

courses for all music teachers in training and thereby the school programs in which they would apply their broadened backgrounds. (Mark & Gary, 2007).

Related to the CMP movement was another attempt, at around the same time, to view music education in a more comprehensive way. The textbook *Foundations and Principles of Music Education*, by Leonhard and House (1959, 1972) described “faulty music programs” as those “with undue emphasis on performance,” as “emphasizing music as an instrument for achieving unmusical ends such as health, citizenship, and so on,” in which “music loses its identity through specious integration with other subjects of the school,” and programs “aimed largely at receiving public approbation” by exploiting students in performing groups used excessively to gain popular approval (Leonhard & House, 1972, pp. 5-6).

Envisioned, as an alternative, was a program in which students are enabled to participate fully in the musical life of their time (p. 74).

Comprehensiveness Unachieved

I want to argue that, some four decades since those attempts to fashion a more comprehensive posture for music education, we have accomplished few of their aspirations. Some, to be sure, but not all, and those few to only a small degree compared with the ambitions those aspirations exemplified. Our faulty programs persist, largely unabated, to this day. Not a happy picture, I’m afraid, at least for those in our profession for whom comprehensiveness remains a worthy, even necessary goal.

I am one of them. In fact I have argued for longer than I care to remember that because of our limited vision of what proper music education consists of we have become progressively more irrelevant to the actualities of the thriving, colorful, and

diverse musical culture in which we live, and particularly irrelevant to the musical lives of the large majority of students

take significant steps toward expanding the musical understandings they cultivate. This is accomplished by becoming more comprehensive in their inclusion of learnings that deepen the performance experience by situating it in broader musical and societal contexts, as the National Standards have called for.

Approaching a Vision of Comprehensiveness

How do we approach a concept of music education that embraces the needs, interests, and proclivities of all our students, as well as the full representation of all the many ways that music is conceived of and practiced in our multimusical world? That is, what would a genuinely comprehensive music program look like, and how would we enable ourselves to offer it?

These questions require attention to two dimensions of the task if they are to be answered convincingly. The first dimension is a grounding theory of what comprehensive education in its totality might consist of. The second is a set of guidelines as to how we in music education can carry out that theory in our practices. Neither theory by itself nor practice by itself will be adequate to the task facing us, because, as we have all no doubt heard many times, theory without practice is empty, and practice without theory is blind. (By the way, that maxim has been attributed to a bewildering array of people, so I am not able to cite it authoritatively.) In this paper I will propose answers to both dimensions, answers I have pursued for most of my career and which I have continued to refine and extend to the present day. I hope that as other such proposals are advanced we will be enabled to create a concept of comprehensive education and of comprehensive music education, along with their necessary practices, that will elevate both education and music education to the

level of relevancy that our culture and our students deserve from us.

Each Child Fulfilled

My answer to the question of what a comprehensive education consists of is based on a philosophical objective; that is, a hoped-for value, that goes directly counter to the presently operative objective of education, known as No Child Left Behind. I have already characterized its deficiencies, so I will not continue to beat this dead horse, except to relate that one of its critics, dismayed by the relentless regimen of testing that it puts students through, proposes that we change its name to “No Child’s Behind *Left*” (A reasonable proposal, I would say).

I have stated my alternative proposal to No Child Left Behind in three words: Each Child Fulfilled. This value, I argue, grounds education in a fundamental goal that is at once deeply humane and powerfully practicable. It focuses on the individual as the essential unit of worth and of nurturance, and it provides endless implications for what an effective, meaningful education will consist of and how it can be carried out in all the myriad practices that a functional education program requires.

Fulfilled individuals, persons whose education has helped them become as completely self-developed as possible *at every stage of that development*, are the basic components for secure and mature cultures to which they are contributors and from which they are beneficiaries. Fulfilled lives, as those lives are being lived day by day, year by year, are lives most worth living, I would propose. People who are living such lives participate fully in wholeness, in optimum realization of each human’s potentials for satisfaction, growth, success, challenge, and joy.

this regard has been made, as we are all aware, by Howard Gardner, in his theory that there are seven, or perhaps eight, or perhaps eight and a half, or perhaps eight and two halves (the existential and the moral, which have turned out to be too hazy to be given full status) (Gardner, 1983, 1999).

Luckily for us, one of them, on the original list of seven, no less, is the musical intelligence. Why music happened to be singled out as an intelligence domain, unlike any of the other arts, each of which was buried within other domains, seemed to me, when I first studied Gardner's theory, to be puzzling, even disturbing. But in my pleasure that we were on the side of the good guys, and were able to play that for all it was worth, basking in the theory's glory, I put aside my qualms and went blissfully on my way. As time passed, other aspects of his theory began to seem to me to be less and less well founded. For example, how a domain was identified in the first place. Why some domains got added and not others seemingly equally as worthy. What intelligence actually consists of absent a clear definition or description of it by Gardner, actually absent any definition of intelligence at all to help establish its parameters. The edifice I had at first left unexamined began, as I looked at it more closely, to crumble before my eyes.

Also, as his theory became more widely applied in education, I witnessed the confusions it was causing as to how and when to apply it, and the absurdities that were appearing in the attempts being made to put it into practice. For an example relevant to us, singing a counting song in an arithmetic lesson as satisfying the presence in arithmetic of the musical intelligence. Or, worse, counting up the beats in three measures of four beats each to introduce the idea of multiplication, again assuming that the musical intelligence had made its

appearance. This sort of thinking, easily found in attempts to apply MI (Multiple Intelligence) theory, simply stripped the veil from my eyes as to the validity or practicality of the theory. I am sorry to say that Gardner has never, to my knowledge, convincingly explained away or corrected the weaknesses in either the theoretical foundation or the application of his theory. I am also happy to say that despite my criticisms of it (he has read my material on the subject and has listened to me lecture on it), he and I remain on the most cordial and respectful terms. I have boundless admiration for him, both as a person who I have come to know quite well and as a

education, is somehow sacrosanct, and that “reform” is largely a matter of tinkering with what now exists. That attitude, so prevalent in education and in music education, is often expressed in the lament that we hardly have enough opportunity to do what we want to do now, and to do it as expertly as we would wish. So how can we do new things, think differently, aim in different directions, when we haven’t entirely succeeded in doing optimally what we try to do at present?

That position, unfortunately, gets us nowhere, dooming us to the status quo forever, dooming us to all the existing irrelevancies in education and in music education from which both of them suffer. We are ready, more than ready, to move ahead boldly to new challenges, new opportunities, and new hopes for what we can be and how we can contribute to human welfare in fundamentally better ways.

So here is that vision as I presently conceive it, at the level of practice. I must state at the outset that I am well aware that I am not capable of imagining all the ways that the theory can be applied, let alone all the ways that it can be developed over time to be as functional, as successful, as I believe it can be. No one person can do that. This is too big, too inclusive of every dimension of learning and teaching, to be fully comprehended beforehand and applied in all its dimensions by any individual. So my suggestions are humbly offered, as being my inklings of what might occur if this direction is taken, a journey that will require both time and a lot of effort by a wide variety of thoughtful, skilled people.

The Dimension of General Education

First, we must recognize that we need a major overhaul of the concept of general education, that aspect of education in which all students are expected to be engaged if they are to be functional in their

culture and in the world. Our tendency in this regard, around the world, is to identify the subject matters (or fields, or domains, or disciplines) that we consider most important for all educated citizens of each culture to be acquainted with, to as high a degree as each culture’s educational system can reasonably be expected to achieve. These subject matters, constituting the core curriculum, vary somewhat from culture to culture, of course, but as the world has become more homogeneous the core has also become more so. We can generally expect primary attention to language studies both domestic and foreign, social studies, mathematics, and sciences, with lesser attention, if any at all, to physical education (or, as it is called in some areas of the United States, “kinetic wellness”), the arts, and various configurations of what used to be called vocational education but which has now graduated to being conceived as career and technical education.

With the exception of that last area, career and technical education, which has always aligned itself with the world outside of schools (although sometimes far behind what is going on outside of schools), the core and auxiliary subjects have dominantly been studied as coherent disciplines, to be learned in and of themselves as bodies of knowledge that are contained within their characteristic ways of thinking and doing. That is, they are largely studied, in and of themselves, as school subjects.

It is true, I believe, that each subject is indeed one way to explore and understand our world, and that each has its characteristic ways to be learned if it is to be understood and practiced genuinely. But the problem with conceiving them as subjects to be learned is that it tends to isolate them from the lived world outside of school. A great deal of schooling, for a great many students—perhaps most schooling for most students—is regarded by them as being

largely or entirely unrelated to the realities of their lives outside the school. Their learning, therefore, is saturated with a sense that it consists of hoops to be jumped through, expectations to be met, disconnected from everything else in their lives that matters to them. This syndrome is especially prevalent at the high school level although it tends to come to consciousness for many students at the middle school level and even earlier. For just one example, algebra seems to be a barrier subject that must be broken through at all costs, despite that there seems to be little if any clarity as to what it has to do with anything that might be of interest or of use.

That particular example is relevant, in various degrees, to the attitudes many have about all the other subjects they are required to learn. As a result the “will this be on the test?” mentality thrives, caused by test results being the major criterion of successful learning. Absent, here, is genuine absorption in and enjoyment of what is being learned as being meaningful to lives being lived. The test-result criterion diminishes education seriously, as it does the humanity of all who become infected with it. This is not a trivial matter: it goes to the heart of what we hope education will accomplish in the lives of all our students—lives more fulfilled than can otherwise be attained.

Here the power of focusing on roles becomes immediately felt, for two fundamental reasons.

First, each of the many roles that people play within fields, requires, as I have suggested, its particular ways to be intelligent. In language studies, for example, it’s one thing to think and do in expository prose, as in journalism. It’s quite another to create poetry. Two different intelligences because they are two very different roles. It’s one thing, in social studies, to think and do as a sociologist. It’s a very different thing

to be an economist. Those two roles can be coordinated (not integrated), each adding its intelligence to the benefit of the other by making meaningful connections among the two. Each has to be clear about its particular contribution. In mathematics, it’s one thing to think and do as an astronomer, but another as an architect. In science, an atomic fusion researcher is intelligent in one particular way; a cancer cell researcher in another. Within each of the fields I have mentioned, and all the others that I have not, there are many sub-roles, each with its particular intelligence that it makes available for our common welfare.

A focus on roles reveals the manifold ways that humans can be intelligent. That multiplicity of human potentials accounts, in large part, for the success of the human species. That focus, as well, insures the genuineness of what is actually learned and experienced in each domain being studied. The level of the domain, the broad, all-inclusive category of a field of thought and action, is useful to demarcate it from other domains. When it is applied to education, however, it is, simply too indeterminate, by itself, to be able to made operative in the ways requiring its many intelligences to be encountered and lived through in order to be learned.

The same is true of music, of course. To be genuine to each subject its many roles must be encountered, because the subject is, in a real sense, the sum total of all the operative roles within it. And, at the macro level, as I have explained, each culture is the sum total of all the roles in all its areas of endeavor. Focusing on roles within domains reveals the genuineness, the particularity, of the many ways in which intelligence can be manifested within the broad category each domain identifies.

General education, therefore, will consist, in this vision, of the development of each student’s intelligences in the identified

endeavor, education should be able to leap at that golden opportunity by meeting the needs of the child who senses fulfillment awaiting. In addition to what is being learned in the inclusive studies of general education, the moment for specialization has occurred, for deeper immersion into a particular role than the general program can be expected to provide. Ideally, the school, by itself or in tandem with various community enterprises, will be prepared to seize the moment and to arrange for appropriately specialized learnings. Appropriate means both relevant to the student's developmental stage and to his or her propensities. If there is no such appropriate opportunity available it is highly likely that the student's potential fulfillment will disappear into the void of missed chances, a void every one of us must live with as being the "what ifs" in our life. We must, if we are to be humane, if we are to be just, if we are to be equitable, do everything we can to be comprehensive in the special opportunities we offer in addition to the inclusiveness of general education, so that we can meet the needs of all children to become absorbed in a role that makes potential sense for their lives, for their own sakes and for the sake of their culture.

Applying the Vision to Music Education

Everything I have proposed here applies immediately and fully to

Figure 1. U. S. National Content Standards For Music Education (Restructured).

A. MUSICIANSHIP ROLES (INTELLIGENCES/CREATIVITIES)

- | | |
|---------------------|------------|
| 1. Singing, Playing | Performer |
| 2. Improvising | Improviser |
| 3. Composing | Composer |
| 4. Arranging | Arranger |

(Reading and notating music)

B. LISTENERSHIP ROLES (INTELLIGENCES/CREATIVITIES)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 5. Listening | Listener |
| 6. Analyzing, Describing | Theorist |
| 7. Evaluating | Critic |
| 8. Understanding relationships between music, the other arts, and disciplines outside the arts | Psychologist, Philosopher, Neuroscientist, Education Theorist, etc. |
| 9. Understanding music in relation to history and culture | Historian, Sociologist, Ethnomusicologist, Anthropologist, Cultural Critic, etc. |

musically provides a goal toward which we
can strive with the dedication of a 2 (h 5 (12)Tj ET Q no2 (a)4 (r)6 (t)-,4 ()] TJ ET Q q 12 12 588 768 re W 1