

Ethnicize and Historicize: Thoughts on Anti-Racist Pedagogy and Post-Secondary Music History

MARGARET E. WALKER

Abstract: The “unmarked whiteness” at the core of most Canadian and US university music programs is an example of racist policy. Anti-racist actions that identify, describe, and dismantle racism can be productively applied to music history courses by adopting strategies outlined in the work of Kyoko Kishimoto. By exploring knowledge production through the historiography of canonic music, challenging Eurocentrism by teaching Western music as “ethnic,” and dismantling the division of white and non-white musics into different disciplines, this article offers an approach to musicultural anti-racism.

Résumé : La « blanchité implicite » qui est au cœur de la plupart des programmes de musique dans les universités du Canada et des États-Unis constitue un exemple de politique raciste. Les actions antiracistes qui identifient, décrivent et démantèlent le racisme peuvent s'appliquer de façon productive aux cours d'histoire de la musique en adoptant les stratégies exposées dans les travaux de Kyoko Kishimoto. En analysant la production de savoir à travers l'historiographie de la musique canonic, en remettant en question l'eurocentrisme en enseignant que la musique occidentale est « ethnique », et en démantelant la division entre musiques blanches et non blanches en différentes disciplines, cet article propose une approche de l'antiracisme multiculturel.

“It is good anthropology to look at ballet as a form of ethnic dance,” wrote dance anthropologist Joann Kealiinohomoku in 1967. “Currently, that idea is unacceptable to most Western dance scholars” (2001: 33). In her

This article has accompanying videos on our YouTube channel. You can find them on the playlist for MUSICultures volume 50, available here: http://bit.ly/MUSICultures_50. With the ephemerality of web-based media in mind, our online content may not always be accessible. We apologize for any inconvenience.

landmark article “An Anthropologist Looks at Ballet as a Form of Ethnic Dance,” Kealiinohomoku went on to identify the disconnect between the language, descriptions, and research methods used by anthropologists studying “primitive” and “folk” dances, and to critique the assumptions made by dance scholars about ballet as “universal,” “acultural” and “truly international,” and thus not “ethnic.” She never mentioned race or the racist assumptions that underlie categorizations such as “primitive” and “exotic,” nor did she overtly identify the inherent and largely unexamined “whiteness” of ballet. Nevertheless, her identification of blind spots in research methods and denial about ethnicity in elite European dance study speaks to similar issues in the study of music.

It may seem rather odd to begin an article about anti-racist pedagogies and music history teaching with the words of a dance anthropologist writing more than fifty years ago. Yet I do so to make several points. Perhaps the most important is that Kealiinohomoku’s observation about how approaches to study can contribute to hierarchical and often racialized divisions between art forms is just as relevant today as it was in the late 1960s. A more personal reason is that anthropology’s musical sibling is ethnomusicology, just as music’s embodied sibling is dance. As an ethnomusicologist whose primary research has been in dance history and who has also taught a great deal of Western classical music history,¹ I have long found academic disciplines much more porous than they are usually understood by scholars and argue that we all have much to learn from fields of study beyond our own. Both of these points about divisions and disciplines then lead to questions about when such categories arose and how the barriers they create might be challenged and dismantled. Finally, Kealiinohomoku’s invitation to see all dance as equally “ethnic” resonates with current calls for equity in the academy and pedagogical reforms in music programs.

Calls for reform to post-secondary music programs in recent years have become increasingly focused on their educational relevance to students both as future professional performers and teachers and also as young people interacting with increasingly heterogeneous societies in a globalized world. Concerns about equity, diversity, and inclusion (EDI) in music programs are in turn shifting these curricular conversations to questions about colonialism, whiteness, and race (see, among many others, Kajikawa 2019; and Stimeling and Tokar 2020). In Canada and the United States, reform has long been hampered by a pervasive post-secondary curriculum that has its foundations in nineteenth-century European music conservatories.² Created for a time when orchestras and opera companies were expanding in both Europe and its settler colonies, this set of courses in performance training supported by music history,

theory, and aural skills served a concurrent industry need for performers of Western art music (Kratz 2015; Moore 2017b; Walker 2020). This curricular model, as Robin Moore (2017b) observes, went on to perpetuate “itself and has proven surprisingly resistant to change” (2).³ While present-day professional and societal relevance of music study is the main focus of publications such as *College Music Curricula for a New Century* (Moore 2017a) and *Redefining Music Studies in an Age of Change: Creativity, Diversity, and Integration* (Sarath, Myers, and Campbell 2017), there is also a clear recognition that the Eurocentricity of the standardized curriculum is part of the problem. Deborah Bradley (2017), in particular, draws attention to the “discourse of whiteness” reinforced by a focus on “the perceived beauty and universal virtues of European-derived music” found in North American university music studies (207, 209).

The music curriculum inherited from the nineteenth century, therefore, has a more insidious problem than just professional obsolescence. Its Eurocentric core, still largely unremarked by many (white) faculty members and students, is reinforced by beliefs about the artistic universality of Western classical music. Such claims of universal value and aesthetic virtue are not only inaccurate, they also send a covert message of European exceptionalism, a belief that European, or European-derived art music has evolved to a pinnacle of artistic profundity and is thus more capable of human expression than other musics. As I have argued elsewhere, this message is deeply embedded in most of what and how we teach in our music programs (Walker, Pearse, and P. Bouliane 2022). It is supported through the Eurocentric and evolutionary historical narrative that underpins most music history textbooks, a narrative also inherited from the nineteenth century (Walker 2020). Ultimately, this idea of European exceptionalism as evinced through its artistic creations is a message of European, or white, superiority.

This article, therefore, offers ideas specifically about the teaching of music history that aim to address and disrupt messages of white superiority embedded in post-secondary education. I hope to complement emergent and existing ideas about reform and contribute to the efforts of colleagues seeking multiple approaches to change. I have three recommendations to add to the many ideas already in circulation. One is that, following Kealiinohomoku, we “ethnicize” European and Euro-American elite music in order to dismantle embedded ideas of its universality and exceptionalism. Another is that historiography, the origins of the music history we study, including its various methods and assumptions, should be a foundational part of music history teaching. In addition to these, I recommend that the disciplinary barriers that continue in many contexts to separate the study of Western art music and its history from the study of every other type of music and culture be problematized and largely dissolved. I argue

that these three reforms can be acts of anti-racist pedagogy, even if they may not seem to be particularly radical ones.

Positions

I made a statement above about what “we” teach in “our” music programs — a statement packed with assumptions about who “we” might be and what “our” programs might entail. Some readers will have marked this with alarm, whereas others will have barely noticed it at all and might have to go back to search for it. I want to clarify that I am fully aware that there are readers who will rightfully point out that they and I are not part of the same “we,” nor are “our” classes, students, or professional contexts similar. But I know also that there will be readers who recognize themselves and their teaching contexts in what I describe. Outlining my own experiences, biases, and positionality will hopefully help to situate my perspectives and thus recommendations.

I have come to this topic and these initiatives through a privileged background. I am a white, Anglophone settler Canadian, born in Toronto and educated initially through the Royal Conservatory of Music as a pianist, teacher, and examiner. This colonial approach to music study was subsequently both expanded and troubled by my education at the Faculty of Music, University Toronto, which culminated in graduate research as an ethnomusicologist specializing in the history of dance in North India. I found myself, as a mature student, frequently questioning both undergraduate and graduate curricular requirements and disciplinary divisions that I met in the academy. I now teach at Queen’s University in Kingston, Ontario,⁴ in an undergraduate music program that still for the most part follows the standard curriculum I outlined above. My journey from exploring decanonization in a series of Canadian University Music Society roundtables (Walker et al. 2013, 2014, 2017) to research on decolonization (Attas and Walker 2019; Walker 2020) and my emergent anticolonial and anti-racist work (Walker et al. 2021) arose from my research, teaching, and collegial encounters, rather than any personal experience of racism or injustice.

Although long aware of the existence and importance of diverse perspectives, I only began to consider the effects of my own position, privilege, and whiteness on my career sometime around mid-2017. Furthermore, my classes have always been largely populated with white, middle-class, female students, who, like me, have not thought a great deal about the privileges they enjoy through their whiteness. Although I am convinced that I have much to offer them through anticolonial and anti-racist approaches to teaching music

history, I also find myself questioning my own motivations. Am I in part doing this work not only because I wish to address inequity and injustice but also because it is trendy? Although I bring a wealth of global information to my classes, what messages continue to be sent by my seeming expertise about “the other”? How truly “anti-racist” can a successful white professor really be?

My words above may seem more confessional than scholarly, but my purpose is to position this article in terms of both authorship and audience. I believe that the greatest opportunities for shifting the narrative of European cultural superiority lie in the first or second year required courses in the standard undergraduate music programs, particularly in courses about music history and culture. What I argue here, while perhaps conceptually of interest to many, is likely to be most useful to professors and instructors who are teaching music history in institutions that retain the standard curricular model. Not all of those readers who place themselves in this category are white, but, given the demographics of the profession, there is a good chance that many of you are. I am unsure if what I have to offer is useful to colleagues who have been racialized or otherwise minoritized in the academy, but hope that some of it might be. I am also unclear how what I am recommending here contributes to or intersects with work on Indigenization and suspect that it does not do so substantially. This would require collaborative work with Indigenous colleagues and reach beyond the limitations of this article. I feel this essay can best contribute, therefore, through assisting mainly white colleagues who want to learn more about how systemic racism is embedded in how many of us learned music history and, through anti-racist strategies, to address its effect on how we teach.

Anti-Racism

Anti-racism, like anticolonialism, is a concept that has arisen in response to both sincere concern and vigorous critique about the adoption of terms like equity, diversity, and decolonization in social institutions like universities without simultaneously addressing underlying inequitable structures. If decolonization is “not a metaphor” but needs to be about returning stolen Indigenous land (Tuck and Yang 2012) and if equity and diversity initiatives can, ironically, reinforce the status quo rather than disrupt it (Ewell 2020), these terms and initiatives should be examined critically and “de-mythologized” (Almeida and Kumalo 2018). Anti-racist and anticolonial strategies, on the other hand, recognize that although history cannot be changed, its consequences need to be addressed by reaching deep into social and institutional foundations, exploring ways to counter and work against embedded racism and coloniality in the present.

As Ibram X. Kendi (2019) explains in his polemical autobiography, *How to Be an Antiracist*, anti-racism is focused above all on actions that address racist inequities, particularly in the sense of deep-rooted policy change. As a strategy, anti-racism insists that it is most productive to see “racist” as an adjective or adverb rather than a derogatory noun or designation, and that we work on undoing racism by unrelentingly identifying racist policies and dismantling them. Kendi goes on to argue that

racist policies have been described by other terms: “institutional racism,” “structural racism,” and “systemic racism,” for instance. But those are vaguer terms than “racist policy” [which is] more tangible and exacting, and more likely to be immediately understood by people, including its victims, who may not have the benefit of extensive fluency in racial terms. “Racist policy” says exactly what the problem is and where the problem is. “Institutional racism” and “structural racism” and “systemic racism” are redundant. Racism itself is institutional, structural, and systemic. (18–19)

In this context, neutrality is not an option. “One either allows racial inequities to persevere, as a racist, or confronts racial inequities, as an antiracist” (Kendi 2019: 11). Music theorist Philip Ewell makes the same point by emphasizing “racism is a structure, not a disease” (Ewell 2020: 1.5). This approach is a useful fit for the university context, as curriculum is certainly a structure and arguably also a type of policy. This is particularly true in the sense of core curriculum, which is often consistent between universities and sometimes tested as part of accreditation. As outlined above, in Canadian and US music programs that follow the standard model inherited from the nineteenth-century conservatories, it is the centrality of Western art music as a curricular policy that cries out for anti-racist action.

A principal anti-racist strategy is to identify unmarked “whiteness.” Although not as new a term as *anti-racist*, *whiteness* is nevertheless a term that can give rise to some confusion particularly among white people themselves. Keeping in mind, to quote Kendi (2019) again, that “racial inequity is a problem of bad policy, not bad people” (217), the concept of whiteness is most productively understood not as a racist condemnation of white people and European culture but rather the existence of a broad range of norms, values, and standards that have emerged from European political and economic dominance over the past four or five hundred years. From standards of physical beauty and ways of speaking to choices of canonic literature and artistic ideals, these norms are not only hegemonic in most Canadian and US contexts, but

they are also often unquestioned. But if white norms are ubiquitous, so too, once again, are unexamined beliefs about their assumed universality and thus supposed superiority. Systemic white supremacy is therefore not about overtly racist individuals, although such people obviously exist, but rather about the continuation of structures, policies, and practices that privilege white mores over all other ways of being and interacting. It is particularly important for white people to recognize and to openly identify these structures, ideals, customs, and values as white rather than “normal” or “universal,” since it is we who benefit from their continued concealment.

Universities and colleges, like conservatories, originated in Europe and were exported into the colonized world, replicating and then imposing their structures, epistemologies, and standards onto both expatriate Europeans and conquered peoples. The role of post-secondary institutions in reinforcing the twin aspects of whiteness and systemic racism, however, is obscured and often difficult for those of us who benefit most to grasp. As Rauna Kuokkanen (2007) puts it: “Even in the academic spaces that consider themselves most open to ‘changing the paradigm,’ individuals are often unwilling to examine their own blind spots” (1). Frances Henry and her colleagues identify this lack of awareness in post-secondary institutions as characteristic of what they call the “equity myth.” The data presented in their study of racialization in Canadian universities shows that “discourses of liberalism, meritocracy, neutrality, and objectivity, and the presence of employment equity or affirmative action policies, mask” the ways in which universities continue to be “powerful sites where race knowledge is produced, organized, and regulated” (Henry et al. 2017: 8). The colonial roots of education combined with the university’s role in training future teachers and researchers make it a powerful site indeed (see also Brown, Hinton, and Howard-Hamilton 2007; Wilder 2013).

All this may sound unconvincing, even hyperbolic, to those meeting these ideas for the first time, but the supposed “universality” of European elite artistic forms such as ballet or Western art music discussed above is an example of both embedded whiteness and racialized knowledge production. In many American and Canadian music programs, this type of knowledge regulation also sits firmly not only in the dominance of European elite music in performance but also in ongoing disciplinary divisions. Separate scholarly societies still exist for musicology, traditionally concerned with European and European-derived art music, popular music studies, which focus largely on mass-mediated, commercial music of recent centuries (most of which has African American origins), and ethnomusicology, which in spite of its colonial roots, prides itself in being more global and inclusive than the other two. Certainly, one can think of many research crossovers and interdisciplinary initiatives, but in standard

undergraduate curricula, most courses in music history and culture continue to separate Western art music from everything else (Stimeling and Tokar 2020).⁵ Returning to Kendi's identification of systemic racism as embedded in policies, the centrality in so many programs of white elite music and its sonic norms while other musics are taught separately or not at all is surely proof of racially inequitable policy.

The whiteness of most Western music programs in universities, schools, and conservatories has been identified and critiqued by scholars such as Julia Eklund Koza (2008), Juliet Hess (2017, 2018), Matthew D. Morrison (2012, 2019), Loren Kajikawa (2019) Philip Ewell (2020, 2021), and Anna Loepp Theissen (2021). There is a characteristic and ongoing colour-blindness that is most prominently expressed through the names of many schools, faculties, programs, and courses, where the word *music* refers not to all music or even some musics but specifically to Western art music (Attas in Pearse et al. 2019: 15; Walker 2020: 3). As Kajikawa puts it, this “near-exclusive commitment to white European and American male composers is taken for granted. Through the use of colorblind language, classical music, like whiteness, manages to avoid becoming an object of scrutiny” (Kajikawa 2019: 158). Moreover, although it has become increasingly acceptable to introduce composers of Western art music who are gendered and/or racialized into music history classes, it can still be perceived as ignorant or combative to question the importance of the canonic white, male centre. From an ethnomusicological standpoint this realization is nothing new. Both Henry Kingsbury, in *Music, Talent and Performance: A Conservatory Cultural System* (1988), and Bruno Nettl, in *Heartland Excursions: Ethnomusicological Reflections on Schools of Music* (1995), drew attention to the unmarked centrality of and commitment to Western European elite music and its values in American post-secondary music schools. Kingsbury (1988), moreover, noted the defensive reactions of the conservatory teachers and students when he asked for clarification about values they saw as self-evident. He found that to question the system, whether to ask about the significance of the musical score, the importance of the private studio, or the concept of talent, was to mark himself as an outsider, someone not musical or educated enough to already know and understand such self-evident “truths” (24–26).

Questioning assumptions is not only important in ethnomusicological research but also central to anti-racism. Philip Ewell, in “Music Theory and the White Racial Frame,” recommends change through “challenging, dismantling and restructuring” the “institutionalized and racialized” structures underpinning musical scholarship (Ewell 2020: 1.3). Kendi gives similar instructions: “The only way to undo racism is to consistently identify and describe it — and then dismantle it” (Kendi 2020: 11). Identifying and describing the white centre

of Canadian and US music programs may seem straightforward enough, but in my experience the suspicion that greeted Kingsbury's more innocent questions more than three decades ago remains a common reaction. Moreover, the ebb and flow of budget cuts that seem particularly to target the arts has made some of our colleagues even more wary of ideas that seem to devalue and undermine the music they hold so dear. Yet for music professors interested in anti-racist teaching, the "whiteness" of the audition process (Koza 2008), the pre-university training (Koza 2008; Loep Theissen 2020), and the school music room (Hess 2017, 2018) are all characteristics of institutional policies that lie at the foundation of what needs to be challenged and potentially dismantled.

Now, in 2023, challenges to the existing "standard" curriculum and recommendations for reform are increasingly easy to find, in spite of resistance to change. From the College Music Society's *Manifesto for Progressive Change* (Campbell et al. 2014) and the volumes edited by Robin D. Moore (2017a) and Edward W. Sarath, David Myers, and Patricia Shehan Campbell (2017) to Dylan Robinson's open letter "To All Who Should Be Concerned" (2019), there is much with which we who are indeed concerned can engage. While, as stated above, many of these resources are primarily concerned with professional training and industry relevance, there is a growing body of work that specifically addresses whiteness and embedded racism. Much of this is very current and found not only in published volumes and scholarly journals, but also on websites and in presentations. Reflective pieces such as the articles by Dave Molk addressing anti-racism in the music theory classroom (Molk 2019; Molk and Ohnona 2020) are joined by lists of resources on university websites (such as <https://music.unc.edu/about/diversity/diversity-equity-and-inclusion-music-resources/antiracism-music-resources/>), dedicated project pages (such as <https://musichistoryredo.wordpress.com/>), and even articles on municipal tourist sites (Bedian 2021). Conversations about anti-racist music history are in my experience most often part of conference panels on global music history, but a dedicated roundtable on Antiracist Pedagogies in the Music History Classroom was part of the 2021 virtual Annual Meeting of the American Musicological Society (Hooker et al. 2021). The words of the final speaker, Ayana Smith, are most encouraging. Her research project on "Creating Real Change" is ongoing and aims to generate material that moves far beyond tokenistic inclusion. She is, moreover, finding that her colleagues and students are much less resistant than they might have been a few years ago. "There's been a shift," she said in a recent interview. "Faculty and students alike want to make changes now" (Smith 2021).

In order to further situate my own recommended changes, I turn to the anti-racist pedagogies advocated by ethnic studies professor and anti-racist

advocate Kyoko Kishimoto (2018). Kishimoto joins Ewell in critiquing solutions that address inequity by adding “diverse” content, claiming that “diversity is about managing race rather than challenging racism” (541). Her strategies for anti-racist initiatives reach beyond the classroom and include not only awareness and self-reflection on racial positionality but also anti-racist work by faculty members in the university and the neighbouring community. In the classroom, she argues for the integration of content addressing racism and racialization “throughout the curriculum” (544) in a way that emphasizes the historical and political significance and the impact of race as a construct. She calls on us “to discuss race, racism, power, and privilege [in order] to provide political, historical, and economical context to the development of [our] discipline[s], rather than looking at knowledge as apolitical, ahistorical, and neutral” (545). Prompting students to challenge their assumptions and become aware of their own positionality while developing collaborative critical skills, she argues, will shift authority away from canonic and internalized information and towards collective responsibility for learning. Exploring knowledge production as part of learning, therefore, forms a key part of her method. “Anti-racist teaching” she asserts, “challenges the Eurocentric curriculum and the apolitical and ahistorical approaches to education, discipline, and course materials” (546).

It is probably easy to argue that much of standard post-secondary music history material aims to be apolitical, but to claim that a discipline so rooted in creative works of the past is ahistorical seems rather absurd. Indeed, the emergence of a concert music culture focusing on past “masterworks” is itself part of Western music history and included in many textbooks and courses on music in the Romantic Era. What is taught much less regularly, however, is the emergence of music history as a discipline in the latter half of the nineteenth century, and it is even rarer to place this development in the concurrent global political and philosophical context. By the end of the nineteenth century, theories of scientific racism and European superiority were complicit with imperial expansion, economic dominance, and the rise of universities in North America (Wilder 2013). The presentation of European elite music as a product of cultural evolution and a pinnacle of human achievement is a product of this context and the concept of European culture as globally relevant and universally valuable also has its roots in this period. In the context of this historical moment, a foundational article by Austrian scholar Guido Adler published in 1885 divided the emergent field of *Musikwissenschaft* or “music science” into the arguably racially segregated domains of historical and systematic musicology (for more information see Mugglestone and Adler 1981 [1885]; Kerman 1985; Karnes 2008; Johnson 2015; Walker 2020; Wilfing 2021).

Foundational music history classes rarely include and engage with these details concerning the development of our discipline. Moreover, the curricular divisions separating historical musicology from ethnomusicology, and more recently from popular music studies, build on and reinforce this nineteenth-century disciplinary separation. Another ongoing concept arising from the work of Adler and his colleagues is the general acceptance that the “scientific” study of music is not only the most appropriate analytical method for European concert repertoire but is also universally applicable to most or all other musics as well. The problem is not, therefore, simply that the dominance of unmarked “white” elite music at the centre of university music programs reinforces institutional structures that took shape during a time when Europeans ruled most of the globe; it also lies in the analytical and epistemological tools that continue to be used in the academic study of music. Kishimoto’s advice to “challenge the Eurocentric curriculum” thus combines productively with Kendi’s and Ewell’s calls to dismantle racist structures and policies, and these in combination then offer several ways to address the Eurocentricity of university music history pedagogy. If we teach music history *as* historiography, teach European music as part of a multiethnic and global history, and try to dissolve the disciplinary divisions that continue to separate Western classical musics from all others, and do this overtly in the classroom as part of pedagogy, we can be part of the process of dismantling the white framework in post-secondary education.

Teaching Music History as Historiography

To my knowledge, it is not usual to teach undergraduate music students about the origins of the history that they are learning. If the disciplinary histories of either musicology or ethnomusicology are taught at all, they are more commonly covered in research methods courses. These tend to be upper-level undergraduate or even graduate level courses and are unlikely to be required of all music students. In core history courses, therefore, most students meet a convincing and decontextualized narrative about European art music that presents the totality of music history as a series of progressive stylistic shifts through chronological periods illustrated by purportedly central compositions and composers. There are, of course, innovative approaches to course design that trace social themes, connect musical production to sociocultural context, and even sometimes place European music in a global context. Nevertheless, the nineteenth-century foundational framework, its content, and its narrative still underpin much of what we conceive of as the history of music. Students who have already studied some music history, whether in their high school classes

or through the Royal Conservatory or a similar examination system, recognize this narrative and its elements. They also notice if it is missing. This has been clearly illustrated to me through the concerns of students who will sometimes, in courses that stray from the Western art music canon, express dissatisfaction about the quality of their education, worrying that they are not being taught what they “need to know.”

Yet, the canonic content given such value is easily accessible through the click of a mouse or the swipe of a finger (as similarly argued in Wineberg 2018). It is the origins of the content, both in terms of historical research methods and also the historical moments when research became text, that students need to learn. It is, moreover, here that anti-racist pedagogy can begin. If music students learn that all historical narratives, whether about music or not, are constructions and products of their time and place, this immediately engages them with the idea that all knowledge is produced and reproduced (rather than existing as a fixed entity). Students can then be encouraged to see that they too have the power to produce or reproduce knowledge, building on or refuting the information they have access to. It is not a great stretch of expertise or resources for music history professors to include research methods as they teach content, nor is it time-consuming to examine critically the positionality of the scholars who gathered the “facts” in the textbook, and to discuss where and when these facts became a “history.” The source readings that are included in some textbooks can be strategically used to begin a discussion about research and knowledge production, one that leads easily into the question of what and who are not in the narrative.

For example, many of my students become quite fond of the phrase “the silences in the archive,” and we discuss the multitude of reasons, including power, gender, economics, and race, that some stories are preserved, and many are not.⁶ Readings such as Vincent Corrigan’s chapter “The Myths of Music History” in *Teaching Music History* (2002), although not about race, can illustrate how narrative gets created as traces of historical fact become manipulated through layers of interpretation. Exploring and discussing the story behind the story encourages students to “critique [the] positivist assumption of knowledge [as] an objective and universal truth” and eventually “to acknowledge the embedded Eurocentrism and male privilege” underlying so many canonic narratives (Kishimoto 2018: 541). Framing such discussions about silences and erasures in canonic (Western) music history with the story of the canon’s creation is key to this approach to anti-racist teaching. It is important not only to identify that the canon privileges elite music composed by white men but also to know that this is because white men compiled the narrative during a time and place where

white people and elite white culture were generally assumed superior to all other peoples and cultures.

Reflective writing, through which the researcher makes their relationship to methods and data visible, is increasingly common in academic writing. In tandem with discussions about the historical development of the discipline, an assignment inviting students to consider their own positionality and resultant preference for everything from types of music to topics for term papers can then lead to an exploration of the positions and preferences of historians of the past. Critically questioning and dismantling the narrative and its seemingly obligatory components should not mean teaching students to reject historical facts or musical material; rather, it should invite them to become aware of the differences between facts and interpretations of the ways in which knowledge is produced. Above all, it means making students aware that the history they are studying was “written,” and that not only does the central narrative date from a particular time and place but the layers of research that have enhanced it since then were also affected by their time and place. This means that “music history” itself has a history, one that is complex, never neutral, and certainly not universal. Learning the historiography of Western music history, returning again to Kishimoto, invites students to historicize and politicize the standard narrative and question its Eurocentricity.

Teach Europe as Ethnic and Globally Situated

One of the persistent assumptions about Western classical music that supports its centrality in university music programs is the belief in its universal expressive features and therefore international appeal. “Music is a universal language,” my students tell me, but as we discuss this language’s “vocabulary,” what often emerges are Western elements such as expressive harmony and singable melody. Another assumption embedded in the nineteenth-century historical narrative is that Western music evolved and progressed until the eighteenth or even nineteenth century without significant influences from outside Europe. A third concern, discussed above, is that the teaching of Western art music history in separate, dedicated courses reinforces the idea that somehow this music is separate and exceptional. As a result, the standard curriculum perpetuates the concept that European elite music and its history stand alone, while all the other various musics of the globe, whether similarly elite or not, can be and are variously grouped together. The persistence of this concept is remarkable, and even when musicologists approach mainstream music history through

sociological or critical lenses, it is still unusual for Western art music to be equitably combined with other musics, even other European musics.

The origins for this bifurcation of “the West and the rest” lies, once again, in the history of the discipline and the emergence of musicology (*Musikwissenschaft*) as a legitimate field of scholarly study in central Europe in the 1800s. Austrian musicologist Guido Adler famously divided the scientific study of music into “historical musicology” (*historische Musikwissenschaft*) and “systematic musicology” (*systematische Musikwissenschaft*), thus setting apart the text-based and historically situated study of the art music of Europe from every other type of music study from pedagogy to acoustics to comparative musicology (Mugglestone and Adler 1981[1885]). I discussed the importance of including Adler’s framework in the teaching of history and historiography above and revisit it here to emphasize the resultant division of European music into what Martin Stokes labels “Europe 1” and “Europe 2.” The study of Europe 1, writes Stokes, is “the story of how Austro-German symphonic music came to set the standards (and the intellectual procedures) according to which *all* music is to be understood, and according to which alternative narratives are delegitimized” (2013: 837). Europe 2, on the other hand, comprises “most European music making,” genres, and practices, which, Stokes claims, are “invisible to academic musicology” (837). Stokes goes on to make an argument for the ethnomusicological study of Europe 2 as part of a more “worldly” musicology. I do not disagree with him but want similarly to argue that the musics of Europe 2 be included in the historical study of Europe 1 (that is, Western classical music) and that any study of European music include both Europes 1 and 2. This way, the musics of Europe can be taught in both history and culture courses as one of the bundles of ethnicities in the complex entanglement of global musics and their histories, rather than something separate and unique.

Stokes points out that the “folk” or vernacular musics of Europe only become of interest to historical musicology when they are “background” to late-nineteenth and twentieth-century composers like Debussy, Bartók, or Sibelius (2013: 837). The ethnomusicological study of European “folk” musics, on the other hand, has a long history in Europe itself but, as Stokes identifies, has been largely relegated to the geographical and cultural edges of the continent. A survey of study groups in the International Council for Traditional Music and special interest groups in the Society for Ethnomusicology supports this observation — of the more than sixty groups within these larger academic societies, only five focus on Europe and three of these are southeastern Europe, the Slavic world, and Celtic music.⁷ This division is also reflected in the choices of European musics represented in standard world music textbooks.⁸ Vernacular or popular

music from Ireland, Spain, and/or the Balkans are the most common, with Russia, Greece, Poland, and Scotland also making appearances (Bakan 2007; Cooley 2009; Shelemay 2015; Miller and Shahriari 2017; Wade and Campbell 2021; Williams 2021). The encyclopedia-style volume *World Music: The Basics* has the longest list, with seventeen European countries, and overtly excludes all “classical” music from its definition of the category of world music (Nidel 2005: 2). By *classical music*, however, the author means only Western classical music since the volume includes “classical” or elite musics of India and some other West Asian cultures (219–23).

Most other textbook authors seem to agree tacitly, as while the art or court musics of many Asian cultures are presented alongside vernacular and popular musics, chapters on Europe generally contain only “folk” musics. For example, Hindustani Sangit, the classical music of North India, while certainly listened to and learned by people who are not of South Asian origin, is in most university courses taught, studied, and understood as a culturally “Indian” form of music arising from South Asian courts and temples. European classical music rarely gets this kind of contextualization. In her chapter on Europe, Sean Williams does address concepts of European cultural superiority such as “the belief that Western European architecture, foods, and arts represent the highest achievements of civilization” (2021: 276); including an example of European art music would then provide students a chance to discuss and deconstruct this belief. One exception to this trend is Andrea Bohlman’s chapter on “Music and Europe” in *Excursions in World Music*, which includes a trumpet concerto by Franz Joseph Haydn, emphasizing the importance of empire and canon in the study of music of Europe (Bohlman 2021). Another exception is Danielle Fosler-Lussier’s open access textbook *Music on the Move*, which offers three chapters presenting entangled histories of Western art music with music in Indonesia, the Romani diaspora, and the African American diaspora (Fosler-Lussier 2020).

In both music history and music culture courses, therefore, we need to push back against the widespread tendency to give European art music a different place historically and culturally than all other musics. Matching examples of Western classical music with types of vernacular musics, both historical and contemporary, from the same geographic regions, will open a way to combine Stokes’s categories of Europe 1 and 2. Presenting European elite music as sonically and culturally linked to its places of origin and other musics in the area, in other words, as “ethnic,” can provide a way to address its unmarked claims to universality and recognize its whiteness. Simultaneously, and perhaps somewhat paradoxically, finding times and places of musical

overlap and exchange can undermine the narrative of the uniqueness of Western musical “evolution.”

My argument about ethnicizing European art music draws not only on Kealiinohomoku but also on the work of postcolonial scholar Dipesh Chakrabarty. Confronting universalism in historical study in *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference* (2000), Chakrabarty points out that it is not Europe as a geographical area that needs provincializing, but rather Europe as “an imaginary figure that remains deeply embedded in clichéd and shorthand forms in some everyday habits of thought” (4). His identification of Europe and the West as “imaginary entit[ies]” that nonetheless hold both appeal and power can be fruitfully compared to “the idealization of an unbroken tradition that stretches from our fragmentary understanding of music in ancient Greece to the most recent works by contemporary composers,” which Kajikawa identifies in our music teaching (2019: 156). Unpacking such ideas of unbroken tradition, musicologist David Irving (2019) has traced the appearance of both the term and concept of Western art music to the early 1800s, and argues, like Lydia Goehr in *The Imaginary Museum of Music Works* (2007), that their application to European music culture, even elite culture, before the nineteenth century is anachronistic.

Chakrabarty identifies a number of concepts, such as citizenship or individuality, that arise from the same period and are considered universal but in fact “bear the burden of European thought and history” (2000: 4). In music history classes, these can be compared to sonic concepts such as harmony or musical form. A straightforward route to ethnicizing what is claimed to be universal is therefore to examine the basic concepts and vocabulary we teach students about music. Many music appreciation textbooks, such as *The Enjoyment of Music* by Kristine Forney, Andrew Dell’Antonio, and Joseph Machlis (2018), begin with these “basic” elements of music: usually melody, harmony, rhythm, timbre, texture, and form.⁹ More “serious” music history texts, such as the volumes by J. Peter Burkholder, Donald J. Grout, and Claude V. Palisca (2014) and Richard Taruskin and Christopher H. Gibbs (2019) do not teach this vocabulary, probably assuming student familiarity with such “universal” categories. Many world music textbooks, however, both teach and problematize these concepts, which are, to return to Chakrabarty (2000), “deeply embedded” in what become “everyday habits” of listening to music (4). Part of ethnicizing European music can therefore begin with the ethnicizing of the language of analysis, including these “elements of music” and their application to the listening (aural) skills taught in university classes. Simultaneously, part of situating European norms globally, can be exploring the range of ways of listening to and thinking about music worldwide.

Rather than beginning with a blank page and unfamiliar examples, musicology and music history instructors can therefore easily and productively draw on some of the foundational concepts of their colleagues who teach world music and ethnomusicology. Many such courses, and their textbooks, begin by not only deconstructing the “elements of music” but also inviting students to examine critically the concept of music itself in order to engage with a range of ontologies. Yet, as I recommended above, instructors of world music and area studies courses can similarly draw on the art music repertoire and personalities taught by their colleagues in musicology in order to include Western art music as characteristic of “ethnic” Europe and its diaspora. These opportunities to share both concepts and content brings me to my final recommendation, that dismantling the disciplinary barriers inherited from the late nineteenth century is a crucial part of dismantling embedded whiteness and racism in the academic study of music.

Dismantle the Disciplines

The curricular structure that sets the study of Western art music and its history apart from other academic courses in music studies, whether these focus on popular musics, non-Western musics, or social and critical themes, is at its core, a racist policy. Returning to the calls by Kendi and Ewell that anti-racism’s goal is not only to identify and challenge racist policies and frameworks but ultimately to dismantle them, it is the responsibility of anti-racist music professors to begin the process of undoing these divisions and beginning to restructure how we teach music history and culture. This may not be easy and certainly will not be straightforward. If, as Chakrabarty (2000) admitted, “the project of provincializing ‘Europe’ refers to a history that does not yet exist” (42), we are faced with teaching an anti-racist music history that similarly does not yet exist. Recognizing and, more crucially, teaching that the history that many of us know so well is a largely nineteenth-century construction and that the concept of Western art music as a monocultural entity is an imaginary, however, are good starting places. The study of music history as a progression of works and styles by master composers needs to be firmly put in its historical and geographical place, allowing the study of music history and culture before eighteenth-, nineteenth-, and early twentieth-century Europe and Euro-America to be as entangled, global, and interdisciplinary as the music itself (Irving 2019).

There are, happily, some accessible sources that are useful for moving toward a multidisciplinary study of music history and culture. *The Other*

Classical Musics: Fifteen Great Traditions, edited by Michael Church (2015), aims to present selected elite music traditions “on a strictly level playing field with no implied hierarchy of quality or importance” (2). The selections range from examples in the ethnomusicological canon like the classical musics of North and South India, the Arabic world, and China to the court musics of Thailand and Uzbekistan, and there are also chapters on North American Jazz and Europe.¹⁰ The chapter on Europe, after a promising beginning that identifies some of the characteristics of European music often assumed to be universal (like the concert hall), unfortunately then turns to the standard historical narrative as a way of “understanding” the music (Hewett 2015: 218). Nevertheless, many of the other chapters include robust historical content that cries out for inclusion in the music history classroom. A contrasting but also useful resource is *Gateways to Understanding Music*, a music history/appreciation textbook that combines Western classical music, world music, popular music and jazz in part “for instructors ... who are dissatisfied with the typical college curricula that divide music and the people who make it among different courses” (Rice and Williams 2019: xvii). Although canonic Western art music makes up almost half of the content and, again, the narrative with its “master composers” remains intact, the book does offer a model for a more integrated approach to music history, particularly before the eighteenth century. One more resource, although its use requires more pedagogical design than either Church or Rice and Williams, is the website project Inclusive Early Music (<https://inclusiveearlymusic.org/>). It is still a work in progress and its bibliography is currently its most robust element, but an invitation to “contribute your knowledge” promises more material for the future.

Integrating the history of popular music, Western and global, into twentieth-century history, is arguably well under way. Danielle Fosler-Lussier’s *Music on the Move* (2020), mentioned above, takes an important step by including selected entangled histories in what is generally not a book about history. Standard music history textbooks, including Burkholder, Grout, and Palisca (2014) and Taruskin and Gibbs (2019) incorporate short sections on parlour music, rock ’n’ roll, and jazz, and it is common in many texts to present twentieth-century music history as comprising many genres and cultures. The only barrier here is the embedded assumption that someone like Babbitt is more important than Beyoncé, in spite of the reality that twenty-first-century North America music students are more likely to know and listen to the latter than the former.¹¹ The racialized reality of such an assumption seems obvious, but it is important to grasp that the problem is not simply the racialized identities of the individual people involved but also the presentation of post-tonal art music

composers as the heirs of a white musical trajectory that began in an imagined Europe more than a thousand years ago.

Conclusion

I return to two of Kendi's conceptual definitions to end this paper. After broadly defining *racist* and *anti-racist*, he proposes two further categories. The first is "Cultural Racist: one who is creating a cultural standard and imposing a cultural hierarchy among racial groups," and the second is "Cultural Antiracist: one who is rejecting cultural standards and equalizing cultural differences among racial groups" (2019: 79). He goes on to say that "to be antiracist is to reject cultural standards and level cultural difference" (81). In the context of academic study, this may seem initially problematic since culturally specific standards are part and parcel of what we teach, whether as performance instructors, historians, or (ethno)musicologists. But if I replace "cultural" with "universal," one of the problematic concepts I have consistently returned to in this article, the definitions become both applicable and helpful. A musical racist creates and supports a supposedly universal musical standard and imposes musical hierarchies among racialized groups. A musical anti-racist rejects the idea of universal musical standards and values cultural differences among racialized groups.

To be a musicultural anti-racist, therefore, one needs to identify and dismantle the concept of universal musical standards and to level cultural and disciplinary difference. Since many of our students already arrive in our classrooms with unexamined ideas about musical standards, including the audition criteria some of them need to meet in order to be able to enter the classroom, we need to begin the process of undoing and levelling right away. We cannot continue to separate "music history" from courses that do address race, class, and other inequities, but need rather to teach the development of our disciplines and identify the roots of the history that has been privileged. We need to identify the ethnicity or ethnicities of Western art music, unravel the making of its history, and take every opportunity to cross and question disciplinary borders and so gradually dismantle the white frame of music study. 🍀

Notes

I am indebted to my colleague Lisa Nielson for her insightful and detailed comments on this article in addition to appreciating the helpful feedback from the editors of *MUSICultures* and the anonymous reviewers. I am also grateful to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for its support of my ongoing research on anticolonial approaches to music history.

1. The elite concert music of Europe and its diasporas is variously called Western art music, Western classical music, and European or European-derived music. I use these terms interchangeably in this article.

2. The conversation about post-secondary music teaching is robust and international. This article's focus on the context of Canadian and US institutions does not negate the importance of pedagogical research and curricular reform in Europe or Oceania.

3. The "standard" set of courses, inherited from the nineteenth century, includes one-on-one lessons in Western music performance, ensemble performance, Western music theory, Western art music history, and aural skills/musicianship. This curriculum is, still in 2023, set out both in the National Association of Schools of Music Handbook (<https://nasm.arts-accredit.org/accreditation/standards-guidelines/handbook/>) and in the Standing Committee of Institutional Members: Guidelines of the Canadian University Music Society (<https://muscan.org/about-us/scim-guidelines/>).

4. Queen's University and Kingston occupy traditional territories of the Haudenosaunee and Anishinaabek.

5. In 2020, with support from a Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Institutional Grant, I conducted an as yet unpublished survey of music history professors in Canada and the United States, which collected data about course offerings among other questions. The majority of answers showed degree programs with two to three required courses in Western music history contrasting with largely optional courses in global, folk, and popular musics. See also Baumer (2015).

6. Such discussions can also lead nicely into discussions of current privilege and whiteness by considering who is or is not accepted into auditioned university music programs.

7. The other two are European Music and Music of the Francophone World, both in the Society for Ethnomusicology. Most of the other study groups and sections in both of these societies are focused on issues or themes such as gender, sound studies, dance, or education. Area studies groups focusing outside Europe, however, form a substantial presence. (<https://ictmusic.org/>; <https://www.ethnomusicology.org/>)

8. The complete exclusion of European music, as in the open access World Music Textbook, is rare (<https://worldmusictextbook.org/>).

9. Tempo, dynamics, and instrument classifications are sometimes also included as elements of musical sound.

10. The “canon” of area studies in ethnomusicology is closely related to areas of European colonization. See Danielson (2007) for more information.

11. It initially frustrated, but later fascinated, me that some of my students assumed that the study of twentieth-century music would automatically centre around popular music rather than composers like Schoenberg, Stravinsky, and Cage.

References

- Almeida, Shana, and Siseko H. Kumalo. 2018. (De)coloniality Through Indigeneity: Deconstructing Calls to Decolonise in the South African and Canadian University Contexts. *Education as Change* 22 (1): 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.25159/1947-9417/3023>.
- Attas, Robin, and Margaret E. Walker, eds. 2019. “Decolonizing Music Pedagogies.” Special issue, *Intersections: Canadian Journal of Music* 39, no. 1.
- Bakan, Michael B. 2007. *World Music: Traditions and Transformations*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Baumer, Matthew. 2015. A Snapshot of Music History Teaching to Undergraduate Majors, 2011–2012: Curricula, Methods, Assessment, and Objectives. *Journal of Music History Pedagogy* 5 (2): 23–47.
- Bedian, Knar. 2021. A Musician’s Guide to Black Music History and Anti-Racism Resources. *Sound of Boston: Est. 2013*. <https://soundofboston.com/>.
- Bohlman, Andrea. Music and Europe. In *Excursions in World Music*, 8th ed., 288–320. Ed. Timothy Rommen and Bruno Nettl. New York: Routledge.
- Bradley, Deborah. 2017. Decentering the European Music Canon. In *College Music Curricula for a New Century*, 211–12. Ed. Robin D. Moore. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Brown, O. Gilbert, Kandace G. Hinton, and Mary F. Howard-Hamilton. 2007. *Unleashing Suppressed Voices on College Campuses: Diversity Issues in Higher Education*. New York: Peter Lang.
- Burkholder, J. Peter, Donald J. Grout, and Claude V. Palisca. 2014. *A History of Western Music*. 8th ed. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Campbell, Patricia Shehan, David Myers, Ed Sarath, Juan Chattah, Lee Higgins, Victoria Lindsay Levine, David Rudge, and Timothy Rice. 2014. *Transforming Music Study from Its Foundations: A Manifesto for Progressive Change in the Undergraduate Preparation of Music Majors*. Missoula, MT: College Music Society.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2000 *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial Thought and Historical Difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Church, Michael, ed. 2015. *The Other Classical Musics: Fifteen Great Traditions*. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press.

- Cooley, Timothy J. 2009. Europe/Central and Southeastern Regions. In *Worlds of Music: An Introduction to the Music of the World's Peoples*, 5th ed., 205–63. Ed. Jeff Todd Titon. Belmont CA: Schirmer Cengage Learning.
- Corrigan, Vincent. 2002. The Myths of Music History. In *Teaching Music History*, 181–91. Ed. Mary Navtig. Aldershot, UK: Ashgate.
- Danielson, Virginia. 2007. The Canon of Ethnomusicology: Is There One? *Notes* 64 (2): 223–31.
- Ewell, Philip. 2020. Music Theory and the White Racial Frame. *Music Theory Online* 26 (2). <https://doi.org/10.30535/mto.26.2.4>.
- . 2021. *Music Theory's White Racial Frame*. <https://musictheoryswhiteracialframe.wordpress.com/>.
- Forney, Kristine, Andrew Dell'Antonio, and Joseph Machlis. 2018. *The Enjoyment of Music*. 13th ed. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Fosler-Lussier, Danielle. 2020. *Music on the Move*. E-Book. Ann Arbor Michigan: University of Michigan Press.
- Goehr, Lydia. 2007. *The Imaginary Museum of Musical Works: An Essay in the Philosophy of Music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Henry, Frances, Dua Enakshi, Howard Ramos, Malinda Sharon Smith, Audrey Kobayashi, Peter Li, and Carl James. 2017. *The Equity Myth: Racialization and Indigeneity at Canadian Universities*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Hess, Juliet. 2017. Equity and Music Education: Euphemisms, Terminal Naivety, and Whiteness. *Action, Criticism, & Theory for Music Education* 16 (3): 15–47. <https://doi.org/10.22176/act16.3.15>.
- . 2018. Troubling Whiteness: Music Education and the “Messiness” of Equity Work. *International Journal of Music Education* 36 (2): 128–44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0255761417703781>.
- Hewett, Ivan. 2015. “Europe. In *The Other Classical Musics*, 216–45. Ed. Michael Church. Woodbridge, UK: Boydell Press
- Irving, David. 2019. Rethinking Early Modern “Western Art Music”: A Global History Manifesto. *IMS Musicological Brainfood* 3 (1): 6–10.
- Johnson, Julian. 2015. *Out of Time: Music and the Making of Modernity*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kajikawa, Loren. 2019. The Possessive Investment in Classical Music: Confronting Legacies of White Supremacy in U.S. Schools and Departments of Music. In *Seeing Race Again: Countering Colorblindness Across the Disciplines*, 155–75. Ed. Kimberlé Williams Crenshaw, Luke Charles Harris, Daniel Martinez HoSang, and George Lipsitz. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Karnes, Kevin C. 2008. *Music, Criticism, and the Challenge of History*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Keallinohomoku, Joann. 2001 [1967]. An Anthropologist Looks at Ballet as a Form of Ethnic Dance. In *Moving History/Dancing Cultures: A Dance History Reader*, 33–43. Ed. Ann Dils and Ann Cooper Albright. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.

- Kendi, Ibram X. 2019. *How to Be an Antiracist*. New York: One World.
- Kerman, Joseph. 1985. *Contemplating Music: Challenges to Musicology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Kingsbury, Henry. 1988. *Music, Talent, and Performance: A Conservatory Cultural System*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Kishimoto, Kyoko. 2018. Anti-Racist Pedagogy: From Faculty's Self-reflection to Organizing Within and Beyond the Classroom. *Race Ethnicity and Education* 21 (4): 540–54. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13613324.2016.1248824>.
- Kuokkanen, Rauna. 2007. *Reshaping the University: Responsibility, Indigenous Epistemologies, and the Logic of the Gift*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Kratus, John. 2015. The Role of Subversion in Changing Music Education. In *Music Education: Navigating the Future*, 340–46. Ed. Clint Randles. New York: Routledge.
- Koza, Julia Eklund. 2008. Listening for Whiteness: Hearing Racial Politics in Undergraduate School Music. *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 16 (2): 145–55.
- Loepp Thiessen, Anna. 2021 Examining Whiteness in the Royal Conservatory of Music History Curricula. https://www.cfmta.org/docs/essays/Loepp_Thiessen.pdf.
- Miller, Terry E., and Andrew C. Shahriari. 2017. *World Music: A Global Journey*. 4th ed. New York: Routledge.
- Molk, Dave. 2019. Teaching Inequality: Consequences of Traditional Music Theory Pedagogy. *New Music Box*, December 11. <https://newmusicusa.org/nmbx/teaching-inequality-consequences-of-traditional-music-theory-pedagogy/>.
- Molk, Dave, and Michelle Ohnona. 2020. Promoting Equity: Developing an Antiracist Music Theory Classroom. *New Music Box*, January 29. <https://newmusicusa.org/nmbx/promoting-equity-developing-an-antiracist-music-theory-classroom/>.
- Moore, Robin D., ed. 2017a. *College Music Curricula for a New Century*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- . 2017b. Introduction: Towards a Model of Reform. In *College Music Curricula for a New Century*, 1–29. Ed. Robin D. Moore. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Morrison, Matthew D. 2012. (De)Constructing Musicology's Borders along the Color Line. In "Musicology Beyond Borders?" Tamara Levitz, convenor. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 65 (3): 849–61.
- . 2019. Race, Blacksound, and the (Re)Making of Musicological Discourse. *Journal of the American Musicological Society* 72 (3): 781–823.
- Mugglestone, Erica, and Guido Adler. 1981 [1885]. Guido Adler's The Scope, Method, and Aim of Musicology (1885): An English Translation with an Historico-Analytical Commentary. *Yearbook for Traditional Music* 13: 1–21.
- Nidel, Richard. 2005. *World Music: The Basics*. New York: Taylor and Francis Group.

- Pearse, D. Linda, Angela Acquin, Robin Attas, and Ann Waltner. 2019. Unpacking a Moment: Decolonization in the Performing Arts? *MUSICultures* 46 (1): 1–31.
- Rice, Timothy, and Dave Wilson. 2019. *Gateways to Understanding Music*. New York: Routledge.
- Robinson, Dylan. 2019. To All Who Should Be Concerned. *Intersections: Canadian Journal of Music / Intersections: Revue Canadienne de Musique* 39 (1): 138–41. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1075347ar>.
- Sarath, Edward W., David Myers, and Patricia Shehan Campbell, eds. 2017. *Redefining Music Studies in an Age of Change*. New York: Routledge.
- Shelemay, Kay Kaufman. 2015. *Soundscapes: Exploring Music in a Changing World*. 3rd edition. New York: W. W. Norton.
- Smith, Ayana. 2021. Changing the Face of Western Music History Teaching. *Indiana University, Research Impact*, January. <https://research.impact.iu.edu/key-areas/social-sciences/race-ethnicity/race-in-music-history.html>.
- Stimeling, Travis D., and Kayla Tokar. 2020. Narratives of Musical Resilience and the Perpetuation of Whiteness in the Music History Classroom. *Journal of Music History Pedagogy* 10 (1): 20–38.
- Stokes, Martin. 2013. “Afterword: A Worldly Musicology?” In *The Cambridge History of World Music*, 826–42. Ed. Philip V. Bohlman. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Taruskin, Richard, and Christopher H. Gibbs. 2019. *The Oxford History of Western Music College Edition*. 2nd ed. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tuck, Eve, and K. Wayne Yang. 2012. “Decolonization Is Not a Metaphor.” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society* 1 (1): 1–40. <https://jps.library.utoronto.ca/index.php/des/article/view/18630>.
- Wade, Bonnie C., and Patricia Shehan Campbell. 2021. *Global Music Cultures: An Introduction to World Music*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Walker, Margaret E. 2020. Towards a Decolonized Music History Curriculum. *Journal of Music History Pedagogy* 10 (1): 1–19.
- Walker, Margaret E., David Brackett, Pauline Minevich, Gordon E. Smith, and Ellen Waterman. 2013. Deconstructing the Curricular Canon: Looking to the Future. Roundtable. Canadian University Music Society Conference, Victoria, BC.
- Walker, Margaret E., Glen Carruthers, Patrick Schmidt, and Betty Anne Younker. 2017. An Irresistible Invitation for Curricular Creativity: Reimagining Music Programs for the 21st Century. Roundtable. Canadian University Music Society Conference, Toronto, ON.
- Walker, Margaret E., Deonte Harris, Carolyn Ramzy, Farzaneh Hemmasi. 2021. Anti-Racist Pedagogies Workshop: Starting with the Syllabus I. Canadian Society for Traditional Music Virtual Conference, November 23.
- Walker, Margaret E., Jeff Hennessy, Mary Ingraham, Susan Lewis, and Ellen Waterman. 2014. What Is the Value of the Bachelor of Music Degree? Roundtable. Canadian University Music Society Conference, St. Catherines, ON,

- Walker, Margaret E., D. Linda Pearse, and Sandria P. Bouliane. 2022. Challenging Embedded Coloniality in Music History Curricula. In *Dialogues: Towards Decolonizing Music and Dance Studies*, edited by Tan Sooi Beng and Marcia Ostaszewski. Digital Book. ICTM. <https://ictmdialogues.org/>.
- Wilder, Craig Steven. 2013. *Ebony and Ivy: Race, Slavery, and the Troubled History of America's Universities*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Wilfing, Alexander. 2021. How to Establish an Academic Discipline: The Multi-Ethnic Makeup of 19th-Century Austria, Habsburg Positivism, and the (Political) Creation of Musicology and Art History. Unpublished paper presented at the Inaugural Conference of the Institute for Austrian and German Music Research, University of Surrey (Online). <https://iagmr.org/inaugural-conference-september-2021-copy/>.
- Williams, Sean. 2021. *Musics of the World*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wineburg, Sam. 2018. *Why Learn History (When It's Already on Your Phone)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Videography

- Hooker, Lynn, John Spilker, Otto Muller, and Ayanna Smith. 2020. Antiracist Pedagogies in the Music History Classroom. Recorded panel. AMS for Musicology *You Tube* Chanel. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=zt3i0ioxv7Y> (accessed November 7, 2023).