-aesthetic response from them.<sup>292</sup> Community music movement pedagogy then, involved a faith that the masses already possessed the ability

---

<sup>289</sup> Thomas Whitney Surette and Daniel Gregory Mason, *The Appreciation of Music*, Ninth, vol. I (New York: H.W. Gray, 1907), iv, 205–9, 221–22, <http://archive.org/details/appreciationofmu00sureoft>; B. H. Haggin, *Music for the Man Who Enjoys "Hamlet,"* (A.A. Knopf, 1945), 118–21, [http://archive.org/details/musicformanwhoen0000bhha\\_d9z9](http://archive.org/details/musicformanwhoen0000bhha_d9z9). Surette and Mason insist that "the music itself is the central point" of their book yet even their early music appreciation course exhibits this tendency towards composer anecdotes, as seen most clearly in their section on Beethoven's humour. According to the authors, *The Appreciation of Music* presents "the continuous and unbroken course of the development of music from the most primitive sounds . . . up to the symphonies of Beethoven, which must always remain among its most wonderful and perfect monuments." Supposedly chronicling all of musical history, more than a third of the book, (four chapters) is devoted to a worshipful encounter with Beethoven—the music and the man. Surette and Mason state that all of this is meant to enable the reader (listener) to enter into "an active, joyful, vigorous co-operation with composers, through which alone he can truly appreciate their art." B.H. Haggin states that the performer "must produce what the printed score directs that he produce" and that it is not true "that two different performances by two celebrated performers must be accepted as equally valid."

<sup>290</sup> Farwell, "Community Music Drama," 231; Dykema, "The Spread of the Community Music Idea," 221–22.

<sup>291</sup> Dykema, "Music in a Democracy"; Farwell, "A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America," 208–9; Farwell, "The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution," 97–98. Dykema in *Music in a Democracy* states that the community music movement "asks for no lowering of standards of performance by artists, but requires that they shall give material which is better adapted to the people as a whole. It insists that the best way to gain the advantages of music is by participating, if only in a slight degree. It maintains that America is in danger of losing the inspiration which comes from the production of music by the great mass of people."

<sup>292</sup> Farwell, "The New Gospel of Music," 222–24.

to appreciate music, and that their response, or lack of response said something accurate about that music, even if it had to be interpreted, rather than taken at face value. Community music movement pedagogy involved observing when and how the masses naturally responded to music, extracting principles from these observations, and then recreating these conditions in order to reliably activate the people's innate sense of musical appreciation.<sup>293</sup> For community music movement leaders, "knowledge of people" was as, and in some cases, more important than "knowledge of music."<sup>294</sup> This was not just a matter of charismatic presentation, but rather an ability to read and understand people and bring them into proper relationship with themselves, each other, and the music.<sup>295</sup>

As I detailed in Chapter 2, the community music movement taught that the meaning and message of music was to be found both in the music itself, and in its social impact. For community music movement proponents, musical appreciation was an emotional and spiritual experience in which people instantly became aware of the joy and beauty to be found both in the musical event, and in the communal effort required to create it.<sup>296</sup> For community music movement proponents, the performer was not merely a servant of the musical work, but rather an indispensable part of the music's meaning.<sup>297</sup> As I showed in Chapter 2, in the community music movement worldview, musical meaning was formed by the interactions between a

---

<sup>293</sup> Farwell, "The New Gospel of Music"; Arthur Farwell, "Evolution of New Forms Foreseen for America's Music," in *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist and Other Essays on American Music*, ed. Thomas Stoner (Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1995), 235–47, <http://archive.org/details/wanderjahreofrev0000farw>. In both articles Farwell observes, extracts principles, and suggesting means of application.

<sup>294</sup> Dykema, "The Spread of the Community Music Idea," 221.

<sup>295</sup> "Every One Sings at the Community Chorus"; Farwell, "Community Music Drama," 232.

<sup>296</sup> Weaver, "Community Music and the Public Schools," 83; Farwell, "The New Gospel of Music," 222. Weaver writes "Have you ever gone to a real, live, up-and-coming community sing? . . . when it is all over you feel that everybody in town is your best friend; and then you whistle that new tune for a week!"

<sup>297</sup> Farwell, "Community Music Drama," 231.

musical work, an ever-changing cast of artists, and even the time and setting of the performance. This meant that musical meaning was ephemeral, rather than fixed, and that performance mattered. What was significant about this approach to musical meaning was that it allowed community music movement proponents to reshape almost any type of music to suit their musical-aesthetic goals. Observing that historical European art music rarely had an emotional impact on the American people at large, yet still having a deep faith that “good” music held profound aesthetic power, community music movement proponents attempted to make that music mean something to the masses by presenting it to them in a new way.<sup>298</sup> Conversely, observing that certain older popular tunes like Stephen Foster’s, “Old Black Joe” could elicit powerful sentimental responses, community music movement proponents transformed them into “good” music by proclaiming them American folk songs, and programming them as part of concerts that also featured “serious” music.<sup>299</sup> Open to change and seeking music that might better resonate with the American people, community music movement proponents were of course naturally interested in the idea of new compositions by American composers.<sup>300</sup> Whereas the music appreciation movement’s support of musical Americanism was perfunctory, community music movement proponents believed that given the right guidance and support, American composers would humble themselves, become part of specific communities, and from a posture of mutuality, provide the rest of the community with

---

<sup>298</sup> Farwell, “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America,” 208.

<sup>299</sup> van Emden, “Popular Singing in Central Park.”

<sup>300</sup> Dykema, “The Effect of the Festival and Pageant Revival on the Teaching of Music,” 68–69; Farwell, “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America.”

the musical material they needed to fully express themselves as part of the “brotherhood” of art.<sup>301</sup>

### How the Proponents Related to Each Other

In this thesis, I have presented music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents as working towards the same overarching goal—what was variously referred to as the popularization, democratization, or socialization of “good” music—while simultaneously maintaining very different conceptions about the nature of the musical-aesthetic experience, the steps necessary to achieve their goal, and what the democratization of music actually meant. What is surprising is that even though these two movements covered so much of the same ground, while embodying such widely different conceptions of art music, I have found no clear examples of music appreciation movement or community music movement proponents publicly critiquing or outright opposing the other movement. Instead, what I have discovered is that music appreciation movement and community music proponents treated each other like professional colleagues, attending the same conferences, publishing their diverging theories in the same periodicals and, from all outward appearances, viewing each other as faithful allies in the cause of “good” music. Even more surprising, there were quite a number of individuals who, focusing all of their attention on the larger goal of making “good” music popular and having no strong sense of devotion to the underlying ideologies of the music appreciation movement and community music movement, were active proponents of both.

---

<sup>301</sup> Chybowsky, “Developing American Taste,” 234–35; Langdon, “AMERICA, LIKE ENGLAND, HAS BECOME PAGEANT MAD”; Farwell, “The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution,” 98; Farwell, “Community Music Drama,” 232, 234.

Some of the more notable examples include J. Lawrence Erb, Robert Haven Schauffler, Thomas Tapper, and even, in later years, Peter W. Dykema.<sup>302</sup>

Some of the lack of friction between the two movements, at least in American music education circles, stemmed from an idea that I mentioned briefly in Chapter 1: music educators viewed both music appreciation and community music as products of the child study movement and as an accepted part of the New Education.<sup>303</sup> The long-standing controversy in American music education circles had been a debate about whether note reading or rote singing would better prepare children for adult musical life. The child study movement finally put this debate to rest by arguing that the best way to prepare children for future musical life was by meeting their aesthetic and expressive needs in the here and now, and that so far as instruction in note reading and rote singing met these needs, they should both be used.<sup>304</sup> Alignment with the child study movement, then, meant alignment with a consensus position that valued a specific result (musical enjoyment or appreciation) over method. Around the same time, music educators in the United States widely embraced scientific-management and the results-oriented-pragmatism they called efficiency.<sup>305</sup> Scientific-management also encouraged consensus over dogmatism, as C. A. Fullerton would tell the MSNC in 1914: “as soon as we begin to discuss ideals and

---

<sup>302</sup> Erb, “Musical Appreciation”; Erb, “Music for a Better Community”; Robert Haven Schauffler, *Music as a Social Force in America and the Science of Practice*, (New York, 1927), <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015009594949>; Thomas Tapper, *The Music Supervisor; His Training, Influence and Opportunity* (Boston and New York: Oliver Ditson and C. H. Ditson & Company, 1916), <http://archive.org/details/music-supervisor-00-tapp-goog>; Birge et al., “What Is ‘Music Appreciation?’”; Hardesty, “Canonic Constructions in Early 20th Century Music Appreciation Classes,” 296. Hardesty details how Frances E. Clark added Dykema to her roster of music appreciation “stars.”

<sup>303</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 163–64, 209–14, 225–29.

<sup>304</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 145–46.

<sup>305</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 114, 181, 251; C. A. Fullerton et al., “Efficiency in Music Teaching and Practical Tests of the Same,” in *Journal of Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors’ National Conference* (Minneapolis Minnesota: The Conference, 1914), 43–58, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008699614>.

methods” we find ourself split into groups, but “if we adopt the scientific management test and the attitude” we can “see the beautiful work that is done, in spite of the fact that they [other music supervisors] may be doing some things that we may think should be left out.”<sup>306</sup> With consensus as an MSNC value, progressive music education avoided being fractionalized into camps, as both liberal and conservative members blended their ideas into a “near unanimity of opinion on the objectives” of progressive music education in the schools.<sup>307</sup>

This new focus on immediate application and efficiency also explains the willingness of school music educators to embrace methods that were originally conceived for adults. According to Helen Place, the editor and publisher of *School Music*, teachers who wished to make music education immediately meaningful for school children should use what the best “musical experience does for men and women in actual life” as a guide.<sup>308</sup> Since the music appreciation movement and the community music movement both claimed to produce with the least effort, and greatest speed, the best adult musical experience, it is easy to see why educators were so eager to adopt the music appreciation and community music ideas for school use. That the two movements taught different lessons about the nature of music and musical appreciation was less important to music teachers and supervisors of music in schools than the mere fact that both movements taught people to enjoy “good” music, in a friendly, enjoyable, and learner focused manner, and provided ample evidence of their efficiency. It of course

---

<sup>306</sup> Fullerton et al., “Efficiency in Music Teaching and Practical Tests of the Same,” 51, 56. In the discussion that followed, Dykema expressed generous and open-minded sympathy with the music appreciation idea, or the idea that it was important to not confuse singing or “performance with the thing itself.” Dykema also notes that he “may not agree with some of the things” that Fullerton, “had in mind—in which these different elements might be called a hinderance.”

<sup>307</sup> Miller, “The Influence of Progressivism on Music Education, 1917-1947,” 12–13.

<sup>308</sup> Birge, *History of Public School Music*, 145–46.

helped matters greatly that the most prominent proponent of the music appreciation movement, Frances E. Clark, and the most prominent proponent of the community music movement, Peter W. Dykema, were both highly active members of the MSNC who had both served terms as President of the Conference.<sup>309</sup>

Another reason why we see a great deal of boosterism for the music appreciation movement and community music movement, but little open debate between proponents of the two movements was due to the imprecise and ambiguous language that proponents of both movements favored. As I explained in Chapter 1, appreciation in its oldest and most general sense was the accepted, though ill-defined goal of all musical activity. Furthermore, in the first half of the twentieth century, influenced by the New Education, appreciation was quickly becoming the goal of all forms of aesthetic education. Music appreciation movement proponents took an already vague term and made it more ambiguous by deploying it in different ways—more often than not, failing to explain what their insider use of the term actually meant. Music appreciation movement proponents used this ambiguity to present their movement as a timeless and inseparable part of the art music tradition that was paradoxically also a brand-new methodology capable of delivering unprecedented results. This meant that to successfully critique the music appreciation movement required disambiguating and deconstructing the term “appreciation”—separating the movement from its claims of legitimacy, while being careful to not be seen as challenging the widely accepted concept of musical appreciation. As *The State of Music*, the composer and philosopher Virgil Thomson’s

---

<sup>309</sup> Hardesty, “Canonic Constructions in Early 20th Century Music Appreciation Classes,” 296.



1939 critique of the music appreciation movement shows, this was not an impossible task.<sup>310</sup> It was, however, something that community music movement proponents demonstrated little interest in doing.

While the core of the community music movement—community singing—was well defined, community music movement proponents preferred to keep the outer boundaries of their movement permeable. As I highlighted in Chapter 2, the basic stance of the community music movement towards other social movements and musical activities was to either fold them into their own movement or, if this was not possible, make them serve community music movement purposes in some way. Appropriating and portraying a wide variety of musical activities as community music was a productive strategy because it helped community music movement proponents maintain the public perception of their movement’s unstoppable rapid growth. Beyond strategic considerations, such syncretism should also be understood as part of the fundamental nature of the community music movement. In the words of Dykema, the community music movement was a “new point of view” that was “measuring all musical endeavors” according to its own standard.<sup>311</sup> The boundaries of the community music movement were permeable because the movement was meant to be a new way for everyone to think about, reevaluate, and reorganize art music activity. For the vast majority of community music movement proponents, then, the music appreciation movement was not something to be opposed through rhetoric, but rather something that, in the arena of application, needed to be made to serve community music movement purposes.

---

<sup>310</sup> Thomson, *The State of Music*.

<sup>311</sup> Dykema, “The Spread of the Community Music Idea,” 223.

For their part, I would argue that music appreciation movement proponents in the United States saw community music making, like other forms of instruction in self-performance, as fundamentally limited in the number of people it could convert to “good” music.<sup>312</sup> As long as community music movement advocacy did not get in the way of music appreciation being offered to ever more people, such activities were of little concern to music appreciation movement proponents who imagined that the community of music consumers or “intelligent” listeners that they could build would be an order of magnitude larger than even the largest possible community of music producers.<sup>313</sup>

### Music Reformers, or Allies in the Cause of Good Music?

Throughout this thesis, I have utilized Gavin James Campbell’s terminology of music reform, and music reformers, as a way to talk about some of the characteristics shared between the music appreciation movement, community music movement, and other musical-social movements active during the first half of the twentieth century. Identifying certain characteristics as shared or “common” has allowed me to better highlight the defining features of the movements I have chosen to study. What I have been careful to point out, however, is that although many different groups of people shared what can be described as music reform beliefs, all chose to identify with the more narrowly defined ideologies of specific music reform movements rather than naming themselves part of a broader push for music reform. Though the idea of a music reform movement is useful analytically, I would argue that music reform

---

<sup>312</sup> Kwalwasser, “Music Appreciation; Is It Vital?,” 17; Forbes, “Sociological Value of Music.”

<sup>313</sup> Edward Bailey Birge, “Music Appreciation: The Education of the Listener,” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 10, no. 4 (1924): 14–18, <https://doi.org/10.2307/3383132>; Yocum, “Appreciation of Music, Literature and Art,” 2–3, 12; Rhetts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America,” 114.

occupied the gray area between social movement and established culture. Obviously, everyone in the United States did not hold music reform ideas, but even Campbell's original study shows that across broad swaths of the population music reform ideas were understood and talked about as though they were "common sense."<sup>314</sup> To identify or self-select based on such broadly held beliefs would have provided little utility compared to identifying as part of the music appreciation movement or community music movement.

If music reformers themselves identified with something larger than their own movements that bound them all together, it was not music reform but rather something that they called "the cause of good music."<sup>315</sup> As I outlined in Chapter 1, the idea that those who loved "serious" music had a duty to maintain "good" music's quality, purify the art music community, and convert new musical devotees was a tradition in the United States that predated the progressive era. Engaging in these activities was the clearest way to show that one was neither a sell-out virtuoso, nor someone who had succumbed to the allure of ballyhoo, but rather someone with a serious or cultivated interest in "good" music.<sup>316</sup> Devotion to the cause of "good" music was an in-group identity marker that involved participation in processes of exclusion and inclusion.

---

<sup>314</sup> Campbell, "A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear," 261.

<sup>315</sup> Beach, "Normal School Problems," 60; F. J. Kelly, "Community Music and Singing," *America* 25, no. 7 (June 4, 1921): 157, <https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hlh&AN=34766343&site=ehost-live>; J. Lawrence Erb, "Music in the Education of the Common Man," *The Musical Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (1919): 308, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738193>; Erb, "Musical Appreciation," 1; Music Supervisors' National Conference, "Constitution and Bylaws," in *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors' National Conference* (Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913), 3–4, <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>.

<sup>316</sup> Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini*, 27–28; Erb, "Musical Education in the United States--Some Observations," 100–101.

In the first half of the twentieth century, in line with larger trends, devotion to the cause of “good” music, a personal moral duty and a marker of “cultivated” taste, also became a national imperative to popularize “good” music.<sup>317</sup> America, it was said, must be made musical so that American composers could create great works on a par with historical European composers.<sup>318</sup> Influenced by the settlement movement to go beyond traditional philanthropic efforts, those who engaged in music reform sought not just to gift people with access to “good” music, but also to engage in a process that brought themselves into closer contact with the people they wished to serve.<sup>319</sup> This impetus, combined with the educational theories of the New Education, turned philanthropic music popularization efforts into a quasi-collaborative process that music reforms viewed as democratization.<sup>320</sup> As confidence that “good” music could be successfully democratized grew, so too did the belief that “good” music offered a plethora of benefits to the individual and society. Democratization became socialization as the focus of music reform subtly expanded from an equal right to participate, to an equal right to experience music’s social and aesthetic benefits.<sup>321</sup> Throughout these developments, however, I would argue that the central motivating factor behind all music reform activities remained the same—an unwavering devotion to the cause of “good” music. Music appreciation movement

---

<sup>317</sup> Chybowski, “Developing American Taste,” 233; Kelly, “Community Music and Singing,” 156; Westcott, “Nationalization of Community Music,” 291. As F.J. Kelly shows, the cause of “good” music continued to be a personal moral duty even as it expanded into a nationalist project.

<sup>318</sup> Rhetts, “The Development of Music Appreciation in America,” 113–14. Rhetts writes: “from all sides we hear the slogan, ‘Make America Musical.’”

<sup>319</sup> Vaillant, *Sounds of Reform*, 94–95.

<sup>320</sup> “CLUBS UNITE FOR COMMUNITY MUSIC.”; Gertrude Himmelfarb, “Victorian Philanthropy: The Case of Toynbee Hall,” *The American Scholar* 59, no. 3 (1990): 377, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41211806>; Carson, *Settlement Folk*, 1–6. Himmelfarb writes of Samul Barnett’s first social settlement that “the residents were not missionaries bringing the faith to the heathen; nor were they almoners bringing them money, food, or clothes. They were ‘settlers’ who came to live among the poor—‘to learn,’ Barnett said, ‘as much as to teach, to receive as much as to give.’”

<sup>321</sup> Forbes, “Sociological Value of Music”; Dykema, “The Spread of the Community Music Idea.”

and community music movement proponents were not just music reformers, they were lovers of serious music continuing the anti-ballyhoo tradition of purifying or reforming the art music community by teaching people to experience art music in the right way and to like it for the “right” reasons. What was different from earlier times was that music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents had opened up two different “right” ways to experience “good” music. Though promoting different pathways for newcomers to gain inclusion granting participation, proponents of either movement continued to see each other as lovers of “serious” music and did not actively oppose each other. This no doubt was because music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents all so very publicly displayed the most fundamental marker of art music inclusion--devotion to the cause of “good” music.

## Conclusion

Whether we conceptualize the music appreciation movement and community music movement as part of some kind of broad music reform movement, or as allies in the traditional cause of “good” music, what is clear is that a full understanding of the history of the art music tradition in the early twentieth-century United States requires working knowledge of both the music appreciation and community music movements. While they may not have been in the habit of debating with each other, by promoting their respective movements, music appreciation movement and community music movement proponents nonetheless advocated for two very different futures for the art music tradition. In this thesis I have presented music appreciation movement proponents as advocating for a restructured, yet still hierarchical

musical-political community where music appreciation teachers, like priests, guided lay listeners into worshipful encounters with the works of genius composers and the actual performer of the music was made the servant of all. In contrast, I have described community music movement proponents as advocating for a utopian brotherhood of music where hierarchical distinctions were temporarily blurred, though not actually eliminated and a worshipful encounter with art music involved a revelation of human worth. The music appreciation movement then was a community of sacralized art music consumption, where, in the words of Joseph Horowitz, it was made a “democratic privilege” to partake in “great music’s exclusivity.”<sup>322</sup> The community music movement, on the other hand, was a community of sacralized art music production where each individual formed an “indispensable part” of a great work of art.<sup>323</sup> Promoting supremacist futures where art music was not just popular with all classes, but the dominant musical-cultural force in the United States, neither movement comes across as particularly democratic today, yet the fundamental questions they posed—whether a truly democratic community can actually be constituted around art production, or if the nature of talent makes communities based around art consumption a democratic necessity, remains unanswered, and equally pressing in the twenty-first century as the twentieth.

---

<sup>322</sup> Horowitz, *Understanding Toscanini*, 202.

<sup>323</sup> Farwell, “Community Music Drama,” 231.

## Bibliography

- Absher, Amy. *The Black Musician and the White City: Race and Music in Chicago, 1900-1967*. Ann Arbor, UNITED STATES: University of Michigan Press, 2014.  
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/west/detail.action?docID=3570550>.
- Addams, Jane. *The Spirit of Youth and the City Streets*. 1972 University of Illinois Press reprint. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1909. [http://archive.org/details/spiritofyouthcit0000adda\\_l5f5](http://archive.org/details/spiritofyouthcit0000adda_l5f5).
- . *Twenty Years at Hull-House, with Autobiographical Notes*. New York : Macmillan Co., 1910.  
<http://archive.org/details/twentyyearsathul00addauoft>.
- Arthur Loesser. *Men, Women, and Pianos*. Dover Publications, 1990.  
[http://archive.org/details/menwomenpianosso00loes\\_0](http://archive.org/details/menwomenpianosso00loes_0).
- B. H. Haggin. *Music for the Man Who Enjoys "Hamlet,."* A.A. Knopf, 1945.  
[http://archive.org/details/musicformanwhoen0000bhha\\_d9z9](http://archive.org/details/musicformanwhoen0000bhha_d9z9).
- Babbitt, Milton. *The Collected Essays of Milton Babbitt*. Princeton University Press, 2003.  
<https://hdl.handle.net/2027/heb06304.0001.001>.
- Barresi, Anthony L. "Edgar B. Gordon: A Pioneer in Media Music Education." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 35, no. 4 (1987): 259–74. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345078>.
- Beach, Frank A. "Normal School Problems." In *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors' National Conference*, 57–60. Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913.  
<https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>.
- Bennett, Rebecca. "Debating Music 'Appreciation' Outside the American Classroom, 1930-1950." *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 33, no. 2 (2012): 128.
- . "The Anxiety of Appreciation: Virgil Thomson Wrestles with a 'Racket.'" PhD diss., ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2009.
- Birge, Edward Bailey. *History of Public School Music in The United States*. New and Augmented ed. Philadelphia: Oliver Ditson, 1937. <http://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.226767>.
- . "Music Appreciation: The Education of the Listener." *Music Supervisors' Journal* 10, no. 4 (1924): 14–18. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3383132>.
- Birge, Edward Bailey, Mabelle Glenn, Fowler Smith, Karl W. Gehrken, Grace Van Dyke More, Anne E. Plerce, Jacob Kwalwasser, Osbourne McConathy, and Peter W. Dykema. "What Is "Music Appreciation?: A Symposium." *Music Educators Journal* 22, no. 4 (1936): 15–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3384673>.
- Campbell, Gavin James. "'A Higher Mission than Merely to Please the Ear': Music and Social Reform in America, 1900-1925." *The Musical Quarterly* 84, no. 2 (2000): 259–86.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/742567>.
- Carson, Mina Julia. *Settlement Folk: Social Thought and the American Settlement Movement, 1885-1930*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990. <http://archive.org/details/settlementfolkso0000cars>.
- Cassano, Graham, Rima Lunin Schultz, and Jessica Payette. *Eleanor Smith's Hull House Songs: The Music of Protest and Hope in Jane Addams's Chicago*. Studies in Critical Social Sciences 131. Boston: BRILL, 2018.
- "Catalogue of the University of Washington for 1913-1914 and Announcements for 1914-1915." Frank M. Lamborn Public Printer, Seattle Washington, 1914.
- Chang, E. Christina. "The Singing Program of World War I: The Crusade for a Singing Army." *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 23, no. 1 (2001): 19–45.  
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/40215234>.
- Chybowski, Julia. "Developing American Taste: A Cultural History of the Early Twentieth-Century Music Appreciation Movement." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 2008.

- . “Selling Musical Taste in Early Twentieth-Century America: Frances E. Clark and the Business of Music Appreciation.” *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 38, no. 2 (April 1, 2017): 104–27. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536600616684969>.
- Clark, Frances Elliott. “Music Appreciation: Leaven or Garnish.” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 14, no. 2 (1927): 21–31. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3382714>.
- . “They Have Ears to Hear and Hear Not.” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 13, no. 2 (1926): 3–11. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3382638>.
- Claude Bragdon. *More Lives than One*, 1938. <http://archive.org/details/morelivesthanone0000clau>.
- Cole, Lucy K. “Music and the Social Problems.” In *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors’ National Conference*, 26–31. Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>.
- “Community Music.” *Music Supervisors’ Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (1914): 28–30. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3382232>.
- Culbertson, Evelyn Davis. “Arthur Farwell’s Early Efforts on Behalf of American Music, 1889-1921.” *American Music* 5, no. 2 (1987): 156–75. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3052160>.
- . *He Heard America Singing: Arthur Farwell, Composer, and Crusading Music Educator*. Vol. 9. Composers of North America No. 9. Metuchen, N.J: Scarecrow Press, 1992.
- Current Opinion*. “Harry Barnhart, the Billy Sunday of Music.” June 1917. <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112045866081?urlappend=%3Bseq=7>.
- Dykema, Peter W. “Music in a Democracy: The Spread of the Community Music Movement.” *The Journal of Education* 84, no. 4 (2090) (1916): 94–94. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42804774>.
- . “Music in Community Life.” *Music Supervisors’ Journal* 20, no. 4 (1934): 34–74. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3383818>.
- . “The Effect of the Festival and Pageant Revival on the Teaching of Music.” In *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors’ National Conference*, 64–71. Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>.
- . “The Relation of Schools and Colleges to Community Music.” *The Playground*, September 1917. <http://archive.org/details/playground11playrich>.
- . “The Spread of the Community Music Idea.” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 67 (1916): 218–23. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1013509>.
- Emden, Frieda van. “Popular Singing in Central Park.” *The Art World* 2, no. 6 (1917): 528–30. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25588091>.
- “England as a Musical Country.” *The Musical Times* 53, no. 836 (1912): 658–59. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/906792>.
- Erb, J. Lawrence. “Music for a Better Community.” *The Musical Quarterly* 12, no. 3 (1926): 441–48. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738249>.
- . “Music in the Education of the Common Man.” *The Musical Quarterly* 5, no. 3 (1919): 308–15. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738193>.
- . “Musical Appreciation.” *The Musical Quarterly* 11, no. 1 (1925): 1–7. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738382>.
- . “Musical Education in the United States--Some Observations.” *The Musical Quarterly* 10, no. 1 (1924): 95–106. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/738259>.
- Farwell, Arthur. “A Glance at Present Musical Problems in America.” In *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist and Other Essays on American Music*, edited by Thomas Stoner, 204–10. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1995. <http://archive.org/details/wanderjahreofrev0000farw>.
- . “Community Music Drama: Will Our Country People in Time Help Us to Develop the Real American Theater?” In *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist and Other Essays on American Music*,



- edited by Thomas Stoner, 227–34. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1995.  
<http://archive.org/details/wanderjahreofrev0000farw>.
- . “Evolution of New Forms Foreseen for America’s Music.” In *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist and Other Essays on American Music*, edited by Thomas Stoner, 235–47. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1995. <http://archive.org/details/wanderjahreofrev0000farw>.
- . “The New Gospel of Music.” In *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist and Other Essays on American Music*, edited by Thomas Stoner, 222–26. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1995.  
<http://archive.org/details/wanderjahreofrev0000farw>.
- . “The Zero Hour in Musical Evolution.” *The Musical Quarterly* 13, no. 1 (1927): 85–99.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/738558>.
- . *Wanderjahre of a Revolutionist and Other Essays on American Music*. Edited by Thomas Stoner. Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press, 1995.  
<http://archive.org/details/wanderjahreofrev0000farw>.
- Fay, Rose Thomas. *Memoirs Of Theodore Thomas*, 1911.  
<http://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.214056>.
- Forbes, George Mather. “Sociological Value of Music.” In *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors’ National Conference*, 32–34. Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>.
- Fowles, Ernest. “Musical Appreciation.” *The Musical Times* 72, no. 1063 (1931): 829–30.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/915609>.
- Frederickson, Jon. “Technology and Music Performance in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction.” *International Review of the Aesthetics and Sociology of Music* 20, no. 2 (1989): 193–220.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/836729>.
- Fryberger, Agnes Moore. “Music Appreciation as Related to the Curriculum.” *The Journal of Education* 93, no. 25 (2335) (1921): 699–700. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42830977>.
- Fullerton, C. A., Frances Wright, Ralph Baldwin, and Peter W. Dykema. “Efficiency in Music Teaching and Practical Tests of the Same.” In *Journal of Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors’ National Conference*, 43–58. Minneapolis Minnesota: The Conference, 1914.  
<https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008699614>.
- Gehrkins, Karl, and Peter W. Dykema. “Three Forthcoming Discussions. Things for You to Think over and to Do.” *Music Supervisors’ Bulletin* 1, no. 4 (1915): 18–20.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/3382214>.
- George, Margaret. “Windego Park Auditorium.” In *SAH ARCHIPEDIA*, edited by Gabrielle Esperdy and Karen Kingsley,. Charlottesville: UVaP: Society of Architectural Historians, July 17, 2018.  
<https://sah-archipedia.org/buildings/MN-01-003-0054>.
- Glassberg, David. *American Historical Pageantry: The Uses of Tradition in the Early Twentieth Century*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1990.
- Gordon, Edgar B. “What Music Did for Winfield.” *The Playground*, May 1917.  
<http://archive.org/details/playground11playrich>.
- Green, Shannon Louise. “‘Art for Life’s Sake’: Music Schools and Activities in United States Social Settlements, 1892--1942.” Ph.D., The University of Wisconsin - Madison, 1998.  
<http://www.proquest.com/docview/304456468/abstract/E63CD1D0AB544225PQ/1>.
- Gregory, Brian. “Educated Ears: Studies on Listening in American Education, 1900–1945.” ProQuest Dissertations Publishing, 2013. <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1430907093/?pq-origsite=primo>.
- Grove Music Online. “Scholes, Percy A(Lfred).” Accessed November 16, 2023.  
<https://www.oxfordmusiconline.com/grovemusic/display/10.1093/gmo/9781561592630.001.0001/omo-9781561592630-e-0000025033>.

- Gustafson, Ruth Iana. "Merry Throngs and Street Gangs: The Fabrication of Whiteness and the Worthy Citizen in Early Vocal Instruction and Music Appreciation, 1830–1930." Ph.D., The University of Wisconsin - Madison, 2005.  
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/305385399/abstract/E53D4119A89D41B0PQ/1>.
- Hardesty, Jacob. "Canonic Constructions in Early 20th Century Music Appreciation Classes." *American Educational History Journal* 38, no. 1–2 (2011): 289–303.
- Harker, Brian. "Milton Babbitt Encounters Academia (and Vice Versa)." *American Music* 26, no. 3 (September 22, 2008): 336–78.  
<https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?p=AONE&sw=w&issn=07344392&v=2.1&it=r&id=GALE%7CA402050760&sid=googleScholar&linkaccess=abs>.
- Higgins, Lee. *Community Music: In Theory and In Practice*. Oxford University Press, 2012.  
<http://oxford.universitypressscholarship.com/view/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199777839.001.0001/acprof-9780199777839-chapter-001>.
- Himmelfarb, Gertrude. "Victorian Philanthropy: The Case of Toynbee Hall." *The American Scholar* 59, no. 3 (1990): 373–84. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41211806>.
- Hinton, Arthur. "The Gift of Musical Appreciation." *The Musical Quarterly* 1, no. 4 (1915): 560–68.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/738065>.
- Horowitz, Joseph. "'Sermons in Tones': Sacralization as a Theme in American Classical Music." *American Music* 16, no. 3 (1998): 311–40. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3052639>.
- . *Understanding Toscanini: How He Became an American Culture-God and Helped Create a New Audience for Old Music*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf: Distributed by Random House, 1987.  
[http://archive.org/details/understandingtos0000horo\\_n0w8](http://archive.org/details/understandingtos0000horo_n0w8).
- Humphreys, Jere T. "The Child-Study Movement and Public School Music Education." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 33, no. 2 (1985): 79–86. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3344728>.
- Johnson, H. Earle. "The Germania Musical Society." *The Musical Quarterly* 39, no. 1 (1953): 75–93.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/740035>.
- Karpf, Juanita. "For Their Musical Uplift: Emma Azalia Hackley and Voice Culture in African American Communities." *International Journal of Community Music* 4, no. 3 (November 2011): 237–56.  
[https://doi.org/10.1386/ijcm.4.3.237\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1386/ijcm.4.3.237_1).
- . "Get the Pageant Habit: E. Azalia Hackley's Festivals and Pageants during the First World War Years, 1914–1918." *Popular Music and Society* 34, no. 5 (2011): 517–56.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/03007766.2010.521441>.
- Katz, Mark. "Making America More Musical through the Phonograph, 1900–1930." *American Music* 16, no. 4 (1998): 448–76. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3052289>.
- Kelly, F. J. "Community Music and Singing." *America* 25, no. 7 (June 4, 1921): 156–57.  
<https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=hlh&AN=34766343&site=ehost-live>.
- Kim, Patricia Costa. "Making Music Their Own: School Music, Community, and Standards of Excellence in Seattle, 1885–1975." *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 21, no. 2 (2000): 162–79.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/40215216>.
- Kopkas, Jeremy. "Soundings: Musical Aesthetics in Music Education Discourse from 1907 to 1958." Edited by Deron Boyles, 2011.
- Krikun, Andy. *Perilous Blessing of Leisure*. Edited by Roger Mantie and Gareth Dylan Smith. Vol. 1. The Oxford Handbook of Music Making and Leisure. Oxford University Press, 2017.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190244705.013.10>.
- Kwalwasser, Jacob. "Music Appreciation; Is It Vital?" *Music Supervisors' Journal* 16, no. 4 (1930): 13–17.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3384043>.
- Langdon, William Chauncey. "AMERICA, LIKE ENGLAND, HAS BECOME PAGEANT MAD: Thousands of Dollars Will Be Spent This Year in Giving Picturesque Dramas of Which the Place Is the Hero and

- the Development of the Community the Plot.," June 15, 1913, sec. Magazine Section Part Five. <https://www.proquest.com/hnpnewyorktimes/docview/97393509/abstract/8F19ED8B790249D9PQ/1>.
- Lasch-Quinn, Elisabeth. *Black Neighbors: Race and the Limits of Reform in the American Settlement House Movement, 1890-1945*. Vol. 1. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1993. <https://heinonline.org/HOL/P?h=hein.civil/bkng0001&i=1>.
- Lee, William R. "Music Education and Rural Reform, 1900-1925." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 45, no. 2 (1997): 306–26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3345589>.
- Levine, Lawrence W. *Highbrow/Lowbrow: The Emergence of Cultural Hierarchy in America*. 1st Harvard University Press pbk. ed. The William E. Massey, Sr. Lectures in the History of American Civilization 1986. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1990.
- Los Angeles Times* (1886-1922). "CLUBS UNITE FOR COMMUNITY MUSIC: ORGANIC BODY TO SUPERVISE PROJECT HERE; Plans Made at Federation Meeting to Systematize Various Efforts Under One General Head, with Music Centers in Various Sections of the City." May 8, 1917. <http://www.proquest.com/docview/160447732/abstract/74F52D5E16C447B7PQ/1>.
- Mantie, Roger. *Music, Leisure, Education: Historical and Philosophical Perspectives*. Oxford Scholarship Online. New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2022.
- Massey, Jonathan. "Organic Architecture and Direct Democracy: Claude Bragdon's Festivals of Song and Light." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 65, no. 4 (2006): 578–613. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25068329>.
- Mathews, W. S. B. (William Smythe Babcock). *How to Understand Music*. 5th ed. Philadelphia: Theodore Presser, 1888. <http://archive.org/details/howtounderstandm01mathuoft>.
- Medley, Anne. "'Musical Appreciation' and the Common Listener." *The Musical Times* 85, no. 1214 (1944): 105–7. <https://doi.org/10.2307/921459>.
- Miller, Thomas W. "The Influence of Progressivism on Music Education, 1917-1947." *Journal of Research in Music Education* 14, no. 1 (1966): 3–16. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3343928>.
- Milne, A. Forbes. "Musical Appreciation in the Early School Years." *The Musical Times* 72, no. 1066 (1931): 1101–3. <https://doi.org/10.2307/915842>.
- Morgan-Ellis, Esther M. *Everybody Sing!: Community Singing in the American Picture Palace*. Athens, UNITED STATES: University of Georgia Press, 2018. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/west/detail.action?docID=5150843>.
- . "Warren Kimsey and Community Singing at Camp Gordon, 1917–1918." *Journal of Historical Research in Music Education* 39, no. 2 (April 1, 2018): 171–94. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1536600616677995>.
- Morris, Robert. "What Milton Babbitt Enabled." *Music Theory Spectrum* 34, no. 1 (2012): 19–21. <https://doi.org/10.1525/mts.2012.34.1.19>.
- "Music Discussions at the N.E.A." *Music Supervisors' Bulletin* 1, no. 1 (1914): 26–28. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/3382230>.
- Music Supervisors' National Conference. "Constitution and Bylaws." In *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors' National Conference*, 3–4. Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>.
- . In *Journal of Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors' National Conference*. Rochester, NY: The Conference, 1913. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/003922907>.
- . In *Journal of Proceedings of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Music Supervisors' National Conference*. Minneapolis Minnesota: The Conference, 1914. <https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/008699614>.

- Music Teachers' National Association. In *Papers and Proceedings of the Music Teachers' National Association*, edited by Karl W. Gherkens. Studies in Musical Education History and Aesthetics Sixteenth Series. Detroit: Music Teachers' National Association, 1922.  
<http://archive.org/details/volumeproceedin00assogoog>.
- nafme.org. "NAfME History - NAfME." Accessed November 12, 2023. <https://nafme.org/about/nafme-history/>.
- New York Times*. "CONCERTS IN CENTRAL PARK: Community Chorus to Sing and Conway's Band Play Today." June 18, 1916.  
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/97917813/abstract/17F9CEB829D343EDPQ/1>.
- New York Times*. "Every One Sings at the Community Chorus: New Movement to Democratize Music Reaches a Climax in a Song and Light Festival to Be Held in Central Park This Week." September 10, 1916, sec. MAGAZINE SECTION.  
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/97855063/abstract/40ABA7677EFD44DBPQ/2>.
- Playground Association of America. "Community Singing Conference." *The Playground*, September 1917.  
<http://archive.org/details/playground11playrich>.
- Playground Association of America and Playground and Recreation Association of America. *The Playground*. Cooperstown New York: Executive Committee of the Playground Association of America, 1917. <http://archive.org/details/playground11playrich>.
- Rhetts, Edith M. "The Development of Music Appreciation in America." In *Papers and Proceedings of the Music Teachers' National Association*, edited by Karl W. Gherkens, 112–20. Studies in Musical Education History and Aesthetics Sixteenth Series. Detroit: Music Teachers' National Association, 1922. <http://archive.org/details/volumeproceedin00assogoog>.
- Rinsema, Rebecca M. "De-Sacralizing the European: Music Appreciation (Then) and Music Listening (Now)." *Music Education Research* 20, no. 4 (September 2018): 480–89.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/14613808.2018.1433146>.
- Sanders, Constance. "A History of Radio in Music Education in the United States, with Emphasis on the Activities of Music Educators and on Certain Radio Music Series Designed for Elementary and Secondary School Use," 1990.
- Saunders, Steven. "The Social Agenda of Stephen Foster's Plantation Melodies." *American Music* 30, no. 3 (September 22, 2012): 275–90.  
<https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?p=AONE&sw=w&issn=07344392&v=2.1&it=r&id=GALE%7CA404495026&sid=googleScholar&linkaccess=abs>.
- Schauffler, Robert Haven. *Music as a Social Force in America and the Science of Practice*. New York, 1927. <http://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015009594949>.
- Scholes, Percy A. *Music Appreciation: Its History and Technics*. Edited by Will Earhart. New York: M. Witmark & Sons, 1935. <http://archive.org/details/musicappreciatio0000unse>.
- . *Musical Appreciation in Schools*. Oxford University Press, 1953.  
<http://archive.org/details/musicalappreciat0000perc>.
- . "The Wider View of Appreciation." *The Musical Times* 74, no. 1080 (1933): 131–34.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/918079>.
- Sloan, Douglas. "Cultural Uplift and Social Reform in Nineteenth-Century Urban America." *History of Education Quarterly* 19, no. 3 (1979): 361–72. <https://doi.org/10.2307/367651>.
- Snell, Alden. "Arthur Farwell's New York City 'Song and Light Festival.'" *American Choral Review* 53, no. 2 (9/1/2011 2011): 2–13.  
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asn&AN=67089221&site=ehost-live>.
- "Social Movement | Definition, Types, Theories, & Facts | Britannica." Accessed November 9, 2023.  
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/social-movement>.
- Sousa, John Philip. "'The Menace of Mechanical Music,'" 1906.

- Spanner, H. V. "Why This Sneer?" *The Musical Times* 72, no. 1062 (1931): 736–736.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/916172>.
- Stoeving, Paul. "A New Mission for the Violin." *Music Supervisors' Bulletin* 1, no. 4 (1915): 24–28.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3382216>.
- Stoner, Thomas. "'The New Gospel of Music': Arthur Farwell's Vision of Democratic Music in America." *American Music* 9, no. 2 (1991): 183–208. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3051816>.
- Surette, Thomas Whitney. *Music and Life: A Study of the Relations between Ourselves and Music*. Boston, New York: Houghton Mifflin company, 1917.  
<https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/007673399>.
- Surette, Thomas Whitney, and Daniel Gregory Mason. *The Appreciation of Music*. Ninth. Vol. I. New York: H.W. Gray, 1907. <http://archive.org/details/appreciationofmu00sureuoft>.
- Symes, Colin. *Setting the Record Straight: A Material History of Classical Recording*. Music/Culture. Middletown, Conn: Wesleyan University Press, 2004.
- Tapper, Thomas. "Music and East Side Children: The Story of a Novel Social Settlement." *Outlook (1893-1924)*, New York, United States: American Periodicals Series III, February 22, 1908.  
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/136625056/abstract/BDDA59B4F5AD4F25PQ/1>.
- . *The Education of the Music Teacher*. Philadelphia, Theodore Presser co., 1914.  
<http://archive.org/details/educationofmusic00tapprich>.
- . *The Music Supervisor; His Training, Influence and Opportunity*. Boston and New York: Oliver Ditson and C. H. Ditson & Company, 1916.  
<http://archive.org/details/musicsupervisor00tappgoog>.
- "The Craftsman (183 Issues) - UWDC - UW-Madison Libraries." Accessed November 13, 2023.  
<https://search.library.wisc.edu/digital/AQ5VII6GNL36H78T>.
- "The Musician's Bookshelf." *The Musical Times* 63, no. 955 (1922): 632–39.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/912223>.
- Thomson, Virgil. *The State of Music*. New York: William Morrow, 1939.  
<http://archive.org/details/in.ernet.dli.2015.86852>.
- Tuttle, Harold Saxe. "Appreciation as a Test of Social Progress." *The Journal of Educational Sociology* 4, no. 3 (1930): 134–46. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2961117>.
- Vaillant, Derek. *Sounds of Reform: Progressivism and Music in Chicago, 1873-1935*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003.  
<http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/west/detail.action?docID=3039457>.
- Vancour, Shawn. "Popularizing the Classics: Radio's Role in the American Music Appreciation Movement, 1922—34." *Media, Culture & Society* 31, no. 2 (2009): 289–307.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443708100319>.
- Wagner, Richard. *Das Kunstwerk der Zukunft*. Leipzig: O. Wigand, 1850.
- Weaver, Paul John. "Community Music and the Public Schools." *The High School Journal* 4, no. 4 (1921): 82–89. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26290586>.
- Westcott, Edith C. "Nationalization of Community Music." *The Journal of Education* 89, no. 11 (2221) (1919): 291–291. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42827367>.
- Winship, A. E. "Appreciation of Appreciation." *Music Supervisors' Bulletin* 1, no. 2 (1914): 14–30.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3382222>.
- Woodford, Paul. *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice*. Counterpoints: Music and Education. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005.
- Yerichuk, Deanna L. "Discursive Formations of Community Music and the Production of Canadian Citizens in Toronto's Settlement Movement, 1900s-1930s." Ph.D., University of Toronto (Canada), 2015.  
<https://www.proquest.com/docview/1767782365/abstract/53D2E1A84FB14AD1PQ/1>.

- Yocum, A. Duncan. "Appreciation of Music, Literature and Art as a Social Aim." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 67 (1916): 1–12.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/1013483>.
- Zanzig, Augustus D. "A National Music Study." *Music Supervisors' Journal* 15, no. 2 (1928): 29–35.  
<https://doi.org/10.2307/3382517>.
- . *Music in American Life, Present & Future*. London: Oxford university press, 1932.  
<https://catalog.hathitrust.org/Record/001454776>.
- . *Singing America, Song and Chorus Book*. Boston, C. C. Birchard & company, 1941.  
<http://archive.org/details/singingamericaso00zanz>.

# Curriculum Vitae

**Name:** Andrew Blimke

**Post-Secondary:** Bachelor of Music with a Minor in History and a Diploma in Church Music. The King's University, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, 2016

Master of Arts in Music. University of Western Ontario, London, Ontario, Canada, 2023

**Honours and Awards:** Canada Graduate Scholarship (CGSM) 2020  
Western Graduate Research Scholarship  
Laurence Decore Award for Student Leadership  
Louise McKinney Post-Secondary Scholarship

**Work Experience:** Graduate Teaching Assistant (UWO 2019-2020)  
Music Department Coordinator (The King's University 2016-2019)  
Studio Music Teacher and Community Music Maker