

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

Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education

Paul Woodford

© Paul Woodford 2007 All rights reserved.

ISSN 1545-4517

The content of this article is the sole responsibility of the author. The ACT Journal and the Mayday Group are not liable for any legal actions that may arise involving the article's content, including, but not limited to, copyright infringement.

For further information, please point your Web Browser to <http://act.maydaygroup.org>

Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond *Democracy and Music Education*¹

Paul Woodford

The University of Western Ontario



I've been told by a few friends at American universities that some of their undergraduate and graduate music education majors initially react negatively to my book *Democracy and Music Education* (2005). I gather that this is an emotional reaction akin to the way that Allan Bloom's *The Closing of the American Mind* is often received by undergraduates. Many of own undergraduates take umbrage with his assertions that classical music is "dead among the young" and that rock music has no intellectual merit; that it is all about sex and instant gratification.² Of course they usually haven't read the entire book and thus don't at first understand what Bloom is saying, anymore than they realize his purpose, which is to motivate conversation. My book has much the same purpose and argumentative tone, although I hasten to add that neither Bloom nor I claims to have a monopoly on truth. Western politics and culture, including music education, are simply too big and varied and many of their problems too complex for any one person to understand them.³ That's why we need to pool our resources by engaging in more research and intellectual debate about the kinds of serious issues and problems raised in my book. As Bloom says, we need one another to understand the truth. If this project is to succeed, however, it should be pursued in the spirit of freedom and friendship.⁴ We need to re-envision the music education profession as a truth-seeking community dedicated to the common good and in which, following Plato's *Symposium*, criticism and disagreement are seen not as acts of war or treason but of friendship and solidarity. This, as British Lord Bhikhu Parekh insists, is the mission of the university:

Driven by curiosity as well as the realization that dialogue with the other is the only way to rise above local prejudices, the university reaches out to other civilizations, seeks to understand and engage in a critical dialogue and aims to become a global assembly of minds. Such a critical and creative multiculturalism highlights the rich diversity and the fundamental unity of the human spirit. . . . No other institution in our society can perform this crucial task.⁵

Music education should have a similar intellectual and social purpose. This is especially important in this disaffected era in which there appears to be no middle ground or meeting of minds in culture and politics. Besides, as I also explain, properly understood, criticism seeks the improvement of the human condition. That's why we should be wary of those in politics, business, or education who would censure, denigrate, or stifle public conversation because they find it unsettling or disturbing, because they simply disagree, or because they don't want to face the truth. As we've seen with the American and British governments' propaganda leading up to and following the second invasion of Iraq, the stifling and impoverishment of public conversation can have serious consequences for society (I'll have more to say about this shortly).⁶ Thus, with respect to students who initially react negatively to my book, I would remind them of the democratic principles of intellectual honesty, openness, and tolerance while also explaining that a university education is supposed to challenge their preconceptions and understandings of their profession and of the world. Indeed, those who aren't willing to wrestle with difficult ideas probably don't belong there.⁷

I thus welcome critical reviews of my book—properly understood as the Platonic search for truth, understanding, and friendship—because they provide the necessary stimuli for me to do more research, to better explain myself, and to correct misinterpretations or errors (both my own and theirs). As John Stuart Mill insisted, even if our critics are partly, or even entirely, wrong we can still learn from them.⁸

Thus far, of the five or six reviews of *Democracy and Music Education* that have previously appeared in printed or on-line sources, the most pointed is by Liz Garnett in *Music & Letters* who complains that I speak more to the past than to the present. In a backhanded compliment, she compares my book to Jean Baptiste Leclerc's impassioned but redundant paper "on the importance of music for the moral and social development of the populace"⁹ presented to the French National Convention in 1796. Apparently the National Convention had already admitted as much the previous year and had taken appropriate steps, so Leclerc's paper was pointless. But, states Garnett, "it remains . . . a fascinating document of beliefs about both music and politics at a particular historical moment. It is possible that musicologists two hundred years from now will be making similar statements about Paul Woodford's *Democracy and Music Education*."¹⁰

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

It's strange that Garnett would refer to my book this way, as whether in The United States, The United Kingdom, or Australia, the New Right continues to monopolize power, while Canada recently elected a federal government that is the realization of George Bush's fondest hopes and dreams. Already, and after only a few short months in power, the Conservative government of Prime Minister Stephen Harper has taken a more aggressive military stance and leadership role in Afghanistan, stated its intention to renege on the Kyoto Accord, and cut a billion dollars in funding to social and cultural programs and agencies, including literacy, youth employment, and adult education programs, the Status of Women Canada organization, museums, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada (SSHRC), and Health Canada's Health Policy Research Program, among others; all this despite a huge federal surplus.¹¹ A further billion in cuts to federal programs is scheduled to follow in the next year or so. According to Harper's Finance Minister Jim Flaherty, the Conservative government is committed in principle to tax reduction.

It's worth noting that Flaherty was previously Finance Minister of the Ontario Progressive Conservative government during the 1990s. Immediately upon their election to government in 1994, this extremist Right-wing government appointed a high school dropout as Minister of Education—which spoke volumes about the government's attitude toward education—scapegoated teachers for all that ailed the education system and society, and then made massive cuts to public education at all levels.¹² One of the many consequences of those funding cuts to education was the elimination of many elementary music programs in public schools. Flaherty's appointment as federal Finance Minister thus doesn't auger well for Canadian public education, and especially for music programs. Fortunately, education in Canada remains a provincial jurisdiction, although the federal government can still exert tremendous influence over public schools through changes to funding formulas to the provinces.¹³ Canada's universities are probably more vulnerable to federal fiscal policy than its public schools because the former receive some of their funding, including significant research funding for the arts and humanities from the aforementioned SSHRC, directly from the federal government. I'll have more to say later on about the Canadian federal government's new policies for higher education and research.

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

It's possible that we may soon see a reversal in the political fortunes of the New Right now that President Bush and the Republicans in the United States have lost control over the House of Representatives and that Tony Blair has stepped down as British Prime Minister.¹⁴ Nevertheless, as I observe in my book, the cultural divide between the political left and right—or more properly between moderates just to the right of center and those on the Far Right—“may for the foreseeable future be a permanent feature of politics in the western democracies” (p. 75). As philosopher Richard J. Bernstein explains in *The Abuse of Evil: The Corruption of Politics and Religion Since 9/11*, the political Left and Right represent different mentalities or ways of thinking and acting in the world that are likely to endure. Those on the extreme Right tend to think in dualistic terms of absolute truths and moral certainty while moderates are by definition skeptics. The problem with appeals to absolutes is that they are “disastrous for politics,” such as happened in the United States following the attacks of 9/11 when criticism of the Bush government was stifled by unreflective and emotional appeals to religion and patriotism.¹⁵

Regrettably, music is often implicated in these kinds of emotional appeals, such as is currently happening with MENC's National Anthem Project (whose honorary chairperson is Laura Bush) and as happened a few years ago when the American military adopted country and western singer Toby Keith's song “Curtesy of the Red, White, and Blue, The American Way” as a propaganda tool for rallying the troops and the public behind the war in Iraq. For those of you who don't know the song, the lyrics include the words “if you mess with us we'll put a boot up your ass, it's the American way.”¹⁶ While perhaps an effective propaganda tool when directed at some Americans, these kinds of sentiments are hardly going to win friends in the Middle East or elsewhere. This, too, was an important point raised in my book, that music and art are the propaganda tools of choice of tyrants and ideologues wishing to manipulate and control us, including corporate advertisers but also democratically elected politicians.¹⁷ We tend to associate propaganda with totalitarian regimes, but we would do well to remember that the modern propaganda industry was an invention of First World War Britain.¹⁸ It is also worth remembering that Hitler was elected and enjoyed massive public support (although political machination was also involved). This should give pause to those advocating

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

democracy in music education—or in Iraq for that matter—without defining what they mean.¹⁹

Often, as Keith's lyrics would suggest, these appeals to religion and patriotism are motivated by hate. Historian John Lukacs explores this theme in his recent book *Democracy and Populism: Fear and Hatred* (2005), arguing that while the political right is motivated by hatred, the political left is motivated by fear. Unfortunately, as Hitler understood all too well, hatred unites and is "a source for strength" while fear incapacitates. This helps explain the political success and failure of Republicans and Democrats respectively during the years immediately following 9/11 (and also because since the 1980s neoliberals and neoconservatives have been waging a massive, long-term, and relentless public relations campaign to undermine the very notion of a public good). As you'll recall, following 9/11 those on the political far right cultivated a climate of fear with their frequent references to the so-called axis of evil, weapons of mass destruction, and approaching armageddon that helped ensure their re-election by pre-empting criticism of their attacks on civil liberties and social services.²⁰ We're hearing much of that same rhetoric and fear-mongering now with reference to Iran. To this day, those on the extreme Right continue to insist that we are in "a great cultural war against terrorists" and that government should thus be permitted to arrest and detain terror suspects regardless of constitutional rights.²¹

Further evidence of this continued divide, and of the timeliness of my own book, can be seen in the plethora of new books by authors of both political persuasions. Among current books by authors representing the political right are Ann Coulter's *Godless: The Church of Liberalism* (2006) and *How to Talk to a Liberal (If You must)* (2004), Newt Gingrich's *Winning the Future: A 21st Century Contract with America* (2006), Pat Buchanan's *State of Emergency: The Third World Invasion and Conquest of America* (2006), and Roger Scruton's *Arguments for Conservatism: A Political Philosophy* (2006). Among recent books critical of the extremism and myopia of the New Right, and in addition to Bernstein's *The Abuse of Evil* (2005) and Lukacs' *Democracy and Populism* (2005), are Lewis Lapham's *Pretensions of Empire: Notes on the Criminal Folly of the Bush Administration* (2006), Howard Zinn's *On Democratic Education* (2005), Noam Chomsky's (2005) *Imperial Ambitions: Conversations on the Post-9/11 World* and, most

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

recently, Al Gore's *The Assault on Reason* (2007). Both sides of this polarized debate obviously recognize the power of popular opinion in contemporary politics. Yet another publication that appeared after the release of my own book but that demonstrates its relevance and timeliness is *Music and Manipulation: On the Social Use and Social Control of Music* (2006).²²

This underscores the importance in education of teaching students how to think but also of learning how to contribute to public debates through both the spoken and written words (and also figuratively through music performance). As Lukacs insists, given the current battle in the media for the hearts and minds of the citizenry “our concern must be with how people think . . . including how they are influenced or impressed to think and speak.”²³ And in important part that means helping children and adults to distinguish propaganda from truth. That is what I have attempted to do in my book, to reveal how music and music education are often implicated in the culture wars between the political left and right (and in other things) while challenging readers to think more critically about the nature, purpose, and value of music education in these highly politicized times. If nothing else, I hope that my book demonstrates that music education *can* really matter in democratic society while also convincing students, teachers, and academics of the necessity of their becoming more involved in the global assembly of minds. We can no longer afford to leave government and politics to the lawyers and business people.

I thus fail to see how Garnett can believe that the cultural divide between the political left and right (or between political moderates and right-wing extremists) is a thing of the past and, by implication, that we don't need to prepare them for that social reality. Indeed, today's academics are increasingly worried about the effects of government anti-terrorist laws and public policy on freedom of speech in universities. As reported in Canada, The United States, Australia, and The United Kingdom, there are real dangers that our governments may attempt to limit academic free speech by withholding funding and/or by enacting legislation to undermine the autonomy of the public university by making the professoriate more directly accountable for what they think, say, and do to their political masters.²⁴ The rhetoric employed by these governments in asserting their “right to manage” universities may be couched in the language of public

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

accountability and diversity, but their real objective is a tyranny of a righteous minority, whether that be of the conservative Christian right, market fundamentalists, a social and political elite, or some perverse and complex alliance thereof.²⁵ The last thing that these governments really want is public accountability, since that would undermine their own moral and political authority (because those governments do not necessarily enjoy massive public support for their initiatives).²⁶ The New Right's sudden interest in diversity is similarly intended to disable critics and academics by contributing to a relativistic, laissez-faire epistemology that undermines moral discourse. Although potentially emancipatory, when merely equated with consumer sovereignty the encouragement of diversity can weaken social support networks and collective action in support of social justice. You'll recall that I spoke about this issue in my book with respect to the problems of social fragmentation, laissez-faire democracy (which is no democracy at all), popular music, and rampant consumerism.

But even if or when New Right governments are eventually overthrown, change in government and institutional culture takes time. It may take years to undo the damage to public institutions and to international relations caused by the New Right's "campaign against government," its destruction of the public common, and its belief in enlightened selfishness.²⁷ Structural changes to American state schools may be particularly difficult to redress because President Bush's government has literally mortgaged the future of the country to pay for the war in Iraq while cutting federal taxes. One of the most damaging of Bush's policies affecting music education and democratic society is his well-meaning but misguided (because too narrow) 2002 *No Child Left Behind* legislation. Music education in American public schools has been in decline for some time, but this legislation, with its emphasis on the so-called basics and standardized testing, "transformed a slow decline into a precipitate fall."²⁸ We're told that in California alone the number of students taking music in school was halved between 1999 and 2004 (although this may be an exaggeration), while across the nation "Seventy-one per cent of school districts . . . narrowed their elementary-school curricula in order to make up the difference, and the arts have repeatedly been deemed expendable."²⁹ Given the federal government's fiscal crisis and the lack of political will of federal and many state governments to raise taxes to pay for public education, it is difficult to imagine how this

damage to music and arts programs can be reversed anytime soon (although some positive steps have been taken since then). Similar concerns have been voiced in the United Kingdom, where “music teaching in state schools remains in crisis” and where there has been a decline of interest in classical and folk music in both school and society.³⁰

Indeed, many neoliberal reforms instituted in the United Kingdom and elsewhere during the past quarter century, including the downsizing of government bureaucracy and the concomitant restructuring of municipal and regional government, the promotion of popular capitalism among lower-middle class voters, and the introduction of market mechanisms to healthcare and education, were all intended to *prevent* future reforms by the cultural left.³¹ A contributing factor to the New Right’s present and future political success is that much of their rhetoric and many of their social and educational policies and practices have by now become institutionalized. Those policies and practices have become so entrenched in our language as to appear “common sense” and thus beyond critique.³²

An Economic Purpose for Education

One of the New Right’s most damaging policies that has become institutionalized and thus seen by many as beyond criticism is that education, including university research, should primarily serve an economic purpose.³³ This notion continues to prevail at the highest levels of American educational bureaucracy, as evidenced by the recent Commission on the Future of Higher Education in which the primary goal for American universities remains to “to turn out students qualified to compete in the global economy.”³⁴ Similarly, in Canada, the federal finance minister recently announced a new economic plan for the country entitled *Advantage Canada: Building a Strong Economy for Canadians* that aims to ensure that “all government programs [including education] are effective and efficient; are focused on results; provide value for taxpayers’ money; and are aligned with the Government’s priorities and responsibilities.”³⁵ An attempt will also be made to “better align post-secondary research with the needs of business.”³⁶ Pressure has already been applied to the aforementioned Social Sciences and Humanities

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

Research Council of Canada to conform to this economic model and purpose for university research.³⁷

This political vision has obvious and dire implications for liberal education and also for research in the arts and humanities, especially given that the Canadian plan calls for “clear objectives and improved results measurement for the granting councils and other research entities.”³⁸ Unhappily, university administrators throughout the west seem happy to comply with their governments’ economic agenda for education and are prepared to take punitive measures against those who resist accountability exercises. According to Nancy Smith Fichter in her 2006 paper “Weapons of Mass Instruction” (presented at the annual meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music in Chicago), “This can foster a climate of fear that results in a deep tainting of collegiality and sometimes a damaging rush to conformity, quite the opposite atmosphere to that in which creativity and experiment are fostered.”³⁹ Indeed, the current utilitarian agenda for higher education is by definition conservative: There is little appreciation of complexity or for anything that is controversial and not of immediate commercial value. That may be one possible explanation for the negative reception that my book has received in some quarters. As Al Gore and Dick Colwell both say, so much of contemporary political discourse is “shallow” and based on emotion rather than reason.⁴⁰

One of the primary ways that governments hold universities and academics accountable to this economic agenda for higher education is through the use of various performance indicators to rank individual faculty and institutions.⁴¹ I refer you to William Bruneau’s and Donald Savage’s *Counting Out the Scholars: The Case Against Performance Indicators in Higher Education* (2002) for an excellent history and critique of this aspect of “number-driven-policy.”⁴² They have an extended chapter on the situation in the United Kingdom during the past decade or so that includes discussion of how Research Assessment Exercises and Quality Assurance Agency systems encourage the closure of smaller departments, such as happened at Exeter, and despite sometimes excellent ratings. Aside from the obvious concerns with respect to a) narrowness of educational purpose (virtually equating higher education with the pursuit of economic goals), b) creation of a Soviet-style centralized and inefficient educational bureaucracy to collect and crunch the numbers and to enforce policy, and c) the encouragement of

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

competition among universities, there is the problem of research quality. Although government officials claim that the Research Assessment Exercises (RAEs) in England have contributed to “gains in research,” those gains appear to have more to do with frequency of publication than with research quality (although the politicians would like the public to confuse the two). There is little evidence showing that they actually work to improve research or education in ways that are clearly demonstrable or that are worth the massive investment in public money and bureaucracy.⁴³ But then this is only to be expected given that few people in today’s wider education debates are talking about “the deeper meaning of quality.”⁴⁴ Very likely these RAEs only serve political and not truly educational ends. What matters is that government is *seen* to be imposing discipline on universities, and not that those institutions actually improve (for to do that we’d have to severely restrict enrolment to the talented). It is more about perception and political spin than it is about real progress.

I hear that the English government is now moving to replace the RAEs with a simpler and “cheaper, ‘research metrics’ formula for evaluating research productivity.”⁴⁵ This just proves that the critics were right about the bureaucratic inefficiency and other problems with these measures. Apparently researchers are now going to be evaluated based on the amount of research money they attract, numbers of graduates, and citation counts. These criteria, however, likely have more to do with university finances than with the pursuit of academic excellence.⁴⁶ In any event, this move won’t help music teacher educators much for the reason that it will almost inevitably result in a research hierarchy in the university with “gadget intensive sciences at the top, positivist social science in the middle, and humanities at the bottom.”⁴⁷ Music educators and scholars in the humanities generally can’t compete with scientists and academics in business with respect to attracting large amounts of research money or developing marketable products. Finally, and as with the older RAEs, because these kinds of measures are often tied to government priorities and economic goals, they will likely still encourage “conservatism in the choice of research topic and in recruitment.”⁴⁸ I’m not at all sure that publication of a deliberately controversial book such as mine would even be permitted under this kind of assessment regime. And in fact my manuscript was rejected by Cambridge University Press (although admittedly that was an early draft).

Music Education Standards as a Measure of “Value for Money”

Many of the above criticisms of the PIs and RAEs apply to the current and obsessive emphasis on educational standards in schools and universities; that they 1) are tied to government and corporate economic priorities,⁴⁹ 2) encourage conservatism in teaching and learning, and 3) do not necessarily contribute to improvements in the quality of learning. Indeed, if the anecdotal testimony of some leading British musicians is to be believed, even after years of standards talk public musical standards in England continue to decline.⁵⁰ Nor, according to Julia Eklund Koza and Colwell, is there much interest in debating the validity of music education standards.⁵¹ MENC, for example, deliberately discourages criticism of the National Music Education Standards because it is thought to be disruptive and thus counterproductive to the primary goal of American music education, which is to inculcate in children the knowledge and skills needed to compete globally.⁵² Music education’s purpose, too, has become primarily economic. This is unfortunate because it distorts the nature and purpose of music education, turning what should be an exercise in the development of critical awareness, human potentiality, and spirit into a competitive race to maintain world economic, military, and cultural dominance. Now this may sound paranoid on my part, but you’ll recall that it was exactly that kind of language that was employed in the 1983 report *A Nation at Risk: The Imperative for Educational Reform*. It’s just taken a quarter of a century for that kind of neoconservative and imperialist rhetoric and propaganda to permeate all of American education, and including music education.⁵³

Given that the national standards are now woven into the fabric of many American schools and universities, influencing not just school and university curricula but also how the work of music teachers, academics, and students is assessed, we should not expect a pendulum swing in the other direction anytime soon.⁵⁴ The situation in American universities is especially troubling with respect to the national standards not just because music teacher educators seem resigned to them but because in at least some states they are now held accountable for addressing them in their curricula. Thus far school music teachers can still choose to ignore the national standards but only because,

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

unlike in England, there is no national school inspectorate to enforce them. Nor to my knowledge are school teachers and programs subject to academic review, as are university schools of music and individual faculty, although in the current political climate that is bound to eventually happen as politicians attempt to establish more direct control over public education through various accountability measures.⁵⁵ In the meantime, MENC has already expressed its willingness to enforce compliance with the national standards. The MENC website calls for the re-education of music teachers to better comply with, and teach for, national standards and for the development of appropriate measures for ensuring that children's learning "is in line with those standards."⁵⁶

Similarly, in England, The Office for Standards in Education (Ofsted) Strategic Plan for 2005-2008 authoritatively states that "the school workforce will be remodeled" (not how or whether it should) and that it is considering "a review of the effectiveness of teachers' continuing development."⁵⁷ The authors of the second Music Manifesto report also declare their intention to "drive up the quality of music education workforce by ensuring nationally recognized and compatible standards."⁵⁸ The report's authors might just as easily be talking about assembly line workers or a herd of cattle as about the teaching profession. And rather than challenging and encouraging music and other teachers to engage in vigorous debate about educational aims and their potential realization, thereby empowering them to seek improvements, government and MENC would prefer to simply impose change.

Things are probably most difficult for music teachers in England, where schools are subject to considerable regulation and an endless cycle of inspection through Ofsted and are charged with "developing a skilled and motivated workforce that takes pride in its work and that is both innovative and accountable" and "focusing . . . resources appropriately to ensure a professional service and value for money" (whatever that means).⁵⁹ Even the new and much hyped Music Manifesto seeks to "develop a world-class workforce in music education" so that England can "remain at the forefront of [the] global music" industry. Ultimately, the authors of the second Music Manifesto report seem less concerned with children's happiness and personal fulfillment as with making the United Kingdom "*the world's creative hub*"[italics mine].⁶⁰ It's worth noting that the

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

Music Manifesto is being administered by the Department of Culture, Media, and Sport, which functions as a music industry sponsor and “advocate within Government.”⁶¹ Surely this is a conflict of interest in which the music industry’s needs may take precedence over those of children and of the wider population of amateur musicians? One would think that this educational initiative would be administered by the Department of Education. There is also the matter of significant public money going to subsidize private musical enterprise when the bulk of it should arguably be invested in state schools where the vast majority of children already reside but which in many cases lack adequate music education resources (this is actually acknowledged in the second report of the Music Manifesto).

I also can’t help wondering if all of this is part of a deliberate attempt by government to de-professionalize school teaching while catering to neoliberals and others seeking to deregulate public education through the World Trade Organization. As Welsh music educator Ruth Wright observes, “moves to vocationalise” the high school curriculum already signal “a rejection of the academic knowledge possessed by teachers . . . in place of knowledge more useful to the world of ‘work and life.’”⁶² And in fact, the second report of the Music Manifesto defines the term music educator very broadly, including school and university music teachers but also community musicians and “others who work in the music industry.” They are all just “music education providers,” workers, and partners.⁶³ Music teaching is being redefined as just another trade, thereby making it potentially subject to the WTO’s General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS). If eventually ratified by the various countries involved, GATS would “promote free trade in education services by guaranteeing open markets for all providers, whether public or private, nonprofit or profit.”⁶⁴ And one of the first things that would likely happen is that governments would lose their ability to regulate music teacher qualifications and accreditation (because they are seen by some countries as barriers to free trade). Obviously this could have dire implications for the profession, not to mention national sovereignty, and not just in Britain.

Can We Talk About Politics?

Predictably, most of my critics thus far, and including several in this present issue, have ignored all this talk of politics, educational aims, and moral and social responsibility to focus on narrowly musical, technical, or philosophical issues that frankly don't matter much in the wider scheme of things. Garnett and David Elliott, for example, dispute my claim that classically trained composers and performers have a communication problem with their audiences, while Heidi Westerlund writes in the *Philosophy of Music Education Review* that I don't have much to say about "Dewey's notion of the aesthetic," which is true.⁶⁵ Elliott similarly complains that I don't have much to say about how students are to be helped to make "informed judgments of musical quality" or how they might become passionate and dedicated musicians, consumers, and teachers. But that's because mine is a political philosophy and vision and less a philosophy of music or art (although there are connections. I'll have more to say about that on another occasion). I'm not interested in defining the nature of music or of musical experience except how it is qualified by events, people, and circumstances in the wider world. Indeed, I'm inclined to agree with Wayne Bowman that "it is at least possible to hear anything musically" and that, further, "one sonorous system's noise may be another's music and vice versa."⁶⁶

My primary concern is that the idea of music in schools and universities is all too often taken for granted and taught as divorced from the world and from other subjects and fields of study, including art, literature, philosophy, world history, religion, and, yes, even economics. If nothing else, my book reveals how music and music education are often implicated in social and political problems (for example, how the American National Anthem Project might contribute to the problems of American chauvinism and exceptionalism). All I'm saying is that music, like drama, literature, history, or science, should be a serious subject of study in school and university and no longer relegated to the status of a "frill" subject or as something taught purely for its own sake. Thus, and while I would hope that students derive enjoyment from music classes, they should also gain an understanding of the sometimes brute realities of the world and of how music can be used to shape individual and collective consciousness.

Far being dualistic in my thinking, as Elliott charges, I'm calling for balance between intellect and emotion (both are needed); enjoyment and social and political

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

awareness; quantitative and qualitative research and assessment (there is currently an imbalance in favor of the latter); classical and other kinds of music; performance and other kinds of skills and musical knowledge; a musical and a liberal education etc. It was Elliott who was saying that a liberal education probably wasn't appropriate for children and that performance should be taught as an end in itself.⁶⁷ Obviously, and as Elliott now seems to agree, it's never a question of one or the other. Elliott is thus exaggerating when he says that we are "completely at odds," since my book acknowledges that he is motivated by a democratic interest and, further, that he is a liberal of sorts. I'm just saying that his conception of democracy is a soft one, which he now appears to be admitting, just as he concedes that he hasn't talked enough about politics in general and about the ethics of practice. Where we disagree most is with respect to the importance of music performance, which I think is often over-rated, and the fact that in his philosophy students are more or less cloistered from the wider world *beyond* music. Elliott has little to say about how music relates to the wider world and its problems, including the problem of conflicting musical values in contemporary society and the dangers of assuming an economic purpose for music education.⁶⁸ That is what I meant by the subtitle "Performance Alone," not that Elliott's philosophy is literally only about performing or that performance classes can't become sites in which democratic values and virtues are modeled and taught (see page 36 in my book). Perhaps I should have used the subtitle "Music Alone" instead of "Performance Alone" to describe his vision, but that wouldn't have captured his meaning that the future happiness of children depends on their ability to seek growth and enjoyment *through* music performance, divorced it seemed from a liberal education and the wider world.⁶⁹

Elliott continues in his critique by saying that none of this is new (which begs the question of why he didn't make his democratic interest more central in his own book or talk about music's potential abuse in the shaping of individual and collective consciousness), that lots of other theorists and teachers in other fields have been calling for a democratic purpose for education. That's true of course, as is freely acknowledged in my preface. As with Elliott's own books, much of my own original contribution consists in applying ideas gleaned from other disciplines and fields to music education. After all, it would be foolish to try to write a book on democracy and *music* education

without drawing on literature in related fields, including political science and education. I also acknowledge that other music education thinkers have published relevant articles before my book (although Elliott doesn't seem to be aware that I published various articles on democratic themes between 1995 and 2001, before I began writing *Democracy and Music Education* in earnest).⁷⁰ I think I'm correct, however, in claiming that my book is the first in our field since James Mursell's in the 1950s to make democracy its central theme.⁷¹ It is also the first book to locate music education practice within the larger political debates of our time (although Lucy Green's 1988 book *Music On Deaf Ears: Musical Meaning, Ideology and Education* addresses some similar concerns. It's well worth revisiting).⁷²

This leads to Elliott's next criticism, which is that the several pedagogical suggestions provided, for example using informal learning strategies etc., are also hardly novel or radical. That, too, is true. But then I never said that I was a radical or that my pedagogical strategies were somehow new (I may have stated at one point that my intention was, like Dewey, to be a radical liberal, but that just means attempting to actually practice what one preaches and not just mouth platitudes). Rather, and as is clearly stated at both the outset and at the conclusion of my book, I am a moderate. I have no intention of destroying tradition. What is new about my book (or at least hardly discussed since Mursell in the 1950s) is the deliberate coupling of democratic principles with music pedagogy and the suggestion that the kinds of very specific political and other problems addressed therein should be included in music and music education curricula (e.g., music as a propaganda tool or weapon, censorship, issues of power and control, ethics of practice, etc.).

The final charges that Elliott makes to be addressed here are that I generalize and resort to invective. You'll recall that Garnett, too, accused me of generalizing, although she was in the end willing to concede that I may be correct in my assertions, for example, that classically trained composers and performers have a communication problem with their audiences and that the vast majority of the public rejects, or is indifferent to, classical music. Elliott provides several counter-examples of recent composers who have reached out to larger audiences while also referring to the existence of hundreds of professional orchestras and youth and community orchestras in the United States. That's

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

good news, since I don't wish to see the demise of professional orchestras or of classical music. But while I tend to generalize on occasion for the sake of argument—it's difficult to talk about anything of importance to society without generalizing to some extent—Elliott's few counter-examples are hardly sufficient proof that orchestras, classical music, and contemporary composers have somehow captured the wider public's interest and imagination.⁷³ Anyone who reads the *International Musician* knows that in North America professional orchestras outside of the major cities have been in trouble for some time and that sales of so-called classical music sales have similarly been in decline (although I understand that there has recently been a slight reversal in some places. The situation is by no means hopeless). Even some orchestras in major cities such as Toronto have recently been on the verge of financial collapse.

Elliott might prefer to look at the bright side, but as Alex Ross reports in *The New Yorker* article to which Elliott refers, the future looks bleak for those and other American musicians whose performances “lack mainstream commercial allure.”⁷⁴ Edward Rothstein probably captures the mood of the wider public in his very recent article in *The New York Times* entitled “Classical Music Imperiled: Can We Hear the Shrug?”⁷⁵ His title says it all.

And as for my assertion that today's classically-trained composers have a communication problem with the public, it goes without saying that most could not survive without the patronage of conservatories and university schools of music, those descendants and modern day equivalents of the medieval monastery or convent. As Julian Johnson explains in *Who Needs Classical Music* (2002), contemporary composers are by definition marginal because they avoid the everyday.⁷⁶ There's admittedly a need for more research on all of this, but if sales of recordings during the mid-1990s and first years of this century are any indication only about 2 to 5 percent of the population is invested in classical music.⁷⁷ I thus can't take seriously Elliott's apparent belief that contemporary composers and classical music have captured the wider public's interest, anymore that I can believe those who dispute global warming. And rather than simply ignoring the problem, I'd prefer that we face the problem head on.

This brings me to the problem of my book's reception. I've already explained my purpose at the outset of this paper, so I won't repeat myself too much here. Elliott and

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

Garnett both think that I'm too harsh and uncompromising in my rhetoric. It's true that my language is often pointed, but when writing the book I was determined not be saccharine or to become just another cheerleader for the profession. I'm aware, however, that some teachers and music education majors resent me, which is a disappointment because it is probably based on a misreading. Although at times very critical (nothing is sacred) of the profession, I have great faith in the intelligence and capacity of the common man and woman, including everyday music teachers, to address the kinds of problems and challenges presented in my book. Further, and as previously suggested, many of those problems and questions can be used to enrich the curriculum (e.g., music as manipulation, consideration of the provenance of individual folk songs etc.) by making it more socially relevant and interesting to students. In the end I'm advocating social responsibility coupled with a healthy skepticism with respect to the roles of government, experts, and other authority figures, including music education philosophers and professional leaders, in our lives. This is a liberating idea because it suggests that no one knows for certain how to teach or perform and that, further, that there is room and a need in music teaching for individual creativity and vision. Some teachers may find this freedom threatening, and particularly those who are socially and politically conservative, but in the end they can take what they want from my book. I'm not interested in prescribing professional practice or in dominating music education philosophy. But regardless of whether teachers agree with me I would hope that we could have an intelligent and friendly conversation so as to clarify our respective positions while perhaps doing more research into the various kinds of problems identified in my book.

I'm thus grateful to Garnett, Westerlund, Elliott and other critics who in the spirit of friendship have taken issue with me or expanded on some of my ideas (as John Finney, Patrick Schmidt and Kirsten Locke have also done). Schmidt, for example, raises an interesting point about the need for conflict and confrontation in a democracy. The questions that immediately arise, however, are "how much conflict and insurrection should be tolerated" and "couldn't this rhetoric potentially radicalize students?" I know what Schmidt means, but there are different kinds and degrees of confrontation and if we're not careful this kind of talk may potentially lead to hatred, aggression, and violence. These are interesting questions but they'll have to wait for another time as I

need to say something in response to Elizabeth Gould and Michael Peters, both of whom are unfriendly.

Gould takes this point about the need for conflict to an extreme in stating that “outrage and contempt fashion new worlds.” She also makes the bizarre claim that “not one [of the western liberal democracies] . . . has managed to guarantee, let alone provide, freedom, justice, and equality for its citizens at any given time” (as if any political system could, or that there has been no progress at all?). It was just this kind of one-sided and expressly ideological thinking that I had in mind when complaining in chapter three that “too many contemporary theorists . . . seem to know the answers to their questions before they have been asked” (pp. 53-54). I like and respect Gould, but her cynical and purely negative attack on the notion of liberal democracy and the common good is actually very conservative. For in urging students to have “utter contempt” for public institutions and programs, including presumably national health care and public education, she is siding with those on the political Far Right who wish to dismantle and destroy them. That can only harm those whom she would most like to serve.⁷⁸ I thus don’t think that she is acting responsibly in valorizing outrage and fury (surely some outrage is unwarranted or even pathological?) and in depicting a liberal music education as merely providing students opportunities to make decisions or as only contributing to assimilation and dominance.

Unfortunately, Gould chose to ignore my book so I don’t know if she realizes that I define liberalism differently (see page 15). One can only assume that she doesn’t want to talk to me about these and other things such as, for example, what it means to engage “the other in terms of her anger, rage, and fury” or what a democracy based on “difference and dissent” might look like (which sounds like a very liberal idea!). Further, and because she doesn’t present a plausible alternative to the status quo or provide any practical advice, her paper remains at the level of generality and abstract theorizing. Of more immediate concern to me, however, is the black and white, axis of evil quality of her rhetoric. She appears absolutely convinced that she and those who think similarly are right, which is ironic given her interest in a democratic model based on difference and dissent. There appears to be no interest in dialogue, which is a disappointment because I’m sure that there is much with which we could agree if she would just talk directly to

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

me about concrete everyday problems and without resorting as much to abstract theorizing.

While I don't know if Gould actually read my book I'm convinced that Peters only read a portion of it, otherwise he would never have made the claims that my philosophy is distinctly American and that I hold the American nation as "significant and sacrosanct." Nor would he have complained that I failed to consider "To what extent does [Dewey's] notion of shared interests and community enable an understanding of the emerging political economy of neoliberalism?" Anyone who has read *Democracy and Music Education* in its entirety (or even just chapters two and four) knows that it offers a sustained critique of neoliberal and neoconservative social and educational policies in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, and elsewhere. I have elaborated on that critique in this current paper with reference to very recent political and educational developments in those countries (thus the second part of this paper's title, "Beyond *Democracy and Music Education*." I don't want to repeat myself too much). Outside of the United States the book can even be read as a form of resistance to American hegemony as, for example, in Canada where we are constantly bombarded by the American media, where music educators are dependent on the American publishing industry for much of their printed music and supplies, and where school instrumental music programs follow an American model. The book is also in several key respects more Canadian than American (although for strategic reasons I don't trumpet that fact), for example, in my commitment to the idea of a common good that includes strong national health care and social welfare systems, my corresponding rejection of rugged individualism, a wariness of patriotic excess, and a belief in the importance of multilateralism in foreign affairs. Among prominent Canadian thinkers who have influenced me are former Liberal Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau, public intellectual John Ralston Saul, political scientist Janice Gross Stein, journalist and historian Gwynne Dyer, and music composer R. Murray Schafer. Saul, Stein, and Schafer are in fact quoted and referenced by me more frequently than is American Richard Rorty (on whom Peters places undue emphasis).⁷⁹

Peters is thus singing the wrong tune when he describes my book as "unapologetically American," just as he is wrong in thinking that it is simply an

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

application of Dewey's philosophy to music education. Rather, as Westerlund acknowledges in her own review, "Woodford borrows ideas from many thinkers creating an interesting synthesis and lines of thought throughout the book."⁸⁰ Aside from the brief overview of his philosophy in chapter one and a handful of references in chapter two, Dewey's name appears infrequently thereafter. That was deliberate because I wished to develop my own voice and not just mouth Dewey, but also because I was aware of the pitfalls of relying too much on a long dead philosopher from another age and country. My intention was to be selective and to simply use him to provide a loose frame of reference and starting point for my own theorizing about many of today's problems. It also occurred to me that the kinds of democratic principles outlined by Dewey and other thinkers, and especially those from the Anglo-American tradition, could be used to hold politicians, teachers, and others accountable to a democratic standard, on their own terms, and in their own everyday language. As Jacques Derrida insists, language matters (which is ironic considering that postmodernists are notorious for their vague and jargon-laden language).⁸¹ We hear a lot of talk nowadays from government and other leaders about freedom, accountability, and choice, but not enough about honesty, integrity, and personal and social responsibility.

Peters, however, glosses over much of this talk of politics and real world problems to quibble over purely philosophical considerations such as, for example, my definition of postmodernism in chapter three. He has nothing to say about my purpose in that chapter, which was to caution against what I perceived to be a destructive tendency among radical feminists and self-identified postmodernists in music education with respect to society, its traditions, and institutions. Gould's paper epitomizes that kind of thinking while drawing, for example, on the work of Gilles Deleuze and bell hooks. As Kirsten Locke correctly observes, my interest here is with the ethics of professional practice, how music educators might approach change without resorting to elitism, a tyranny of the majority, or some form of extremism. Among other things, I'm calling for more reflexivity and collegiality with respect to how we approach professional problems while also revealing how music education is implicated in the blocking of the very kinds of dialogical communities needed to address them. Quite probably our greatest problems are internal to the profession. MENC's discouragement of debate about the U.S. National

Woodford, P. (2008). Fear and Loathing in Music Education? Beyond Democracy and Music Education. *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 7/1: 105-38.
http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Woodford7_1.pdf

Standards for Music Education is one such example of a blockage of professional dialogue. Peters' hostility and condescending language can also be seen as contributing to blockage, albeit on a smaller scale. Clearly he is not interested in dialogue or collegiality.

The Need for Professional Vision

Despite Gould's evasion of my book and Peters' hostility and confrontational style they still made me think, although I would have much preferred a more friendly approach. Several of the reviews of my book in other professional journals, however, are just book reports that merely summarize without engaging with or elaborating on my ideas. You'll find examples of such book reports in the *Music Educators Journal*, *American Music Teacher*, and *Research in Music Education*.⁸² This, however, is to be expected, since, as Finney observes, "Politics, morality and the social order are rarely spoken . . . of amongst music educators at all."⁸³ But as Colwell says, we need more personal and professional skepticism of the kind "that asks to what extent do music and music education contribute to a better life in a just society."⁸⁴ Sam Hope, Executive Director of the National Association of Schools of Music in the United States, similarly calls for a bigger professional vision that goes far beyond the music classroom and performance skill to speak to higher educational aspirations such as "Freedom, honor, compassion, and generosity." This is desperately needed to counteract the current vision for education that is based on accountability, the consolidation of power, and a "corresponding lack of respect for local knowledge and initiative."⁸⁵ It's when society lacks that kind of grander and more humane educational vision that the "forces of centralization" seek to fill that vacuum by appropriating educational evaluation as means of consolidating power. Sound familiar? Referring to the 2006 report of the U.S. Secretary of Education on the future of higher education, Hope complains that it portrays a vision based not on service or progress but on winning and fear.⁸⁶ "What is our vision," he asks, and "what do we want to happen in terms of music? Too often, this kind of question is not as central to us as it might be."⁸⁷

My book provides one such vision for music education that goes beyond performance and the classroom to speak to the global assembly of minds and that, further,

is motivated by love and hope; not fear and hatred. I'm thus puzzled by some of the emotional reactions to my book since, if you read the last two chapters, you'll see that I'm trying to be constructive. As Colwell says, we need more criticism of this kind that, while sometimes difficult to hear, is meant to be constructive and to "advance the profession."⁸⁸ We need more controversial "idea" books for the profession and for the public that help explain why and how music and music education matter, beyond performance, and we need to begin analyzing and contributing to the political realm. Academics such as Noam Chomsky, John Ralston Saul, Janice Gross Stein, Howard Zinn, and Henry Giroux should be viewed by those of us in academia as potential professional role models for their commitment to the public good and because they have long exemplified the kinds of political engagement in educational and other wider debates that are needed if music educators are to have a voice in the global assembly of minds. All of them have gone beyond their own narrow academic fields or disciplines and abstract theorizing to provide moral and social leadership, although they are hardly gentle in their criticisms. Unfortunately, and although one can easily think of recent examples of successful social activism in support of music education by professional musicians, including prominent orchestra conductors in the United Kingdom, we music teacher educators are by comparison mere dilettantes.⁸⁹ Some of us teach for social justice in our classrooms but often fail to engage with the world, or even with other fields and disciplines within academia. But as John Ralston Saul insists,

Now is the time to take risks with our lives – risks as citizens. Now is the time to get used to being original, to criticizing in a loud voice, to using our imagination for the long term. . . . Each of us and all of us must act in an imaginative, ethical, and cutting-edge way.⁹⁰

One way of contributing our critical voices to the global assembly of minds is through our research. There is a desperate need for scholarship that transcends national and cultural boundaries to examine, for example, the effects of globalizing tendencies on music education and the arts throughout the world (such as, for example, the above mentioned attempt by those within the World Trade Organization to deregulate public education). We are all members of a global village and need to take a broader view that takes into account, for example, the different ways that New Right educational policies are being implemented throughout the world.

One of my own doctoral students, for example, is about to begin a comparative study of national music education advocacy efforts in Canada and Australia. Already she has noted how constitutional and/or structural differences between those countries either exacerbate or mitigate the effects of neoliberal social and educational policies on music education. Another of my doctoral students is doing a case study of the effects of globalization, European integration and democratization on music education in Romania. Similar studies involving other countries are needed if the profession and music education majors are to understand the various political and other forces acting upon them and if they are to anticipate future threats. I'm willing to bet that most American and Canadian music educators today know very little about politics and music education in the United Kingdom or elsewhere. The point is that ideas and ideology travel well and that North Americans in particular can no longer afford to ignore or isolate themselves from the rest of world. That's why we need in-depth and critical studies of government led initiatives such as the Music Manifesto so as to help music teachers and others see through ministry propaganda and thus better anticipate and, if warranted, defend against their importation.

Finally, for present purposes, we need more conceptual studies exploring and presenting different democratic visions that may inform and inspire music educators while empowering them to contribute to the shaping of professional and public opinion (that's another reason for the second part of this paper's title, "Beyond *Democracy and Music Education*"). And all of us in education need to be vociferous in reminding government and the public that democracy is not synonymous with capitalism and that there are alternative political visions to those on the extreme political Right or Left. Thus far, however, and while I've noticed a welcome growth of interest of late in policy analysis among music education scholars, the idea of democracy as it relates to music education remains under-defined and more or less taken for granted as a self-evident truth. As already mentioned, it can be dangerous if we don't first define what we mean while considering the possible consequences. For there are many different conceptions of democracy and some of them (such as the currently prevailing one in which democracy is considered as virtually synonymous with global Free Trade and unbridled capitalism) may be detrimental to public music education. I have provided one social democratic

vision, but, as was acknowledged in *Democracy and Music Education*, I've literally only scratched the surface. There are other possible visions, including conservative ones, needing to be heard. Conservative Roger Scruton, for example, has some very interesting things to say about art, politics and education.⁹¹ And in fact there is much in his vision with which I personally agree, for example, that immigrants should be expected to adapt to democratic society. We need more philosophers and researchers to contribute their voices with respect to what a democratic purpose for music education means and entails. As for those who disagree with my vision, or take exception to my criticisms, I would urge them to contribute their own constructive ideas and visions to professional and public forums so we can learn from each other.

Notes

¹ An earlier and much shorter draft of this paper was presented 12 April 2007 at the conference for Research in Music Education (RIME) at the University of Exeter, England. I wish to thank Richard Colwell and Wayne Bowman for their helpful comments on this paper, and the editors of ACT for inviting me to respond to my critics in this journal.

² Allan Bloom, *The Closing of the American Mind: How Higher Education Has Failed Democracy and Impoverished The Souls of Today's Students* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1987), 69.

³ This reminds me of Theodor Adorno's "disjunction between ideas and material reality, a gap within which the former might be useful, indeed, even 'effective,' but never eternally or comprehensively true. There were, in Adorno's view, grave dangers associated with equating ideas and reality." Tia DeNora, *After Adorno: Rethinking Music Sociology* (Cambridge U. Press, 2003), 4. DeNora also talks about the "humility of knowledge" (5).

⁴ Richard Colwell, "Can We Be Friends?" *Council for Research in Music Education Bulletin*, no. 166 (Fall 2005): 75-91. Colwell observes that there is a dearth of criticism in the music education research community.

⁵ Bhikhu Parekh, "Fighting the War on Dogma," *Canadian Association of University Teachers Bulletin* 53, no. 9 (November 2006): A3, A8. Originally published in the 28 July 2006 edition of the *Times Higher Education Supplement*.

⁶ According to Donald Macedo, in the period leading up to the second invasion of Iraq, sixty per cent of American "college students believed that Iraq had something to do with 9/11," this despite all evidence to the contrary. Howard Zinn blames this fact on the "total lack of critical thinking found in schools to counterbalance the propaganda apparatus" of the state. Howard Zinn and Donald Macedo, *On Democratic Education* (Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers, 2005), 54.

⁷ As Parekh insists, if thinking is the “lifeblood” of the university, then “those who refuse to think [or who aren’t willing to critically examine their own beliefs] do not really belong” there. Parekh, “Fighting the War on Dogma,” A8. Bloom says something similar in *The Closing of the American Mind*. A true liberal education “requires that the student’s whole life be radically changed by it, that what he learns may affect his action, his tastes, his choices, that no previous attachment be immune to examination and hence re-evaluation” (p. 370). As for keeping an open mind with respect to criticism of professional practice, Mortimer J. Adler, in his *How To Read a Book: The Art of Getting a Liberal Education* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1966) reminds readers of the principle of charity, which is that they should try to empathize with and understand the writer before criticizing. People often rush to judgment or misinterpret.

⁸ John Stuart Mill, *On Liberty*, ed. David Spitz (New York: W.W. Norton, 1975).

⁹ Liz Garnett, Review of the Book *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics, and the Politics of Practice*, by Paul Woodford, *Music and Letters* 87, no. 3 (2006): 478-480.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ *The London Free Press*, 27 September, 2006, A4. See also *AUCC Update*, the newsletter of the Association of Universities and Colleges of Canada, 8 (October, 2006): 4.

¹² This was John Snobelen, Minister of Education for the Province of Ontario from 1995 to 1997. Interestingly, Snobelen has recently been charged with “careless storage of a firearm, unauthorized possession of a firearm and unlawful acquisition of a firearm.” *London Free Press*, 13 January 2007, B2.

¹³ According to Flaherty, education is one of the three budget priorities of the current Conservative government. The other two priorities are the economy and the environment. The Conservatives suddenly developed an interest in environmentalism after the election of new Liberal leader Stephane Dion in the Fall of 2006. *The London Free Press*, 10 February 2007, D1.

¹⁴ The Democrats in the United States regained control of Congress in November, 2006. This was the first time that they had control of Congress since 1994. See Beth Gorham, “Democrats Control Congress,” *The London Free Press*, 9 November 2006, A5.

¹⁵ Richard J. Bernstein, *The Abuse of Evil: The Corruption of Politics and Religion Since 9/11* (Polity, 2005), 15.

¹⁶ For more about MENC’s National Anthem Project see Constance Bumgarner Gee’s paper “Future of Art Music: Advocacy that Works” (paper presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting of the National Association of Schools of Music, Chicago). <http://nasm.arts-accredit.org>. Accessed 22 February 2007.

¹⁷ Chomsky claims that the propaganda industry was actually invented by the British during the First World War. The Ministry of Information was created for the express purpose of directing world thought. Noam Chomsky, *Imperial Ambitions: Conversations on the Post 9/11 World* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2005), 19. His source is Randall Marlin’s *Propaganda and the Ethics of Persuasion* (Broadview Press, 2002), 66.

¹⁸ Chomsky, like Howard Zinn, has a lot to say about the aims of education in democratic societies and how political and business leaders often don’t want schools to create

informed citizens with minds of their own. See Chomsky's chapter "Democracy and Education" in *Imperial Ambitions* (170-183). I also recommend Joel Bakan's *The Corporation: The Pathological Pursuit of Profit and Power* (Toronto: Penguin Books, 2004). Bakan says that today's schools seem more interested in creating consumers than decent human beings (127).

¹⁹ Woodrow Wilson's oft-repeated but conceptually vague call for self-determination of nations following World War One contributed to all sorts of problems in countries made up of different ethnic groups. Many of those groups were inspired by Wilson's rhetoric and sought to claim nation status (much like Francophone Quebecers in Canada today). Wilson later admitted his ignorance of geo-politics and grew to regret his high-minded rhetoric. See Margaret MacMillan, *Paris 1919: Six Months that Changed the World* (New York: Random House, 2001), viii.

²⁰ John Lukacs, *Democracy and Populism: Fear and Hatred* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 2005), 208-209. Of course hatred and fear exist in all of us. The point that Lukacs is making is that one or the other tends to prevail (47). For a history of the political Right's public relations campaign to win the hearts and minds of Americans, and then to export their ideology to other countries, see Lewis Lapham's *Pretensions to Empire: Notes on the Criminal Folly of the Bush Administration* (New York: The New Press, 2006). According to Chomsky, the Republicans have capitalized on the events and aftermath of 9/11 to create a culture of fear that has sustained them in political power while they work to "destroy the institutional basis for social support systems" and while also undermining constitutional rights. *Imperial Ambitions*, 25. See also Al Gore's *The Assault on Reason* (New York: Penguin Press, 2007).

²¹ In Canada, evangelical Christian columnist Michael Coren recently attacked the Supreme Court as a bunch of "unelected and unaccountable" judges for determining that the government's security certificate system violated the Charter of Rights and Freedoms. Coren contends that we are in "a great cultural war against terrorists" and that government should thus be permitted to arrest and detain terror suspects regardless of Charter rights. Michael Coren, "Surprisingly Foolish," *London Free Press*, 3 March 2007, A14. Those who disagree with him are simplistically described as "'repugnant fellow travelers" or "complete fools." For him, there is no middle ground and thus no possibility of debate.

²² Steven Brown and Ulrik Volgsten, eds., *Music and Manipulation: On the Social Use and Social Control of Music* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2006). See also Jonathan Ritter and J. Martin Daughtry, eds., *Music in the Post-911 World* (New York: Routledge, 2007).

²³ Lukacs, *Democracy and Populism*, 47. Lukacs reminds us that "the 'why' is so often latent in the 'how.'" Students should thus be encouraged to critically examine methodologies while attempting to identify underlying assumptions and ideologies. This has obvious implications for music education. For more about how schools render children passive, see Chomsky, *Imperial Ambitions*, 32.

²⁴ Jonathan R. Cole, "Intellectual Diversity in the U.S.: To What End," *Academic Matters* (Fall 2006): 13-16. See also in the same issue Gargi Bhattacharyya, "Britain's Anti-

Terrorism Laws: What is the Agenda,” (8-9); Jenny Hocking, “Australia’s Anti-Terror Laws Target Ideas, Debate, and Dissent” (10-12), and Mark Rosenfeld, “Academic Freedom and Public Policy: Government Policy Promoting the Erosion of University Autonomy is a Grave Threat to Academic Freedom” (32). Cole’s paper raises specific concerns about David Horowitz’s proposed Academic Bill of Rights that is being contemplated by many state legislatures. While claiming to promote intellectual diversity and “balance,” Horowitz is said to be really attempting to reign in what he and fellow conservatives perceive to be a leftist-liberal professoriate by making faculty more accountable to government. If Horowitz and his fellow conservatives are successful, faculty in the sciences, for example, may well be forced to teach Christian “intelligent design” alongside Darwin’s Theory of Evolution. Parekh, in “Fighting the War on Dogma,” expresses similar concerns about the British government’s strictures on freedom of speech in Britain’s universities, particularly with respect to anything that might be perceived as justifying terrorism (A8). One can easily imagine an academic being censored for simply talking in class about the historic role of British and American imperialism in the Middle East and in other parts of the world and how that likely fostered resentment. See also *Chomsky’s Imperial Ambitions*, 179-180.

²⁵ John Beck, “Makeover or Takeover? The Strange Death of Educational Autonomy in Neo-Liberal England,” *British Journal of Sociology of Education* 2, no. 2 (June, 1999): 231. See also Chomsky’s *Imperial Ambitions* and Lapham’s *Pretensions to Empire*. Canadian journalist Greg Weston reveals how the new federal Accountability Act proposed by the recently elected Conservatives would “add twelve new blanket exemptions and exclusions, almost doubling the current number of secrecy provisions preventing certain kinds of government documents from being released.” Ironically, and although the federal Conservatives campaigned on a promise of greater accountability, they are in reality a very secretive government. Greg Weston, “Harper Spin Falls On Its Face,” *The London Free Press*, 13 October 2006, A8. The Federal Accountability Act was passed on December 12, 2006. *AUCC Update* 1 (February 2007): 3.

²⁶ This was one of the hidden reasons for the creation of the quango state in England, where much of the responsibility for defining and implementing policy was downloaded to “centrally appointed quasi-nongovernmental organizations.” Desmond King and Stewart Wood, “The Political Economy of Neoliberalism: Britain and the United States in the 1980s,” in *Continuity and Change in Contemporary Capitalism*, eds. Herbert Kitschelt, Peter Lange, Gary Marks, and John D. Stephens (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999). Quangos were invented during the 1980s as part of a move to downsize and insulate government from public scrutiny and political fallout from unpopular decisions (390). According to Beck, in “Makeover or Takeover,” quangos are “quasi-autonomous and politically ‘neutral’ managers” that are constitutionally protected “to some degree from both effective parliamentary scrutiny as well as from criticism from ‘below’” (231).

²⁷ Lapham, *Pretensions to Empire*, 9.

²⁸ Alex Ross, “No Musician Left Behind,” *The New Yorker*, 4 September 2006, 83. For a personal account of the decline of orchestras and classical music in the United States and

the dilemma facing classical musicians, see Blair Tindall's *Mozart in the Jungle: Sex, Drugs, and Classical Music* (New York: Atlantic Monthly Press, 2005), 298-307.

²⁹ Ross, "No Musician Left Behind," 83.

³⁰ Nick Crowe, "Melody Makers," *Prospect Magazine*, no. 124 (July 2006): www.prospect-magazine.co.uk/article_details.php?id.7538. See also an online BBC News Report, "UK Children Can't Name a Composer," <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/entertainment/music/2229138.stm>.

³¹ King and Wood, "The Political Economy of Neoliberalism." These and other neoliberal reforms and strategies were considered "an investment against the possibility of a return to traditional social democracy" (390). See also Beck's "Makeover or Takeover." Beck refers to the "machinery of the 'quango state' through which policy is not merely implemented and monitored, but also, increasingly, defined" (231). In Canada, according to journalist Carol Goar, the "welfare state is history." She bases her assessment on the work of Ernie Lightman, a professor of social policy at the University of Toronto. Although progress is still possible, Lightman contends, it will be difficult to achieve. And Canadians should no longer look to the federal government for leadership in building a social safety net. The federal government has more or less abandoned that role. Carol Goar, "Worst is Over, Best is Long Gone," *Toronto Star*, 7 May 2007, A14.

³² Henry Giroux raises a similar concern in his new book *The University in Chains: Confronting the Military-Industrial Complex* (Paradigm Publishing, 2007).

³³ Novelist and music composer Anthony Burgess summarizes this belief thusly, "Education is of little value unless, directly or indirectly, it leads to the expansion of the Gross National Product." See his article "Thoughts on the Thatcher Decade," in *One Man's Chorus: The Uncollected Writings*, selected and with an introduction by Ben Forkner (New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers Inc., 1998), 147.

³⁴ *The New York Times*, 11 August 2006, quoted in Bumgarner-Gee, "Future of Art Music," 4.

³⁵ *AUCC Report*, Economic and Fiscal Update (November 2006): 3.

³⁶ Jennifer Ditchburn, "Ottawa to Unveil Research Strategy," *London Free Press*, 17 March 2007, A3.

³⁷ According to Elizabeth Church in the *Globe and Mail*, 18 June 2007, although this research funding agency received an additional eleven million dollars in the most recent federal budget, "it came earmarked for research in management, business, and finance." Moreover, some members of this federal government "see no value in funding humanities research and would like to see SSHRCC gone or greatly diminished." See www.theglobeandmail.com/servlet/story/RTGAM.20070618.whumanities18/BNStor.

³⁸ *AUCC Report* (November 2006): 3.

³⁹ Nancy Smith Fichter observes that there has been a change in "administrative personality at the uppermost institutional [university] levels." She continues, "implied penalties for noncompliance [to government and bureaucratic directives] smacks of the bully pulpit in full power" (6). See her paper "Weapons of Mass Instruction," presented to the National Association of Schools of Music 2006 Annual Meeting, Chicago. <http://nasm.arts-accredit.org>. Accessed 22 February 2007.

⁴⁰ Colwell, “Can We Be Friends,” 76. For example, the first review of my book that I found on-line was by an anonymous music education graduate student who condemned it without providing any kind of rational justification (other than dismissing it as more of a pamphlet than a book. Apparently size matters). The internet and other communications technologies now enable people—and including government—to say what they want without being held accountable. Gore makes a similar point in *The Assault on Reason*.

⁴¹ Paul Axelrod, *Values in Conflict: The University, The Marketplace and The Trials of Liberal Education* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2002), 93.

⁴² William Bruneau and Donald C. Savage, *Counting Out the Scholars: The Case Against Performance Indicators in Higher Education* (Toronto: James Lorimer & Company Ltd., 2002). See also Julia Eklund Koza, “Corporate Profit at Equity’s Expense: Codified Standards and High-Stakes Assessment in Music Teacher Preparation,” *Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education* 152 (Spring 2002): 1-16. This is required reading for those interested in what has been happening in the United States. Bruneau and Savage also have a chapter on the United States in *Counting Out the Scholars*. I’d also recommend Yaroslav Senyshyn’s “Rise of Authoritarianism in Higher Education: A Critical Analysis of the Research Assessment Exercise in British Universities,” *Journal of Educational Thought* 39, no. 3 (2005): 229-244.

⁴³ Ibid. Bruneau and Savage explain that “PIs certainly make it easier to end programmes unpopular with legislators or businesspeople while making decisions look reasonable, business-like, and efficient. But almost without exception, the promises of PIs have not been realized” (170).

⁴⁴ Marion Brady, “Thinking Big: A Conceptual Framework for the Study of Everything,” *Phi Delta Kappan* 86, no. 4 (2004): 281. Quoted in Colwell, “Can We Be Friends,” 75.

⁴⁵ W. Wesley Pue, “A Research Idea the Brits Can Keep,” *CAUT Bulletin* 54, no. 27 (February 2007): A3.

⁴⁶ Axelrod, in *Values in Conflict*, observes that grant-getting activity by academics often has more to do university finances than with the pursuit of excellence and the creation of new knowledge (98). Ability to attract grants does not necessarily correlate with good scholarship. This practice of using citation counts to assess research is hardly new. My own university in Canada compiles statistics on the numbers of academic citations for our various faculties and schools, including the Arts and Humanities. Those data are then used to rank our research output against other Canadian universities. To my knowledge there is no money tied to those figures, but they are submitted, along with 85 or so other measures, to government as part of a public accountability exercise. This is done voluntarily so as to pre-empt government intervention.

⁴⁷ Pue warns in “A Research Idea the Brits Can Keep” that “Humanities scholarship needs to be saved from the enormous condescension of a uni-polar world” (A3).

⁴⁸ Bruneau and Savage, *Counting Out the Scholars*, 86. As they observe, “centralized research management is likely to prefer the safe to the controversial or the unproven.”

⁴⁹ Cathy Benedict Kassell, “The National Standards Viewed Through a Critical Theorist Framework” (Ph.D. diss., Teachers College, 2004). See also Colwell’s “Can We Be Friends?”

⁵⁰ Crowe, "Melody Makers," 1. Crowe quotes orchestral conductor John Eliot Gardiner, King's College choral director Stephen Cleobury, and composer and conductor James MacMillan. All three speak about a decline of music standards in Britain.

⁵¹ See Koza's "Corporate Profit at Equity's Expense" and Colwell's "Can We Be Friends," 75.

⁵² Jeff Bush, "The National Standards for Arts Education: Curriculum or Political Instrument?" Unpublished paper submitted to the MayDay Group's *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* e-journal. According to Bush, there is a lack of discourse about the national standards in MENC sponsored journals. "The casual reader of music education journals (most of the largest of which are sponsored by MENC) might conclude that there is agreement within the profession on the value and importance of the standards" (8).

⁵³ The United States under President George W. Bush has been accused of imperialism in its approach to foreign relations, including its use of economic and military measures throughout the world against those to whom it is politically opposed. See Niall Ferguson's *Colossus: The Rise and Fall of the American Empire* (New York: Penguin Books, 2004). "Sadly," states Ferguson, "there seems to be no better alternative for the United States and the world" (xxviii). It is better that the United States lead the world than China.

⁵⁴ Koza, "Corporate Profit at Equity's Expense," 3. Jeff Bush, in "Curriculum or Political Instrument?" observes that, as of 1997, "all states had or were in the process of adopting or adapting the National Standards for Music Education," (6).

⁵⁵ Ibid. Koza refers by way of example to an article by Brent Sandene of Educational Testing Service entitled "Suggestions for Conducting Large-Scale Assessments in Music" that was published in the *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* 6, no. 4 (Winter 1995): 45-55. See also Catherine M. Schmidt's "Who Benefits? Music Education and the National Standards," *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 4, no. 2 (1996): 71-82.

⁵⁶ See MENC's website at <http://www.menc.org/information/research/agenda.html>.

⁵⁷ The OFSTED Strategic Plan 2005-2008. www.ofsted.gov.uk, p. 12.

⁵⁸ Music Manifesto Report No. 2, 80. See www.musicmanifesto.co.uk/research?pageid=2

⁵⁹ OFSTED Strategic Plan 2005-2008, 5.

⁶⁰ Music Manifesto Report No. 2, 18.

⁶¹ United Kingdom Department for Culture, Media, and Sport, www.culture.gov.uk/what_we_do/Creative_industries/music/. Accessed 27 February 2007.

⁶² Ruth Wright supports this observation in her dissertation where she states that "teachers now occupy a lower position in the social field in terms of possession of the economic and cultural capital valued by society." Secondary students are also said to show a "lack of respect . . . to many teachers" (17). Ruth Wright, "Music as Pedagogic Discourse: An Ethnographic Case Study of One Year 9 Class of Pupils and Their Music Teacher in a South Wales Secondary School" (Ph.D. diss., University of Wales, Cardiff, 2006).

⁶³ Music Manifesto Report No. 2, 63. See also p. 58. As stated in the report, “The current music education workforce includes qualified teachers and support staff in schools, music services and further and higher education institutions; musicians—freelance or community, orchestral players, and private tutors—who combine performance with education roles including teacher, tutor, leader, mentor or facilitator; and those working in the music industries who advise, support and train those wanting to join the music industry” (75). The report’s authors clearly state their intention of “remodeling . . . the school workforce enabling many more practitioners to work in and with schools” (16).

⁶⁴ “WTO Talks Resume,” *CAUT Bulletin* 54, no. 21 (February 2007): A2. Wright, “Music as Pedagogic Discourse,” 17.

⁶⁵ Heidi Westerlund, Review of the Book *Democracy and Music Education: Liberalism, Ethics and the Politics of Practice*, by Paul G. Woodford. *Philosophy of Music Education Review* 14, no. 2 (2006): 235-240. Westerlund misreads my point that children in Dewey’s Laboratory School at the University of Chicago were ironically not prepared to deal with the complexities of life in a capitalist world. I was speaking only about his Laboratory School (see p. 98 in *Democracy and Music Education*).

⁶⁶ Wayne Bowman, “Sound, Sociality, and Music: Part One,” *The Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* 5, no. 3 (Fall, 1994): 53. Michael Peters, in his review, says that my philosophy could apply equally well to mathematics and geography teachers etc. This is only partly true since those teachers and also politicians and corporate executives are hardly concerned with the power of those subjects to shape individual and collective consciousness.

⁶⁷ David J. Elliott, *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), 307-8.

⁶⁸ As reported by the Office of National Statistics in England, during the past summer, “loud music and barking dogs were the most common grievances” among neighbors. *The Guardian*, 11 April 2007, 6.

⁶⁹ This discussion brings to mind Peter Kivy’s *Music Alone: Philosophical Reflections on the Purely Musical Experience* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1990).

⁷⁰ Readers are directed to the following journals for articles on democratic themes written by me between 1995 and 2001: the *Canadian Music Educator* (1995, 1997, 1999), the *Music Educators Journal* (1995), the *Philosophy of Music Education Review* (1996 and 1999), the *Quarterly Journal of Music Teaching and Learning* (1996/1997), and the *Journal of Aesthetic Education* (2001). Bennett Reimer acknowledged my leadership in this area in an e-mail dated January, 1998. To quote him, “As far as I can tell, you’ve carved out an area of expertise quite unique to you in music education, and have thereby opened up a whole new dimension of thinking for us.” Both Reimer and Elliott were important mentors to me during my formative years as a university student. I remain grateful to both men for their guidance, inspiration, and friendship.

⁷¹ As Colwell has said with respect to my book, “Whether one reads Lee Shulman’s *The Wisdom of Practice* (2004), Nel Noddings’ *Happiness and Education* (2003), John Goodlad’s *Romances with Schools* (2004) or Carl Bereiter’s *Education and Mind in the Knowledge Age* (2002) one learns that the fundamental principle in education is that schooling must be compatible with the best democratic ideals. Only Paul Woodford has

seized upon this requisite and applied it to the structure of music education.” Colwell contacted me by e-mail shortly after my book’s release to say that he liked it. The above quotation was generously provided by him at my request for use in promoting the book. He also subsequently used *Democracy and Music Education* to form part of his argument in his recent *CRME Bulletin* article “Can We Be Friends.”

⁷² Lucy Green, *Music On Deaf Ears: Musical Meaning, Ideology and Education* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988). I am grateful to Lucy for reminding me of how our books overlap in some respects and also for giving me a copy of her own.

⁷³ According to Tindall, in *Mozart in the Jungle*, “Classical music has built a fortress that alienates audiences and has priced itself out of reach of the casual listener. Many of its performers are miserable, as revealed by mediocre performances that further expel the ticket-buying,” (303).

⁷⁴ Ross, “No Musician Left Behind,” 84.

⁷⁵ Edward Rothstein, “Classical Music Imperiled: Can You Hear the Shrug?” *The New York Times*, 2 July 2007, accessed July 4, 2007 at

www.nytimes.com/2007/07/02/arts/music/02conn.html?ex=1184126400&en=2f48eda...

⁷⁶ Julian Johnson, *Who Needs Classical Music? Cultural Choice and Musical Value* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002). As Johnson says, “Unpopularity is not so much the choice of contemporary composers as it is their fate” (104).

⁷⁷ We’re told by Crowe that “classical music now accounts for little more than 2 per cent of music sales in Britain,” while Martin Kettle, music critic for *The Guardian*, claims that classical music “endures overwhelmingly on the strength of its back catalogue and performance tradition, not of any new creativity . . . Solo performers remain of a high standard, but sound less and less like the bearers of a living tradition” (8). Kettle is quoted by Crowe in “Melody Makers.” According to the Statistics Canada website, releases of classical music recordings in Canada have been steadily declining since 1998. See www40.statcan.ca/101/cst01/arts29.html.

⁷⁸ As philosopher Lawrence Cahoon cautions, purely negative criticism can contribute to a relativization of authority that can encourage “the self-serving, aggressive, and paranoid tendencies of any political community.” Lawrence Cahoon, *The Dilemma of Modernity: Philosophy, Culture, and Anti-Culture* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 1988), 231.

⁷⁹ James Kloppenberg’s term cosmopolitan pragmatism captures the essence of what I am proposing. “By cosmopolitan pragmatism I mean . . . [an] emphasis on fostering a broad perspective that undertakes to understand and respect the perspectives of others, that prizes the ideal of reciprocity, and that recognizes the desirability of carrying that pragmatic sensibility from the realm of abstraction to the realm of daily life by engaging in the practice of deliberation as a means of truth testing and problem solving.” James T. Kloppenberg, “Cosmopolitan Pragmatism: Deliberative Democracy and Higher Education,” in *Education and Democracy: Re-Imagining Liberal Learning in America*, ed. Robert Orrill (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1997), 74.

⁸⁰ Westerlund, Review of *Democracy and Music Education*, 235. I’m also heartened that she describes the book as of “global significance” as that was to some extent my intention. Examples of problems or issues from various western democracies were

included for purposes of illustration but also in recognition that we live in a global village (there's yet another reference to a Canadian thinker, Marshall McLuhan).

⁸¹ As cultural anthropologist Orin Starn complains in "Fieldwork Under Fire," *Western News*, 10 November 2005, postmodernist literature is "unintelligible to anyone who doesn't have one of those secret postmodern jargon decoder rings" (5). This article was originally published in *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Unfortunately no date is given. Although Starn is referring specifically to the field of cultural anthropology, similar complaints have of course been made in education and in other fields. My reference for Derrida's statement about the importance of language is his chapter "Remarks on Deconstruction and Pragmatism," in *Deconstruction and Pragmatism*, ed. Chantal Mouffe (London: Routledge, 1996), 77.

⁸² Colwell, in "Can We Be Friends," observes that this is a chronic problem with professional journals in music education (85). He provides a number of examples from the *Music Educators Journal* in which book reviewers failed to offer critique.

⁸³ Finney, Review of the Book *Democracy and Music Education*, 242.

⁸⁴ Colwell, "Can We Be Friends," 88.

⁸⁵ Sam Hope, "Oral Report of the Executive Director," National Association of Schools of Music, 2006 Annual Meeting, Chicago. Accessed at <http://nasm.arts-accredit.org/>

⁸⁶ Ibid. Hope describes the vision portrayed by the Secretary of Education as "derived from fear, based on fear, intended to produce fear, and full of proposals to shape the future of higher education through fear."

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Colwell, "Can We Be Friends?" 88.

⁸⁹ Zinn and Macedo, *Howard Zinn on Democratic Education*, 63-64.

⁹⁰ John Ralston Saul, 2003 address to students at the University of Calgary, www.gg.ca/gg/fgg/bios/03/jrs-bio_e.asp

⁹¹ Roger Scruton, *A Political Philosophy: Arguments for Conservatism* (London: Continuum, 2006).