Keeping Time: Institutionalizing Jazz in 1930s American Schools

Tim Aberle

In a 1933 article written for music educators, William Arms Fisher urged teachers to "let old walls crumble and obstructing fences fall flat, even though the clinging ivy and mass that hid their decay with a touch of beauty and sentiment fall with them."[1] Encouraging a reform in standard music curricula and teaching methods, Fisher reacted to a social controversy that affected American life in several fields, specifically focusing on music. Widening at an alarming rate throughout the 1920s, a gap had developed between the youth and the adults of America that was evident in the differing values held by each group. As American youths acted according to a sense of independence that was unprecedented in comparison to previous generations, adults reacted with shock while their children rejected traditional values, tastes, and customs. By the 1930s, the difference seemed to become an irreversible trend.

Jazz music, as a fresh, popular art form championed by the younger generation, provided a soundtrack to the decay of all customs that adults deemed proper, demanding the attention of alarmed educators throughout the nation. As a result, the 1930s saw a decade marked by impassioned discussion as writers offered suggestions and criticized others that were directed toward America's teachers, who stood on the front line in the conflict between generations. While some lamented jazz's influence and hoped for its decline, others recognized it as a part of America's heritage, acknowledging its legitimacy as a genuine art form while submitting to its irreparable presence. Collectively, teachers began to integrate the genre into their course materials despite reluctance led by a conservative spirit and initiated jazz into one of America's permanent institutions.

For the sake of simplicity, jazz music from the 1920s and 1930s must be understood as an umbrella term for a variety of different musical genres, because jazz itself is a complex form of music that is difficult to define. The arguments of 1930s educators took place at a time when the very definition of jazz was a matter of considerable dispute. In his history of bebop, a sub-genre of jazz, Scott Deveaux illustrates the problem by writing that defining jazz "has been a noisy process, characterized by bitter disputes pitting advocates of one vision

[1] William Arms Fisher, "Music in a Changing World," *Music Supervisors' Journal* 19, no. 4 (March, 1933): 16.

of jazz against another."[2] Adding that "resemblances must take precedence over differences if jazz is to cohere as a whole,"[3] Deveaux acknowledges that the genre is most accurately defined as a composite of several different "visions" of jazz. This is worth noting because music educators at the time were not competing with one passing trend that had a concrete definition. Rather, the various new styles of music known collectively as "jazz" suggested that the elements of American music were changing. Instead of adhering to the classically-trained fundamentals that educators had been teaching, American musicians were taking music in a different direction. Also, due to the ambiguity of the term, voices in the discussion on jazz and education itself further expressed the confusion involved in forming a definition. One writer asked in frustration, "Do we know the difference between hot jazz and sweet jazz, or for that matter, the difference between jazz and swing?"[4] Exemplifying the versatility of the music form through her question, the author did not seem to know how to pinpoint an exact variation. She associated each form with the others instead. Another author, writing that "young people's tastes are now swinging over to 'swing' (whatever that is),"[5] further illustrated the problem of defining jazz, expressing confusion about the subtle differences among its various forms that made them difficult to identify. Because these authors could not easily identify variations of jazz, educators had a difficult time curtailing the genre's influence and focusing on the specific musical elements that made it unique. Instead of dealing with a few traits that defined jazz, they were dealing with a broad collection of different styles that they did not understand. As a result, when writing about the controversy of music in the 1930s, authors related several forms of new music to what was known as "jazz." Likewise, references to "swing," "modern music," "dance," "popular music," or any other names of new music from the time will be characterized as "jazz" in the context of the controversy.

Despite this ambiguity, jazz developed from a general origin and followed a path to popularity. Knitted together with a broad range of African- American and European musical influences, jazz first came to be when musicians combined those influences together to form a new, unique sound.[6] Commenting on the variety of musical influences that led to the creation of jazz in *Pioneers of Jazz: The Story of the Creole Band*,

---

[2] Scott DeVeaux, *The Birth of Bebop: A Social and Musical History* (Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1997), 5.

[3] DeVeaux, 4.

[4] Lilla Belle Pitts, "Music and Modern Youth," *Music Educators Journal* 26, no. 2 (Oct., 1939): 18.

[5] Robert Clark, "Music Education vs. Radio and Dance-Hall Rhythm," *Music Educators Journal* 23, no. 6 (May, 1937): 34.

[6] Lawrence Gushee, *Pioneers of Jazz: The Story of the Creole Band* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 4.

Lawrence Gushee further describes the genre as a derivative of heterogeneous parent influences, adding that "the beginnings of jazz are not so much the beginnings of a music but the beginnings of the use of a word."[7] Essentially, jazz was not necessarily a totally new style of music, but it was a way of combining the elements of different styles to form a new interpretation. Partly due to jazz's complex mixture of musical styles, historians have traced the development of jazz to various origins. However, many generally locate the birthplace of jazz in New Orleans, Louisiana, where professional bands first became popular for playing the genre.[8] From there, jazz steadily gained popularity and became a national phenomenon, especially among the youth.

Jazz gradually spread from New Orleans as musicians moved to cities throughout the country. Kathy Ogren, a professor and author of *The Jazz Revolution: Twenties America & the Meaning of Jazz*, an investigation of jazz music in the 1920s, attributes the migration to the exposure of jazz to mass audiences. Referring to the migrants, Ogren writes that they found "new performance environments and commercial markets for electrically and mechanically reproduced jazz that catapulted the vernacular into a national rage."[9] In the "new performance environments" of the cities, jazz artists were able to share their music with the public. Finding venues in "nightclub and entertainment venues that provided an escape from Prohibition," jazz greeted the ears of partygoers, developing an association with the "carnal pleasures" that accompanied such settings.[10] As a result, jazz attracted larger audiences while patrons sought the relaxation, fun, and leisure of the clubs. However, despite the following that jazz developed in the cities, other factors developed that spread jazz with an even greater effect. Mentioning "commercial markets for electrically and mechanically reproduced jazz," Ogren hints at the development of the radio and the phonograph, which were pivotal in propelling jazz to mainstream popularity. Although jazz developed a strong following in urban dance and club settings, it was the radio and the phonograph that relayed jazz to the more remote sections of the country. William Barlow, in his article about the radio in the Jazz Age, writes that "dance bands made up of professional musicians were prominently featured on live remote broadcasts from hotel ballrooms, dance halls, and nightclubs."[11] As the radio was mass produced and widely consumed,

---

[7] Gushee, 14.

[8] Gushee, 14.

[9] Kathy J. Ogren, *The Jazz Revolution: Twenties America & the Meaning of Jazz* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), 8.

[10] Ogren, 5.

[11] William Barlow, "Black Music on Radio During the Jazz Age," *African American Review* 29, no. 2 (Summer, 1995): 326.

developing a distribution of "12,048,762 sets among slightly fewer than 30,000,000 families" in 1930,[12] those live broadcasts reached the smaller towns between the cities as well as the sitting rooms of popular fraternity houses. As a result, a much broader audience heard the music.

In addition, the successful broadcasts became "vulnerable to commercial exploitation" as "white entrepreneurs…tailored them to appeal to a white audience."[13] In attempts to capitalize on its radio popularity, entrepreneurial phonograph record manufacturers recorded jazz on what was referred to as "canned music," making it available to buy, store, and listen to at any time in any location.[14] One writer describes the development as having the effect of "broadening musical experience to a hitherto unprecedented extent."[15] With the availability of phonographic records, music lovers did not have to visit clubs or tune a radio in at a given time to hear jazz music. Instead, they could play a record whenever they wanted to. One writer, passionately supporting the record business, witnessed the intoxicating impact it had on listeners by writing that the average man no longer "needs opium nor the poet's soul to fill his waking hours with fantasy and passion."[16] He later testified to the contagious popularity of the recordings, writing that, "the neighbors hear weird sounds coming out of his open windows, and resolve fiercely to tell the janitor about it the next day."[17] In this way, jazz was able to claim a permanent presence in American popular culture, which was a powerful influence on children and young adults. As a result, jazz demanded the attention of music educators, who had to take into consideration the cultural conditions that affected their students.

Before examining the controversy of jazz music and education in the 1930s, one must first understand the conditions immediately preceding it. During the 1920s, American society experienced a transitional period in which new social customs, such as listening to the radio, developed. Also, more so than in previous decades, the 1920s saw the development of adolescence and young adulthood as independent stages of youth free from the influence of older generations. With their newfound autonomy, American youths experimented and introduced new customs to society that had only marginal influence before. Their freedom to experiment was a factor in jazz's rise to popularity.

---

[12] I. Keith Tyler, "Radio in the High School," *Educational Research Bulletin* 14, no. 8 (Nov., 1935): 208.

[13] Barlow, 325.

[14] Garry Joel August, "In Defense of Canned Music," *The Musical Quarterly* 17, no. 1 (Jan., 1931): 138.

[15] Pitts, 18.

[16] August, 142.

[17] August, 145.

Specifically focusing on the youth of the decade, Paula S. Fass explained the youth culture's birth and significance in her 1977 book, *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s*. In the book, Fass asserts that the youth were both a "product of change and the agents of change" as they became a significant institution in American society.[18]

Fass emphasizes how factors such as economic restructuring, low birth rates, and increased parental attention toward children led to an increase in college attendance in the early twentieth century and, with it, a new and independent social group.[19] As more and more individuals entered college as opposed to the workforce, the college years became a standard stage in the lives of many American children. Finding themselves in the "self-contained social environments" of colleges,[20] youths developed a new culture based on their interactions with peers. Surrounded by other youths in the college environment while being separated from work and family influences, they developed a new institution in American society out of that insulated culture, which Fass describes as the peer group institution.[21]

The peer group developed as a result of a uniquely different childhood experience in America, and according to Fass, it became a new influence in the lives of youths across the country. Fass summarizes the effect of the peer group well in writing that it "permitted the individual to experiment without making him personally responsible for all his actions," adding that "devotion to the group and group enthusiasms…relieved him of personal responsibility for bad choices."[22] Essentially, because they were free from the influence of family and work life, the youth partaking in that institution had only the influence of each other.[23] Since they needed to gain approval of their peers only, they were free to deviate from traditional norms. Therefore, pressure to conform to values held by peers rather than adults significantly influenced the behavior of youths, encouraging them to adopt values that would please their peers and give them acceptance and success in the youth culture.[24]

As a result, many young Americans developed a set of values that were unique to that segment of society, disregarding whatever was not acceptable to their peers. That development facilitated the rise of new customs apart from those traditionally passed down from older

---

[18] Paula S. Fass, *The Damned and the Beautiful: American Youth in the 1920s*, (New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), 6.

[19] Fass, 56.

[20] Fass, 133.

[21] Fass, 56.

[22] Fass, 372.

[23] Fass, 133.

[24] Fass, 57.

generations. In other words, if a fad developed at one college, then students spread news of it to friends at another, and the widespread influence of such fads created new social customs. At the same time, high school students imitated their older, college-aged peers, following their steps and sharing their tastes in anticipation of joining their ranks.[25] Consequently, a wide age group essentially separated itself from the rest of American society. In this way, the youth peer group developed and became a force of change within American society.

As the youth brought about change and developed social customs that were unique to their generation, they violated traditional values and customs held by the nation's older generations. As a result, older Americans reacted with hostility toward the products of the younger generation, rejecting the new customs due to their fear of change and distaste for disobedience. Reflecting that fear of change in an article that addressed youths' independence, Harold de Wolf Fuller discussed the youths' potential to either positively or negatively influence society. He represented the sentiment of the older generation well in writing that youths meant "to shape their lives not as their elders, but as knowledge" dictated.[26] Implying that his generation could no longer control its young and that youths would learn their own lessons instead of following their parents' examples, Fuller revealed the sense felt by the older generation that they had lost control over the future of their society. That loss of control provoked a defensive attitude in the minds of older Americans, whose traditionally authoritative role was in jeopardy.

Since the youth had become an independent population, older adults knew that they could not reverse the potentially negative social consequences of the youths' actions, such as encouraged debauchery, idleness, irresponsibility, and a host of other moral violations. With that in mind, they viewed as risks the changes brought about by youths, which they thought could have potentially threatened America's moral fiber. Therefore, most social fads, such as new styles in clothing, dance, language, and forms of music, carried a negative stigma in the eyes of adults, representing a rebellious and disobedient youth. As jazz became highly popular among college students, whom the *Ohio State Lantern* described as "jazz inebriates,"[27] the genre developed an association with mischief. Specifically referring to jazz, one college professor "called jazz degenerate because it 'expresses hysteria, incites idleness, revelry, dissipation, destruction, discord, and chaos.'"[28] One can infer then that

---

[25] Fass, 217.

[26] Harold de Wolf Fuller, "The Myth of Modern Youth," *The North American Review* 227, no. 6 (June, 1929): 757.

[27] Fass, 304.

[28] Letter to the editor, *Daily Illini* (December 21 1920): quoted in Fass, 303.

jazz, included in the array of new, youthful customs, was a risk associated with the social ills that accompanied the younger generation's independence in the minds of traditionalist Americans, thus attracting negative attention and controversy.

With the rise of jazz occurring at the same time as the development of an increasingly independent generation, the stage was set for a conflict. Responding to the influence of their peers, youths fell in love with jazz, preferring it to traditional forms of music. They could not wait to go home, listen to the exciting new music, and forget about the dry music presented to them in schools. One student described the appeal, sharing that "swing on the radio distracts my attention from the things I don't want to remember."[29] At a time of widespread hardship caused by the Great Depression, that distraction may have enhanced the genre's appeal even more. It provided upbeat and exciting breaks in what could have been many stressful and discouraging days that youths had to endure. In addition, an educator declared that the radio had become "more powerful than the school."[30] As a result, traditionalist music educators began to witness the erosion of what they perceived as proper musical tastes in their students, which created a cause for concern. Like the conservative, older generation with its cautious attitude toward new social trends, educators were alarmed.

In a 1937 article written for *Music Educators Journal*, Robert Clark, a professor of Psychology and Education at a teaching college, reflected that alarm, reporting that students "honestly admit that their chief interest in instrumental music is to play in some dance orchestra" as opposed to a more classical environment.[31] As illustrated by Clark, music educators could no longer identify with the majority of their students. The material that they taught fell on deaf ears, leading one frustrated teacher to acknowledge that their "purified conception of music" means "little or nothing to most of the students."[32] In response to such a sentiment and others like it, music educators rallied together in the 1930s. Presenting in journals to be read by educators all over the country, they polled each other throughout the decade for ideas about how to preserve traditional music and combat the offending popularity of jazz. What would ultimately unfold would be an effort to bridge the gap between the polarized generations.

In the ensuing discussion, several educators addressed a common fear that formed the basic foundation of the issue in the first place. They were concerned with forever losing their rich, musical traditions in the wake of popular music. Thus, they treated their role as educators as one

[29] Pitts, 19.

[30] Clark, 34.

[31] Clark, 34.

[32] Alton O'Steen, "Swing in the Classroom?," *Music Educators Journal* 25, no. 4 (Feb., 1939): 26.

with great gravity, taking upon themselves tremendous responsibility to reverse the trend. In *Music Educators Journal*, Lilla Belle Pitts demonstrated that sense of responsibility:

> Music education has given evidence of being potentially powerful enough to exercise a dominant influence in building the musical future of America. There is a risk, however, of falling short of maximum service unless we turn to advantage what happens to be, for us, the two most strategic negative factors in the present situation—one the vast, heterogeneous mass of secondary school students musically unprovided for; the other, the equally vast and heterogeneous body of entertainment music loosely classified as *popular.*[33]

As Pitts suggested, many educators experienced a self-imposed pressure to immediately act, feeling the need to reach students before jazz corrupted their musical tastes indefinitely. They felt that their pupils' experience would either perpetuate jazz's rise, which would ultimately destroy traditional music's influence, or slow it down to a manageable rate. Adding to the pressure, educators realized that their students would ultimately determine the future of music, depending on how they reacted to the educators' efforts. Illustrating the hopeful as well as fearful view through which educators perceived that generation of pupils, Fuller writes that "it is not inherent qualities, but conditions which they themselves have had no part in introducing, that make members of the present younger generation appear so spectacular."[34] Acknowledging the generation's independence as a different group than that which initially propelled jazz into popularity, Fuller implied that the future lay in his pupils' hands and would be determined by their decisions, therefore making them "spectacular." In other words, as quickly as one generation fell in love with jazz, the next could reverse the trend by rejecting the genre and driving it to the margins of American culture. John S. Ellsworth, Jr., who was a young man at the time, supported Fuller's point, declaring that his peers were not "the young men and women who came back from the War and started the jazz age" and that the "revolt" was accomplished before they came of age.[35] Instead, his peers held an independent status that enabled them to reject their older siblings' product or to accept it. Educators recognized

---

[33] Pitts, 18.

[34] Fuller, 760.

[35] John S. Ellsworth, Jr., "The Depression Generation," *The North American Review* 234, no. 4 (Oct., 1932): 358.

that and saw an opportunity to influence the generation, reacting with its independence in mind.

Initially, educators acted by ignoring the cause of the problem. Alton O'Steen, another contributor to *Music Educators Journal*, described the motivation behind the method, sharing his colleagues' attitudes in writing, "These children are going to hear plenty of jazz at the movies, over the radio and at their dances. In school we have such a limited amount of time for music that we should use it to expose them only to the best."[36] Despite the outcome implied in O'Steen's comment, which would mean a successful student conversion, Robert Clark described the student reaction. He writes:

> Pity the children in the elementary grades whose teacher thinks they should learn 'classical' music. She plays selections from grand opera on the school phonograph, and then asks (in some cases perhaps honestly): 'Now don't you *too* love that?' And in chorus they loyally, dutifully answer: 'Yes m-a-a-a-m.' If this is typical of public school music instruction in appreciation; and if education is a gradual *development* not only of knowledge and intellect but also of appreciation—and we try to educate the children in the primary grades *up* to grand opera—then what will be left but jazz and topical songs for the high-school adolescent?[37]

As Clark observed, ignoring jazz and only studying classical music did not affect student preferences. They did not develop a taste for classical music, nor did they moderate their jazz listening habits. Instead, the method seemed to make the problem worse. Clark was not necessarily for or against jazz as entertainment, but he was arguing that teaching methods had to change if teachers were to promote an appreciation for classical music. As they came to similar conclusions, educators resorted to a different approach.

Realizing that their previous method of avoiding jazz and focusing solely on traditional music failed, educators then acted by acknowledging jazz's presence as well as the need to change. O'Steen complied, submissively acknowledging that the jazz "situation is deplorable but inevitable."[38] Likewise, Pitts admitted that "the field of popular music…is an area virtually unexplored and unexplained by music educators in general,"[39] adding that "young folk are making this

---

[36] O'Steen, 25.

[37] Clark, 34.

[38] O'Steen, 25.

[39] Pitts, 18.

aspect of their environment important to us because it is important to them."[40] Understanding that what was familiar to students was foreign to instructors, Pitts asserted the importance of embracing jazz in order to effectively reach pupils.

Supporting Pitts's call to change, Fisher, who so artfully alluded to change in urging old walls to "crumble" along with their "clinging ivy,"[41] explained why the youth rejected traditional music, writing that "the mechanics of playing and its drudgery were given the first place and music itself and its joy but a lagging second place."[42] Fisher was essentially suggesting that if educators were to reverse the trend, then they had to create an appeal for their music by evoking joy, which students found in the elements of jazz. O'Steen, Pitts, and Fisher implied that educators had to relate to their students, which would mean adopting methods with which their students could identify. As a result, jazz entered the school.

Some educators attempted to relate to their students by stepping even further, which meant experimenting with popular influences such as the radio. Referring to the instrument that initially helped to unleash the jazz menace, I. Keith Tyler, a writer for the *Educational Research Bulletin*, writes, "The radio has assumed such a commanding place in the regime of modern life as to demand consideration by the school."[43] Tyler continued, reasoning that the youths' "standards of taste in humor and in music, likewise, often can be attributed to specific programs to which they are addicted."[44] Realizing the importance of the radio in socializing a student, Tyler implied that the instrument could be used as a learning tool. Hopeful that the new technology could establish a common ground where they could identify with their students, educators, led by Tyler and others with similar insight, took another step toward reform, involving the radio in the classroom along with jazz.

Although many adopted jazz and technology, educators strived toward different goals regarding the change. For example, many educators found in them an opportunity to gradually guide students away from degenerate jazz music. Those educators integrated jazz in order to dissuade students from devoting their attention to it. New technology served as a means to support that end. Agreeing with Tyler in implying that educators should pay attention to and use whatever demands the students' attention, Pitts writes, "The music educator's primary concern is, therefore, to study the character of this interest,

[40] Pitts, 19.
[41] Fisher, 16.
[42] Fisher, 17.
[43] Tyler, 208.
[44] Tyler, 209.

then combine with co-workers in making a serious effort to provide musical experiences which will emancipate youth from dependence upon the immediate and the transitory."[45] By involving the radio in the classroom or by simply studying jazz, as she implied in her statement, Pitts realized that educators could balance the listening diet of their students. Once that could be accomplished, educators could then "build standards of taste with regard to radio listening" like they cultivated taste in literature through English courses, according to Tyler.[46] O'Steen summarized the ultimate goal, writing that "with swing music in the classroom, we can help our students to increase their discrimination with regard to it,"[47] which would be evident "in the hours of listening away from school."[48] Educators saw hope in integrating jazz, finding a way to possibly wean students off of the genre, the "immediate and transitory" influence, and reinvigorate an appreciation for classics.

At the other end of the spectrum, some educators completely supported the study of jazz, deeming it to be actually worthy of devotion. Despite his desire to see his students ease their obsession with jazz music, O'Steen did write that what educators "scorn today becomes tomorrow's accepted practice" and that what they "shudder at today becomes the subject of tomorrow's Ph. D."[49] Fisher added, "Standing on the threshold of the new era, and lifting our heads above the confused and noisy welter that for the moment disturbs us, it is for us to vision the coming day, especially to see the divine ministry of music as a vital, functional part of it."[50] Suggesting that educators, in their conservative stubbornness, may have been "overlooking the most important musical development" of their time,[51] O'Steen and Fisher acknowledged a quality to jazz that many overlooked.

In addition, Randall Thompson mentioned that jazz "may pass or gradually evolve into something else, but already it is part of our heritage."[52] He elaborated by writing, "In three hundred years we have developed musical dialects of our own. Jazz at once leaps to the mind."[53] Referring to the African and European-rooted "dialects" that influenced jazz, Thompson promoted the genre as a naturally American form of

---

[45] Pitts, 68.
[46] Tyler, 210.
[47] O'Steen, 27.
[48] Tyler, 211.
[49] O'Steen, 26.
[50] Fisher, 16.
[51] O'Steen, 26.
[52] Randall Thompson, "The Contemporary Scene in American Music," *The Musical Quarterly* 18, no. 1 (Jan., 1932): 10.
[53] Thompson, 10.

music, asserting that it should be studied and mastered in order to honor and continue building America's musical legacy. Pressing traditionalists who viewed jazz negatively, Thompson tried to persuade them otherwise, suggesting that "jazz should be at least as useful a source of inspiration to us as many highly abbreviated Russian folk-songs were to Russia."[54] Pulling the prestigious and highly respected Russian products, which were judged as classics by educators, into the discussion, Thompson urged educators to change their attitude toward jazz and respect it.

As displayed in O'Steen, Fisher, and Thompson's articles, some educators looked beyond the problem and envisioned a time in which jazz would contribute to something great, or perhaps be considered great in itself. Therefore, they did not view the integration of jazz into music curricula as a way to counter its rise, but they saw integration as an imperative measure to follow the path that American music should have been taking. However, music educators generally wrote with a tone that likened jazz to an unwelcome guest, or a bump in the road. Even Thompson and Fisher did not blatantly refer to jazz as an art to be admired. Instead, they supported its study in order to accelerate toward an undefined creation in the future. With that considered, one can infer that music educators generally held an opinion that expressed ill favor toward jazz, varying between different extents. Although they conceded to including jazz in class materials, they viewed it as a necessary evil. Regardless of their motives, music educators did include jazz in their classes. In doing so, they effectively institutionalized the genre and created another milestone in jazz's journey from the streets of New Orleans to the ranks of America's most celebrated cultural creations.

To his fellow educators, Fisher stated that "the dynamic of this revolution leaves no one untouched" and that "no institution is above the wash of its current."[55] They acted accordingly. By the 1920s, the youth of America had led a revolution in values and music that would forever change American social dynamics. The older population was no longer in charge, and an independent youth quickly pulled American society in a different direction. Shocked and frustrated, music educators responded in an attempt to preserve the remnants of their vanishing musical treasures. Trying to stay above the rising tide, they turned to jazz, hoping to regain a lost connection with their students. Ultimately, they initiated jazz into a permanent position in American education, paving the way for a vast amount of musical developments. In doing so,

---

[54] Thompson, 10.
[55] Fisher, 16.

they kept time, making sure that what was “fully half begun” anyway would “in the end be well done.”[56]

Tim Aberle of Fairbury, Illinois, is a senior majoring in History with Teacher Certification in Social Science. He wrote this paper for "HIS 2500: Historical Research and Writing" with Dr. Elder during the spring of 2010.

[56] Thompson, 17.