Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education

A refereed journal of the

MAYDAY GROUP

Action for Change in Music Education

Volume 14 Number 3
November 2015

Marie McCarthy, *Guest Editor*

Vincent C. Bates, *Editor*

Brent C. Talbot, *Associate Editor*

The Dynamics of Multiculturalism in *Music Matters:*
A Philosophy of Music Education

Deborah Bradley

Special Features: When this document is open in Adobe Reader, endnotes and citations can be viewed by placing the cursor over the corresponding number or date.

The Dynamics of Multiculturalism in *Music Matters: A Philosophy of Music Education*

Deborah Bradley

Abstract

This review of Music Matters, Second Edition, focuses on the portion of Chapter 13: "Music Education and Curriculum," dedicated to the discussion of multicultural music education. Discussions are presented through the discursive lens of antiracism and critical multiculturalism, positioned against the backdrop of the racial violence experienced in the U.S. between August 2014 and July 2015, and the long history of human rights abuses in both Canada and the U.S. Following from a discussion of multiculturalism's initial emergence as a way to remedy racism, and an investigation of the relationship between multiculturalism and power, the review turns to Elliott and Silverman's preference for the term intercultural (over multicultural) music education. An examination of the differences between interculturalism and multiculturalism, and the possible unintended consequences of an interculturalist stance in music education, conclude the review.

Keywords: *multicultural music education, intercultural education, antiracism, critical multiculturalism, critical race theory, identity, global migration*

W hen I was asked to review the second edition of *Music Matters (MM2)* (2015) by David Elliott and Marissa Silverman, I felt as though my academic life may have come around full circle. I initially "cut my philosophical teeth" in music education in a class David Elliott taught, during the period in which he wrote the first *Music Matters* (*MM1*) text (Elliott 1995). In fact, my initial reading of that text was in manuscript form, and I had the opportunity as an undergraduate at the University of Toronto to obtain a glimpse into the process of transforming concepts from discussion topics into ideas on paper that resulted in the book that has informed my thinking for twenty years. That original published edition is now well worn: sticky flags, highlighted text, and/or margin notes adorn most of its pages. I probably could rely strictly on motor memory—in other words

blindfolded—to locate it on my crammed bookshelves. The book has been a frequent companion and source of reference throughout my academic journey from undergraduate studies to the present day.

Upon first scanning this new edition of *MM2,* I appreciated the extent to which the authors had revisited the original text and expanded upon it in a way that promotes 21st century musical thinking and knowing. Incorporating new scholarship in psychology, philosophy, neuroscience, and curriculum, and including completely new material related to personhood, musical products and processes, and musical understanding including emotion, the second edition represents a significant amount of new research. Thus I began my reading adventure by attempting to engage the text as if I were not already intimately familiar with *MM1*. I soon realized, however, that just as *MM2* articulates ideas and concepts that have evolved for both authors since the first edition, and includes significant new scholarship, I likewise could not approach the read without the influence of some of the ways of thinking that have imprinted my own personhood (Elliott and Silverman 2015, see Chapter 5) over the past twenty years. Specifically, these influences include antiracism education and critical multiculturalism, critical race theory, postcolonial deconstruction and decolonization, as well as understandings drawn from feminist theory. This broad yet related set of discursive practices informed my thinking as I read *MM2*.

I write this review at a time when issues of racism and human rights seem to monopolize the nightly news. Most recently, Baltimore, Maryland, has experienced riots in the streets following the death of Freddie Gray while in police custody, a death for which six police officers have since been charged. Mr. Gray's death follows others of Black men at the hands of police over the past year—a year fraught with violence that included the deaths of Michael Brown in Ferguson, Missouri, Eric Garner in New York City, and no doubt many others whose names I do not know because their deaths did not receive media attention.[1] During the same week when images of Baltimore in chaos filled my television screen, Loretta Lynch became the first African American female Attorney General, serving the administration of the U.S.A.'s first African American President, and the U.S. Supreme Court continued to wrangle with a decision to legalize gay marriage nationwide. In Canada, the Royal

Canadian Mounted Police (RCMP) acknowledged that nearly 1,200 aboriginal women have been murdered or have disappeared in the past 30 years (MacCharles 2015), yet the government continues to refuse to hold a Parliamentary inquiry into the conditions which allow for such violence.[2] The complexities of racism and oppression weigh heavily on my mind these days, and I trust that my comments here may encourage some productive conversations on music education's role in undoing the damage.

Multicultural Discourses

With the above background in mind, I would like to focus my remarks on the section of Chapter 13 in *MM2* entitled "The Inclusive Music Curriculum," which deals with multicultural education, or as the authors prefer, intercultural education. In this section, the authors briefly discuss both descriptive and evaluative definitions of multiculturalism. In its descriptive sense, multiculturalism refers to the coexistence of unlike social groups in a common social system—in other words, meaning culturally diverse or pluralistic (Elliott and Silverman 2015, 446). In the evaluative sense, the term multiculturalism conveys a social ideal, "a policy of support for exchange among social groups to enrich all while respecting and preserving the integrity of each" (446). I call attention to this particular evaluative sense of the term, "preserving the integrity of each," as this concept occasionally seems at odds with other statements made in the section, particularly the focus on intercultural education.

In order to orient the reader to how the authors conceive multiculturalism, or interculturalism, they draw on Richard Pratte's (1976) work in which he describes a multicultural community as one meeting three specific criteria: 1) cultural diversity, meaning a number of cultures including ethnic, racial, religious, economic, and so forth; 2) the co-existing cultures approximate equal political, economic, and educational opportunity; and 3) the necessity of a public policy commitment to the values of interculturalism as the basis for social organization (446). The second point, that communities approximate equal political, economic, and educational opportunity to be truly multicultural, seems somewhat utopian considering present-day concerns for the achievement gap in education, the increasing income gap and

percentage of the population living in poverty, and the disenchantment with and occasional disenfranchisement from political processes across North America. Thus in my remarks, I focus predominantly on how these realities seem to belie stated goals for multicultural or intercultural education.

The earliest concepts of multicultural education emerged in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century, and became "a significant component of school policy" (Campbell 2002) in the 1960s. The concept of multicultural education has been adopted and adapted to educational systems around the globe, as global migration has led to increasingly diverse populations in North America, Europe, Asia, and Australia, although the phenomenon cannot be confined to only those locales. As Campbell explains,

> Multicultural education has formulated its position from a variety of constituencies . . . it is a metadiscipline of sorts, and it aims for increased educational equity for all students and for representation of their values and worldviews in the curriculum. (Campbell 2002, 28)

As I have argued elsewhere, however, despite the positive intent of statements such as these, including legislated multicultural policies, in practice multiculturalism has not always achieved those goals. In Canada, multiculturalism became official policy in 1972; even in its earliest enactment, multiculturalism was accused of being divisive[3] because of government policies that provided funding to "identifiable ethnic groups" (Mackey 2002) for special programming, thus converting the original concerns about opportunity for heritage language education and other minority culture supports into a competition for money. In addition to making funding to support cultural programming competitive, politicians have appropriated the multicultural discourse, using it as "a 'power of truth' . . . in the making of a Canadian White identity that perceives itself as liberal and non-racist" (Bedard 2000, 50).

Rectifying racism

Although rectifying the abuses of racism provided one of the early motivations for multicultural education (Elliott and Silverman 2015, 447), Ladson-Billings (1996) argues that concerns about race and racism have been muted from the multicultural discourse. Dei (2000) suggests that "the denial of the significance of race in

academic discourse and practice" is one symptom of "the insidious politics of denying racial differences in formulating social policy for justice" (30). Indeed, the citation above from Campbell makes no mention of race or racism in the goals articulated for multicultural education. As Dei argues, problems lie not in the recognition of difference, but in interpretations of difference that discredit and demonize particular groups of people.

The discourse of multicultural education emerged in the United States from African-American scholarship through the writings of W.E.B. DuBois and Carter Woodson (Campbell 2002, 28); in Canada, the discourse evolved from discussions related to biculturalism (English and French), and became a discourse of multiculturalism only after First Nations, Métis, and Inuit peoples, along with various ethnic immigrant populations, demanded a place at the discussion table (Mackey 2002). In other nations and educational systems, multicultural policies arose to improve educational opportunities for children from diverse backgrounds, including diverse languages and cultural backgrounds. In countries such as South Africa, Australia, and New Zealand, multicultural education sought in part to counteract the oppression of indigenous peoples and the effects of "raced and colonial hierarchies . . . embedded in institutions," through which "everyday racism travels like a virus through institutional structures, policies, practices, relationships, fights and identities" (Fine, Powell, Weis and Wong 1997, cited in Dei 2000, 24). What is common among the various policies related to multiculturalism, however, and as Ladson-Billings states, is that the language of race has become absent from multicultural discourse. No longer named specifically as a goal within multicultural education, concerns for race and racism are addressed only within "separate" discourses such as antiracism and critical race theory. bell hooks (1992) referred to such discursive tactics as a "divorce strategy" to separate the discourse of race from the politics of racism. Given that multiculturalism and multicultural education emerged initially as ways to address the politics of racism, it appears that the divorce has become final within the language of multicultural education.

Multiculturalism and Power

Multicultural policies cannot be separated from the power structures within which they are authored and enacted, evident in the following statement:

> Multiculturalism is a call for fairness and a better representation of the contributions of all Americans. Multiculturalists do not disparage the school's role in developing a cohesive, national identity. At the same time, however, they recognize schools must ensure *all* students preserve, as well, their individual ethnic, cultural, and economic identities. (McCarthy 2004, cited in Elliott and Silverman 2015, 447)

In the above quotation, power structures lurk beneath the statement "developing a cohesive, national identity." Such statements raise a number of questions: is developing national identity a crucial part of education, and if so, who determines how that identity should look, sound, or behave? How does one go about "teaching" for national identity, and is this truly the work of schools—in other words, is national identity a form of thinking and knowing that all children must acquire in order to be well educated? What happens when concerns for national identity conflict with the desire to preserve one's ethnic, cultural, or religious identity? We only need to remind ourselves of the terrible outcome of exactly such a situation under the Third Reich (Adorno 1998; Kertz-Welzel 2005).

This question of conflict appears important for Elliott and Silverman as well in their discussion of a typology of multicultural music curricula (Elliott and Silverman, 2015, 447) based upon the now 36-year old work of Richard Pratte. Through brief descriptions of the six types of multicultural curricula that Pratte identified (see 448–9), it is easy to recognize forms of multicultural teaching and learning that continue to linger in today's classrooms, and as such, the typology offers some value for pre-service teachers coming to their own understandings of what is meant by multicultural education. However, as a reader I found it curious that Pratte's work provides the primary reference for discussion in a book that in other areas builds its arguments upon more recent scholarship. The world has changed significantly since 1979 when Pratte's *Pluralism in Education* was published. When viewed through the lens of today's increasingly globalizing world, fraught with racial tensions, the use of Pratte's typology raises questions, which I explore in the following sections of this paper.

Hybridity and Essentialism

In some respects, Pratte's work has stood the test of time. Although the authors reject the notion of the "modified multicultural curriculum" as incongruent with praxial music education's ideals (with which I concur), Pratte's description of that curriculum suggests that his concerns may have extended beyond those raised by the authors (work-concept of music and insularity of cultural choices): "The goal of multiethnic education is to make students aware of the *cost* of being *Americanized* and to extoll the virtues of cultural diversity in terms of groups being modified over time" (Pratte 1979, cited in Elliott and Silverman 2015, 449, emphasis added). In this statement, Pratte appears to be critical of education focused on developing national identity, surely an idea ahead of its time in 1979. Such criticism aligns with present-day paradigms of critical pedagogy, critical race theory, antiracism education and critical multiculturalism, and culturally relevant pedagogy (Ladson-Billings 1995, 2009) in concerns for interrogating power issues and structures. Notable in the quote is Pratte's critique of so-called "melting pot" mentalities that serve national identity interests. Even so, we must recognize that cultures *do* change over time; global migration yields cultural hybridity, or "the cultural logic of *translation* . . . increasingly evident in the multi-cultural diasporas and other mixed and minority communities of the post-colonial world" (Hesse 2000, 226). This concept of hybridity, or what Hesse terms cultural translation, represents an important point that today's educators ought to recognize in order to avoid essentializing cultures in their teaching. In Pratte's typology, this understanding seems absent, or at least underdeveloped.

Ladson-Billings (2000) argues that educational discourses tend toward essentialization even in attempts to recognize hybridity, through identifiers such as African American, Asian American, or the grouping of all Spanish speakers under the rubric "Hispanic." Such groupings belie the "problematic inherent in attempts to create a unitary consciousness from one that is much more complex and multiple than imagined or constructed" (261). Music education, too, may be guilty of this attempt to create "unitary consciousness" through widely held notions of musical traditions as static, rather than dynamic. Such musical essentialism serves little purpose in a world where "traditions keep changing with the demands of the times,

in an organic way, or in a conscious effort to retain relevance to their audiences"
(Schippers 2010, 45).

Converting subgroup affiliations—say what?

Just as cultures are dynamic, Pratte identified a "dynamic multiculturalism" which
the authors endorse. (Elliott and Silverman prefer the term *dynamic
interculturalism*, which I address later). The term dynamic multiculturalism may be
read as conveying a subtle acknowledgement that cultures change over time (a point
that the authors acknowledge), that traditions are continually invented and
reinvented, and that global migration creates the necessity for cultural translations
for those who have moved, by choice or force, to new homelands. However, the
authors assert that dynamic multiculturalism "emphasizes the need to *convert
subgroup affiliation* into a community of concern through a shared commitment to a
common purpose" (Elliott and Silverman 2015, 449, emphasis added). While
encouraging diverse identities to form shared committments for resolving issues or
local problems suggests an ideal operational type of multiculturalism, I am troubled
by the notion of converting subgroup affiliations—to what should they be converted,
and for what purpose? Who has the power to decide what affiliations need
converting, and which may remain intact? Elliott and Silverman do not provide an
explanation of how they understand subgroup affiliation, other than the inclusion of
a short list of the "symbols of subgroup affiliation (music, literature, fashion,
religious practices, etc.)" (448).

     The authors explain that dynamic interculturalism overlaps with concepts of the
music curriculum as a reflective practicum, which takes place "in teachers' and
students' full awareness of the pedagogies and power structures in and for different
musical praxes" (449), guiding students to "deeper understandings of the beliefs and
power structures (artistic, social, cultural, gendered, embodied, and beyond) that
influence music making and listening . . . to examine the musical consequences of the
beliefs underlying different music cultures" (450). This explanation aligns well with
various critical theories of education and related pedagogies, including antiracism
education, but it avoids engaging Pratte's recommendation to "convert subgroup
affiliation." What types of subgroup affiliation require conversion? Does the term

Bradley, Deborah. 2015. The dynamics of multiculturalism in Music matters: A philosophy of music
education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 14(3): 10–26.
act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bradley14_3.pdf

subgroup affiliation entail racial or ethnic identity, linguistic identity, or in the case of recent immigrants and refugees, identity with one's former homeland? Such forms of identity reside deep within an individual's sense of being; attempts to "convert" such affiliations, even in the development of a community of shared interest, may become an unintentionally harmful assault on that individual's personhood. One could argue that residential schools for First Nations and Inuit peoples in Canada, or Native American boarding schools in the United States, represented an attempt to convert subgroup affiliation, with disastrous outcomes for the children so "educated." Similarly, colonial education systems around the world also represented attempts to convert the subgroup affiliations of colonized indigenous populations. Many years later, after the damage done could no longer be ignored or denied,[4] governments and their agents, typically various Christian churches, began to acknowledge the racism and abuse at work in these schools, drawn from ideologies that promoted the eradication of cultural "otherness."

Global migration and subgroup affiliation

While these are perhaps extreme examples, today's world operates at extremes, as represented by the ongoing phenomenon of global migration. Global migration imposes the necessity for children to develop multiple subgroup affiliations as they adapt to new locales and cope with the circumstances of their relocation. Preparing children to live in diverse communities, teaching them to "work effectively and tolerantly with others to solve shared community problems" (Higgins, cited in Elliott and Silverman 2015, 449) represents an important goal of multi or intercultural education within a reflective musical practicum, but I suggest that this worthwhile goal does not itself require conversion of subgroup affiliation. Bedard (2000) posits that cultural/intercultural education "highlights every aspect of multicultural education, namely the concerns for cultural and linguistic continuity, issues related to ethnic and race relations, Aboriginal peoples' rights, integration of immigrants, bilingualism and human rights" (51). In Bedard's interpretation of intercultural education, subgroup affiliation remains intact.

Marsh's (2012) research with refugee children indicates that subgroup affiliations related to a former homeland represent critically important strategies for

immigrant children, many of whom have been traumatized by war, famine, or natural disasters, as they transition to life in a new country and everything that may entail. Incorporating subgroup affiliations into musical creative activity enables students to use or acquire "skills related to West African or Arabic drumming, and drum kit, keyboard, guitar, and gamelan performance, frequently deployed in the context of musical fusion" (15). Such musical fusions provide "refugee and newly arrived immigrant children . . . important ways to unite with others, draw comfort, and develop resilience" (Marsh 2012, 16). By recognizing students' needs to connect with their former homeland's culture through musical engagement, the program in which Marsh conducted her research supported cultural maintenance as the grounding point for translation and transition into the new homeland culture.

Social scientists and political philosophers have begun to raise serious questions about expectations for identity groups in today's liberal or neoliberal democracies. How can nation-states construct civic communities that reflect and incorporate the diversity of citizens and yet have an overarching set of shared values, ideals, and goals to which all citizens of that state may be committed (Banks 2009, 306)? Global migration has created a situation in which:

> National boundaries are eroding because millions of people live in several nations and have multiple citizenships. Millions have citizenship in one nation and live in another.[5] Others are stateless, including millions of refugees around the world. The number of individuals living outside their original homelands increased from approximately 33 million in 1910 to 175 million in 2000. (Banks 2009, 308)

The sense of transiency and impermanence, even with respect to the nation-state one may call "home," represents one of the ongoing challenges for multi or intercultural education. Banks cites several studies conducted with immigrant youth in the United States; these studies all found that immigrant youths did not define their national identities in terms of their country of residence. They considered their identities to be transnational—identifying as Palestinians, Vietnamese, and Pakistanis who resided in the United States. They also distinguished between "national identity and citizenship" (312). Findings from one of the studies revealed that youth often viewed themselves as citizens of the United States, but did not identify as American, because, as they explained, they were not White and mainstream. Banks proposes that such attitudes reflect the consequences of racism,

discrimination, and exclusion experienced by immigrant youth in their schools and communities (312).

Through the phenomenon of global migration, race has taken on an increasingly complex meaning, intertwined with national identities and the globalization of markets (today's form of colonialism) (Bedard 2000, 43). Students need to develop knowledge, attitudes, and skills to enable them to function in a global society (Banks 2009, 308). As Banks argues, identity groups (a form of subgroup affiliation) can "enhance individual freedom by helping individuals to attain goals that are consistent with democratic values and that can be achieved only through group action" (307). Rather than converting subgroup affiliations, I concur with those who argue for a critical multicultural (antiracist) approach to education that supports those affiliations as important aspects of personhood.

What's in a word? Interculturalism or multiculturalism?

In advocating for dynamic multiculturalism in the music curriculum, Elliott and Silverman state that they prefer the term *interculturalism*—a change from *MM1* wherein Pratte's term dynamic multiculturalism stood unaltered—without providing a rationale for that preference. The two terms may appear at first glance to be somewhat interchangeable, and in fact, within "officially multicultural" Canada, the term intercultural education is preferred in the province of Quebec (see Bouchard 2011 for a discussion of the Quebec politics around multi/interculturalism). Interculturalism has recently gained favour as the preferred terminology in European discourse (Brahm Levey 2012), yet as Brahm Levey argues, this may be a "distinction without a difference." He explains that interculturalists claim to place more emphasis on dialogue than do multiculturalists; "however, there is nothing in multiculturalism that precludes an emphasis on intercultural discursive exchange, indeed, quite the opposite" (219). In his exploration of the two terms, Brahm Levey cites Bouchard (2011) who proposes that a categorical difference exists between interculturalism and multiculturalism:

> Where multiculturalism is said to operate in a "diversity" paradigm, in which individuals and groups have equal status under the same laws and there is "no recognition of a majority culture," interculturalism is said to operate in a "duality" paradigm, where "diversity is conceived and managed as a relationship between [immigrant] minorities and a cultural majority that could be described

as foundational. (Bouchard 2011, 441–2)

Brahm Levey (2012) summarizes the difference between the two paradigms: "interculturalism wants recognition for a foundational majority culture, and multiculturalism . . . wants to refuse it" (220). Based on Bouchard's and Brahm Levey's interpretations of the paradigms, I am uncertain as to why Elliott and Silverman prefer intercultural education, as it does not appear to fulfill their curricular ideals for music education and the interrogation of power. More importantly from an antiracist perspective, interculturalism offers little to no challenge to the oppression of minority groups by the majority culture, particularly when that majority culture has a long history of racism against minorities.

In the closing paragraphs, Brahm Levey suggests, "the term 'multiculturalism' has become so mired in controversy and is so maligned in public debate, that its semantic capital, as it were, has been spent" (223). Perhaps Elliott and Silverman likewise felt that the term multiculturalism has seen better days. It would have been helpful to explain to readers the rationale that supports the authors' preference for dynamic interculturalism. Without this background, some readers may assume the authors advocate for recognition of a foundational majority (White) culture. The concept of converting subgroup affiliation could hide easily within this particular understanding of intercultural education. I should emphasize here that within the paradigms of antiracism and critical race theory, racism is considered to be normal, not aberrant, in both the U.S. and in Canada's foundational majority cultures (Ladson-Billings 2000, 264). Thus it becomes difficult to see how interculturalism offers a better solution to disrupt racism.

Ignoring Race Doesn't Make Racism Go Away

It should be apparent to readers by this point in the paper that incorporating issues of race and racism into discussions of multiculturalism presents challenges; as the author of this paper I have had at times to deliberately interject those terms into my discussion to resist the phenomenon against which I write. Multiculturalism, despite its emergence as a discourse designed to address issues of race and racism, has allowed that language to disappear from its operational vocabulary (Dei 2000; Ladson-Billings 1996). Yet as I watch and read the news and listen to casual

conversations on the street, I become increasingly aware of the embeddedness of racism in everyday language—in fact, racist language seems to have experienced a renaissance. The nightly news offers ample evidence of racism in society and its institutions, including many police forces. Furthermore, racism is institutionalized within all levels of education and educational policy, remaining entrenched in part through a collective aversion to discuss it (Castagno 2014; Pollock 2004, 2008), creating the situation that Bonilla-Silva (2003) so aptly described as "racism without racists."

The authors of *MM2* clearly acknowledge that "music education is not a neutral enterprise" (Elliott and Silverman 2015, 451), and as an antiracism music educator, I agree completely. There is much to discuss related to music education's lack of neutrality of enterprise in many areas, including its too-frequent failure to address issues of race and racism that may remain hidden within various multicultural (or intercultural) initiatives. Globalization, global migration, and the rapidly increasing levels of diversity in nation-states around the world require looking at questions of the common good through new lenses, lenses capable of bringing into relief the insidious nature of racism.

Music can play a crucial role in helping people feel connected to new homelands, or to feel a part of the societies in which they live, by helping them through the cultural translations required to build those connections. When racism is addressed intentionally, music becomes a powerful tool to disrupt both unconscious and unnamed racisms, and racisms institutionalized in educational systems (Bradley 2006a, 2006b, 2007). To ignore race, particularly when we speak of multicultural or intercultural education, may be indicative of what Vaugeois (2013) has called the "terminal naivety" that stymies opportunities for social change through educational practice.

Through discussions of the second edition of *Music Matters*, I trust that music educators, as a community sharing interest in these issues, will engage in conversations that enable us to consider the strengths, shortcomings, and ambiguities of various philosophies of education and their constructs, including dynamic multi/interculturalism within a praxial philosophy of music education.

References

Adorno, Theodor W. 1998. Education after Auschwitz, translated by Henry W. Pickford. In *Critical models: Interventions and catchwords*, 191–204. New York: Columbia University Press.

Banks, James A. 2009. Diversity and citizenship education in a global age. In *The Routledge international companion to multicultural education*, edited by J. A. Banks, 303–22. New York: Routledge.

Bedard, Gabriel. 2000. Deconstructing Whiteness: Pedagogical implications for anti-racism education. In *Power, knowledge, and anti-racism education: A critical reader*, edited by G. S. Dei and A. Calliste, 41–56. Halifax, Nova Scotia: Fernwood Publishing.

Bonilla-Silva, Eduardo. 2003. *Racism without racists: Color-blind racism and the persistence of racial inequality in the United States.* Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.

Bouchard, Gerard. 2011. What is interculturalism? *McGill Law Review* 56: 435–70.

Bradley, Deborah. 2006a. *Global song, global citizens? Multicultural choral music education and the community youth choir: Constituting the multicultural human subject.* PhD Dissertation, Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario.

———. 2006b. Music education, multiculturalism, and anti-racism—Can we talk? *Action, criticism, and theory for music education* 5(2). http://act.maydaygroup.org/php/previous.php

———. 2007. The sounds of silence: Talking race in music education. *Action, criticism, and theory for music education* 6(4). http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bradley6_4.pdf

———. 2012. Good for what, good for whom? Decolonizing music education philosophies. In *The Oxford handbook of philosophy in music education*, edited by W. Bowman and A. L. Fega, 409–33. New York: Oxford University Press.

Brahm Levey, Geoffrey. 2012. Interculturalism vs. multiculturalism: A distinction without a difference? *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 33 (2): 217–24. doi:10.1080/07256868.2012.649529

Campbell, Patricia Shehan. 2002. Music education in a time of cultural transformation. *Music Educators Journal* 89 (1): 27–32.

Castagno, Angelina E. 2014. *Educated in Whiteness: Good intentions and diversity in schools* (Kindle ed.). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dei, George J. Sefa. 2000. *Power, knowledge and anti-racism education.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Elliott, David J. 1995. *Music matters.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Elliott, David J., and Marissa Silverman. 2015. *Music matters: A philosophy of music education,* 2nd edition. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hesse, Barnor, ed. 2000. *Un/Settled multiculturalisms: Diasporas, entanglements, 'transruptions'.* London: Zed Books.

hooks, bell. 1992. Representing whiteness in the black imagination. In *Cultural studies,* edited by L. Grossber, 338–46. New York: Routledge.

Kertz-Welzel, Alexandra. 2005. The pied piper of Hamelin: Adorno on music education. *Research studies in music education* 25 (1): 1–12. doi:10.1177/1321103X050250010301

Ladson-Billings, Gloria. 1995. Toward a theory of culturally relevant pedagogy. *American Educational Research Journal* 32 (3): 465–91.

———. 1996. "Your blues ain't like mine": Keeping issues of race and racism on the multicultural agenda. *Theory into Practice* 35 (4): 248–55.

———. 2000. Racialized discourses and ethnic epistemologies. In *Handbook of qualitative research,* second edition, edited by N. Denzin and Y. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

———. 2009. *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

MacCharles, Tonda. 2015. 1,000 native women murdered, missing in Canada over 30 years: RCMP News. *Toronto Star* (May 1): 1–3. http://www.thestar.com/news/canada/2014/05/01/1000_native_women_mur dered_missing_in_canada_over_30_years_rcmp.html

Mackey, Eva. 2002. *The house of difference: Cultural politics and national identity in Canada.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Marsh, Katherine. 2012. "The beat will make you be courage": The role of a secondary school music program in supporting young refugees and newly arrived immigrants in Australia. *Research Studies in Music Education* 34 (2): 93–111. doi: 10.1177/1321103X12466138

Ong, Aihwa. 1999. *Flexible citizenship: The cultural logics of transnationality.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Perez-Peña, Richard. 2015. Fatal police shootings: Accounts since Ferguson. *The New York Times* (July 29): 1–9. http://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2015/04/08/us/fatal-police-sho...ion=U.S.&module=RelatedCoverage&region=Marginalia&pgtype=article

Pollock, Mica. 2004. *Colormute: Race talk dilemmas in an American school.* Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

Pollock, Mica, ed. 2008. *Everyday antiracism: Getting real about race in school.* New York: New Press.

Schippers, Huib. 2010. *Facing the music: Shaping music education from a global perspective.* New York: Oxford University Press.

Vaugeois, Lise. 2013. *Colonization and the institutionalization of hierarchies of the human through music education: Studies in the education of feeling.* PhD dissertation, University of Toronto.

Notes

[1] In the time since I wrote the first draft of this essay, racism's death toll in the U.S. has risen again. On June 16, 2015, Dylann Roof killed nine worshippers at the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston, South Carolina. On July 19, 2015, a White campus policeman shot Samuel DeBose in the head after stopping him for a minor traffic violation (driving while Black). For an overview of Black deaths at the hands of police in the U.S. between August 2014 through July 2015, please see (Perez-Peña 2015).

[2] Justin Trudeau, who was elected in October 2015 as Canada's new Prime Minister with a majority Liberal government, campaigned on a promise to open such an investigation.

[3] In *MM2*, the authors cite an article in which I critiqued various music education philosophies, and conclude that I stated multiculturalism "is divisive" (Elliott and Silverman 2015, 447). My discussion in that text, however, focused on how multicultural approaches often "maintain cultural separation instead of creating the kind of inclusion that lets students keep 'their cultural differences intact'" (Bradley 2012, 425). While potential for divisiveness exists within the multicultural paradigm, it is not always divisive.

[4] In Canada, the last residential school closed in 1994; the government issued a formal apology for the system of residential schools in 2008.

[5] Ong's *Flexible Citizenship* (Ong 1999) offers a fascinating discussion of this phenomenon.

About the Author

Deborah Bradley received a Ph.D. in Sociology & Equity Studies in Education from OISE/University of Toronto. She was Assistant Professor in the Department of Curriculum and Instruction at the University of Wisconsin-Madison from 2006–2010, and taught at the University of Toronto from 1997–2005 and 2010–2014. She retired from UW-Madison in 2010 and the University of Toronto in 2014. Her publications on antiracism education include articles in *ACT, Philosophy of Music Education Review, Journal of Aesthetic Education, Music Education Research, Theory into Practice,* and chapters in several Oxford University Press handbooks: *Philosophy of Music Education* (2012), *Handbook of Music Education and Social Justice* (2015), and the *Handbook of Choral Pedagogy* (2016).