

## Telling of “Untold Tales”: Correcting the ‘Story’ Told of The MayDay Group

Thomas A. Regelski

The paper “Ethnomusicology, Feminism, Music Education: Telling Untold Tales” by Roberta Lamb, published in *De-Canonizing Music History*, Vesa Kukela and Lauri Väkeva eds. (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009; 141-161) is scrutinized and critiqued in what follows.

To summarize from its Introduction (pp. 141-142), the chapter promises to present a “careful” history and critical analysis of “a professionalized North American music education reform that *appears consistent* from the first years of the Music Educators National Conference through the folk song revival of the Works Progress Administration, the corporatization of the MENC and the development of the MayDay Group” (italics added). The history of this alleged consistency—seemingly elevated to the status of *canonicity* in the conclusions—begins with an account of the contributions of Ruth Crawford Seeger as “one example of gendered and professionalized music education reform” and of certain other accounts of “a nascent feminism”: “During the time of Crawford Seeger’s activities and influence” and later “under the influence of Lilla Belle Pitts and Vannett Lawler” and others, these gendered and professionalized relationships are described as having been strengthened by MENC in positive ways, with folk music being introduced into American school curricula. However, “by the 1990s” MENC is described as having “turned its primary efforts to music education advocacy as a major lobby linked to some questionable corporate partnerships.” This purportedly negative turn is asserted to have alienated much of MENC’s membership, “which includes twice as many women as men.” As a result, “simultaneously to the 1990s changes in MENC, The MayDay Group (MDG)” is reported as having emerged to promote “improved critical theorizing and practice.”

Pages 142-151 proffers a history of “a nascent feminism” in the early years of MENC and a one paragraph (p. 151) critique of MENC since the 1990s. A decidedly judgmental and negative history of The MayDay Group is then alleged (pp. 151-155), followed by conclusions (pp. 155-156) that depend on accepting that the histories provided have “carefully” and clearly demonstrated a problematic canon in music education that needs de-canonizing.

Mainly addressed below is a *corrected account of MDG history*. In particular, note is taken of factual errors, misrepresentations, and omissions, and the lack of attention to certain scholarly criteria and evidence that is typically expected of such a historical critique and its attendant conclusions.

This correcting of the historical record will hopefully not divert attention from things that should really matter—namely important issues of music teaching and learning that are the focus of The MDG agenda and its activities. However, given the author’s claim that “a careful review of power structures and gender issues in both MENC and MayDay Group reveals histories different from the ones represented on their respective websites” (142), it is necessary to correct the historical record because at least the “tales” about The MDG are *not* carefully told and thus are not accurate.

### *Selected quotations: Nascent Feminism and MENC (141-151)*

The following selection of quotations from the first ten pages of the paper may go to the context, subtext, and accuracy of the “tales” told about the early, gendered history of music education in the US.

p. 141. The overall thesis seems to be that “sociological and historical models demonstrate gender playing a role in the stories we tell about music education scholarship and what we value in music education.”

144: For example: “We see ourselves in her [Ruth Crawford Seeger’s] superwoman trials. We engage in a ‘recursive process, one that involves revisiting and reevaluating the culture of the past in the light of the present.’ (Filene 2000, 8) But when we do not recognize this process in a self-reflective, self-critical manner, we run the risk of re-inscribing limited and dichotomous roles for women. This is what happened in much early feminist work.”

144: “The difficulty here is that we retain the hierarchy of values in writing her [Seeger’s] compositional life as the most important. The greater emphasis on composition, as the peak of the pinnacle is logical in a social context that values the individual creator and her/his high-art, high-class creation more than what appears common and mundane, such as folk music or teaching young children” [punctuation *sic*].

143: Alleged is that the “three careers of composer, folklorist and music teacher, as well as her [Seeger’s] domestic role as wife and mother, are contradictory and oppositional, symptomatic of a gendered hierarchy . . . .”

144-145: Furthermore, “typical stay-at-home moms” (144) are distinguished from “women with the same kind of professional drive, powerful intellect and creative capabilities as Ruth Crawford Seeger,” women who were “experts in their own fields,” (145)—the kind of multiple roles cited above (p. 143)—and a consequent need is asserted for straddling the supposedly intractable ‘borders’ created between such multiple roles.

150: “Although women have been leaders and innovators throughout U.S. music education history, the profession tends to recognize its male leaders more than its female.”

151: “The MENC of the twenty-first century is not an organization of music teachers, music education administrators and music education scholars, but a well-oiled lobby designed to promote a particular pragmatic and politicized vision of music education, presuming that this is what is necessary.”

#### *A Corrected ‘History’ of The MDG*

The quotations reproduced below from the text specifically concerning MDG history and events are followed by corrections of the facts, and are accompanied by comments and other clarifications of the historical record. Given that “it”—The MDG—is not organized according to a formal governance structure, “it” can sometimes be misunderstood. What follows can also help correct those misconceptions. The account of The MDG written by J. Terry Gates, and found at <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/general/gates-agenda.php>, is also relevant to a proper understanding of the spirit and agenda of The MDG.

151: “Music education researchers’ dissatisfaction with MENC prompted various responses, one of which launched the MayDay Group (MDG) in 1993. This was an era when there was a lot of distrust in North American music education—distrust between school music teachers and music education professors, feminists and left-leaning political thinkers, MENC and anyone else, and so forth.”

- While neither evidence nor explanations concerning such allegedly widespread “distrust” are given, the lack of opportunities for dialogue among theorists was a motivating factor in the 1993 launching of The MDG.
- However, it was *not* its main purpose, which was to discuss a wide range of issues in music education.

151-152: “In a manner similar to the 1907 founding meetings of the MENC . . . , Thomas A. Regelski and J. Terry Gates issued an invitation to like-minded music education scholars who shared similar experiences . . . ; however, this invitation was limited to twenty rather than the 100-plus supervisors invited to meet in Keokuk, Iowa in 1907.”

- In November 1906, Philip C. Hayden wrote to 30 music supervisors in the Midwest, inviting them to meet at Keokuk, Iowa on April 10-12, 1907. Response was sufficiently positive that the National Education Association leaders authorized a general call for participation. Of the 104 people who came to the meeting, 69 (44 women and 25 men) agreed to found an independent national association of music teachers, then called the Music Supervisors National Conference [MSNC]. (See Mark and Gary, 1992, ch. 11; Birge, 1926/1966, ch. VIII.<sup>1</sup>).
- There is no accurate record of the number of invitees to the 1993 University at Buffalo (UB) meeting that launched The MDG, but (with the exception of Keith Swanwick) it was largely a regional meeting. No general call was issued because space and the desirability of a discussion-sized group were limiting factors.
- Unlike the Keokuk meeting of 1907 (as described earlier on p. 150), at the first meeting of The MDG, there was no “turmoil,” no “diplomacy between rival groups,” and it was not a contentious “town meeting” (like the 1907 event that, as reported on p. 150, needed to be mediated by Frances E. Clarke).
- “Like-minded,” if applicable at all, could describe only that invitees were music educators with some record of concern about the status quo in the profession. How “like-minded” they were was what the meeting proposed to explore and prospectively build on. Some of those invited did not appear to be ‘on the same page’ (e.g., Elliott and Swanwick).
- “. . . who shared similar experiences”? This was not a criterion or true. Even the ‘critical’ positions of participants were dissimilar.

152: “Four graduate students observed the seminar, but were not allowed at the table. One female graduate student acted as the recorder of the proceedings.”

- This account mistakenly suggests that an inner and outer hierarchy of status or power has existed from the first via imposed seating arrangements, and this erroneous claim of *exclusion by seating* is repeatedly asserted regarding subsequent MDG meetings through 2008.
- In truth, the four students were master’s students from SUNY Fredonia who had been invited as *observers* not as participants—a typical format of an audience observing expert panelists.
- The “recorder” was a University of Buffalo doctoral student hired to provide an ethnographic account not, as suggested in the endnotes, an assistant professor. From the details of her report (<http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia/I.php>) it should be clear that she was busy recording events (not a participant observer); and she did sit at the table with the discussants during the entire meeting.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mark, M., & Gary, C. (1992). *A history of American music education*. New York: Schirmer Books.  
 Birge, E. B. (1928/1966). *History of public school music in The United States*. Washington, DC: Music Educators National Conference.

- In fact, the quotation from the minutes—“Although the size of the group was already at maximum conversational size, more female members might be desirable to counteract the white male domination”—is *positive evidence* that the unpredicted gender imbalance had been duly noted.
- This account also fails to take into consideration those invited who did not attend. We regret that more women were not at the first meeting but there certainly was no intent to exclude them or any other group. The conference was sponsored by two individuals, not representing any particular professional group or institution, at which no scholarly papers would be given, to discuss a position paper written by Regelski that had been circulated with the invitation. The entire first meeting was devoted to a wide-ranging discussion of the various issues raised by this paper (see: <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/theoreticalpapers/regelski-criticaltheoryandpraxis.php.paper>), and to the possibility of continuing dialogue. The benefits of such dialogue led to the idea of an ongoing and expanded group. Subsequently, The “MayDay Group” moniker was adopted, both for its symbolic meaning (viz., a call for help, and an occasion for renewal) and because the first meeting took place on May 1.

152: “The MayDay Group held their second colloquium directly after the Second International Symposium on the Philosophy of Music Education in Toronto, 1994. *Again*, observers (graduate students and women) sat around the outer circle, while the Mayday Group members surrounded the seminar table. Untenured assistant professor Patti O’Toole refused to sit in the outer circle and joined the senior male scholars at the table” (italics added).

- This account is also incorrect. First, with the incorrect stipulation of “again,” the claim of “the outer circle” is carried forward to MDG II from the previous and entirely mistaken imputation of a *seating hierarchy* at MDG I.
- Furthermore, the attribution of Patricia O’Toole is *mistaken in all details*, except that MDG II took place in Toronto in 1994.
- In fact, only a handful of members attended (following the Philosophy of Music Education II conference). There was no table, no inner circle of “senior male scholars” or members, with an outer circle of others. The meeting took place in the basement of a private home, having been moved there to avoid a heat wave and the un-air conditioned University of Toronto venue originally planned.
- Only four MDG colloquia<sup>2</sup> have involved seating around a central table (the rest involved classroom or auditorium seating), and three of those easily accommodated all present (more below on the exception, MDG XIV). At one of those, Dallas 1998, O’Toole did present a paper, but there was ample room at the table for all, including two non-members (at the time)—both women—who were welcomed and participated in all discussions. Attempts at contacting O’Toole to gain clarification have failed.

---

<sup>2</sup> A distinction should have been made between the main colloquium sessions at which what The MDG calls “provocations” (i.e., papers intended to *provoke free-wheeling discussion*) are given and short MDG business meetings. Of the latter, only one such meeting was held around a table (MDG IV) and, at that, a graduate student who had chosen to sit back from the table was immediately invited to the table. At this meeting, consensus on the policy of open membership was reached. *Seating arrangements and other physical requirements have, since the beginning, been made by the conference sponsors*—members of The MDG who have volunteered to host the event. Thus seating variables are determined by the facilities chosen by the hosts for the meetings. Several hosts have been women (a part of the gendered tale not told), including by Patricia O’Toole in 2002. Given the nature of MDG “provocations” and the variety of key topics over the history of the various MDG colloquia (<http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia.php>), it should be clear that any allegations of gendered hierarchies and exclusionary acts (etc.) had ample opportunity to be publicly aired.

- The two anonymous ‘witnesses’ cited in n. 13 (p. 162) to something that did not and could not have happened (given the year, location, and circumstances) are clearly mistaken and, in any case, recourse to unsubstantiated hearsay is not expected of a reliable historical record.

152: “First discussions focused on connections between philosophy, theory and practice, resulting in the Action Ideals for Change statement, which was signed at the 1996 meeting. (MayDay Group n.d., 1).”

- This, too, is factually inaccurate. The Action Ideals were *not* discussed at MDG II at Toronto in 1994 (see: <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia/II.php>).
- The working draft of the Ideals originated with Gates and Regelski, developed via many e-mail messages, and with consultation and input from a variety of others along the way.
- This draft was substantially edited and revised (the original, for example, did not take the form of questions) at the New England Conservatory (NEC) meeting in 1996 (hosted by Richard Colwell), which was convened expressly for that purpose.
- The text was not “signed” at the 1996 meeting since not all ‘signatories’ were even at the NEC meeting. The final text was subsequently circulated and affirmed through e-mail by those who had made some contribution or provided some feedback along the way.

152: “The current organizational form of The MayDay Group was ratified at the IV Colloquium (1997), the first time where a MDG meeting was widely publicized and open to the public; however, presenters continued to be invited. Open calls for papers would not go out until the second decade of MayDay.”

- The first part of the sentence above is quoted accurately from the report on The MDG website. However, were it suspected that so much would be made of the word “ratified,” it would not have been used since business meetings reach *consensus* without votes.
- Furthermore, while much is made of purportedly gendered “power relations” and “structures,” in actuality The MDG is a ‘virtual’ group, existing mainly in cyberspace. “It” is also those who show up and contribute at particular MDG colloquia and business meetings, and those who provide input on and otherwise contribute to The MDG agenda. For example, and—contrary to claims of exclusion on p. 154—at the 2008 business meeting at Boston University (BU) membership was not required: all who attended the business meeting participated, whether or not registered as members on The MDG website, including a large number of BU graduate students who had attended the colloquium sessions. The consensus of that 2008 business meeting concerned a need for a policy of editorial succession for *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* (ACT), the MDG e-journal (subsequently submitted by Wayne Bowman, editor and confirmed by its Advisory Board) and the passing of a hat—indeed, Lamb’s very own—to collect money needed for software (etc.) in support of ACT.
- Following a discussion about organizational possibilities (specifically about whether or not to elect officers, charge dues, different categories of members, etc.), the consensus of the business meeting at MDG IV (1997) at the University of Maryland was to remain ad hoc and that those who wanted to be members would only have to declare their intentions and provide contact information. This policy is clearly neither gendered nor in any way hierarchical and excludes no one. And women (and the aforementioned graduate student) sat equally at the table and participated in the

meeting, the event having been organized by Marie McCarthy as part of the “Charles Fowler Colloquium on Innovation in Arts Education.”

- The move to open calls for papers could, if one were being fair-minded, be seen as *positive* development, not as an indictment of the previous years of The MDG. As The MDG website states in the introduction to its “Historical Documents, Commentary, and Essays from MDG Colloquia” (<http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia.php>), the original (and reasonable) plan was to interrogate (via invited “provocations”) each of the seven Action Ideals in turn. Once that initial agenda was completed (at back-to-back Friday/Saturday sessions of MDG XIII and XIV [Vancouver 2003]): <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia/XIII-XIV-programme.php>), subsequent topics and calls have been framed by colloquia sponsors.
- NB: Many other symposia and conferences in the music education community continue to announce calls based on topics or themes decided on by an ad hoc coterie of planners, which also sets dates and locations, invites speakers, vets submissions (etc.). The MDG is thus not unique in this practice—one that hardly rises to the level of canonicity.

152: “At VI Colloquium, Dallas 1998, its five-year anniversary, MDG members agreed upon an open membership statement.”

- One again, this account is factually incorrect. The Dallas meeting occurred *after* the 1997 University of Maryland meeting at which the aforementioned consensus on an open membership policy was reached. The Dallas Colloquium was V (June 1998) not VI. (The 1996 NEC meeting was not given a sequence number because of its limited purpose—the shaping of The MDG ideals.) The 1998 Dallas meeting was *after* The MDG Action Ideals had been drafted and shaped by a working group of committed volunteers in 1996. Thus they were published on The MDG website in 1997 *before* the 1998 Dallas meeting (see below).
- From a March 10, 1998 e-mail from Regelski to Gates, a statement for circulation to members (NB: *before* Dallas June 12, 1998):  
“By design, we began our Group as membership by invitation. This changed in subsequent years and now we are open to anyone who is interested in our agenda for music education theorizing and the willingness to contribute to the profession in that way. *The following appears on our website* in the ‘Contact the Coordinators’ page: ‘Membership in the MayDay Group is open to anyone interested in contributing to discourse that challenges current assumptions about music and music-making, and who wishes as well to help advance the MayDay Group’s regulative ideals for music education practice’” (italics added). The text following the colon was repeated in the follow-up e-mail to members summarizing the event.
- The Dallas business meeting dealt with setting dates for the fall Toronto meeting, mapping out of the survey of Action Ideals through 2003, a proposal for a series of publications (which was never realized), the idea of starting an e-journal, and the announcement of the new membership statement.

152: “Some may see this reporting as unduly critical of the MayDay Group . . . .”

- “This reporting,” as noted above (and below), is filled with factual errors and distortions.
- While mistakes may well have been made in the launching of The MDG they were certainly inadvertent and due to ‘trying something new’. And the possibility in such cases is always that some who were either not involved or were observing from afar or in hindsight might not have agreed with various decisions. We apologize for any

perceived problems that may have resulted and have remained vigilant to such issues going forward, thus accounting for our various mid-course corrections and ongoing improvements.

- The corrected history of The MDG (above and below) does not, however, sustain the assertions and conclusions drawn by the history being corrected.

152-53: “What I demonstrate here is the connectedness across ninety years of similar ways of thinking that may (or may not) have been useful at one time, but are now obstructive. This exclusive and presumptive approach to problem solving, including the idea that music education needs to be saved from those who do not know what we professionals know, runs as a strong thread . . . . It is so much a part of the culture of North American music education that we do not recognize it.”

- The purported “connectedness across ninety years of similar ways of thinking” has not been demonstrated; and if such connectedness is supposedly the “obstructive” canon that thus needs de-canonizing, the evidence and arguments provided simply do not support the conclusion.
- The supposedly “exclusive and presumptive approach to problem solving” asserted of The MDG (and MENC, pp. 148-151) seems unfairly to blame individuals or groups that have attempted to define and address some perceived need for change. The scope and context of such historical occasions were, in retrospect, usually not amenable to ‘taking a vote’ and it remains unclear what other alternatives might have been followed by groups that have undertaken such agendas for problem solving.
- Foregrounding “the idea that music education needs to be saved from those who do not know what we professionals know” unwarrantedly deprecates the intentions of such individuals and groups. History *does* show that there has been (and continues to be) a need for problem solving in the profession to which various individuals and groups have responded.
- Also, as a matter of the historical record, “we professionals” are *not* always in agreement about all these matters and, in fact, the groups and issues in question often came about precisely due to *differences* of perspective and value.
- That these supposedly “similar ways of thinking” have become “obstructive” is asserted without explanation, evidence, or argument.
- *Not mentioned* regarding innovative agendas was the formation of SRIGs (Special Research Interest Groups) in the MENC to accommodate what, previous to SRIGs, some might characterize as a single-minded canonicity or paradigm regarding research. The Gender SRIG thus formed and legitimated under the aegis of MENC in 1998 was a result of the efforts of GRIME International, founded in 1991, devoted to gender research in music education—which does appear to have its own agenda for problem solving in music education..

153: “Both Marie McCarthy and Hildegard Froehlich have been frequent, recent MDG presenters and participants, bringing insight, calming presence, and tough questions.”

- This statement gives the misimpression that only a few bold women have dared to intervene in otherwise gendered and exclusionary acts. In fact, that they *have* been able to raise “tough questions” demonstrates neither a hierarchy of in-group versus outsiders nor the exclusion of women’s voices.
- In the long history of the MDG, many other provocateurs and discussants, women as well as men, have also raised tough questions and made important contributions. Such voluminous and varied contributions and critiques are the very *raison d’être* of The MDG, yet that record is not acknowledged in the historical account being corrected here.

- If the supposed MDG ‘canon’ *was* pre-ordained and protected among its members, evidence of any need for such “calming presence” is not offered.
- For the record: The discussions ‘provoked’ by papers given at MDG colloquia are extensive and sometimes lively. While professional protocols and decorum are typically observed, the length of the discussions, the topics themselves, and the level and intensity of give-and-take are often quite different than is the case with conferences that, in comparison, allow less time for discussion of papers and where responses to papers are more about scholarship *per se* rather than for promoting dialogue and exchanges of points of view.

153: Concerning Colloquium XIV 2003: described are “[an] inner circle of participants seated around a large seminar table and outer circle participants sitting behind and around the inner circle. The astonished women who reported this did not know the tribute significance and saw this configuration only as an exclusionary act. During the lunch break when most everyone left the room, Cathy Benedict and Elizabeth Gould re-organized the furniture into one large circle accommodating all participants. Not a word was said about this intervention and the colloquium continued.”

- Once again, this claim of hierarchical circles of seating arrangements is entirely false.
- As already mentioned, local hosts have always made decisions concerning the venue, seating, accommodations, etc. Scott Goble, the host of XIV, writes: “In fact, the people who were seated around the large seminar tables at the colloquium when we convened were simply the people who arrived in time to get those seats; those who arrived later sat behind them. No one said anything to me about seating arrangements, and I did not assign seating” (personal communication, 2010).
- Thus, neither those sitting by chance at the table (in the purported “inner circle”) nor the overflow could have been characterized according to any supposed hierarchy or shared status.
- The “astonished women” are not identified for the historical record and since seating was by chance, what they could be astonished about is called into question.
- Why the seating was understood “only” as an exclusionary act, not as the result of the usual variables by which one chooses a seat at a conference table is not explained—though having jumped so quickly to such an unwarranted conclusion may itself indicate an otherwise ‘untold’ agenda.
- If an exclusionary seating plot *was* suspected (or noticed as a matter of fact that had somehow gone undetected by others, including other women), why it was not *immediately* objected to, discussed, and remedied before beginning is not explained. Why should it have waited until lunch?
- That “not a word was said” is not, in fact, the case. First of all, many assumed the rearrangement to either have been planned to accommodate the afternoon session, or simply as an adjustment by the host to what seemed to be the unanticipated overflow in the morning. The latter, according to Goble (personal communication, 2010), was in fact the case: the suggestion of rearrangement into a circle *was* mentioned to him, and he *did* agree to it. However, many did not know of his role in the decision and thus some privately shared their displeasure: e.g., “I remember being annoyed (and a little bit embarrassed) . . . because it was disrespectful of the hosts/organizers, who’ve always and rightly made decisions about logistics” (personal communication, 2010).

153: “Recommendations made from the floor about The MDG’s direction included that where and when to hold the next colloquium be sent out to the membership list for a vote; however, the suggestion was ignored and the next meeting announced.”

- The next meeting was announced because a host had already volunteered.
- The MDG has no formal membership role or decision making structure for decisions such as this. There have been a couple of membership polls in the past, but returns have been so small as to discourage forming valid conclusions on the basis of such polling.

154: “The women proffered that MDG examine its own practices to remove exclusionary controls.”

- Given the claim that such “exclusionary controls” *were* being discussed, it is clear that they were neither “exclusionary” nor “controls.”
- If this account of “the women” refers only to the earlier mentioned “astonished women,” it is reasonable to expect that a proper historical critique should listen to and represent *all* voices at the forum, those willing to go on record as being “astonished” *and* those (men and women) participants who were not and who felt comfortable and welcomed. The MDG has always been about ideas for change, not about seating arrangements, in-group politics, or politics involving other professional groups.

153: “Members cite Gould’s critiques from 1999 and 2003, but do not seem to be so effective in implementing them, because similar issues continue to arise in later colloquia. For example, ‘the issue of racism and the challenges of talking about race seemed to emerge as concerns that would warrant further, and more focused discussion at some future meeting. Additionally, there seemed to be some general agreement that our understandings of hegemony, power, and exclusion would be enhanced by looking at the way these operate within the MayDay Group itself—a point well taken. And finally, there was widespread interest in advancing our understanding of power: in particular, the ways it circulates in networks and becomes embodied. (Bowman 2005)’ ”

- Gould’s 1999 paper was delivered at MDG VII, the colloquium focusing on interrogating Action Ideal #3, and thus focusing on the question “Can music teachers influence a culture’s musical life?” In the program, Gould’s paper is entitled “Questions still open, issues unresolved, topics untreated: Things to think about overnight. (Discussion on these will begin on Sunday morning).”
- Her 2003 MDG XIV presentation (a session shared with Carol Scott-Kasner) was one of *five* invited sessions of critiques and proposals devoted to the topic “Taking Stock after Ten Years: The Next Agenda of the MayDay Group”—the last of the series of programs devoted to interrogating the seven MDG Action Ideals, that then looked ahead to new possibilities.<sup>3</sup>
- Critiques and proposals raised as “provocations” at these two colloquia would have been extensively discussed and weighed. And since the five critiques/proposals of 2003 were far from in agreement, and were raised not in a business meeting but for discussion, no conclusions were reached (or sought) that could have been ‘implemented’. With the completion of the series of reviews of the seven Action Ideals at MDG XIV *in mind*, colloquium topics have since been decided on *by colloquium hosts* and many issues have been revisited from ever-new perspectives.
- The quotation above from Bowman (about MDG XVI 2005, again in Vancouver) is taken out of context and appears to have him recommending that critiques of past lapses concerning important topics (e.g. race, hegemony) *needed* to be raised, rather than that he was in fact acknowledging/summarizing that they had *already* been raised, including at MDG Colloquium XVI (2005) itself, and were important to be

---

<sup>3</sup> See the wide-ranging programs: <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia/VII-programme.php>; <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia/XIII-XIV-programme.php>.

kept in mind. This will not be immediately apparent to the reader who is not aware of the full context of his “Overview” of the Colloquium at <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia/XVI-bowman-overview.php>.

- For example, the following from that “Overview” clarifies the actual context: “This second MayDay Group colloquium in Vancouver *was devoted to discussions of the theme (or themes) of hegemony, power, and exclusion* (italics added). The presentations and ensuing discussions were stimulating, open, and constructive. If any one thing was accomplished it was, I venture to say, a renewed appreciation for the complexity of these issues and their significance to music education. In her keynote address, Hildegard Froehlich reminded us of the complexity of systemic change, and that concerns over exclusion are nothing new to music education, having been raised repeatedly, decade after decade . . . . What was accomplished in Vancouver was probably the barest of beginnings. However, the importance of these topics was made abundantly clear by those who presented papers, and there is considerable interest in seeing such discussion continue. The abstracts that follow will help those of you who were unable to attend get a feel for what went on (see: <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia/XVI.php>). But, as is always the case, there was much that happened between sessions, in less formal exchanges, and in dialogue with participants who did not themselves present papers”
- Thus Colloquium XVI (2005) itself expressly *focused on* the very issues of hegemony, power and exclusion that The MDG is accused of having systematically excluded! Colloquiums VII (1999) and XIV (2003) had earlier interrogated and substantially critiqued related issues (see n. 3, p. 8 herein).
- And the complexity and history of such issues, as noted by Froehlich’s *keynote*, was also acknowledged by Bowman. The continuing need for attention to such issues is precisely due to this complexity and to the impossibility of ever solving such matters once-and-for-all. And, as already noted about The MDG, “it” is, in effect, a different “group” at each colloquium and thus problems are not ‘solved’ at a particular meeting but analyzed and highlighted for the benefit of those present, who draw their own conclusions.
- Note, too, Bowman’s mention of the “stimulating, open, and constructive” discussions and of the many and productive informal dialogues among participants.

154: “On the one hand MDG invites participation from all, but on the other hand does not make pragmatic adjustments in MDG structures or engage with gender, equity, ant-racism [sic] or social justice in the terms defined by scholars in these fields.”

- As mentioned above, The MDG has no modernist governance structure.
- Colloquium XVI (see its program at the URL indicated above) covered just such a range of issues. Other Colloquia (e.g., XXI, XVII, XI, IX, VII) have ‘engaged’ with a variety of related issues. Colloquium XXII (upcoming in June 2010) will engage such matters as they touch on ethics.
- Furthermore, special issues of ACT have targeted several of those concerns: e.g., 6/4 (2007) on *social justice* (6 women authors of 10); 5/2 (2006) on *gender* and aesthetics (5 of 6); and 4/3 (2005) on *race* (2 of 7). Individual articles in other issues (e.g., 9/1: 2010) also address these and other problems.
- Starting in January 2010, and in planning during 2009, the following e-columns were added to the MDG website: “Music, equity, and social justice” (coordinated by Deborah Bradley), “Rural music education” (Vincent Bates), “Music education in urban contexts,” (Patrick Schmidt), and a column written by and for students, “Students for a change” (coordinated by Carlos Rodriguez, with student advisor

Betty Anne Younker)—all involving the kinds of topics the MDG is accused of excluding.

154: “Hildegard Froehlich’s XV Colloquium 2004 presentation tackled the exclusionary issue directly: ‘It may be time for us to heed our own advice.’ There can be no doubt that the ‘us’ is MDG, as well as, but not separate from, the music education professoriate as a whole.”

- Here the historical chronology is confusing, going back to 2004.
- The reader who fails to consult the reference list will be unaware that: (a) Froehlich’s 2004 paper was entitled “Music Educators at the Tertiary Level: A Secret Society? Thoughts About Our Profession”; (b) that the “secret society” metaphor is not her code-word for The MDG; and (c) that the “us” in question is the professoriate in music education in general, not The MDG in particular.
- Mention of “the [!] exclusionary issue” that was “tackled” by Froehlich is made to seem to be evidence of “the” same purported exclusionary acts that The MDG is repeatedly and wrongly accused of perpetrating. Froehlich writes in her abstract (<http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia/XV-froehlich-secret.php>), that her paper “resulted from exploring characteristics of my own profession, that of *music educators in higher education*, from the perspective of symbolic interaction theory” and concludes that “the focus of our *research and scholarship* should be self-examination rather than telling our colleagues in primary and secondary schools how to teach in environments largely unlike our own” (italics added).
- Thus, Froehlich’s paper dealt with “how others [including school music teachers] view” the music education professoriate and how critical theory and reflective practice in teaching and research can improve help us all to be better “models of what we [as a profession] preach.” In focus, then, were the *research and scholarship* of music education professors, *not* “the” purported exclusionary practices of The MDG.
- That the “us” in question in Froehlich’s position paper should also include MDG members would be appropriate since most (but not all) members are music education professors.

154: “Four years later . . . the same issues remain, because Froehlich mentions the secret society metaphor when responding to a question about her presentation on relationships among different kinds of communities within music education,” mistakenly citing “(Froehlich 2008).”

- The above 2008 citation of Froehlich is to the 2008 accessing of the on-line abstract of Froehlich’s 2004 paper. Typical scholarly practice is to cite the year the document is written, then to give the date the document was accessed at the end of the citation in the reference list. Failure to observe that practice in this instance results in a misleading chronology and faulty impression.
- The “relationships among different kinds of communities within music education” (see comments for p. 154, immediately below) is mistakenly made to seem to have been directed at The MDG in particular, about which it is claimed that “the same issues remain.”

154: The “four years later” (above) refers to the 2008 keynote (not the mistaken 2008 citation of the 2004) paper Froehlich gave at the MDG Colloquium held at Boston University—another keynote paper by Froehlich, thus again illustrating the lack of exclusion of either women or exclusion of “tough questions.”

- Whether or not she may have mentioned the 2004 “secret society metaphor”—which it should be noted again, was *not* intended as a codeword for The MDG—in

responding to a question in 2008, the focus in her 2004 paper was on a variety of “communities within music education.”

- Concerning Froehlich’s understanding of “community,” she writes in ACT: “this article suggests that the term ‘community,’ when used unexamined and without a clear concept of how individuals from within different social groups interact with each other in the context of formal schooling, including music education, can prevent well-guided action and constructive activism” (“Music Education and Community Music,” [http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Froehlich8\\_1.pdf](http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Froehlich8_1.pdf); 86).

155: Froehlich is quoted again, this time jumping back to her 2005 paper dealing with the professoriate and various communities in music education. Again, the misimpression given by the manner of quotation is that Froehlich’s critique is directly aimed at The MDG in particular.

- In fact, as is shown by Froehlich’s abstract for that paper on The MDG website (<http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia/XVI-froehlich-mirror.php>) she is clearly not addressing “the same” purportedly exclusionary acts of The MDG. Instead, and to the contrary: “This paper gives examples of contradictions and paradoxes in behaviors among music educators, foremost among them music instructional practices and faculty behaviors that can be viewed as exclusionary in nature.” Specifically concluded is the need to become “serious about arguing for and developing more diverse auditioning and acceptance criteria in the music academy than are currently in place,” *not* particular MDG policies or practices.
- Having read the above clarifications (pp. 10-12 herein), Froehlich confirms that her scholarly intentions are described accurately in our corrected account (personal communication 2010).
- An historical fact of The MDG’s formulation was the first four years of inviting membership. Members of the profession not invited to the earlier meetings might have felt ‘excluded’, but any hurt feelings would have been unfortunate and certainly not intended. We apologize for any such inadvertent consequences that might have resulted, but the issue was remedied at MDG IV with the policy of open membership. MDG membership has since swelled to over 300 members.

154: Another claim of purported exclusion: “Indeed, several first-time attendees commented to me, on separate occasions at XX Colloquium [Boston University, 2008], that they perceived an odd disconnect between the welcoming, inclusive language on The MDG web site and the propensity for exclusion at the colloquium . . .”

- As mentioned earlier, a large number of BU DMA students attended all sessions, took part in those discussions, and fully participated in the business meeting *despite not being MDG members*. And, aside from again citing anonymous hearsay as history, this assertion is made as though representing the impressions of *all* first-time attendees and without evidence of *their* reactions. Who was purportedly excluded, by what means, and to what supposed purposes is left unaccounted for by this hearsay.
- If certain long-time members who already know each other personally and professionally sit together during, or socialize outside of formal proceedings, this hardly rises to the level of a “propensity for exclusion” of first-time attendees or students. No organization is immune from such natural patterns of socializing.
- Patrick Jones, the host of the BU colloquium, reacts thusly: “This [claim of a “propensity for exclusion”] is just plain wrong . . . From all I have heard, the BU students in attendance felt very welcomed and embraced. They commented on how impressed they were that they were included in a room of such respected scholars.

They particularly commented on YOUR openness to them and willingness to discuss ideas with them” (personal communication, 2010; emphasis in original).

- Accounts from students and first-time presenters can be produced that contradict the allegation of any “propensity for exclusion.”

154: “Blaming is not helpful.”

- Not helpful in understanding the history and contributions of The MDG has been the misstating of facts, distortions of events, quoting out of context, and citing of hearsay recollections—the latter, “tales” reminiscent of a whispered story passed around a circle that ends up becoming progressively distorted with each repetition.
- Rather than being openly raised as constructive criticism via the many opportunities for such commentary and dialogue afforded by The MDG colloquia and various e-columns on The MDG website, such ‘whispered’ “tales” have been misrepresented as history and mistaken conclusions drawn from them.

155: Following a few positive words about The MDG: “The challenge to MayDay Group is for each one of us who participates to examine her/his own place, role and actions and, thus, engage in self-reflective, self-critical analysis that takes responsibility for those places, roles and actions.”

- Invitations to contribute to the ‘leadership’ of The MDG have been consistently, repeatedly, and honestly offered. Being largely ad hoc, The MDG operates without a secretariat and, since grappling with the problems of providing its services require much volunteer time and effort, there is always need and room for volunteers. ‘Leadership’ in such an organization takes the form of service to the organization's members, year after year, engaging in good faith with the discourse of planning and delivering events and other services.
- The “each one of us” in The MDG who are challenged to engage in such self-reflective, self-critical analyses seems unfairly to blame members—particularly present volunteers and past participants—for *uncritically* accepting and advancing the purported ‘canon’ of exclusionary and hegemonic actions. Thus mention of Vincent Bates (immediately below), is offered as an atypically positive example.

155: “One most successful analysis was made at XX Colloquium by Vincent C. Bates in his presentation reflecting on his experience of growing up poor, white and rural, but now being a university music education professor (Bates 2008).”

- As noted already, many issues concerning social justice, race, inequality (etc.) *have* been given focus at various MDG Colloquia, in ACT, and on The MDG website (see, herein, bottom of p. 9, top of p. 10 above)—including the new “Rural music education” e-column by Bates.
- Part of the gendered history not mentioned at this point is that Bates is “former chair-elect of the MENC Gender SRIG (2006-2008) and chair of the MENC Gender SRIG/co-chair of GRIME (2008-2010)” (personal communication, 2010).
- The MDG does not hold that being part of the professoriate is a prime marker of high achievement. The organization does not list members' degrees or job titles on its website, nor were Bates' ideas and contributions taken more or less seriously when he became a professor. They were always taken on their merits, as are contributions of others.

### Conclusions?

Believing that a “clear analysis” has been presented that convincingly demonstrates a history of exclusionary practices, hegemony (etc.) by The MDG and profession-wide (viz., MENC), the following conclusions are reached by Lamb.

155. “First, I suggest that each of us follows Froehlich’s advice to engage in constant self-reflection in order to improve our own practice through the wisdom of self-understanding and, second, apply that wisdom as the basis for ethical models of inclusivity for ourselves, to share with but not prescribe to our peers and our students.”

- Such stipulation of “ethical models of inclusivity” egregiously implies supposedly contrasting *unethical* models of *exclusivity* on the part of The MDG (and others) that the historical record does not support.
- The criteria of self-reflection and self-understanding might fairly be raised as scholarly desiderata in writing any history, but especially for a historical critique such as this.

155: “One useful method in this ‘decanonizing’ project is ‘new’ history, which is ‘associated with postmodernism, is multivocal and multiperspectival, draws on multiple methodologies, and is self-critical’ ”—quoting McCarthy (2003).

- Though neither the canon or canonicity have been explicitly defined or explained, the reader is apparently supposed to accept the false and misleading allegations made against The MDG (and MENC as symptomatic of the entire profession) as evidence of the supposed need for de-canonizing and as warranting the recommendation for postmodernism over (‘old-fashioned’?) modernism.
- In this regard, a key platform of The MDG has been its championing of Habermasian “communicative rationality” which accepts that all communication depends on the expectation of reason by communicants. Habermas thus attempts to correct the defects of modernity by rehabilitating the role of reason. In contrast, postmodernists offer their ‘deconstructions’ of the so-called ‘totalizing discourses’ of modernist rationality as their preferred alternative, arguing (albeit, using reason) instead for multivocal, multiperspectival, and self-critical thinking and methods. One wonders if modernity is the unstated canon being criticized, and if disapproval of The MDG’s platform of communicative reason is an ‘untold’ sub-text of this faulty history?
- McCarthy, cited above, has since confirmed that she was *not* referring in her paper to social structures in The MDG but to sociology in music education in general and that The MDG was among the first to acknowledge the importance of sociology (personal communication 2010). NB: see #4, p. 16 below.
- In any case, the historical record of the activities of The MDG give ample evidence of its commitment to multivocal, multiperspectival, and self-critical approaches. For example, see the bottom of p. 15 below for a description of the 2010 book of essays based on the MDG action ideals as contributed by 16 authors and edited by Regelski and Gates.
- Again, if a “new history” and its “language” are multivocal, multiperspectival, and self-critical, these criteria might well be applied to the distorted history of the MDG offered as evidence of its supposed canonicity.

155: “The language associated with new history is communal, thus, decreasing the intellectual distance between scholars.”

- Without getting into scholarly details, this statement in favor of decreasing intellectual distance between scholars closely echoes the Habermasian (and MDG’s) quest for the kind of communicative dialogue that works towards improving mutual understanding, even if complete agreement is not always possible or even likely.

Thus The MDG has been committed from the first to the need to “decrease the intellectual distance between scholars” in music education.

- Again, the language of the history corrected here fails on this criterion, an error-laden history that in no way is communal, multivocal, or multiperspectival. While some of the women scholars quoted in that history were consulted about the citing of their scholarship, the overall history in question was not submitted prior to publication by the author to long-time MDG members who could have corrected its many errant ‘facts’ and assertions.

156: Lamb’s third and fourth conclusions recommend ethnomethodologies and the sociological study of networks in music education, of “the overlaps between such cooperative networks,” and of new structures needed to bring about change.

- Ethnomethodologies receive only passing mention: a two-sentence quotation from Patricia Shehan Campbell, the relevance of which to the de-canonizing of music education, or the alleged exclusionary acts of The MDG (etc.), is totally unclear. (NB: Shehan Campbell is a MDG member and sponsored Colloquium VII mentioned earlier in connection with Gould’s 1999 paper.) Moreover, ethnomethodology, as a sociological approach that analyses in great detail how people ‘make sense’ of or account for their actions and activities, is *highly descriptive, not evaluative*. Thus, the scholarly criteria required by this method are at odds with Lamb’s highly judgmental and negative account of The MDG and MENC.
- Similarly, mention of “cooperative networks” is in a one sentence quotation from Becker’s *Art Worlds*, a book influenced by symbolic interactionism’s focus on meaning as emerging through social interaction. Becker’s book is noted in sociology for its research strategy of *participant observation*; but, again, its relevance to the de-canonizing project, to the “sociological study of music education as ‘art worlds’,” and as correcting the alleged misdeeds of The MDG (and others) is left unstated and thus unclear. What it has to do with any purported canonicity isn’t demonstrated, not even suggested.
- Readers can judge for themselves whether “overlaps” between “cooperative networks” in music education are advanced or impeded by the largely negative and highly judgmental history being corrected here.
- Finally, readers should consult The MDG’s “Action for Change” agenda and draw their own conclusions about the spirit and intent of its recommendations and criteria for change: see, <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/actionideals.php> and the earlier cited <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/general/gates-agenda.php>.
- The seven guiding ideals of that agenda serve as the basis for *Music Education for Changing Times: Guiding Visions for Practice* (Springer 2010), eds. T. Regelski and J.T. Gates. Each ideal is analyzed, interrogated, expanded, and sometimes critiqued in separate chapters by two authors—not all from music education, including men and women and leading international figures. Thus, and reflecting The MDG advocacy of constructive dialogue, *two* different perspectives (not a univocal ‘party line’ or ‘totalizing discourse’) per ideal are offered. This book is further testament to The MDG’s commitment to multivocal dialogue and it amply demonstrates the highly varied range of perspectives that its agenda promotes.

156: The concluding sentence: “A fourth method is to listen carefully to music education’s critics, particularly those excluded from the canon: feminists; ant-racists [*sic*]; those who are not middle-to-upper-class, white, American, able-bodied, heterosexual, male, Anglophones. By humbly and compassionately making use of these interdisciplinary and multivocal

methodologies, concurrently recognizing the constant possibility of re-inscribing canonical values and practices, we may be able to authentically theorize and ‘decanonize’ music education.”

- Not only has The MDG listened carefully to “music education’s critics,” the record shows that it has been among the leaders in identifying and critiquing problems in the profession. Again, there is ample contrary evidence on The MDG website, in the record of past colloquia, ACT, and the above cited 2010 book, that The MDG has been inclusive of these supposedly excluded groups. In addition, the web site’s “Resources” section invites papers in languages other than English (see “Non-English papers” at <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources.php>), and it has published such papers.
- However, despite this concluding recommendation to listen to critics, the critical agendas of various (unidentified) groups were earlier demeaned (on p. 153) for attempting to save music education “from those who do not know what we professionals know.”
- Again, the alleged and problematic ‘canon’ has never been explicitly described nor has canonicity been defined. If “canonicity” involves conforming to orthodox or well-established rules or patterns of hegemony, such an orthodoxy has not been “carefully” documented or otherwise demonstrated as regards The MDG. Many music education scholars have constructively addressed a history of various profession-wide problems, and there is no doubt or disagreement that more professional vigilance is needed. That such vigilance is at work is seen in the plethora of new conferences and publications—by The MDG and others—dealing specifically with the topics, issues, and groups that this concluding sentence claims have been systematically excluded.
- The exaggerated claim of such widespread exclusion “from the canon” in music education (or by the MDG) of feminists, anti-racists, lower socioeconomic strata, non-white, non-American, non-able-bodied, homosexuals and bisexuals, women, and non-speakers of English is simply unwarranted and is increasingly contradicted by ongoing developments in the profession.
- In any case, if the groups supposedly “excluded *from* the canon” (italics added) have been so excluded *by* the ‘canon’, it would seem that they might be better off for this exclusion and that the purported ‘canon’ is not as monolithic and hegemonic as is claimed. Either the reasoning here is dubious, or the language used is careless.
- Concerning the humility and compassionate use of language and methods, the need for the present corrected history of The MDG also speaks for itself.

#### *Et cetera*

Some additional *conspicuous omissions* from the history of The MDG are noted below. They clearly don’t comport with or support the critical “tales” told and conclusions drawn.

1. Women and those from other purportedly excluded groups have been included at all stages and phases of The MDG’s history, and in all its various undertakings—including as sponsors of colloquia, in various dialogues concerning directions and decisions, as provocateurs and discussants at colloquia, business meetings, in MDG publications, e-columns on the website, et cetera. The record is clear for anyone to consult.
2. Three colloquia have been held outside North America (two in conjunction with ISME, one hosted by the Sibelius Academy in Helsinki, Finland). Four have been held in

- Canada (twice each at Toronto and Vancouver). Membership is international, represented by more than 20 different countries.
3. Most notably, the special four-day MDG Institute of 2002 included an *half-day program featuring feminist scholarship in music education* that Lamb was invited to organize, and she was also the co-chair of that evening's discussion session.
  4. At the same Institute, Marie McCarthy, Hildegard Froehlich, and Scott Goble organized a half-day program on sociology and social issues.
  5. The entire 2002 Institute focused on the need and directions for change across a wide variety of areas of music education. For the details of the program and ample evidence that clearly contradicts allegations of MDG 'canonicity', exclusionary acts, etc., see: <http://www.maydaygroup.org/php/resources/colloquia/MDGInstitute-programme.php>.
  6. Much of the controversy at Vancouver in 2003 concerned allegations about the funding of the planning group's hotel expenses at the four day MDG Institute in 2002. That decision was made by local sponsor Roger Rideout, and it included Roberta Lamb as one of the major planners (see 3 above)—a fact not known to those who came prepared to critique The MDG's supposed lack of "transparency."
  7. The MDG has no constitutional 'structure' per se that might be accused of systematic heavy-handedness, hierarchies, or hegemony. In fact, to date, consensus at business meetings has consistently rejected such hierarchical governance structures and, instead, has operated as a loose-knit 'virtual' or ad hoc entity with decisions made on the basis of a consensus of members who are interested enough to sustain a dialog about issues, among which has been a so-called "kitchen cabinet" of advisors that includes women. In fact, its rather "nomadic" nature (to borrow a term from Elizabeth Gould's 2002 Amherst paper) finds "The MDG" as a different instantiation at each colloquium and business meeting.
  8. Certain 'leadership' carried out in the name of The MDG—namely, colloquium coordination (the coordinator and local hosts), ACT editorship (including the Editor, assistant editors, the Advisory Board, and the production staff), The MDG website production (from the site coordinator to the site manager and e-column editors), and the Listserv/membership list manager—are all functions undertaken by volunteer members over multiple years.
  9. The MDG has no strategic action group other than its members, acting professionally within their own various spheres of influence. Its "action plan" is to engage the members with issues that are of professional interest. The organization's steady growth and its 17-year record of service to music education stand as evidence of its relevance and staying power.
  10. The invitation to host MDG colloquia is always open, and regional or topical meetings on The MDG model will always have the support of a content-rich web site, a first-rate e-journal, and a world-wide e-mail network.

#### *Ironies.*

1. The original model for The MDG was "The Women's Committee of 100" that had gained considerable media attention in the closing years of the 1980s for protecting and advancing certain welfare policies that mainly affected women and the poor. That Committee, of course, was by invitation; no open announcement was made and exactly 100 women attended the first meeting by chance. And, no doubt a result of the social dynamics of the times, only women were invited. However, this was not seen (at least by organizers) as without good reason. The inspiration for the first MDG meeting was thus

- to convene a similar focus group to openly discuss music education and the need for change.
2. While The MDG been criticized by some for its invitation-only first meeting, it is difficult to imagine how such a meeting could have been arranged by other means than by inviting a manageable discussion-group of individuals and building from that. The two organizers were surprised that anyone at all agreed to come, since financial support from universities for travel to such an unusual event seemed unlikely. It was not a scholarly meeting, nor was it intended to be the start of a typical professional organization: it was a convened as an ad hoc discussion group intending to explore possibilities for consensus and perhaps agree on the creation of a forum for ongoing discussion of important issues—such lack of opportunities at the time being one of the topics discussed. Thus begun, The MayDay Group has grown apace and continues to provide a forum for dialogue concerning needed changes in music education, including constructive suggestions for improving its own practices on behalf of the profession.
  3. The chapter corrected above begins with a largely positive account of gendered music education reform (at least as regards women) but the critique of MENC in the 1990's fails to note that, despite the alleged “tendency to undervalue women” (p. 150), three of its five presidents during the 1990s were women, and a woman was president in 2008 when its next biennial national conference was cancelled due to declining participation of members. Moreover, the supposedly gendered ‘history’ of The MDG is largely offered as a negative one, mainly describing alleged attempts by certain “astonished” and intrepid women members to oppose and ‘reform’ the purported acts of exclusion, hegemony (etc.) of its senior male members. It would indeed be ironic if this kind of selective telling of gendered “tales” and values obscures the pressing need for widespread change—a need that goes well beyond gender to involve all kinds of responsibilities and roles in always overlapping professional groups and activities.

April 17, 2010  
Minor edits May 16, 2010