Can this strategy for the creation of a discipline be successful? It would seem to depend on the terms. The accumulation of information was not dispatched on a search for methodological agreement; rather, it was organized as part of a strategy for placing popular music explicitly in the university curriculum.

The conference participants (all male, with one official and one unofficial exception, not counting the audience of course) did not expect to agree on what popular music should be taught, how, to whom, not on the pedagogical implications of one or another orientation. The presentations, with one or two exceptions, did not explicitly address such questions. Given all the "noise" made on behalf of this conference's purpose to discuss pedagogic practices that would give popular music a view in the university, both music and pedagogy were terribly absent. In the absence of a fruitful theoretical framework it remains that a pedagogy for the study of popular music doesn't yet exist. What do exist are a number of different modes of intellectual and cultural organization, shaped by existing institutional structures, and, within these, by the available intellectual discourses, which shape or appropriate the discussion of popular music by the terms they set. This was made clear at the conference literature sees rock as commercial product, and amasses melancholy economic statistics, romanticizing the "independents" while paradoxically bemoaning technological progress; and the "sociology of work" literature reconstructs the processes of producing the music itself, but doesn't explain them any better than other models of symbolic interactionism.

In a spirited investigation of Reagantie rock à la Baudrillard ("Life's a bitch and then you die."), Lawrence Grossberg, University of Illinois - Urbana, argued that young people don't "read" the media, but enjoy it in a state of distraction, as Walter Benjamin argued in his "Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," thereby being continuously reanimated against the cultural debris of information saturation. Since Reagantie youth don't make sense of their musical attachments, Grossberg argued, neither should we. In effect, such an argument not only pre-empts the possibility of critical pedagogical practice, but it is also resigned to capitulating to this form of "reading" the history of the present.

According to John Shepherd, the future for the study of popular music in the universities rests in its successful legitimation within the academic establishment in a manner which would have the simultaneous and necessary what the criteria for such an event might be. We agree that there is a need for the critical study of popular music to be, or develop a way to be, something a "disciplinary" university "needs" to be and not just a question of respect for these questions are not at all compelling.

Shepherd identifies the primary obstacle and problematic for a "critical musicology" of popular music with the differences which exist between the competing object domains of the traditional disciplines of sociology and musicology. Sociology, he maintains, brackets the musical language of popular music from its analysis of its social constituents, and musicology, which has the competence to come to terms with the musical language, distorts and de-legitimizes popular music because its methods of analysis are biased in favour of "serious" music. This problem is pinpointed by Adorno more accurately:

Sociological findings about music are the more assured the further they are from, and the more extraneous they are to, music itself. Yet as they imbue themselves more deeply in specifically musical contexts they threaten to keep growing poorer and more abstract as sociological ones.

As it is, whether or not one technical musical language is more appropriate than another (yet to be created), the significance of Adorno's insight should not be lost. Musical and sociological analysis will always retain a certain amount of tension and divergence. Rather than recognizing the challenge of this tension, Shepherd wishes to create a more efficient discipline. To this end, he too often resorts to oppositions between the "popular"...
and the "serious" which are mutually, and often irrecognizable, homogenized into uniformly polarized identities. He believes he is hastening this opposition on real musical differences: in the name of these differences, he absolves their differences to institute a domain of exclusive sameness. The result is such that when Shuttleworth does commit his "technical" knowledge of music to paper he justifies a certain dubiousness towards it. Yet in spite of his belief that music departments are inherently hostile to treating popular music in the manner he envisions, Shuttleworth argues that:

...is inevitable site of intervention for the advancement of popular music studies is the discipline of historical musicology. It is clearly impossible for critical theory to engage in a dialogue with a view to developing categories of analysis appropriate to "musical process" if historical musicology keeps the door firmly shut.

One wonders why, given this contention that musicology is both inappropriate and incapable of coming to terms with what he considers to be significantly different characteristics and criteria in popular music, he insists on situating his study in such an unhappy environment.

And what are students to gain from these developments? In other words, how is this "pedagogy" to respond to the ubiquitous processes of popular music, without reproducing, in both "content" and form, the boundaries between production and consumption whose maintenance already can't make sense of musical culture itself. Isn't the whole point of introducing popular music to the classroom to reveal the mystification and limitations (social or epistemological) of such divisions in the context of contemporary cultural context? So why reproduce them in the classroom?

II
"Serious" Vs. "Popular" Or The "Social Soundtrack" -

We reject setting the debate in terms of a methodological or epistemological tension between musical and social truth claims. We don't want to resolve this tension, but seek to turn it into a pedagogical and methodological insight. Acknowledging the productive values of this tension brings into view differences which may lead to less entangled theoretical and empirical work on music. The opposition between "serious" and "popular" lead to the same bunkerization as the adjudication of the various truth claims between sociology and musicology by a "closed" discipline created in the legitimation of popular music studies in the university. Indeed this legitimation of a new discipline depends on this opposition and, in fact, continues to reproduce it as knowledge. The result is that a particular framework of analysis, based on this opposition, is already in place (even in a state of "epistemological crisis" before it is brought to the exploration of the social relations of music and musical practices.)

As far as this opposition must identify itself with an already given formulation of the "popular" it is incapable of generating fruitful questions about the "popular" outside of this given formulation. Popular music, for instance, is defined as that which is mass-produced, technologically mediated, organized by a hit parade and a star system and characterized by a symbiotic relationship between performance, recording and broadcasting, and by its articulation with various social groups. But then so classical music. Despite the current image of aristocratic aloofness, of privileged autonomy, which surrounds its usual social critique, the classical business is even more a business of stars than the pop record business, and the classical buyers even more star-oriented and less adventurous than the typical young buyer of pop records. The international classical record market is one dominated by a few international superstars mostly performing familiar repertoires for conservative buyers.

If our experience of popular music is shaped by radio, by records, a star system and a highly ritualized performance spectacle in which musicians reproduce their already-recorded sounds in perfect simulation, so is our experience of classical music, and for that matter, the avant-garde.

If our experience of popular music is shaped by radio, records, a star system and a highly ritualized performance spectacle in which musicians reproduce their already-recorded sounds in perfect simulation, so is our experience of classical music, and for that matter, the avant-garde.
There is already a "study of popular music in the universities", though it is not recognized as "study" by legislators or hired practitioners. This is the campus/community radio station, whose producers know more about current developments in popular music than most heretofore granted a degree in the field.

It is hard to avoid reflecting on the meaning of images; they are always before us — staring at us and we at them. Sound/music operates in our society in ways which, more often than not, may be characterized as being "behind our backs". (One need not "face the music" to hear it.) This property of the sonic/musical object permits it to be experienced in far more unconscious ways than images. Sonic/musical forms are often in the background to various social activities as well as serving as the "soundtrack" to visual forms.

Since an explicit emphasis in the work of Berliner and Wagner music has become a misleadingly subtle form of accompaniment to social action. Indeed, sound and the Hollywood soundtrack may be traced back (as Adorno has suggested) to Berliner's "idee fixe" and Wagner's "lienzmotiv" which programmatically identifies a social act/interaction with a recurring, recognizable musical theme or motif.

There is already a "study of popular music in the universities", though it is not recognized as "study" by legislators or hired practitioners. This is the campus/community radio station, whose producers know more about current developments in popular music than most heretofore granted a degree in the field.

1 There is already a "study of popular music in the universities" which has been in place in Canada for a decade, though it is not recognized as "study" by legislators or hired practitioners. This is the campus/community radio station, whose producers know more about current developments in popular music than most heretofore granted a degree in the field.

2 A formally worked-out pedagogy for the study of the "popular" in music must begin by addressing the particular resistance of the sonic/musical domain. This context resistance is meant to refer to both the physical or material properties of an object (e.g. the physical properties of stone, metal and wood each exhibit a different resistance which it tangible), and their historically. This point may be clarified by comparison with the far greater critical and pedagogical articulation achieved in the analysis of image-forms (photography, video, film).

3 Music as pedagogy, pedagogy as music? We denote a mediation whose name is media. Music as production, music as consumption? We denote a mediation... Music as sound, music as social organization? All of these problematic divisions can be broken down only in the course of a pedagogical and technologically mediated practice. In that sense campus radio provides both a model and a context for a different kind of productive/analytic work. It makes more sense to ask students to organize an analytic discourse on music (and their experience of it) through the more democratic technology of tape, than to invite them to their guitars for a jam session. The former produces (and potentially, disseminates) knowledge; the latter, therapy.

As an organization of narrative and sonic materials, tape-form represents a challenging and practical alternative to those uninterested or unfamiliar with the language and techniques of tracional music ("popular" and "serious"). The horizon for historiographic and analytical applications is quite broad; one can gather sonic/musical "documents" and re-present them, decontextualized and decontextualized, taking full advantage of their sonic and historical properties (cf. resistance above) in a manner not inconsistent with an exploratory narrative such as the essay form. The task of the "instructor" in such a situation is to both deconstruct the technological tool and to help "students" master the formal elements of its "speech".

In this way one would not replicate uncritically the existing musical forms and "their" pedagogical practices. If, following Cage, music is defined as organized sound, the field of research and practice can open up to include those forms of organized sound which are heard and deployed inside and outside concert halls, clubs, radio, video, etc. in the "normalization" of social spaces.

4 Given that the pedagogical project here is to encourage students to simultaneously speak and produce their own knowledge and experience, there appears to be a problem in encouraging such "speech" through a paralyzing unfamiliar mode, e.g. the tape recorder. The introduction of technological literacy is a dual process, in that it encourages a greater understanding of existing media discourse and also re-articulates problems in the social rhetoric of university discourse, i.e. the organization of knowledge. Empirically, the fact that this process welcomes, simultaneously, strategies of quotation (accesses) and of open-ended questioning (uncertainty), it tends to outweigh the potentially diminishing qualities of media technology. I say (8) "empirically" because I have found women to be as open as men to working with cameras, tape recorders, video and other tools of quotidian questioning with sound and/or (more often) image reconstruction. So these
It is hard to avoid reflecting on the meaning of images, they are always before us — staring at us and we at them. But sound/music operates in our society in ways which, more often than not, may be characterized as being "behind our backs."