Action, Criticism & Theory for Music Education

The refereed journal of the

Volume 7, No. 1
January 2008

Wayne Bowman, Editor

Frank Abrahams, Associate Editor

Electronic Article

Music for Citizenship: A Commentary on Paul Woodford's *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice*

David J. Elliott

ISSN 1545-4517

Music for Citizenship: A Commentary on Paul Woodford's *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice*

David J. Elliott
New York University

Many years ago, Paul Woodford was an undergraduate student in my classes at the University of Toronto. Thus, it is a pleasure to read and reflect on his *Democracy and music education*. Although I intend to criticize some of the ways that Woodford grounds and articulates his claims, I do so as a collaborator. I hope my reflections will lead to a better understanding of our individual views and the ideas that I believe we hold in common.

Basic Themes

Woodford's basic themes are clear from the outset. He wants music education to take a "radical liberal" turn in order to "prepare [music] students to participate in democratic society and thereby contribute to the common good" (Woodford, 2005, p. x). Consistently following in the footsteps of John Dewey, Woodford sees critical thinking as a moral and political kind of thinking. Applying this to music education, he asserts: "if music and other teachers are to provide the necessary educational leadership in democratic society . . . then they had better learn how to communicate with the public in ways it can understand" (p. xi). He wants our profession to reclaim a democratic purpose for music education by contributing to intellectual and political conversations about the nature and significance of music education. "This kind of political philosophy and action, I believe, is essential to securing a place for music education in public schools" (p. xi). He objects to the way music educators take a laissez-faire attitude toward other people and their beliefs about music and pedagogy.

Over and over in his book, Woodford rightly emphasizes the undeniable need for music teachers, philosophers, and students to model empathy, civility, compassion, respect, mercy,

Elliott, D. (2008). Music for Citizenship: A Commentary on Paul Woodford's Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 45-73. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Elliott7_1.pdf

tolerance for others' beliefs, mutuality, humility, a willingness to listen and reach out to others, and to base judgments on careful research. "Rather than simply blaming others for their transgressions, we should seek reconciliation and friendship" (p. xv). His mission is to explain and argue for these ideals. In this regard, he asserts that, although "the coupling of education with democracy is difficult and no longer fashionable," he has chosen to "face professional and social problems head on and courageously" (p. xvii).

First Thoughts

To begin my reflections, I am curious about Woodford's statement that "the coupling of education with democracy is difficult and no longer fashionable." Even a cursory examination of the literature on educating for democratic citizenship shows that theorists and teachers in all fields have anticipated Woodford's manifesto, both theoretically and pedagogically. To cite a few examples, Gordon Pradl has a long history of infusing democratic citizenship in English Literature education, which he documents (for example) in *Literature for democracy: Reading as a social act* (1996). In the area of art education, Susan Leshnoff (2003) discusses "Teaching art, moral conduct, and John Dewey for today." Hein (2006) examines "John Dewey's 'wholly original philosophy' and its significance for museums." In the area of Theater Education, my NYU colleague, Philip Taylor, is a prolific author on democracy and social justice in his area (see, for example, *The drama classroom: Action, reflection, transformation*, 2000). Social studies educators have written a copious amount on the theory and practice of teaching for democratic citizenship (e.g., Hahn 2001; Jones, Pang, & Rodriguez, 2001). Kirman (2003) examines geography education in relation to Dewey's philosophy. Shannon (2004) examines "moral literacy" education for environmental activism. Discussions that combine theoretical and practical aspects of education for democratic citizenship include Sharf (1977), Raywind (1987), Parker (2001), and Jones (2001). In our field, DeLorenzo (2003) discusses "Teaching music as democratic practice" and Allsup (2003) examines "Mutual learning and democratic action in instrumental music education." So, while it is true that discussions of democracy and music education are still few in number, Woodford has many colleagues in most other fields of education who have met the challenge of writing abundantly on theoretical issues and practical

strategies for democracy in education, which Woodford could have acknowledged and drawn upon to support and contextualize his effort.

More broadly, Woodford might have linked Dewey to another radical liberal theorist who shares Dewey's ideals: Paulo Freire[1] (Lichtenstein, 1985). Indeed, Freire's work has had a major impact on music education philosophy and practice in recent times; in some cases, music education professors place his writings at the center of music teacher education.

On the way to explaining his "manifesto," Woodford spends his first chapter outlining "John Dewey's Moral Project" and its relationship to music education. I believe that most professional (competent and caring) teachers will find these themes familiar and fundamental. For example, Woodford (via Dewey) says that the school must allow students the freedom to develop their individuality. Yes, of course. Perhaps we have more than our share of autocratic teachers (i.e., rigid ensemble conductors, formulaic theory teachers, and so forth), but let us not forget the thousands of music teachers, past and present, for whom nurturing and interacting with students as individuals has always been a deep concern. Indeed, I am sure I am not alone in saying that I know many deeply devoted music teachers who work from dawn to dusk, six or seven days a week, to foster students' individual growth by means of extracurricular groups of many kinds; individual lessons (e.g., performing, composing, improvising, theory); community music events; and by working with parents on behalf of music students—all for no financial compensation.

Woodford emphasizes that we must treat students not as empty heads, but as sources of new knowledge, developed through reflective thinking: "a socially situated, flexible, and fallible way of thinking" (p. 3). Again, this is not new; it echoes Freire's objection to "banking-style" education,[2] not to mention many reiterations of this theme in the copious writings of Peter McLaren, Henry Giroux, and many others. The difference is that Freire's critical pedagogy goes further than Woodford's manifesto by emphasizing student-teacher interactions for the *transformation* and *conscientization* of *both* the student and the teacher in the cause of social justice.

Woodford rightly lauds James Mursell as a proponent of music as a social art that requires teachers who are dedicated to helping children deliberate, choose, and act cooperatively.

Elliott, D. (2008). Music for Citizenship: A Commentary on Paul Woodford's Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 45-73. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Elliott7_1.pdf

The aim and operative concept is democratic *participation* in the processes of music teaching and learning to broaden students' social, musical, and political horizons. Once more, though, democratic participation has a long history of practice in all fields of education, as confirmed by the sources I cited above. And, as I shall explain later, key strategies for democratic participation in music education have been proffered before Woodford's book.

Opportunities for Reconciliation?

Woodford's second chapter is his "manifesto." It is subtitled: "A Liberal versus Performance-Based Music Education?" He begins by objecting to my rejection of classical liberalism, which, of course, he *also* rejects. I find this odd because in making my case against classical liberalism I cite a passage (Elliott, 1995 [or *MM*], p. 307) from Dewey's *Democracy and education*, a fact that Woodford overlooks.

> There is a standing danger that the material of formal instruction will be merely the subject matter of the schools, isolated from the subject matter of life-experience. Thus we reach the ordinary notion of education: the notion which ignores its social necessity and its identity with all human association that affects conscious life, and which identifies it with imparting information about remote matters and the conveying of learning through verbal signs: the acquisition of literacy.
>
> (Dewey, 1916, pp. 9-10)

Clearly, following Dewey, I do not accept the "ordinary notion of education." But this does *not* mean that I reject radical liberalism or a liberal concept of music education, as I will demonstrate in a moment.

Woodford's next step is to reduce praxial music education (PME) in the following statements. "The future happiness of all children, he [Elliott] says, depends on their ability to pursue the life values of self-growth, self-knowledge, and musical understanding and enjoyment through musical performance—in short, 'a certain musical way of life' " (Woodford, p. 16). He states that, without intellectual teacher-student conversations, "Elliott's pursuit of happiness, enjoyment, and self-growth through musical performance seems self-indulgent and of only secondary importance" (p. 25). Woodford goes on to say that "in the absence of intellectualizing and public conversation about the nature and role of music and music education therein, performance and skills-based approaches can lead to the continued isolation and marginalization

of music education" (p. 25). Just to be clear, then, Woodford is convinced that PME is nothing more than skill-based performing with no "intellectualizing" about the *nature* of music. In other words, he is saying that PME provides no concepts of the nature of musical works, musical knowledge, creativity, listening (and so forth) that students and teachers can call upon in their musical and intellectual discussions and writings.

In another section of the same chapter, which he calls "Performance Alone" (p. 31), Woodford states that "there is little sense in Elliott's praxial philosophy of children being prepared to eventually participate either musically or verbally in democratic society as political beings and moral agents of musical and social change" (p. 31). He states that my view is a laissez-faire approach to democracy in which musical cultures are to be simply accepted: children are inducted into pre-existing musical cultures, but there is "all too much emphasis on congruence with authentic, real, or genuine existing traditions" (p. 32). "Nowhere, at least that I can find, does he [Elliott] explicitly address the importance of children and teachers . . . engaging in meaningful musical conversations among themselves and with the public about the social consequences of their respective beliefs and values, of the ethics or morality of their actions" (p. 32).

I am surprised that Woodford chose to introduce his manifesto in terms of "Liberal versus Performance-Based Music Education." Since he sees no value in my views, why not just eliminate this part of his discussion and save the space in this short book for other issues? There have been many detailed critiques of PME during the last ten years, pro and con. So, I do not see how our profession benefits from his caricature of PME. And why create an immediate either-or, black-white dualism? I doubt that Dewey would approve of this dualistic approach, which Woodford himself exhorts us to avoid. Indeed, Woodford's strategy seems to undercut his many calls for mutuality, cooperation, and reconciliation. Recall his words: "Rather than simply blaming others for their transgressions, we should seek reconciliation and friendship" (p. xv). But his tone implies 'case closed'; Woodford and Elliott are completely at odds; there is no common ground. I am not so pessimistic. In fact, I believe there *is* common ground, if Woodford is willing to consider what the praxial view *actually* says in relation to what he hopes his book will improve in our profession. Toward this end, and because Woodford opens the topic for

discussion, I will take some time now to examine several of Woodford's claims against praxial music education.

Reflections on Woodford's View of Praxialism

Woodford's version of PME as merely "performance alone" and "performance-based" is untenable. First, as Professor Reimer states (2003), (and as many others acknowledge): "he [Elliott] continually points out that musicianship always includes listenership," meaning that we should teach "performing-listening, improvising-listening, composing-listening, arranging-listening, and conducting-listening" (p. 257, note 4). When I use the term "performance-based," I apply it in the context of explaining that music is a performing art, such that musical works are "performatives"—i.e., scores needing activation by music makers or improvisations needing the sonic consummation of a music maker's covert musical thinking. Also, although I argue that performing and improvising (a very different kind of performing) are primary forms of music making in the curriculum, I insist that these be supported by composing, arranging, conducting (or "leading," where applicable), moving or dancing. I insist that listening must be taught always in relation to all forms of students' music making *and* in relation to recordings and other media (e.g., videos). Woodford never mentions the heavy emphasis I place on listening. If I did not think listening was central in the curriculum, why would I devote three chapters (4, 6, and 8) of *Music Matters* (*MM*) to explaining the nature and values of listening and musical works? I even outline a general music curriculum in which all forms of musicing and listening are integrated (*MM*, pp. 275-277).

An accurate portrait of PME would argue in relation to a *comprehensive* account of *MM*. But Woodford takes "performance-based" out of context. Thus, his claims commit the fallacies of *slanting* and *misleading context*. Inexplicably, these mistakes are at odds with Woodford's deep intelligence and his adoption of Dewey's liberal commitment to "thoughtful valuation" (Woodford, p.18).

Second, although Woodford makes it seem as though PME is "performance-based" in the simplistic sense of teaching mere skills and indoctrinating students in static styles, what I actually say (detailed in chapters 3 and 4 of *Music Matters*) is that musical understanding

involves ten interlocking forms of musical thinking and knowing: procedural, verbal, experiential, intuitive (i.e. cognitive emotions), and metacognitive—as these apply to *both* musicianship and listenership. Moreover, I include ethical obligations as part of musicianship. I argue that musical understanding is always *situated*, meaning that its nature, values, and evolution always depends on the social/historical/cultural/artistic context of the commune of people who make and listen to musical works of a particular style. I cannot overemphasize that a fundamental premise of PME is the necessity of 'placing' the teaching of musical understanding, musical works, music listening, musical creativity, and so forth, in their social/historical/cultural/artistic contexts, which is also a major theme of *Democracy and music education*. In short, whereas Woodford does not even sketch an idea of what musical understanding might be, which seems basic to implementing his manifesto, PME provides a multidimensional model of musical understanding (which Woodford might possibly use). Note that this model includes verbal knowledge, which is a necessity for Woodford's focus: intellectualizing and sharing ideas about music's natures and values in face-to-face conversations, writings, and so on.

So, PME is completely opposed to music education as rigid 'drills and skills' and simplistic 'sound producing.' Moreover, I never say that the goal of music education is to produce professional musicians. What I say is that every style of music has competent, proficient, and expert music makers and listeners who contribute to the emergence and development of specific styles and traditions (e.g. blues traditions, 'new music' styles/traditions, jazz traditions). So, without advanced musicians (e.g., Miles Davis), it is hard to imagine how Cool Jazz would have come into existence, or be preserved, or how it has been appropriated and developed by followers of this style-tradition. Without an expert like Jimi Hendrix, it is unlikely that the creativity and energy of later forms of rock music would have advanced in the ways they did. What I say is that music students should learn about such people (their beliefs; their historical/social 'life and times') in the course of learning to make and listen to music. And while Woodford seems to think that by musical style-practices I mean a "narrow" range of musics (Woodford, p. 34), the fact is that, from the first page of *Music Matters* onward, I refer to over eighty pieces of music across dozens of cultures and styles in order to confirm that PME is open

to teaching any kind of music in relation to developing what I call "critically reflective music makers and listeners."

Regarding our teaching corps, I say that some teachers and musicians have more expertise than others; some students develop or seek to develop more or less ability in jazz, rock, classical (or whatever). I never say that children should become experts. I simply say that there is a continuum of expertise from novice to expert. It seems to me that most music teachers seek to assist children in their efforts to gradually develop their musical understandings, from their first steps to whatever levels they want to achieve. To provide such assistance, I state that music teachers must have a reasonable level of musical understanding and "educatorship" (*MM*, pp. 262-263), by which I mean several forms of knowledge: for example, philosophical, sociological, psychological, historical, and other forms of liberal education. I believe Woodford would agree. Moreover, I do not speak against teachers who are not expert musicians, as Woodford claims (p. 32). I state that teachers "who may have a strong minor or a second major in music" should be included in our teaching core[3] (*MM*, p. 253).

Woodford argues that I take a laissez-faire approach to democracy such that children are simply inducted into pre-existing musical cultures: there is "all too much emphasis on congruence with authentic, real, or genuine existing traditions" (p. 32). This is curious because at one point in his book Woodford recommends "informal" learning (p. 101), by which he means learning by rote, mimicking recordings, and/or consulting professional rock musicians about technicalities. In fairness, he acknowledges that students should be cautioned about the problems with this approach. But overall, he seems to take a laissez-faire approach to teaching rock music. He does not say anything about infusing his rock-teaching example with dialogues about the cultural, historical, ethical, moral, or emotionally expressive dimensions of the rock music the students are learning in this informal context. As Woodford presents it, his informal rock-teaching example is truly "performance alone." Also, notice how the so-called informal teaching approach he recommends is actually top-down, and that students are inducted into a real or genuine [rock] musical tradition, which he sees as a weakness of PME (Woodford, p. 32). True, he recommends using jam sessions in which discussions occur. But this, too, is a real, authentic, genuine feature of amateur and professional rock, pop, jazz, rap, and hip-hop

practices. Of course, variations on this strategy can happen in any music-teaching situation. Consider, also, that learning from recordings is usually difficult for the vast majority of students: a student needs, or must develop, very good 'ears' to do this, which usually takes a great deal of time. This factor, together with the fact that rock bands are small, can easily lead to the exclusion of many school music students.

Well-educated band, string, and choral teachers consistently engage students in working together formally and informally in brass and woodwind quintets, string quartets, and so forth. Jazz vocal groups (which often sing pop songs) frequently use the same informal techniques; and these kinds of groups have existed in the U.S. and Canada since the 1970s. Similarly, others (over many years) have recommended the few other suggestions Woodford mentions (which I italicize below) for developing students' awareness of democratic/political participation. For example, Patricia Sheehan Campbell and her many colleagues have devoted their careers to promoting, producing curricula for, and teaching many *musics of other cultures* to expand students' cultural horizons. Woodford's own music department is named after Don Wright, a renowned Canadian teacher, arranger, and composer who developed many techniques and materials for *sing-along* instruction in the 1930s and '40s. Also, to name just a few, Cutietta and Brennan (1991), Rodriguez (2004), Boesplung (1999), and Hebert and Campbell (2000) have discussed the need for *pop and rock in schools*. And I discuss the need for teachers to carefully screen and discuss *inauthentic arrangements* (*MM*, pp. 171-172).

Mutual Concerns

PME emphasizes that "a music class in which the ensemble director finds, solves and reduces all musical problems himself or herself is *not* a reflective practicum" (*MM*, p. 287). In PME, teaching professionally means enabling students to think critically, independently, and creatively. "Students need opportunities to assume multiple roles or stances (performer, coach, critical listener, advisor, conductor)" (*MM*, p. 286). When I chose to use the word "praxial" as a short form for my philosophy, I intended to highlight the importance of conceiving music more broadly than pieces of music alone (i.e., aesthetically). I meant that we should consider music holistically—as including the situated actions and pieces/products of all forms of music making

and listening by all interested people involved, all of which are "revealing of one's self and one's relationship with others in a community" (*MM*, p. 14). "Relationships with others in a community" necessarily include all manner of contextual and contingent interactions, including personal, cultural, ethical, and moral matters. Thus, as Marie McCarthy (2000) says about PME, "at no other time in our professional history did we have a view of music education that is as people-focused" (p. 3). McCarthy describes the praxial curriculum as "a social collective" based on "ongoing dialogue between teacher and student" (p. 3). She confirms the praxial commitment to "individual creativity in the context of a shared communal practice" (p. 5).

To me, a basic part of what we need in order to reclaim our place in the public sphere, and to become articulate about and for music and music education, is an understanding of what music *listening* involves and what there is to listen-*for* in musical works. Except for a brief reference to "objective" qualities, Woodford does not provide any concept of how to teach students, undergraduates, teachers, and the public to listen musically and critically, and/or what there might be to listen-*for* in musical works. Thus, *Democracy and music education* provides no basis for discussing or making judgments of musical quality, which is another major focus of Woodford's manifesto. He makes many negative comments about certain musical styles (which I discuss in the next section), but these are not based on any concept of the nature or value of works.

To help in this regard, I suggest that Woodford might be aided by three chapters in *Music Matters* (chapters 4, 6, and 8) in which I discuss the nature of listening and what to listen-*for* in musical works. The *open*, contingent, heuristic model of musical works that I build over the course of these chapters posits that music works include at least six dimensions of musical meaning to listen-for: musical design; stylistic issues; expressions of emotions; musical representations of people, places, and things; musical expressions of various kinds of beliefs (personal, political, and so on); and how all of the above are interpreted and performed. I emphasize that there is no one way to listen to all music in the world. Each person is a 'free listener.' I detail many ways composers and arrangers can create emotional expressions and characterizations of ideas, people, places, and things. To me, all these dimensions seem germane

to Woodford's cause of teaching students to intellectualize about music and make informed judgments of musical quality.

I also discuss moral and ethical issues (pp. 167-168). For example, I discuss the ethical issues involved in Ewe drumming, Herbert von Karajan's immoral decision to remain in the Third Reich and conduct for the Nazis, Sir Georg Solti's ethical refusal to conduct in his native Hungary when it was under communist rule, and so on. Another example I include is how Ellington's *Daybreak Express* symbolizes issues of racial prejudice (pp. 232-233). Granted, I should have said more in these regards, but issues of ethics and morality in music *are* present in PME.

At this point, I want to acknowledge that I did not explicitly state that a critical endpoint of music education is to prepare elementary and secondary school students to engage with the public sphere through intellectual speaking and writing. *Democracy and music education* has made me aware of this deficiency in my work. I hope to correct and elaborate this vital issue in the future. However, as the authors I cited at the beginning of this paper all agree, and as Woodford acknowledges, all forms of education aimed at democratic citizenship can contribute to this cause by creating and applying a variety of *participatory* democratic strategies during teaching-learning processes. Woodford argues that PME does not do this at all—that PME does not explicitly address the importance of children and teachers engaging in meaningful conversations among themselves about the musical-social consequences of their respective beliefs and values, or the ethics and morality of their actions. To a point, I agree. However, toward mutual support and understanding, let me now refer to and briefly explain several strategies that I discuss in *MM* (pp. 278-285), which I strongly believe we should use in the course of teaching all forms of musicing and listening. I believe these strategies affirm PME's commitment to the importance of meaningful and democratic transactions among and between students and teachers, which, in Freire's sense, also *transform* both students and teachers.

Praxial Strategies for Democratic Engagement

First, I refer to the concept of *articulation* wherein students discuss their musical efforts through words, diagrams, analogies, and models. I conceive a "musical curriculum-as-practicum"

(p.266; pp. 270-71) as involving several kinds of verbal and nonverbal reflections that evolve *together* as students learn how to make music and listen musically. *Comparative reflection* takes the ideas of articulation and reflection one step further through the use of audio tapes and videotapes that students can employ for discussing and participating in constructive evaluations of their improvisations, compositions, or solo performances, from various perspectives. *Exploration* is the term I use for "generating and selecting" music and ideas. That is, if students are to become independent critical and creative musical thinkers, they need opportunities to practice exploring, generating, constructing, and selecting musical problems and solutions themselves, and we need to engage in *coaching*, not "teaching" in the authoritarian top-down sense, which praxialism opposes (as stated in *MM*). *Ensemble critiques* encourage students' written reflections and discussions about music making by peers.

Next, I recommend the use of a teaching strategy called *fading*. By this I mean giving students frequent opportunities to lead classroom musical activities and discussions while we withdraw to the margins. Doing so encourages individual and group decision-making, and develops students' leadership skills, thereby allowing students to take ownership of their musical ideas, actions, responsibilities, aims, and accomplishments. To take just one example, suppose (as I describe in *MM*) a teacher divides his or her class choir (guitar ensemble, African drum group, composition class, or whatever) into several smaller groups. The teacher might then assign different portions of a new piece/project to different members of the smaller group with the goal of giving students time to practice the sharing of ideas, improve their awareness of musical processes-and-products, and control their own thinking. Woodford states that "students in performance classes should . . . be given frequent opportunities to formulate, clarify, express, and justify their own informed musical understandings and opinions with others through musical sounds, physical gestures . . . and the spoken word" (p. 89).

At this point, and in light of the above, I suggest that PME emphasizes several of the same themes that Woodford does. The difference is that PME offers specific strategies for putting them into practice. And there is more.

The *listening log* (*MM*, p. 285) takes the preceding strategies another step. In this case, each student organizes a personal listening diary using concepts of what to listen-for in a musical

work. Students can write down their thoughts, feelings, and musical criticisms as they listen to recordings in class, after school, or at live concerts. As part of the listening log strategy, PME recommends that teachers and students examine and include reviews of concerts, CDs, and music DVDs by critics in local newspapers or in (for example) *Stereo Review*, *Gramophone, Fanfare, The New York Times*, *Downbeat* (today I would add *MusicTech*, *Guitar World*, *Synthesis*, as well as numerous other sources on the Internet). In my experience, DVDs are an extremely powerful means of illuminating the 'life and times'—the social, cultural, moral, and ethical dimensions—of musics and musicians. Here I am thinking of (say) *Great Conductors of the Third Reich: Art in the Service of Evil*, *Ray* (Ray Charles), *Claudio Abbado: Europa-Konzer from Palermo*, *Ella Fitzgerald: Something to Live For*, or *Bob Marley: Spiritual Journey* (among hundreds of other possibilities).

A few words now about composing (which Woodford touches on only lightly) and its capacity to facilitate student exchange and preparation for democratic citizenship. Margaret Barrett (2005) states that "Elliott's concept of creativity goes far beyond traditional notions of creativity-as-composing to include *all* forms of music making: arranging, composing, conducting, improvising, and performing . . . he sees each kind of composing 'as embedded in a web of social-historical-musical thinking-in-action' " (p. 177). My own composing efforts began during my middle-school band classes in the early 1960s. Along with many other youngsters, I was given classes with a young composer named R. Murray Schafer, who documented our experiences and *conversations* in *The composer in the classroom* (1965). (Woodford celebrates Schafer). Although I was not aware of 'democratic teaching-learning principles' then, this is what Schafer modeled. But he was not unique, by any means. Composing and arranging projects, with mutual teacher-learner respect, and dialogues, were also regular parts of my secondary school curricula (1963-1967), punctuated with occasional visits by professional composers. What I valued then, and what I advocate and teach now, is that to learn composing effectively, intelligently, and joyfully, students need continuous opportunities to interact with their peers as fellow music makers and listeners, and to hear their efforts interpreted and performed musically (not merely 'produced').

Elliott, D. (2008). Music for Citizenship: A Commentary on Paul Woodford's Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 45-73. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Elliott7_1.pdf

In addition to these strategies, PME emphasizes *opportunity-finding* and *formulating* (*MM*, p. 234), rather than just carrying out musical assignments. By these terms I mean encouraging students to research and generate their own innovative musical works to perform on their own, or in peer ensembles; generate multiple approaches to interpretive, improvisational and/or compositional problems; plan innovative interpretations; generate plans and sketches of musical arrangements; edit given compositions or arrangements—all of these in continuous relation to music listening so that students gain understandings of the style frameworks in which they are creating or 'crossing over.' All of this can be done in relation to composing works about important moral, political, and ethical problems in students' lives and in our contemporary world. Doing so is common in visual art and English literature classes where students create paintings, poems, and stories for these same reasons. I suggest that all these strategies align with Mursell's concept of democratic teaching and teaching for democratic citizenship.

Music education for musical creativity requires sustained periods for students to generate, select ideas, rework, and edit their interpretations and arrangements. During these processes, I state that we need to avoid undermining our students' motivation, thinking, and enjoyment by gushing-over, hovering-over, or taking-over while students work at producing creative musical results. I state that guiding students toward creative achievements calls for a music teacher-as-coach, advisor, and informed critic; *not* teacher-as-proud-mother, stern father, or "know-it-all big brother" (*MM*, p. 234).

What role does assessment play in democratic education? Except for asking students to engage in discussions and 'paper writing,' I can't seem to find any mention of possible assessment strategies in *Democracy and music education*. So, how can we resolve (a) the inherent tensions between democratic (ethical, moral, caring) teaching and (b) the school's 'controlling' demands for assessment? PME suggests the use of multidimensional process-folios in which students, in consultation *with* their teachers, gather a *variety* of their individual and group work for formative assessment. I suggest that a diversity of materials, and student-peer-teacher mutuality in constructing and maintaining a portfolio over time, puts major features of music-democratic citizenship into practice. In *MM*, I propose the following: students create audio tapes (and videotapes, whenever possible) of their individual practice sessions; make tapes of

solo and small group rehearsals and compositions; write self-evaluations; and gather feedback from teachers and peers. These efforts fuel the development of student autonomy and social interactions. Also, they lead to teacher-student *transformations* toward (hopefully) the cause of social justice, an issue that *Democracy and music education* might have developed more explicitly.

A Summary and a Question

Woodford holds that music education for democratic participation requires that teachers model civility, mutual respect, and teach students how to exercise careful judgment with respect to what is of musical value while also learning how to express their informed opinions. He wants face-to-face conversation through mutual feedback and conversation; classroom discussions, personal reflections, and critical papers: "Viewed this way, verbal criticism and musical performance [I would also insist on adding all forms of music making, and listening] are forms of moral and ethical deliberation." Given the points I have summarized and cited from *MM*, I believe it is clear that I agree with Woodford. I submit, then, that Woodford and I are closer in our views than he states. Nevertheless, Woodford insists that in PME "there is little evidence of a true exchange, interplay, and cross-fertilization of beliefs, values, and ideas [among musicians, music teachers, students, and expert and foreign beliefs]. Nor is there an attitude of mutual respect" (Woodford, p. 34).

To end this section of my commentary, I would like to ask this: are Woodford's criticisms of PME fair and accurate, or are they off the mark? Due to important errors and omissions, I suggest that his book's portrayal of PME is a straw man. This is disappointing because it counters Woodford's repeated commitments to fair exchange and careful research. Thus, it also weakens his book as a model of democratic deliberation for students and teachers. Most importantly, I think, it overlooks several ways in which PME supports and contributes to his liberal mission.

Emotion and Abstract Reasoning

Except for Woodford's few references to caring, and the ways that commercial music can manipulate and dull our senses, matters of emotion seem noticeably absent from *Democracy and music education*. Although Woodford knows from Dewey that music is a primary means for society to make life more intense and enjoyable, he never really connects music education with the affective power of musical experiences, the necessity to develop students' intrinsic motivation for learning music, and the knowledge and skills teachers need to create emotionally positive classroom environments. In short, Woodford draws a border between thinking and feeling. This gives his book a pallid quality; it is not an uplifting, optimistic, or positive read.

This lack may seem unimportant to his intellectual mission, but I think it works against his desire to reclaim the public musical sphere. For surely the future of music education depends on doing everything we can, in every teaching-learning episode, to ensure that music students and future teachers leave our classrooms as highly motivated, passionate, and joyful 'musical citizens,' not only judicious critics and articulate speakers. Indeed, why would any student or teacher want to do the hard work of learning how to intellectualize, write, and speak for music and music education in the public sphere unless he or she had undergone deeply felt corporeal experiences of music as moving and enjoyable—unless he or she was *in love with music*. (Woodford never seems to link body-mind-emotion in his book).

Indeed, arts educators who have adopted Dewey's principles for democratic citizenship have not shown the same penchant for dividing thinking and feeling. For example, Louise Rosenblatt, a devout follower of Dewey and a renowned teacher of English Literature educators, warned against segregating emotions, and the experience of an art we want to teach, from intellectualizing about it.

> It is comparatively easy for the students to think rationally about difficult human problems when impersonal academic treatments make them abstract subjects of thought. Unfortunately, that kind of thinking is probably not very useful; it lacks the conflicting impulses or emotional perplexities out of which thinking usually grows in real life.
>
> (Rosenblatt, 1938, p. 268)

Dewey (1922) emphasized the relationship between reason and feeling in *Human Nature and Conduct*:

> The conclusion is not that the emotional, passionate phase of action can be or should be eliminated in behalf of a bloodless reason. More "passions," not fewer, is the answer . . . Rationally, once more, is not a force to evoke against impulse and habit. It is the attainment of a working harmony among these diverse areas. (pp. 170-171)

These points are fundamental in democratic teaching and critical pedagogy. As bell hooks (1994) puts it: while excitement is often discussed in relation to elementary and secondary schools, this is not so in higher education where it is seen as "potentially disruptive of the atmosphere of seriousness assumed to be essential to the learning process" (p. 7). Indeed, 'teachable moments' often follow from enjoyment and enthusiasm, and generating excitement flows from encouraging students and teachers to 'lighten up' and make spontaneous shifts in regular classroom practices. I endorse Woodford's concern for cultivating abstract reasoning among current and future music teachers and for involving music students in such reflection, but not at the expense of passion.

Woodford wants to employ abstract reason on behalf of reconciliation and critically reflective mutuality. However, it seems that Woodford compromises his commitment to these ideals, and to the elimination of polarizations, by offering rather unbalanced views on many issues he criticizes—in very strong language. For example, he creates an unhelpful dualism by calling musical enjoyment and students' future happiness "self-indulgent" (p. 25). This is odd in view of the fact that Dewey insists that music and the arts are primary means for individuals and society to make life more purposeful, intense, and enjoyable. And early on in his book, Woodford associates community music with enjoyment (in the absence of 'intellectual conversation').

His claim that "contemporary composers have simply and deliberately abandoned the public sphere altogether" (p. 26) is more of a sweeping dismissal than a rational argument. It has the familiar ring of comments by bygone critics of (for example) Debussy, Stravinsky, Bartok, Schoenberg, and Webern. More importantly for us, I think that writing in terms of "simply" and "deliberately" is not the kind of "intellectualizing" that we want to encourage in our future music teachers and students. And specifically, Woodford's charge overlooks the fact that composers in all eras are involved in the long and difficult process of transforming musical styles, pushing the envelope, and developing new audiences. Composers do not 'get it right' overnight. New styles

are constantly emerging; some fail. Some composers can 'make them work'; others cannot. Composing is like all forms of creativity—it is a continuous 're-searching' process. Living in New York, I am constantly aware that new music is always being composed, performed, and critiqued by informed critics, and a healthy amount of this music is stunning in its originality and musicality. *The New York Times* offers reviews and feature stories on contemporary composers, ensembles, and compositions on a weekly basis. These composers want to be heard; their works are very much in the public sphere. And educationally, we owe a great deal to 20th and 21st century composers whose techniques have given teachers wonderful educational means for involving our students in musical creativity. Does this count as an aspect of musical/ethical/political liberation for students' access to creativity? I believe it does. In terms of his book's moral mission in the public sphere of music, I think of the artistry and moral dimensions of John Adams's *On the Transmigration of Souls* (dedicated to victims of 9/11); Philip Glass's *Symphony No. 6* (which is based on Alan Ginsberg's poem *Plutonium Ode*, a passionate outcry against nuclear contamination); Istvan Marta's *Doom*: *A Sigh*, which is a testament to Hungarian Villagers who befriended Marta and offered him their folk songs. A year later, the police levied heavy fines on the villagers who had sung for Marta and 'resettled' them.

Woodford seems to indict today's entire music industry as simply "seducing impressionable young minds" (p. 68). He is not specific about styles, but he probably means to include hip-hop, for one. If so, this is largely true, but not balanced (balance is a central theoretical plank in Woodford's manifesto). For example, Richard Shusterman's *Pragmatist aesthetics* (2000) offers a brilliantly argued counterweight to Woodford's polemic. Also, there are grass-roots movements that employ hip-hop as a form of community music for disadvantaged youth (e.g., Chris "Kharma Kazi" Rolle's *The Hip Hop Project*, and the inner city hip-hop curricula created and carried out by Toronto's Royal Conservatory of Music). In addition, it is important to differentiate the commercial music industry from the *independent* music industry. The latter is constantly supporting innovative musicians and styles that defy commercial values and interests, thereby allowing new creators (including students) the opportunities they need to record, produce, and communicate their music around the world.

Next, I wonder about Woodford's view that "despite the public's clear rejection of the classics" (p. 59), many music teachers still view themselves as "conservers" of tradition and "masterworks" (p. 59). We all know what he means: some teachers teach nothing but the classics. This is unacceptable. There must be breadth *and* depth, as he wants, and as I insist on in *MM*. But again, his quick jabs at these topics hide some key points. For one thing, at the outset of his book, Woodford notes that we have an obligation to help students know their "earlier selves" (p. 17) and balance individuality with enabling them to preserve, transform, and transcend tradition. At least part of what music students require toward doing these things is to experience making (in some form) and listening to 'great' musics of the past. I think it's fair to say that the teaching strategies used by many good 'Mursell-based' teachers over many decades have contributed significantly to helping students intelligently and musically preserve, transform, and transcend tradition. If we want students to develop an informed, liberal attitude toward musics, I believe this includes opening them to what they have *not* experienced before they enter our classrooms. As Woodford says, it's not what we do; it's how we do it (p. 6).

Woodford wants us to carry on open dialogues about musical issues in the public sphere. He wants us to reach out to people in all walks of life; he urges us to help children to exercise careful judgments with respect to what is of musical value and how to craft informed views. But often his book exemplifies the opposite; it lacks a sense of compromise, openness, and careful deliberation that might otherwise reach out to music listeners of all kinds. He offers his opinions—not as personal and provisional—but as uncompromising conclusions, as in the case of classical music. Is it reasonable and balanced of Woodford to say that the public *clearly rejects* the classics? He should discuss this issue from various perspectives, not close it off. Many informed people would wish to temper Woodford's view. Indeed, even a recent article in the popular press (*The New Yorker*) celebrates the fact that "even now, the number of [classical] ensembles remains vast: nearly four hundred professional orchestras and some fifteen hundred volunteer, youth, and collegiate orchestras" in the USA (Ross, 2007, p. 63). Classical music may be 'down' in terms of hip-hop sales, but it is not *so clearly* rejected by the public as Woodford (simply) states.

Elliott, D. (2008). Music for Citizenship: A Commentary on Paul Woodford's Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 45-73. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Elliott7_1.pdf

As one example of what Woodford might want to see, and what many other music teachers are doing today, let me outline the work of one of my colleagues[4] who teaches in an inner city high school in Queens, New York: Long Island City High School (LICHS). I believe her praxial teaching exemplifies a combination of democratic ideals and musical expertise in the service of expanding her students' critical awareness of many kinds of music, from 'their' hip-hop, to jazz, salsa, Machaut, Mozart, Schoenberg, Opera, and so on. She begins by asking them to bring *their* favorite musics to class. This initial strategy enables her students to immediately 'see and feel' the shift from their common, undemocratic classrooms to something new: a liberated sharing of student-teacher power, control, freedom, and student-teacher-peer morality in relation to music. In this way, she respects and engages them in conversations in which they scrutinize their musics and, gradually, critically discuss other styles and pieces in terms of structural, expressive, situational, narrative, and ideological dimensions. In these ways, she also enables them to discuss, understand, and experience many other students' musical, personal, and cultural values (her class is made up of fifty students from twenty-eight countries). Her key is mutual respect, as Woodford says (and as the sources I cited at the beginning of this essay also insist upon). On this basis, her students also learn to compare recordings of the same pieces and write musical criticisms. Under her guidance, they combine their written criticisms in a school paper, *Crescendo*, which (last semester) they distributed to 100 students in other classes, administrators, other teachers, and parents. Of special note is the fact that, because many of her students are not fluent in English, she must combine ESL instruction with her approach to general music.

This last point raises a key issue: Woodford's emphasis on intellectualizing about music (by writing papers and participating in face-to-face discussions) overlooks one of today's urban realities: that many students do not have the English fluency needed to participate. So, just as any approach to music education can be used or abused, abstract thinking can easily eliminate many students, unless the language of exchange is carefully considered and educated. The danger of putting too heavy an emphasis on students' *verbal* performance in class—in the sense of participating in discussions and writing research reports—is that it can work to disenfranchise students who lack fluency in the language of dialogue. ESL students, for example, may be

rendered embarrassed, shy, passive, or subservient to verbally astute English-speaking teachers and peers.

In addition to the above, my colleague's students at LICHS learn that skilled and sensitive musicians breathe new life into the standard 'classical' repertoire through interpretation. This does not always happen, to be sure. But her students learn that music is not a 2 + 2 game; it is an interpretive art. To take one example of resources that can be used to assist students and teachers in this regard, *The New York Times* (and countless other Internet and ipod news organizations) offer reviews and feature stories about classical, jazz, "world music," and pop concerts. Students can access these sources in relation to their listening and deliberating, as I advised in my discussion of the praxial listening log.

My last remarks in this section concern Woodford's indictment of such professional organizations as the Mayday Group. He sees us as merely self-satisfied academics, thus failing to acknowledge the many innovations of the Mayday Group during the last decade. He calls the Canadian Music Educators Association "anemic" (p. 91). Again, this is harsh. This is not the way to win the hearts and minds of our profession. Woodford needs to *apply* his philosophy of civility and empathy by showing respect for the hard work and devotion of his colleagues, who volunteer huge amounts of time and energy on behalf of music education—whether this occurs in our own public-professional sphere, or beyond. Absolutely central to Woodford's manifesto is his commitment to moral, ethical, rational, and compassionate words and deeds. But I fear that some readers will get the opposite message from *Democracy and music education* due to its often *un*-caring impatience and intolerance of others, and its shortage of rational justifications for many of its assertions. In fact, Woodford acknowledges in his *Apologia* that someone will probably find him "overly negative in my own criticisms and assessment of the music education profession" (pp. 96-97). His motive, he says, "was to motivate conversation" (p. 98). Disturbing people in their complacency, he says, is "just the price of personal and civic responsibility" (p. 98). But there are more and less effective ways to do this. Given my review of Woodford's comments above, his *Apologia* does not have the ring of a true liberal. To me, it does not communicate a "delight in mankind" (p. 97). I doubt that John Dewey would have penned *Democracy and music education* in the same tone of argument.

Elliott, D. (2008). Music for Citizenship: A Commentary on Paul Woodford's Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 45-73. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Elliott7_1.pdf

Community Music

I was pleased to see that Woodford emphasizes the importance of community music (CM) in his mission of music education for democratic citizenship. But this is not new, let alone revolutionary. For a long period of time, large numbers of music educators worldwide have been emphasizing our social, moral, and political responsibility to take the 'CM turn.' During the last 20 years, the voluntary CM SRIG of ISME has been very successful in creating a 'meeting place' for CM musicians, music educators (at all levels), and 'CM workers' across the globe. The purpose of these biennial meetings is to share practical strategies and to nurture political, intellectual, and proactive connections among CM teachers/facilitators in order to expand and improve CM practices worldwide, which, in fact, has occurred in many ways.

The CM SRIG of MENC was conceived in 1995 by Chelcy Bowles and David Myers; it held its first meeting in 1998.[5] Since then, its members have hosted biennial meetings at each MENC national conference. These conferences have spawned numerous networks of CM programs in the U.S.

In terms of CM in the U.K., Lee Higgins (2006) points out that, after the devastations of World War II, many community music workers in the U.K. formed arts education collectives. Their mandate was to assist people at all levels of society to heal and express their feelings and ideas of loss, hope, and renewal, and to mobilize creativity for societal changes through individual and group creativity. For the most part, U.K. community musicians have seen themselves as 'musical social workers' (Woodford duplicates this term: p. 99) and political activists dedicated to improving the lives of people who are not able to help themselves. CM in the U.K. continues to thrive today. But in contrast to many North American efforts, the aims of U.K., European, and Scandinavian CM efforts tend to focus on the power of music for individual liberation through group music making for all ages, abilities, and disabilities. The Liverpool Institute for Performing Arts has been a stellar example of this tradition.

Recall Woodford's claim that praxialism is merely "performance alone," lacking in any concern for, or explicit commitment to, democratic, moral, and political aims. Once again, more research might have caused Woodford to reconsider his views. Praxialism and CM are closely

linked. It was because of my twelve-year participation in the ISME CM SRIG that I worked with Kari Veblen (Woodford's colleague at the University of Western Ontario) to establish the *International Journal of Community Music* (www.intljcm.com) in 2004. The purpose of the IJCM is to disseminate CM research and reports of practical projects worldwide, thereby serving many global-networking aims of CM.

In 1986, I emphasized that music teachers and professors needed to "deschool" music education toward establishing community, business, and industry- based music programs that would provide music education to a much more diverse population. For pre-service music education students I suggested that:

> softer forms of deschooling music education might entail a career in one of several forms of community music combined with a practical involvement in traditional music education, or a leap into comprehensive arts education . . . (Elliott, 1986, p. 146)

In 1996, I took part (with Kari Veblen) in the founding of an MA degree in community music at the University of Limerick, Ireland. Recently, I designed and implemented an MA program in community music at New York University.

Lastly, *Music Matters* emphasized the need to:

> develop dynamic communities of musical interest by expanding music education "horizontally and vertically" beyond conventional schooling. This task includes developing ways to: link school and community-based music education programs; initiate and develop links between professional music educators and the musical needs and interests of corporate employees; develop mentor-apprenticeship relationships between senior music students and junior students in the same school system; and so on. (p. 306)

Further Possibilities

Expanding on Woodford's themes, I suggest that we need to get our own homes in order in three ways. First, Woodford complains bitterly that undergraduates are "ignorant" (p. 74) of the world around them and of the "grand political, philosophical, artistic, and social movements that shape their culture" (p. 74). Another sweeping indictment. He finds that his seniors can't distinguish Marxism from capitalism, and so on. (I believe this occurs in many other fields: science education, business, law, and medicine). I know what Woodford means. But when *some* (not all) music education undergraduates and graduate students lack important understandings of political issues and grand social movements (and so on), surely this is not completely their fault. Do music education philosophy professors model how to write and speak engagingly on behalf of

music in the public arena, and in our university *music*-teaching situations, and in music philosophy/foundations courses? Is (say) *Democracy and music education* an excellent example? Do we demonstrate how to use Internet technologies to communicate with the public sphere? Do we build bridges among our colleagues in (say) musicology, performance, music technology, political science, history, and neuroscience? Do we invite colleagues from different departments into our classes to help our students better understand the relationships among capitalism, classical music, hip-hop, critical pedagogy, Marxism, religion, the music business, and the achievements of contemporary composers worldwide? In my experience, most future music educators are eager to learn. But they need the proper conditions, which we can provide by means of the above. I think Woodford could have emphasized these issues.

Woodford is worried about the fact that music education students see themselves only as performers. At one point he constructs a troubling dualism: "Rather than seeking exceptional music teachers, I am actually calling for an *improvement* in professional standards" (p. 99). This is not well put. Does he really mean that by accepting *less* qualified *music* makers we will *improve* music education and our ability to make a difference in the public sphere? I can't imagine that Woodford means this the way it sounds. I hope not. But I fear his readers might take it this way. Notwithstanding my own commitment to philosophical reasoning, I would never suggest that we stop seeking exceptional *music* students and music makers of all kinds. Following Dewey, I think it's essential that we dissolve this dualism and commit ourselves to attracting and nurturing *both* fine thinkers and musicians. Why can't we work to raise the standards of musicing and thinking *simultaneously*? Woodford wants to attract and develop idealistic and visionary music teachers who see themselves as public intellectuals. Yes. But I wonder how we teach undergraduates "to exercise careful judgment with respect to what is of musical value" (p. 87) without also educating them to be very well-rounded and proficient performers, listeners, improvisers, composers, and conductors with solid understandings of music history, theory, culture, and so forth.

Woodford's strong emphasis on the need for abstract reasoning at all levels of music education, while essential, seems to diminish what teachers, future teachers, and the public would deem a potent force for changing society: musical experiences. It is in our best interests

that we enable our students to conceive themselves as *artistic citizens*: as cultural creators for moral world citizenship. Let us not overlook the importance of enabling our music education majors to develop *musical replies* to social/moral/political dilemmas by creating *musical* (or hybrid musical/bodily/visual) expressions of social problems. Becoming a *musical artist-educator for citizenship* requires all the myriad skills, understandings, and dispositions that make up musicianship. I am suggesting that we ought to prepare our music education majors to reclaim a democratic purpose for music education by also enabling them to express their political-social ideas, feelings, stories, and ideas in musical forms—through the power of sonic-performative means. In fact, many rock, country, jazz, and folk musicians have done the same for decades, as have composers from all centuries, including the contemporary composers I referred to earlier in this essay. After all, our music teacher education programs are often embedded in *research* universities or liberal arts colleges that place a premium on *forwarding* knowledge and preparing young people for *new* worlds. To me, creating, researching, and forwarding new knowledge includes creating music for political deliberations—an artistic way of working as "opinion leaders and champions of the public good" (Woodford, p. xi). If we do so, then I am optimistic that our students will come to realize their musical-public responsibilities and discover their potentials to create music that reflects and leads audiences to *hear and feel the sounds* of AIDS, urban violence, degenerating cities, poverty, injustice, discrimination, and so on. The aim is to mobilize the public to eradicate *sounds of injustice*. In fact, art, theatre, and dance educators have a long history of doing the same with students from elementary school to advanced university levels. We need to pluralize our communicative efforts in the cause of participatory democracy. We need to grasp the potential of the public's corporeal/visceral response to our students' voices-as-songs. For Connelly (1999), visceral-musical responses are "thought-imbued intensities" (p. 29): our "artful-selves" are twin—subjective and intersubjective—sides of a "politics of becoming" (p. 49).

Conclusion

Democracy and music education is an important contribution. It underlines our profession's need to take a proactive approach to the ethics of our practice for the sake of students' musical

citizenship; it rightly emphasizes our responsibility to pursue a democratic sense of purpose and community. Woodford urges us to become public intellectuals, deeply political in and for our profession and our musical society. Toward this end, he insists that if we hope to succeed as educational leaders for a democratic society, we had better learn how to communicate much more effectively—and, I would add, in ways that *inspire* public understanding. Woodford exhorts liberals to demonstrate their ideals by intellectually engaging critics and the public to create a more inclusive and just society.

The present question is, does *Democracy and music education* fulfill its stated ideals? Does it provide a model that might guide, inspire, and move music students, teachers, and professors toward the laudable ends it promotes? Does it represent an example of how to "communicate with the public in ways that it can understand" (p. xi). Based on the considerations and concerns in this commentary, my answer is—partially.

Notes

[1] Lichtenstein (1985) provides a clear and comprehensive discussion of the similarities and differences among the radical liberal theories of John Dewey, Ivan Illich, and Paulo Freire.
[2] See Freire (2000, 71-86). Freire argues that "authentic" education aims for liberation through mutual respect and dialogue among students and teachers. Thus, Freire rejects oppressive forms of education that view students as passive, empty bank accounts waiting for authoritarian, "bank clerk" teachers to deposit their "verbalistic" knowledge.
[3] This statement is embedded in an MENC statement that I cite in *Music matters* (p. 252) about music teaching credentials.
[4] I refer here to Dr. Marissa Silverman who holds an undergraduate degree in English Literature and an MA and PhD in music performance.
[5] I am grateful to Don Coffman, David Myers, and Chelcy Bowles for this information.

References

Allsup, R. E. (2003). Music learning and democratic action in instrumental music education. *Journal of Research in Music Education*, 51(1), 24-37.

Barrett, M. (2005). A systems view of musical creativity. In D. J. Elliott (Ed.), *Praxial music education: Reflections and dialogues* (pp. 177-195). New York: Oxford University Press.

Elliott, D. (2008). Music for Citizenship: A Commentary on Paul Woodford's Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 45-73. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Elliott7_1.pdf

Boesplung, G. (2004). Popular music and the instrumental ensemble. *Music Educators Journal*, 85, 33-37.

Connolly, W. (1999). *Why I am a secularist*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Cutietta, R., & Brennan, T. (1991). Coaching a pop/rock ensemble. *Music Educators Journal*, 77, 4-45.

Dewey, J. (1922). *Human Nature and Conduct*. New York: Modern Library.

_____. (1916). *Democracy and education*. New York: MacMillan.

DeLorenzo, L. C. (2003). Teaching music as democratic practice. *Music Educators Journal*, 90(2), 24-37.

Elliott, D. J. (2005). *Praxial music education: Reflections and dialogues*. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. (1995). *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*. New York: Oxford University Press.

_____. (1986). Finding a place for music in the curriculum. *British Journal of Music Education, 3*(2), 135-151.

Freire, P. (2000). *Pedagogy of the oppressed: 30th anniversary edition*. New York: Continuum.

Hahn, C. (2001). Democratic understanding: Cross-national perspectives. *Theory Into Practice, 40*(1), 14-28.

Hebert, D. & Campbell, P. (2000). Rock music in American schools. Positions and practices since the 1960s. *International Journal of Music Education*, 36, 14.

Hein, E. (2006). John Dewey's 'wholly original philosophy' and its significance for museums. *Curator, 49*(2), 181-203.

Higgins, L. (2006). Boundary-walkers: Contexts and concepts of community music. PhD dissertation, University of Limerick.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress*. New York: Routledge.

Jones, E. B., Pang, V. O., & Rodriguez, J. (2001). Social studies in the elementary classroom: Culture matters. *Theory Into Practice, 40*(1), 35-41.

Kirman, J. M. (2003). Transformative geography: Ethics and action in elementary and secondary geography education. *Journal of Geography, 102*(3), 93-98.

Leshnoff, S. (2003). Teaching art, moral conduct, and John Dewey for today. *Art Education, 56*(6), 33-36.

Lichtenstein, P. M. (1985). Radical liberalism and radical education: A synthesis and critical examination of Illich, Freire, and Dewey. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology, 44*(1), 39-53.

McCarthy, M. (2000). Music matters: A philosophical foundation for a sociology of music education. *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* (144), 3-9.

Parker, W. C. (2001). Educating democratic citizens: A broad view. *Theory Into Practice, 40*(1), 6-13.

Pradl, G. M. (1996). *Literature for democracy: Reading as a social act*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Raywind, M. A. (1987). The democratic classroom: Mistake or misnomer. *Theory into practice, 26*, 480-489.

Reimer, B. (2003). *A philosophy of music education: Advancing the vision*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Rodriguez, C. X., ed. (2004). *Bridging the gap: Popular music and music education*. Reston, VA: The National Association for Music Education (MENC).

Ross, A. (2007, April 30). The anti-maestro. *The New Yorker*, 60-71.

Rosenblatt, L. (1938). *Literature as exploration*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Schafer, R. Murray (1965). *The composer in the classroom*. Don Mills, ON: BMI Canada.

Scharf, P. (1977). Moral development and democratic schooling. *Theory Into Practice, 16*(2), 89-96.

Shannon, P. (2004). The practice of democracy and Dewey's challenge. *Language Arts, 82*(1), 16- 25.

Shusterman, R. (2000). *Pragmatist aesthetics: Living beauty*, *rethinking art* (2nd ed). New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Taylor, P. (2000). *The drama classroom: Action, reflection, transformation*. London: Routledge-Falmer.

Woodford, P. (2005). *Democracy and music education: Liberalism, ethics, and the politics of practice*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

About the Author

David J. Elliott is Professor of Music and Music Education at New York University. He is the author of *Music matters: A new philosophy of music education*, editor of *Praxial music education: Reflections and dialogues*, founder and editor of the *International Journal of Community Music*, and an award-winning composer/arranger with works published by Boosey & Hawkes.