

Apples and Oranges, Solar Systems and Galaxies: Comparing Systems of Community Music

**Kari K. Veblen, *University of Western Ontario*
*London, Ontario, Canada***

In this paper, I examine the ways that people think about community music groups, systems and networks in several countries. Among the CM organizational schemes compared are Joss's (1996) UK CM groupings, Breen's (1994) Australian typology, Horfilla's (2000) organization of arts groups in the Philippines and one from North America. The North American typology (Veblen & Olsson, 2002) expands on an initial model by Leglar and Smith (1996). What do these structures look like? How do they compare? In what ways do they bear out or further sociological notions of community first proposed by Tönnies and other thinkers of the 19th and 20th century?

When we think about Community Music (CM) -- particularly when a group such as this gathering of international community music workers and scholars considers Community Music -- we seem to find much common ground in our intentions, our spirit and our attitudes towards the people we work with. We might even all come to a similar definition of community! But at the same time, we are individuals with many perspectives and notions on what CM is and might be. These perspectives are individual of course, but also colored by the ways CM is delineated and funded in our local contexts.

In this presentation, I'd like to examine some of the ways that people are currently thinking about community music groups, systems and networks in several countries. After a brief look at a seminal theory about community, I'll compare several CM typologies (in Ireland, the UK, Australia, the Philippines, and North America).

Apples and Galaxies

Many of the latest developments in CM are indicated in ephemeral documents – usually not in library archives. So in preparation for this paper, I've surfed hightide at the internet, always addicting – that rush of information, images, of music and video. [Suddenly it's 2 am and my numbed fingers type on, in pursuit of one last thing].

You probably won't be surprised to hear that there are whole star systems out there – immense list serves of bands, choirs, heavy metal fans, folk troupes, bell ringers, gamelan aficionados, riot grrrl groups and so forth. They are in German, Spanish, Japanese, everything!

And in the process of perusing and finding typologies, I've begun to reflect on the old dichotomies of local vs. larger communities and how these notions have weathered the past century or so. In 1887 the German thinker Ferdinand Tönnies laid the foundations for current sociological theories about community. He was a contemporary and much influenced by Karl Marx. Like Marx and other thinkers of his time,¹ Tönnies reacted to the big societal changes of his day such as the industrial revolution, the Irish potato famine, and great changes in power throughout the world. (In fact, it's said that sociology began as a romantic response to changes people saw happening in daily life).

Tönnies coined the binary of *Gemeinschaft* and *Gesellschaft* to describe how society was organized. *Gemeinschaft* or community is characterized by personal, deep interactions, enduring social relationships, clear understand of individual's play, rooted, and assigned roles. In *Gemeinschaft*, relationships are homogenous and small scale; church and family are potent factors. In other words, this view of community is pictured as pastoral, rural and idyllic where everyone knew their neighbors, were interdependent etc.

By contrast, *Gesellschaft* or society indicates the presence of these factors: Rational and calculative interactions, fleeting relationships, social and geographic mobility and fluid roles. In *Gesellschaft*,

Tönnies theorized, what you are and achievement are most important. Society is large scale, heterogeneous; the state, business, education and media are powerful. Groups and relationships are ones forged from by one's volition.² Here's where the notion of the "Metropolis" fits in – where the workers are crushed beneath the weight of the endless time clock and life is alienated, gritty, shallow etc. etc.³

Like Marx and others, Tönnies saw the advances of industrialization and urban life as negative forces – as signaling the loss of community. His notions were seized upon by later sociologists, up to this day and minute! -- and taken to mean various things. For some thinkers, the two models are seen as opposing dichotomies and community losses because Gemeinschaft always turns into Gesellschaft. And still others posit that the two states may exist simultaneously.⁴

Before leaving Tönnies' model, it's also important to note some of the characteristics imbedded here: Community is 1) geographic expression – a fixed and bounded locality; 2) local social system; and 3) type of relationship. As the field of community studies developed, these three characteristics led to new theories, branching off into both more vague, holistic models AND more sharply delineated structures. But, detailing these developments is beyond the limits of my patience!

In the intervening century and some since Tönnies began this academic dialogue, the world has changed. We will now look at a few typologies of CM. As we do, you may want to ask yourself: In what ways do they bear out or further sociological notions of community first proposed by Tönnies and other thinkers of the 19th and 20th century?

Rapidly Accelerating: Typology from Ireland

Ireland has long been subject for community studies – some of the seminal work in this field was done in the late 1930s by Harvard professors Arensberg and Kimball who described family and community relationships in Co. Claire.

Therefore, although I hadn't planned on studying community in my first study in Ireland in 1991, I quickly found myself doing just that. I'd planned to focus on teachers teaching Irish traditional music. But it soon became apparent that everyone was connected with other people. Consider this typology of Irish traditional music organizations, which I brought to my first community music seminar in 1994.

Government Agencies

Arts Council
Arts Council of Northern Ireland
Department of Education

Archives / Museums

Irish Traditional Music Archive
University College Dublin folklore archives
Ulster Folk and Transportation Museum and others
Other archives maintained by other organizations

University Affiliated / Education Oriented

Cumann Cheol Tíre Éireann
University College Cork Music Department
Music departments in other university colleges
Irish Traditional Music Society / UCC
An Cumann le Béaloideas Éireann
Local societies
Local educational facilities such as the Cork School of Music
Programs such as Teastas I dTeagasc Ceolta Tíre

Interest Groups

(General) Comhaltas Ceoltóirí Éireann

(Fiddlers) Cairdeas na bhFidléirí
(Harpers) Cairde na Cruit, Cláirseoirí na hÉireann
(Pipers) Na Píobairí Uilleann, Irish Pipe Band Association, Armagh Pipers Club
Willie Clancy School and other summers schools
(Theater) Siamsa Tíre
(singers) various

Media Oriented

Claddagh Records, Gael-Linn, Clo Iar-Chonnacht, Camus Productions
Raidió Teilifís Éireann, Raidió na Gaeltachta
Local radio/ TV programs

ORGANIZATIONS WHICH PROMOTE TRADITIONAL MUSIC IN IRELAND

In the dozen years since I first documented and formulated this, there have been astounding developments in Ireland. There is a half inch thick book listing music organizations, websites, pages, CM programs and so forth. While some of these programs were in existence in 1991, many were not. They've sprouted up in a decade! A number of factors (among them Ireland's joining the EU, flowering of Irish/Celtic global culture, infusion of money and many social factors) no doubt contributed to this – along with internet access and increased musicians' access to controlling their own creations. At the same time, there seem to be many threads of continuity, linking present to the past.

Let us take a look at models in other places.

CM Model from the UK

Since the UK is one of the pioneers in thinking about CM, I tried hard to find a well developed typology. And I'm sure there is one somewhere, but not accessible to me at this time. [Note: See the papers by Lee Higgins, Phil Mullen, David Price and Katherine Zeserson in this proceedings for current commentary from the UK !]

However, one of the initiators of Sound Sense, (the UK CM advocacy group) and also the Chair of this commission from 1992-1994, characterized CM as active participation in music-making. In 1996, Tim Joss wrote that it is rooted in community life, with a developmental edge as well – and a commitment to equal access, local decision making, creative projects and so forth. He noted that CM embraces creative amateur activities, composer-in-residence schemes, participatory projects to develop indigenous music-making, community recording studios, outreach programs by orchestras and opera companies, local music amateurs, and much more.

Joss 1996 Typology *Based on UK Experiences*

Characteristics include:
active participation in music-making
rooted in community life
developmental edge
commitment to equal access, local decision making,
creative projects and so forth.

Kinds of Activities

- **creative amateur activities**
- **composer-in-residence schemes**
- **participatory projects to develop indigenous music-making**
- **community recording studios**
- **outreach programs by orchestras & opera companies**
- **local music amateurs**
- **and much more.**

CM Model from Australia

In Australia, Breen (1994) constructed a topology of interest continuums sponsored by public funding. He also offers corresponding typology of seven purposes for CM in Australia: utilitarian, industrial, oppositional, pluralist, normative, consensus, welfare. (1) Utilitarian projects are the least developed situations: Here a CM worker contributes minimal opportunities for community participation. (2) Industrial projects link performance or product with media and possibly commercial enterprises. (3) Oppositional situations refer to using CM to express political or minority views. (4) Pluralistic formations set forth access and tolerance as priorities in music making. (5) Normative formations indicate that music happens within defined affinity groups such as ethnic migrant circles. (6) Consensus structures denote programs targeted at specific groups, often with aims of social uplift. And finally, (7) Welfare programs exist to bring musical participation to disadvantaged social groups.

Breen 1994 Typology <i>of Purposes / Interest Continuums Funded in Australia</i>	
<u>Utilitarian</u>	least developed situations minimal opportunities for community participation.
<u>Industrial</u>	link performance or product with media & possibly commercial enterprises
<u>Oppositional</u>	express political or minority views
<u>Pluralistic</u>	access & tolerance priorities in musicing
<u>Normative</u>	music happens within defined groups such as ethnic migrant circles
<u>Consensus</u>	targeted at specific groups, often aims of social uplift.
<u>Welfare</u>	disadvantaged social groups

Breen asserts that CM is extremely mobile, comfortable with simple means or with the latest in digital technology. He identifies communities of music interest, not listed in any particular order in the chart below.

¹ Certainly many thinkers such as Marx, Durkheim, and Weber viewed this formation of capitalist society as a negative thing. Marx noted the changes in feudal face-to-face partial oppression to one of systemic and complete oppression. Durkheim contrasted organic (or pre-industrial) with mechanical (or urban) society.

² In addition to source materials, I've culled from several set of notes on the internet:

a) lecture notes from Lecture 18-25 September 2000: The Concept of Community that appears to be Sligo, Ireland. However, neither author's name, nor contact information were available.

(staffweb.itsligo.ie/staff/pshare/cs/lectures/Lecture%201.htm)

b) lecture notes from the University of Georgia, Department of Geography, 2000 from Geog 3630 Fall 2001 "Social Life in the City," again no name or contact information; and,

c) Mary F. Neff's dissertation on the web.

³ These visions of slave-workers working underground and chained to the wheels of a massive machine come from Fritz Lang's 1926 expressionist film "Metropolis."

⁴ Engerman reviews Bender's *Community and Social Change in America* (1978): "While Tonnies used these terms as ideal types, American interpreters, especially Chicago-school sociologists like Lewis Wirth and Robert Redfield saw them in a linear fashion: A *Gemeinschaft* would become a *Gesellschaft*." Bender suggests that this is not necessary and that G & G could co-exist "not only at the same time, but even as tendencies in the same place."

Breen's 1994 Typology

Based on Australian Experience

Communities of Music Interest

Geography

Precinct – Local – Regional – National – Global

Users

Children – youth – ethnic – adult – senior citizens – disabled – unemployed – 'ordinary garden variety'

Genres

Acoustic – folk – rock – pop – experimental – world music – women – choir – acapella – orchestra – brass bands – theatre

Industry

Personal – subcultural/specialist – recording – print – radio – television

Breen 1994:317

CM/ Arts Model from the Philippines

In his typology of cultural organizations in the Philippines, Horfilla traces systems that exist on the island of Mindanao. In doing so, he hopes to encourage these groups to collaborate and broaden the base of creative action. Horfilla notes that a variety of creative activities (drama, dance, musical puppetry, storytelling, video and so on) used in cultural work (health, structural development, education, therapy, etc.).

Horfilla discusses these in terms of the theatre network there MINDULANI, (whose name is derived from "Ani sa Dulang Mindanao" or a harvest of people's theatre and culture). Horfilla notes that

This creative harvest is rooted in the popular theatre movement in Mindanao during the decades of the 70s and the 80s. It is best characterized by the unity of cultural workers during the time

when arts and literature were means to liberate the people from a culture of silence and repression. [It is also] the organizational expression of cultural workers, artists and Arts Councils based in Mindanao –a broad-based cultural network that consciously strive to sustain the community theatre and cultural action work in the region. Likewise, it continues to draw wisdom from the sources of Filipino identity. . .” (Horfilla, 2000).

Horfilla’s 2000 Typology
Cultural Organizations in Mindanao, Philippines

Nature of Organizations	Cultural Groups & their Base
Repertory Theatre Companies: School-based, Community-based & Semi-Professionals Groups	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sining Kambayoka, Marawi City * Sining Kabpapagariya, General Santos City * Sining Theresian, Tandag Surigao del Sur * IPAG, Iligan City * Kariala Music Traditions, Iligan City * Kalambagohan Repertory, Cagayan de Oro City * SINAG, Butuan City * Kaliwat Theatre Collective, Davao City\
Young People’s & Children’s Theatre Program	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Kahayag Community Theatre and Dance Co., Marbel * Kathara Theatre and Dance Collective, Davao City * CINE Children’s Theatre, Tagum City * KABIBATA, Davao City
Community-based &/or Multi-sectoral Cultural Programs	<p>Various Cultural Programs in Mindanao:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sector-focused Cultural Programs * Parish-based Cultural Events * Secular Community Celebrations / Festivals
Programs on Theatre-in-Education:	<p>MINDULANI in consortium with Heritage Associates</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Summer Institutes for Teachers and Cultural Workers (MSU Marawi & General Santos) * Mobile TIE in Basic Education (Davao City) * Learning Centers for Heritage & Innovative Education (CINE, Tagum) * TIE Programs in the Tertiary Level (Notre Dame, Midsayap) * Theatre in Adult Education & functional Literary (Various Sites)
Cultural Institutions, Arts Councils & Networks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * EDCADS Inc. * Marawi Arts Council * Koronadal Arts Council * Iligan Arts Council * Sentrong Bayan Ng Sining At Kultura, Davao City
Indigenous People’s Cultural Organizations & Folkloric Cultural Troupes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Sining Pananadem, Marawi City * Tambuli Cultural Troupe, Tawi-Tawi> * Talaandig Youth theatre Group, Bukidnon * Others

**Local Government Unit's
Cultural Affairs Offices**

- * Iligan Cultural Affairs Office
- * South Cotabato Cultural Affairs Office>
- * Others

www.ncc.gov.ph/phil_culture/arts/dramatic-mindanao.htm C 20000 National Commission for Culture & the Arts, email: cyberspace@ncca.gov.ph

CM Model in North America

The following typology (Veblen and Olsson, 2002) looks at the variety of groups in North America.⁴ It augments an earlier version by Leglar and Smith (1996) which included three groups: (1) community music schools; (2) community performance organizations; or (3) ethnic/preservation groups.

Veblen & Olsson's 2002 Typology <i>Community Music in North America</i>	
(1)	community music schools
(2)	community performance organizations
(3)	ethnic / preservation groups
(4)	religious
(5)	associative organizations with schools
(6)	outreach initiatives of universities & colleges
(7)	informal, affinity groups

The first example, community music schools include both individual, isolated freestanding academies and members of the National Guild of Community Schools. These take a myriad of forms and serve many functions from early childhood classes through seniors activities.

Orchestras, bands, choirs, and many other nonprofit groups are included in the second category of community performance organizations.

The third classification, ethnic / preservation groups, includes multiple immigrant communities as well as First Peoples or native American groups and recreated traditions groups. Gatherings often serve as a way to celebrate or build community. In addition to preserving traditions, CM groups in North America may also recreate, improvise, invent or adopt traditions.

Religious groups include choirs, processional bands and many other kinds of ensembles Some CM musicians also perform as soloists, cantos, organists and other kinds of leadership roles. While these musicians may perform publicly, members may feel that they are worshiping or fulfilling a role in a liturgical service rather than performing for an audience. Sometimes the music and rituals are part of an immigrant or displaced community, thus serving to preserve heritage as well as worship.

Associative organizations with schools refers to the many partnerships between orchestras, opera companies and other professional organizations partner with school systems, as well as with other branches of the community.⁴

The sixth category refers to the outreach programs undertaken by many colleges and universities. These range from sponsorship of local arts and music events to outreach efforts into schools and affiliated early childhood or senior centers. Choirs, bands, orchestras and other ensembles are often featured.

The final example, affinity groups, is taken from Slobin (1993:98): "charmed circles of like-minded music-makers drawn magnetically to a certain genre that creates strong expressive bonding."

Many CM groups (if not most) fit into this last category. In fact, all of the categories blur and blend.

Nevertheless, there are informal, affinity groups that seem to need a special designation. Perhaps these would be communities which perform music together, or perhaps they are affinity groups that never meet face-to-face. It is possible that they could only exist and collaborate in cyber space. Or they may connect via web, then play together later. Friends of mine in Madison Wisconsin told me how they linked up with Irish musicians from all over via the internet to learn a common repertoire of tunes. They then met and played together at the Milwaukee Irish Fest, reputed to be the largest Irish music festival in the world. [I'm hoping to find more examples of this, as it's wonderful to contemplate]. Research is just emerging concerning virtual music communities and new modes of interacting using the latest media. (See Bryant (1995); Neff (1996) and Kibby (2000) for more on virtual music

Comparing the Typologies

How do these various typologies match up? Are they equivalent in some way, or is this truly a case of apples and oranges? Or to return to Tönnies and others who first formulated dichotomies of local vs. larger communities: Do the same local / larger notions continue to inform our thinking about communities?

What's first apparent in these examples is that people are putting energy into naming and qualifying musical activities on smaller and larger scales. In all of the cases we've seen, a kind of Gemeinschaft can be traced. We are looking at local phenomenon in Ireland, the UK, Australia, the Philippines and the US. But do these small scale musical groups fit squarely within Tönnies binary? Is there simply a residue of previous associations? Or is this a new development?

From my perspective, some of these structures are opaque. Why would someone separate musical practices or groups in a certain way, and not others? Why is one system ranked so loosely, while another sets forth much information? It would seem that the understandings of Community Music are rooted in their particular situations. It may be necessary to be a part of a geographic place with its unique context (historical/social/cultural/artistic etc.) to appreciate some of the distinctions being made here – and to more fully describe what is suggested here.

In addition to detailing local phenomenon, the majority of the typologies allow room for potential, emerging, larger-scale or expansive musical communities. Joss and Horfilla indicate potential CM groups with the words “and much more” or “other”. Breen specifies a continuum from local to global. Veblen and Olsson cover a multitude of sins with their “informal, affinity groups” designation. Does this necessarily indicate Gesellschaft? Again, the binary implied in several typologies suggests historical correlations – as well as charting of newly observed phenomenon.

What Does This Mean and Why Should We Care?

To my mind, these are exciting developments for us as musicians/ educators/workers and as people who will have a larger influence on community music issues in our own countries. We are witnessing an acceleration here. People are trying to order the proliferation of musics that they witness. This is especially important for those of us who work in community and music education.

There seems to be a large-scale effort to organize and professionalize what has always happened informally. This trend may not have been possible previously. Consider that now musicians may control their images and their musics, may freely disseminate them (although access to the net is still confined to those of privilege – but that's changing). It may be that the theoretical frameworks that are emerging, along with the research being generated, will usher in changes we cannot imagine.

In reference to the proliferation of communities in cyberspace, John C. Dvorak (1996, in Mark & Smith, 1999) said: “The sociologists are going to love the next 100 years.” I'd like to amend that to say that these are good times for us in this field and to suggest that we in Community Music are going to love the next 100 years.

References

-
- Arensburg, C. & Kimball, S. T. (1968, 1940). *Family and community in Ireland*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Breen, M. (1994). Constructing the popular from public funding of community music. *Popular Music*, 13(3), 313-326.
- Bryant, W. (1995). *Virtual music communities: The Folk-Music Internet Discussion Group as a cultural system*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, Los Angeles.
- Horfilla, N. T. (2000). *Theater networking in Mindanao: Recognizing creative diversities and building a culture of peace* © National Commission for Culture and the Arts, Philippines E-mail: cyberspace@ncca.gov.ph
www.ncca.gov.ph/phil._culture/arts/dramatic/dramatic_mindanao.htm
- Joss, T. (1996). Setting the stage: The mission of the seminar In Mary Leglar (Ed.). *The Role of Community Music in a Changing World; Proceedings of the 1994 ISME Commission on Community Music Activity*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia. Pp1-3
- Kibby, M. D. (2000). Home on the page: A virtual place of music community. *Popular Music*, 19 (1): 91-100.
- Marc, S. & Peter Kollock, P. (Eds.). (1999). *Communities in cyberspace*. London: Routledge
- Neff, M. L. (1996). *Media usage among folk music communities*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Florida. web link: www.coe.ufl.edu/courses/EdTech/Wault/Folk/Community.htm
- Slobin, M. (1993). *Subcultural sounds: Micromusics of the west*. Hanover, NH: Wesleyan University Press.
- Tönnies, F. (1887/1988) *Community and society (Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft)*. (C.P. Loomis, Trans.). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Veblen, K. K. (1995). *Sociology of music education: Remembered homelands, chosen destinations and the construction of musical identity*. In Rideout, R. (Ed.) *On the sociology of music education*. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma. pp. 22-42.
- Veblen, K. K. (1996). "Community music networks: Tradition and change in Ireland." In Mary Leglar (Ed.). *The Role of Community Music in a Changing World; Proceedings of the 1994 ISME Commission on Community Music Activity*. Athens, GA: University of Georgia. Pp.46-61
- Veblen, K. K. & Olsson, B. (2002). *Community Music: Towards an International Perspective*. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The New Handbook of Research on Music Teaching and Learning*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Werner, O. (1996). *Music programs in the community college*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Colorado State University.