



INDIANA UNIVERSITY PRESS

Language, Music, and Revitalizing Indigeneity: Effecting Cultural Restoration and Ecological Balance via Music Education

Author(s): Anita Prest and J. Scott Goble

Source: *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, Spring 2021, Vol. 29, No. 1 (Spring 2021), pp. 24-46

Published by: Indiana University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.2979/philmusieducrevi.29.1.03>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Indiana University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Philosophy of Music Education Review*

JSTOR

LANGUAGE, MUSIC, AND REVITALIZING INDIGENEITY: EFFECTING CULTURAL RESTORATION AND ECOLOGICAL BALANCE VIA MUSIC EDUCATION

ANITA PREST

University of Victoria, Canada

aprest@uvic.ca

J. SCOTT GOBLE

University of British Columbia, Canada

scott.goble@ubc.ca

Abstract

In this paper, we explore challenges in conveying the culturally constructed meanings of local Indigenous musics and the worldviews they manifest to students in K-12 school music classes, when foundational aspects of the English language, historical and current discourse, and English language habits function to thwart the transmission of those meanings. We recount how, in settler colonial societies in North America, speakers of the dominant English language have historically misrepresented, discredited, and obscured cultural meanings that inhere in local Indigenous musics. First, we examine three ways in which the use of English has distorted the cultural meanings of those

Philosophy of Music Education Review 29, no. 1 (Spring 2021), pp. 24–46

Copyright © 2021, The Trustees of Indiana University • doi: 10.2979/philmusieducrevi.29.1.03

musics. Next, we explain how historical discourses in English have intentionally undervalued or discredited the values intrinsic to those musics, also describing how some current music education discourse in English might work against the embedding of Indigenous meanings in school music education settings. We then consider additional factors distinguishing Indigenous languages from European languages (especially English) to show how a people's "language habits" influence their perception of and thus their relationship with their natural environment. We conclude by considering the role of music education in revitalizing local Indigenous languages and musics and advancing the cultural values of their originating communities.

Keywords: music education; language; Indigenous; decolonization; discourse

Cross-cultural encounters are often temporary confluences, fluid spaces of possibility and vulnerability that lead either to collaboration and invention, or to misinterpretation and decimation. The intentions and assumptions of those involved, plus the quality and modes of their communication, can surely influence the outcomes. But when cross-cultural encounters are ongoing, and one party holds more power than the other (owing to superior technologies or sheer numbers), the more powerful party may come to dominate or even eradicate the other, and the worldviews, languages, and cultural expressions of the subjugated party become casualties of the encounter. This is precisely what has transpired since the beginnings of the European colonization of North America, where the speakers of culturally dominant languages (especially English, French, and Spanish), through their discourses, have historically misrepresented, discredited, and obscured the worldviews and cultural meanings that inhere in the local languages and musics of peoples indigenous to the continent.¹ Ironically, the languages the Indigenous peoples speak, the musical practices in which they engage, and the very worldviews manifested in these distinctive cultural aspects of their lives may come to be widely recognized as more life-giving and sustainable than those of the colonizers.²

After more than a century of what can only be described as cultural genocide, in which Indigenous children were sent to residential schools under a national policy "to eliminate Aboriginal people as distinct peoples and to assimilate them into the Canadian mainstream against their will," the federal government belatedly established the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada (TRC) in 2008 to address the abuse inflicted on Indigenous peoples through the residential school system and its harmful legacy.³ Following on this fundamental reversal, the British Columbia (BC) Ministry of Education mandated in 2015 the incremental embedding of local Indigenous knowledge, pedagogy, and worldviews into K–12 curricula in all subjects.⁴ Moreover, in 2019, the BC

Teachers' Council (BCTC) revised its Professional Standards for BC Educators, directing (in a new, ninth Standard) that all BC teachers embed "First Nations, Inuit, and Métis worldviews and perspectives into learning environments."⁵ As a result, music teachers throughout BC—most of them non-Indigenous—have been called upon to embed local Indigenous content, pedagogy, and worldviews in their classes.⁶ In 2016, we undertook a study of the ways in which some public school music educators in rural BC have worked with Indigenous community members to successfully facilitate the embedding of local Indigenous knowledge in their K-12 music classes and schools.⁷ In this paper, we attend to Matthew Graham's call for "research that examines the role of music and music education specifically within the context of settler colonialism in order to theorize how educators might respond," and we focus specifically on aspects of language that might affect music educators' responses.⁸ Although some sociologists in Canada have begun to attend to the challenges of decolonization and Indigenization in their field, philosophers of music education have only recently turned their attention to decolonization in the settler colonial context.⁹ Our goal is to share the learning on language we have acquired as we have engaged in our own ongoing decolonization, and to broaden the theoretical discussion by focusing on the linguistic challenges of Indigenization.

We begin by examining three ways in which the English language inherently distorts the cultural meanings of Indigenous languages and musics, thereby contributing to cultural misunderstandings. Next, we recount how historical and current discourses in English have intentionally undervalued or discredited the values that inhere in those musics, also considering how some current music education discourse in English might work against the embedding of Indigenous meanings in school music education settings in meaningful ways.¹⁰

We then consider additional factors distinguishing Indigenous languages from European languages (especially English), suggesting that a people's "language habits" influence their perception of and thus their relationship with their natural environment. We conclude by considering the role of music education in revitalizing local Indigenous languages and musics and advancing the cultural values of their originating communities.

HOW LANGUAGE AND ITS MEANINGS ARE CENTRAL TO THE CULTURAL CONTINUITY OF A COMMUNITY

Language, epistemology, and "artistic" expressions of culture such as music are closely interwoven.¹¹ Catherine Bell and Val Napoleon argue that grasping "the central role of songs in [Indigenous] ceremonial practice and transfer protocol is premised on an understanding of the language."¹² Kanien'kehá:ka

scholars Sandra Styres and Taiaiake Alfred have noted that “language [is] . . . particularly influencing . . . on the ways individuals make sense of their world,” and that language reveals the culture that undergirds it.¹³ As noted above, Canadian government officials designed and implemented policies (for example, *The Indian Act of 1876, the 1969 White Paper*) for more than a century to assimilate Indigenous peoples into the mainstream population. They targeted and prevented Indigenous youth from acquiring their particular Nation’s language by forcing them to attend residential schools, recognizing that, as Styres has noted, “to lose a language or to change its structure is to lose or alter all the thought and knowledge embedded in the language.”¹⁴ As a result of this policy, all seventy Indigenous languages in Canada came to be listed as endangered by 2010, thirty-five critically so.¹⁵

In recent years, Indigenous scholars, organizations, educators, and activists have labored to reverse this trend, aware that “language is by far the most significant factor in the survival of Indigenous Knowledge” and that “language revitalization is . . . a prerequisite for all other aspects of cultural continuity and restoration,” including sustenance of musical practices.¹⁶ Since 2008, the number of Indigenous language speakers in Canada has increased by more than three percent.¹⁷ But Indigenous adult language learners who speak English as a first language may encounter challenges when working to gain competency in their heritage languages because translation equivalence problems, grammatical structures, and loss of context operate to distort cultural meanings.

HOW LANGUAGE DIFFERENCES DISTORT CULTURAL MEANINGS

Word and Conceptual Equivalence

Three types of translation equivalence problems distort cultural meaning. First, translators are mindful that some words or expressions exist only in the original language, so translating the word or expression requires a longer explanation in the target language. Michael Marker gives an example of a Lummi (a Coast Salish language) word related to *learning* that is inclusive of landscape and stories connected to the land, which thus cannot be reduced to a single word in English. He translates this word—*sche’lang’en*—as “the way of life of the people as related to all things in time and space.”¹⁸

Marker’s effort to express the meaning of *sche’lang’en* in English draws attention to the second problem in translation equivalence: some words in the original language denote a way of thinking about a concept that must be explained to people who speak the target language independent of the actual translation.

For example, Sarah Davidson and Robert Davidson point out that “the Haida word for ‘teach’ is *sk’ad’ada*, and the base of the word ‘teach’ is *sk’ad’a*, which means ‘learn’ . . . [T]he connection between these two words reflects . . . that it is impossible to teach without learning.”¹⁹ Most experienced English-speaking music educators likely have experience of this relationship, but because the concept is embedded in the language itself, all individuals who speak the Haida language—not only educators—tacitly recognize that ongoing learning is integral to effective teaching.

Music, too, is a concept that is conceptualized differently in many Indigenous cultures. Robin Ridington and Jillian Ridington describe the *Dane-Zaa* conception of music:

To say ‘I hear a sound’ could also be expressed as ‘There is listening within me.’ Sound is not just ‘out there.’ It is also within us as we bring it into being. It is at once objective and experiential. Sound is alive as we are alive, alive as music is alive.²⁰

In this view, music is sentient (imbued with spirit), agentic, and purposeful, not a reified cultural object, valued primarily for its aesthetic qualities.²¹

A third challenge associated with attempted translation equivalences concerns how a word denoting a single concept in the original language must be translated into two distinct words/concepts in the target language, thereby obscuring its distinctive cultural meaning. For instance, for the Haida people of British Columbia, “the Haida word for *mind* is the same as the Haida word for *throat*,”²² indicating an interconnection between the two. When the original Haida word is translated into two distinct English words (*mind* and *throat*), this aspect of their worldview is lost. In all of these cases, translation equivalence is impossible owing to epistemological differences.

Grammatical Structures Reveal Epistemology

Shawn Wilson has observed that many Indigenous languages (e.g., Anishnaabemowin, Nêhiyáw, Haida, Coast Salish, Secwepemctsin) are verb-based, meaning that “objects themselves are not named; rather, what they might be used for is described.”²³ For a speaker of English, the implications of thinking in and speaking a verb-oriented language are immense. First, “the concepts or ideas are not as important as the *relationships* that went into forming them . . . Indigenous epistemology has systems of knowledge built upon relationships between things, rather than on the things themselves.”²⁴ For instance, in Coast Salish languages, objects under discussion are described in terms of their physical relation to the people discussing them (deixis):

English-language pointing words are . . . organized in a simple binary fashion [here: there]; in Salish languages, pointing words are much more complex . . . they involve three dimensions: whether something is close to the speaker . . .; close to the addressee . . . or away from both speaker and addressee . . . [A]dditional dimensions concern whether the object referred to is visible (present), invisible (absent), or real or hypothetical, and when objects or people are in motion, whether the motion is towards or away from the person speaking.²⁵

Second, John Borrows emphasizes that Anishnaabemowin speakers apprehend the world as dynamic rather than static, aware that even objects that appear to be solid and permanent are always in a temporary state.²⁶ Styres notes that this dynamism is reflected in many Indigenous languages, which are primarily kinesthetic, or verb-based, whereas Western languages are image- or noun-based.²⁷ In Haida, for example, speakers can “refer to, or allude to, the shape and consistency, motion or direction, and action of something on something else without even mentioning it as a ‘thing.’”²⁸ In such a view, all existence is animate, conscious, and agentic.²⁹

Third, Styres points out the foundational connection between European languages and Western European ways of engaging in scientific inquiry. She states, “languages that are noun-oriented give primacy to objectifying, classifying, and categorizing reality, leading to a large number of fixed concepts that are then grouped into rigid constructs of thought.”³⁰ Marianne Ignace and Ron Ignace consider the related notion of *categorization*, observing that while verb-based languages do categorize the world, they do so in a manner very different from noun-oriented modes of communication:

Through its grammatical structure, each [Indigenous] language also includes fascinating and different ways of categorizing experiences When a Secwepemctsin speaker talks about something that has happened, he/she always indicates whether the issue that is reported is known to the speaker because 1) he/she had first-hand experience of what happened, 2) he/she knows that something happened from hearsay . . . , or 3) physical evidence shows that something has happened. This information is embedded as suffixes attached as endings to verbs—evidential particles.³¹

In other words, noun-oriented languages emphasize what an individual knows, whereas verb-oriented languages highlight how an individual comes to know something.

Fourth, Nuu-chah-nulth, Coast Salish, Secwepemc, and other Indigenous ways of knowing emphasize the importance of humility.³² This value is reflected

in speech; individuals make their “actions, state of being, and possessions appear small” so as to acknowledge “the social status of the person or people being addressed” and their importance in the community.³³ Thus, through their orientation, verb-based languages highlight relationships, the animacy and temporary state of objects, the importance of how one comes to know, and the desirability of an unassuming nature.

Contexts Implied in the Original Words Have Been Discounted or Lost in Translation

In addition to the translation challenges of equivalence and grammatical structure, Indigenous scholars have brought to light the context-laden quality of certain words in Indigenous languages that are common knowledge to the people of a language group, but unfamiliar to target language speakers. Atleo affirms, “Nuu-chah-nulth words may be associated with a world, or cultural or historical context, that is commonly understood”³⁴ by Nuu-chah-nulth people but not by others. For instance, the word *wind* “has spiritual overtones,” an association that English-language speakers might not make.³⁵ Tanya Talaga compares Western and Anishinaabe/Nêhiyaw understandings of the word *leadership*. She explains that, “in Ojibwe [Anishinaabe] and Cree [Nêhiyaw] culture, leadership didn’t mean power; it meant caring.”³⁶ Marker expands on this conception, noting that leadership entails the uplifting of one’s community and culture, rather than the aggrandizement of the individual.³⁷ Such context-related meanings are important for Indigenous adults learning their traditional languages to consider, especially if they have grown up in an urban landscape in which English speaking is predominant, far away from their traditional territories.

A number of differences in Western (that is, English) language and Indigenous perspectives have become clear in our brief examination of the inherent challenges of translating cultural meanings and worldviews. We distinguish between these epistemological perspectives not to essentialize them, but to enable more nuanced discussion of the challenges inherent in introducing the diverse meanings of culturally different peoples’ musics into school music education settings. To summarize: Whereas perspectives embedded in the English language tend to be object-, image-, category-, fact-, universal-, outcome-, and individual-oriented, perspectives in the Indigenous languages addressed in this paper are action-, kinaesthetic-, relationship-, method-, context-, process-, and community-oriented. Likewise, concepts described in English tend to be conceived as fixed, while Indigenous languages describe and conceive concepts as more fluid.

APPLICATIONS IN THE MUSIC CLASSROOM

Recognizing that Indigenous peoples' verb-based languages manifest strikingly contrasting worldviews, how might K-12 school music teachers' conceptions of music and their music education practices be informed by Indigenous perspectives? Since endangered languages and—by extension—cultural practices are intimately connected to their contexts, how could music educators best learn about those contexts and convey their importance to students? First, it would be important for music educators to fully embrace a praxial philosophy of music education because praxial philosophy affords consideration of Indigenous perspectives in at least two ways.³⁸ In a praxial view, the *praxis* (action) of music making or *musicking* may be emphasized over the *product* (music).³⁹ Music is “something people do.”⁴⁰ This “doing” harmonizes with First Nations' verb-based languages and epistemology, which prioritize action, process, and relationships.⁴¹ Also, a praxial conception advances the importance of learning musics of diverse cultures on their own terms; it thus emphasizes that the meanings ascribed to the musical practices of any given culture are essential for a comprehensive understanding of that music.

In adopting a praxial perspective and establishing relationships with Indigenous community members on whose land they are teaching, music educators could make it part of their practice to highlight the relationships among musicians, musicians and audience, and musicians and Land that inhere in Indigenous musicking, rather than prioritizing perfection in students' renderings of written compositions.⁴² In fact, performing from written notation itself might come to be recognized as requiring careful handling and explanation because, as Leavitt has argued, “learning by reading (that is, teaching with texts) removes education from the realm of personal interaction and breaks the link between knowledge and the value system.”⁴³ Although we believe there is a role for published scores and the written word in music teaching and learning, Leavitt's caution is pertinent to the notation and printing of local traditional musics because there is an inherent danger that printed music might be taken out of context and appropriated through a disregard for local protocols. In fact, many of the Indigenous knowledge keepers and culture bearers from multiple Nations who have contributed to our research have emphasized the importance of using oral, face-to-face pedagogy when teaching songs and observing specific protocols associated with them.

Further, music educators could underscore the importance of students' respect for their instruments' animacy and spirit, discounting students' interest in the instruments' make or price.⁴⁴ They could focus more on the quality and

life-enhancing consequences of educational experiences, not just on the skills and concepts to be acquired. Student musicians and music educators would focus on learning/teaching, playing, and singing together with a heightened awareness of contextual factors, rather than comparing, competing against one another, and forging a hierarchy of achievement.

In the following section, we turn from considering the ways in which the English language can inherently distort the cultural meanings of Indigenous languages and musics toward an investigation of how historical English-language discourse on the *potlatch* intentionally undervalued or discredited the values that inhere in the Indigenous musics and cultural practices of the Pacific Northwest coast. We then examine current music education discourse, tracing vestiges of colonial thought, and consider ways in which modern discourse on music might undermine efforts to meaningfully embed Indigenous cultural parties in music classes.

HOW DISCOURSES SERVE TO SUPPORT COLONIZATION

Discourse on the Potlatch

The initial contact between Europeans and First Nations communities in the vast territory now called British Columbia occurred in the late 1700s. By the 1840s, the Hudson's Bay Company controlled and managed locations key to the British crown on the monarchy's behalf through its networks of forts. In 1858, three official crown colonies were established; they merged in 1866, forming the colony of British Columbia, which, in 1871, joined the recently established Canadian confederation. Within a twenty-year period, provincial and federal bureaucratic discourse had inaccurately named and defined many Indigenous cultural practices, including the many feasts held in diverse Indigenous territories for various purposes. According to Catherine Bell, Heather Raven, and Heather McCuaig, people shared and verified their history and their connection to the land and the spirit world during those feasts, by singing, telling stories, and dancing. The feasts, which later came to be known collectively (and wrongly) as *potlatches*, provided a space for social healing, opportunities to let go of differences by sitting and witnessing together—processes for coming together through cultural practice.⁴⁵ For the Kwakwaka'wakw, feasts formed the basis for their “economic, political, social, spiritual, and legal systems . . . they also promoted values such as humility, generosity, responsibility, and respect.”⁴⁶

From Kwakwaka'wakw territory on Vancouver Island to Dakelh territory in northern British Columbia, the ways people engaged during those feasts affirmed their cultural identities, their sense of belonging, and their relationships to the

land, while also reinforcing their codes of conduct.⁴⁷ Dakelh people engaged in ceremonies or bah'lats, which formed the legal basis for inheritance, family law, resource management, governance, and codes of conduct.⁴⁸

In *The Potlatch Papers*, Christopher Bracken systematically examines the written correspondence, laden with racist commentary, between key provincial and federal bureaucrats from the time of the Canadian Confederation in 1867 to the early twentieth century. He itemizes the political decisions (for example, banning of the “potlatch”) that ensued from that correspondence, which radically altered living conditions for Indigenous peoples throughout Canada for over seventy years. Bracken tracks the way in which the definition of the putative “potlatch” changed over time, from referencing an event involving distribution of property “only on the condition that it be returned later”—reflecting a system of exchange or reciprocity over a period of time—to denoting a social practice of giving or “spending without return,” an act considered wasteful by the European bourgeoisie.⁴⁹ While an exchange system was considered somewhat acceptable to the government because it pointed to trade, gifting broke the entire “circle of the economy” and thus had to be stopped.⁵⁰

In fact, neither an exchange system nor gifting accurately described what transpired at the various feasts, nor did administrators pay attention to First Nations’ narratives about those events. In 1882, George Dawson inflammatorily described the potlatch as “a war fought with property.”⁵¹ The federal government banned the potlatch through an amendment of *The Indian Act*, legislation that lasted for nearly seventy years (1884–1951), summarily destroying Indigenous peoples’ entire ways of living and processes of relating to one another. In 1887 and again in 1895, Nisga’a elders traveled to Victoria (a distance of over a thousand kilometres) to protest the legislation, declaring that the potlatch was “not a divisive war fought with property, but a way of strengthening the social bonds that link people together . . . a method that we have of showing our goodwill toward one another.”⁵² A 1914 petition by the Nuu-chah-nulth people stated much the same, but to no avail. Regalia, songs, rattles, drums, masks, and dances associated with “potlatch” activities were made illegal, confiscated by government officials, and then sold for profit to museums around the world. In some cases, those activities and the knowledge and worldviews they expressed were lost forever; in other cases, they went underground, barely surviving until the law was repealed in 1951.

Of what concern and relevance are historical discourses of Indigenous cultural practices in the Pacific Northwest to music education in the present? Music education scholars have analyzed the many ways in which colonial practices persist in multiple guises. For instance, Graham has examined “the unspoken assumptions that allowed for the perpetration of . . . *current* expressions of settler

colonialism” in wind band repertoire.⁵³ Bradley has systematically outlined the ways in which colonialist attitudes from the past are implicated in current music education discourse in English-speaking North America. She states, “colonialism as an economic system was rooted in racism . . . the system’s effects continue to wield influence in many of the ways that we think and express ourselves.”⁵⁴ Several Indigenous education scholars agree, arguing that the liberal humanist notion of multiculturalism (as it is understood by educators in Canada) is, in certain respects, at odds with the aims of Indigenizing education.⁵⁵ On a related note, although many Indigenous scholars have supported culturally responsive pedagogy, some have pointed out the limitations of this approach for Indigenous students in particular.⁵⁶ In the next section, we examine the ways in which these two discourses may work against the meaningful embedding of local Indigenous musics in BC public school music classes.

Current English-Language Music Education Discourses

Multiculturalism. Bradley has shown that colonialist overtones are apparent in multicultural policies in Canada, where ethnicities and cultures are deliberately emphasized and discussion of race or color is avoided. Contained in these ostensibly equity-driven policies is an unquestioned White-centered standpoint that unwittingly reveals itself in its discourse and terminology (for example, “visible minority”).⁵⁷ Bradley has also pointed to the inherent danger of focusing solely on “our basic humanness” and downplaying “inequities of difference by accentuating shared commonalities.”⁵⁸ Indeed, multicultural discourse in Canada is celebratory in nature, affirming cultural difference while minimizing the naming and discussion of systemic inequities founded on racism and classism; such discourse does not easily create a space to interrogate unquestioned societal biases or unexamined and engrained values based on racism. Nêhiyâw education scholar Verna St. Denis concurs, arguing that these “discourses of recognition, tolerance, and fairness . . . have tremendous power in educational settings . . . Multiculturalism has been and is used to defend public schools against the need to respond to Aboriginal education.”⁵⁹

As Prime Minister of Canada in 1969, Pierre Elliott Trudeau suggested that the time had come for the Indian Act to be abolished and for Indigenous peoples of Canada to become fully assimilated into Canadian society.⁶⁰ The same year, Nêhiyâw politician, scholar, lawyer, and activist Harold Cardinal, realizing that such assimilation would work against Indigenous peoples’ treaty rights and their entitlement to unceded lands, mobilized Indigenous peoples throughout Canada to protest this proposal, eventually overturning it and establishing the modern-day Indigenous rights movement. In his 1969 book, *The Unjust Society*, Cardinal invoked the then-recently advanced multicultural mosaic metaphor to

suggest that Indigenous peoples be represented by a “red tile,” contributing to the visual and metaphorical vitality of the Canadian mosaic.⁶¹ However, since that time, he and many Indigenous scholars and activists have come to reject this metaphor. St. Denis has explained that the reduction of a multitude of Indigenous peoples to a single tile that equates them “with racialized minorities and particularly ethnic immigrants” is yet another “form of colonialism.”⁶² Other Indigenous scholars and activists in Canada have also expressed concern regarding the tendency of some Canadians to minimize the unique characteristics of individual Nations. In their eyes, it is essential to focus on the specific context of each Nation, in order that federal and provincial governments will meet Treaty obligations and work in concert with those Nations living on unceded territory to resolve their individual land claims.⁶³ Approximately seventy-five people from twenty-two First Nations participated in our two recent research studies. Without exception, they emphasized the importance of music educators’ engagement with local Indigenous people in learning local protocols for introducing Indigenous musics to students, thus concurring with activists and scholars that unique forms of drums, drumming patterns, ways of singing, and protocols must be acknowledged in order that myriad Indigenous ways of knowing and being as expressed in diverse cultural practices can be maintained.

Although Indigenous and racialized peoples have much in common, St. Denis notes, multiculturalism also “works to distract from the recognition and redress of Indigenous rights.”⁶⁴ Indigenous scholars underscore that Indigenous peoples are the First Peoples of the land that is currently known as Canada. They are the foundation of the society that later included English and French speaking peoples, and eventually peoples from all nations of the world. Both their status as First Peoples and their ongoing marginalization via colonialist practices distinguish them from racialized minorities.

Thus, the discourse of multiculturalism has worked and continues to work against the meaningful embedding of Indigenous content, pedagogy, and worldview in music classes in three ways: it centers Whiteness, substitutes inclusion for genuine engagement, and does not address injustices specific to Indigenous peoples. But an arguably insidious effect of multiculturalism is that its presence in schools as official policy “makes it possible for non-Aboriginal teachers and schools to trivialize Aboriginal content and perspectives, and at the same time believe that they are becoming more inclusive and respectful.”⁶⁵

Culturally Responsive Pedagogy. Whereas *culturally relevant* pedagogy “helps students to accept and affirm *their* cultural identity while developing critical perspectives that challenge inequities that schools (and other institutions) perpetuate,”⁶⁶ *culturally responsive* pedagogy focuses on “multi-cultural competencies,

or helping students learn more about their own *and others'* cultures, as part of their personal development and preparation for community membership, civic engagement, and social transformation."⁶⁷ Thus, culturally responsive pedagogy is especially appropriate for pluralistic classrooms. Culturally responsive pedagogy, initially conceived by Frederick Erickson and Gerald Mohatt in the context of teaching Native American youth, has been promoted for Indigenous students for the past forty years as a "strategy for improving the education and increasing the academic achievement of American Indian and Alaska Native . . . students in U.S. schools."⁶⁸ Both culturally relevant and culturally responsive pedagogies contain elements of critical consciousness, whereby students learn why and how to question the current social order. Relationships and teacher self-reflexivity are at the heart of these pedagogies. In music education, Carlos Abril, and Vicki Lind and Constance McKoy, have demonstrated the effectiveness of culturally responsive pedagogies in culturally pluralistic music classes.⁶⁹

However, some Indigenous scholars have noted the limitations of such strategies for Indigenous students. For them, culturally responsive education is ensconced in the language of multiculturalism and embedded in dominant Western ideologies; thus, it does not adequately address the problem.⁷⁰ Instead, some Indigenous scholars use the term *culturally appropriate*.⁷¹ This form of pedagogy centers the Land where students live (including stories, songs, and ceremonies that are land-based historically and contemporarily). For Indigenous peoples, a Land orientation is more appropriate than a more neutral place-based approach.

Dwayne Donald, Florence Glanfield, and Gladys Sterenberg highlight their concern that culturally responsive pedagogy "is too easily reduced to essentializations, meaningless generalizations, or trivial anecdotes—none of which result in systemic, institutional, or lasting changes to schools serving Indigenous children."⁷² In its place, Donald, Glanfield, and Sterenberg have urged teachers to "involve a *culturally relational* stance. We have come to think of our practice in this way. This means that we are all related: We are relations."⁷³ Django Paris has taken a somewhat different approach, suggesting a *culturally sustaining* perspective that "seeks to perpetuate and foster—to sustain—linguistic, literate, and cultural pluralism as part of the democratic project of schooling,"⁷⁴ while Teresa McCarty and Tiffany Lee have promoted a *culturally revitalizing* pedagogy that advocates "for community-based educational accountability that is rooted in Indigenous educational sovereignty."⁷⁵

Culturally appropriate, relational, sustaining, and revitalizing pedagogies extend the range of pedagogical responses available to music teachers seeking to embed Indigenous content and worldviews in their classes according to their individual contexts. Certainly, Indigenous communities in British Columbia are calling for greater accountability from educators and educational institutions; these

nanced pedagogical strategies extending from a culturally responsive approach point to ways in which music teachers might embed Indigenous knowledge in school music education settings more meaningfully, while also being accountable to their local Indigenous communities. They place Indigenous knowledge and ways of being at the heart of pedagogy.

HOW INDIGENOUS LANGUAGE HABITS REFLECT RELATIONSHIP WITH THE NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

There are additional aspects of Indigenous languages and musical practices that we have not yet discussed which must also be noted, as they may have implications both within and beyond the frame of music education. Along with the Indigenous scholars mentioned previously, numerous researchers in cultural anthropology and ethnolinguistics have recognized that the holistic, environmentally rooted, and cyclical worldviews evident in the languages of Indigenous peoples contrast directly with the linear, progressive, and industry-oriented conceptions inherent in Western Eurocentric languages. Among them, Chawla has observed that language and cognitive reality (or worldview) are closely related, and she has attended to the ways in which a people's "language habits" influence their perception of and thus their relationship with the natural environment.⁷⁶ She draws attention to three such habits of "Amerindian"—i.e., Indigenous—languages that distinguish them from the English language:

Comparing Amerindian languages with the English language, scholars have pointed out three distinct features of Amerindian languages: (1) Amerindian languages make a distinction between real and imaginary nouns, (2) they do not give form to intangibles and mass nouns, and (3) they treat time as being continuous. In contrast, the English language uses the same linguistic structure for real and imaginary nouns, . . . [gives] form to intangibles and mass nouns, and has a fragmented (three-dimensional) conception of time.⁷⁷

Chawla argues that these three characteristics of English predispose those who embody the language and speak it to cognitively "fragment reality" rather than to perceive its constituent parts as holistically or relativistically interrelated, as Indigenous peoples do. She suggests further that the adoption of the English language by different cultures worldwide (as "the language of technology") is diminishing the number of cultures whose languages and values are more ecologically beneficent, leading the world toward environmental disaster. We will consider in turn each of the language characteristics Chawla has identified before addressing her conclusion.

First, “Amerindian languages make a distinction between real and imaginary nouns,” whereas the English language does not inherently do so. Indigenous language speakers use different terminology for “touch-and-see” objects and conceptual objects—that is, for what is physically real (for example, a tree, a person) and what is metaphorically real (for example, a year, marriage, wealth). To illustrate, experientially and in Indigenous languages, length of time is subjective and thus imaginary, but in the English language (and in all European languages), time is objectified (as minutes, years, centuries) and the concepts are treated as “real.”

Second, Indigenous languages “do not give form to intangibles and mass nouns.” For a linguist, *individual nouns* denote a body with definite outlines (for example, a tree, a person), and *mass nouns* denote homogeneous continua that have no implied boundaries (for example, water, emotions). In English, mass nouns are individualized through the use of linguistic devices (for example, *the glass of water*, *an hour of happiness*). The inclusion of articles (such as *the* or *an*) and the device of introducing a container or unit (such as *glass* or *hour*) reveal the cognitive habit of separating an object from the mass. English speakers, in giving form to mass nouns, tend to objectify aspects of experience, which makes it possible for them to be measured. In contrast, Indigenous languages display the indefiniteness of mass nouns as they do not individualize or use linguistic devices to make them definite, hence the idea of measuring the things they denote would not occur to an Indigenous language speaker. A consequence of this is that, whereas speakers of English can think of organic life in terms of distinct biological classifications, speakers of Indigenous languages tend to think of human beings and other forms of organic life as a unified whole.

Third, Indigenous languages “treat time as being continuous or fluid.” Aleksandar Janca and Clothilde Bullen have provided a helpful description of this characteristic, which expands on Chawla’s observation:

Many Indigenous people and a number of non-Indigenous cultures . . . describe [time] as having a ‘circular’ or ‘cyclic’ form. According to such a conceptualisation of time, time is perceived as ‘static’ and the individual person is ‘in the centre of time’ (i.e. surrounded by concentric ‘time circles’). Life events are placed in time along and across the ‘time circles’ according to their relative importance to the individual and his or her respective community (i.e., more important events are placed closer to the individual and are perceived as being closer in time; unimportant or irrelevant events occupy peripheral time circles, although some of them could have happened very recently according to linear or ‘practical’ concept time).⁷⁸

Owing to the fluid concept of time inherent in them, Indigenous languages display little development of differences in the tenses of verbs, and their speakers perceive time as a two-tense system, earlier and later, which is close to the subjective feeling of duration as it is experienced. At any moment in one of the time circles within the “eternal now,” one can make decisions informed by one’s own and one’s community’s past experiences, knowing that the decisions one makes today may or may not become patterns for the future. By contrast, speakers of English perceive time in a three-sense time scheme (with past and present leading to a real or imaginary future goal), which, when measured and controlled by clocks, diminishes or ignores the subjective awareness of time as a fluid experience. By Chawla’s account, this conceptual linearity has consequences in a technological society: “If A leads to B, then upon reaching B, A is abandoned [etc.] . . . The habit is to build upon the past but in a way that makes the past irrelevant to the present and the future.”⁷⁹ We might note that Christopher Small has observed that this linear conception of time inheres not only in the syntax of the English language, but also in the “tonal functional harmony” with which much of the music of European culture-based societies is composed.⁸⁰

In sum, Chawla presents a compelling case that the English language habits of using the same linguistic structure for real and imaginary nouns, giving form to intangibles and mass nouns, and framing time in terms of past, present, and future are all factors influencing English speakers *not* to experience the natural environment holistically as Indigenous peoples do. She suggests further that the effects of such fragmented thinking are having a devastating impact on the world’s ecosystem. She wryly observes, “As long as we think of the water in the home and the industrial waste water in the rivers or ocean as distinctly separate, it will be difficult to avoid water pollution.”⁸¹ Chawla asserts that a change in the language habits—and thus the thinking—of both lay persons and the scientific community toward holistic and cyclic thinking is now urgently required.

Chawla recognizes that changes in language habits and cultural habits are not likely to happen quickly, but she affirms, “[I]f any change is to come about, it will have to be at the level of perception, and, at the linguistic level, such perception is reflected in language.”⁸² As we noted above, such habits of perception are also reflected in music.

CONCLUSION

In our introduction, we observed that when one party holds more power than another in an ongoing cross-cultural encounter, the more powerful of the two may come to dominate or even eradicate the other, and the worldviews,

languages, and cultural expressions of the subjugated party may become casualties of the encounter. We noted further that this is precisely what has taken place in North America since the beginnings of European colonization, as the speakers of culturally dominant languages have, through their actions and discourses, historically misrepresented, discredited, and obscured the worldviews and cultural meanings that inhere in the local languages and musics of the continent's Indigenous peoples, nearly eradicating them.

We are now at a critical juncture in the history of Canada. Following on the creation of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada in 2008 and its efforts to address the abuse inflicted on Indigenous peoples through the residential school and its harmful legacy, as well as the BC Ministry of Education's 2015 mandate to incrementally embed local Indigenous knowledge into K-12 curricula in all subjects, we have reason to hope that BC educators in all subjects—including music—will work together to address the social and societal problems stemming from settler colonialism. Introducing culturally appropriate, relational, sustaining, and revitalizing pedagogies into all subjects holds promise for foregrounding Indigenous knowledge and Indigenous ways of being in the schools and in Canadian society.

At the same time, citizens of BC and people throughout the world are also facing the environmental threats of climate change, deforestation, pollution, loss of biodiversity, and population growth. It has become evident that these problems stem largely—if not entirely—from human cultural practices rooted in the fragmenting, linear, progressive, and industry-oriented worldview of the European colonizers of this continent, which are manifested in their languages and musics. While enterprises grounded in Western worldviews have afforded extraordinary technological benefits, physical power (for example, military strength), and social influence (for example, via mass media) to those who have advanced them and others, they have also wreaked havoc on the earth's ecosystem. By contrast, the holistic and cyclic worldviews of Indigenous peoples, manifested in their languages and social practices, including those practices Western observers conceptualize as “musical,” have been far more ecologically beneficent.

Insofar as the actions of Westerners have proven to be environmentally unsustainable and even destructive of the earth's ecosystem, curricular changes that tilt educational curricula towards the more sustainable, holistic, ecologically beneficent, and cyclical worldviews of Indigenous peoples are sorely needed at present. Educators' fostering of students' engagement with the languages, musical practices, and worldviews of Indigenous peoples might be considered as important preliminary steps in moving them towards an essential counterbalancing shift. Humanity's healthful survival on earth may depend on the execution of a multitude of such cultural shifts through education. Languages and musics matter.

NOTES

¹Christopher Bracken, *The Potlatch Papers: A Colonial Case History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1997). Walter D. Mignolo, *La Idea de América Latina: Herida Colonial y la Opción Decolonial* [The Idea of Latin America: Colonial Wound and the Decolonial Option] (Barcelona: Gedisa, 2007).

²Throughout this paper, we use the term *Indigenous* to refer to First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples. We use the names of specific peoples wherever possible to avoid pan-Indigenous generalizations. In this footnote, we list all Indigenous peoples and languages mentioned in this paper with their corresponding colonial names and their locations.

Kanien'kehá:ka (Mohawk): Eastern Ontario, Southern Québec, New York State

Lummi (a branch of the larger language group of Coast Salish peoples): Washington State

Haida: Haida Gwaii (formerly the Queen Charlotte Islands), northwest British Columbia

Dane-Zaa (Beaver): Northeast British Columbia and northern Alberta

Anishnaabemowin (language of the Anishinaabe–Algonquin, Odawa, Saulteaux, Ojibwe): generally, throughout Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, Québec, and northern United States

Nêhiyáw (Cree): more northerly than the Anishinaabe in Alberta, Saskatchewan, Manitoba, Ontario, and Québec

Secwepemctsin (language of the Secwepemc–Shuswap): Central British Columbia

Nuu-chah-nulth (Nootka): Vancouver Island, British Columbia

Kwakwaka'wakw (Kwakiutl): Vancouver Island and south-central Pacific coast, British Columbia

Dakelh (Carrier): north-central British Columbia

Nisga'a: north-central British Columbia, west of the Dakelh

Hul'qumi'num (Coast Salish): southern Vancouver Island

³Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada, *What We Have Learned: Principles of Truth and Reconciliation* (2015): 3. <http://www.trc.ca/assets/pdf/Principles%20of%20Truth%20and%20Reconciliation.pdf>, accessed June 6, 2019.

⁴See British Columbia Ministry of Education. Aboriginal Education Enhancements Branch. *Aboriginal Worldviews and Perspectives in the Classroom: Moving Forward*, (2015). http://www.bced.gov.bc.ca/abed/awp_moving_forward.pdf, accessed June 23, 2019.

⁵British Columbia Teachers' Council. *Professional standards for BC educators*. Victoria; 2019. https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/kindergarten-to-grade-12/teach/teacher-regulation/standards-for-educators/edu_standards.pdf, accessed June 1, 2019.

⁶At present, 11% of students in BC self-identify as Indigenous (First Nation, Inuit, or Métis). <https://www2.gov.bc.ca/assets/gov/education/administration/kindergarten-to-grade-12/reports/ab-hawd/ab-hawd-school-district-public.pdf>, accessed November 18, 2020.

⁷We are non-Indigenous researchers currently doing research with Indigenous partners.

⁸Matthew Graham, "Heralding the Other: Sousa, Simulacra, and Settler Colonialism," *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 15, no. 2 (2016): 146–47. act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Graham15_2.pdf, accessed June 1, 2019.

⁹George Sefa Dei, "Critical Perspectives on Indigenous Research," *Socialist Studies* 9, no. 1 (2013): 27–38. Vanessa Watts, "Indigenous Place-Thought and Agency Amongst Humans and Non-Humans (First Woman and Sky Woman Go on a European World Tour!)." *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education and Society* 2, no. 1 (2013): 20–34. Jennifer Matsunaga, David Long, Anthony Gracey, and Lee Maracle, "CRS Symposium on Reconciling Indigenous-Settler Relations in Canada: Whose Voice Counts?" *Canadian Review of Sociology* 53, no. 4 (2016): 457–460. For music education and decolonization, see Deborah Bradley, "Music Education, Multiculturalism, and Anti-Racism: 'Can We Talk?'" *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 5, no. 2 (2006): 3. http://act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Bradley5_2.pdf, accessed June 3, 2019; Juliet Hess, "Decolonizing Music Education: Moving beyond Tokenism," *International Journal of Music Education* 33, no. 3 (August 2015): 336–47. doi:10.1177/0255761415581283. Matthew Graham, "Heralding the Other: Sousa, Simulacra, and Settler Colonialism," *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 15, no. 2 (2016): 146–77. act.maydaygroup.org/articles/Graham15_2.pdf, accessed June 3, 2019.

¹⁰Bracken, *The Potlatch Papers*.

¹¹We use the word *artistic* provisionally here for reasons of brevity, recognizing that the European concept of *art* (from which *artistic* stems) has historically tended to prioritize aesthetic valuing of cultural artifacts over the cultural processes and practices that produced them, simultaneously obscuring their import within the epistemes of the peoples with whom they originated.

¹²Catherine Bell and Val Napoleon, eds., *First Nations Cultural Heritage and Law: Case Studies, Voices, and Perspectives* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008), 24–5.

¹³Sandra Styres, *Pathways for Remembering and Recognizing Indigenous Thought in Education: Philosophies of Iethi'nihténha Ohwentsia'Kékha (Land)* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017), 146. Styres refers to the so-called Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, the premise that "the way we speak is connected to the ways we understand and connect to our reality" (146). Also see footnote 72, below. Taiaiake Alfred, *Wasáse: Indigenous Pathways of Action and Freedom* (Peterborough, ON: Broadview Press, 2015).

¹⁴Styres, *Pathways*, 151.

¹⁵See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_endangered_languages_in_Canada and https://www.itk.ca/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/TableauFiP_EN.pdf, accessed June 5, 2019.

¹⁶Marie Battiste, *Indigenous Knowledge and Pedagogy in First Nations Education: A Literature Review with Recommendations* (Ottawa: National Working Group on Education and the Minister of Indian Affairs. Indian and Northern Affairs Canada, 2002), 17. Bell and Napoleon, *First Nations Cultural Heritage and Law*, 24.

¹⁷Onowa McIvor, *Indigenous Languages in Canada: What You Need to Know* (Ottawa: CCUNESCO, 2018).

¹⁸Michael Marker, "Geographies of Indigenous Leaders: Landscapes and Mindscapes in the Pacific Northwest," *Harvard Educational Review* 85, no. 2 (2015): 239.

¹⁹Sarah Davidson and Robert Davidson, *Potlatch as Pedagogy: Learning Through Ceremony* (Winnipeg: Portage & Main Press, 2018), 13.

²⁰Robin Ridington and Jillian Ridington, *When You Sing it Now, Just Like New: First Nations Poetics, Voices, and Representations* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2006), 16.

²¹In Hul'qumi'num and other First Nations cultures, the drumbeat is the heartbeat of Mother Earth. See Anita Prest and J. Scott Goble, "Toward a Sociology of Music Education Informed by Indigenous Perspectives," in Ruth Wright, Geir Johansen, Panagiotis Kanellopoulos, and Patrick Schmidt, eds., *The Routledge Handbook to Sociology of Music Education*, (New York: Routledge, 2021).

²²Davidson and Davidson, *Potlatch as Pedagogy*, 20.

²³Most of these language groups consist of several dialects. Each dialect may or may not be understood well by members of that language group who speak other dialects. Shawn Wilson, *Research is Ceremony: Indigenous Research Methods* (Black Point, NS: Fernwood Publishers, 2008), 73.

²⁴*Ibid.*, 74, italics added.

²⁵Marianne Ignace and Ron Ignace, "Canadian Aboriginal Languages and the Protection of Cultural Heritage," in Catherine Bell and Val Napoleon, eds., *First Nations Cultural Heritage and Law: Case Studies, Voices, and Perspectives* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008), 423.

²⁶John Borrows, "Earth-Bound: Indigenous Resurgence and Environmental Reconciliation," in Michael Asch, John Borrows, and James Tully, eds. *Resurgence and Reconciliation: Indigenous-Settler Relations and Earth Teachings* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2018): 51–2.

²⁷Styres, *Pathways*, 144–5.

²⁸Ignace and Ignace, *Canadian Aboriginal Languages*, 422–433.

²⁹Borrows, *Earth-Bound*, 52.

³⁰Styres, *Pathways*, 149.

³¹Ignace and Ignace, *Canadian Aboriginal Languages*, 422.

³²See Richard Atleo (Umeek), *Tsawalk: A Nuu-chah-nulth Worldview* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2004); Richard Atleo (Umeek), *Principles of Tsawalk: An Indigenous Approach to Global Crisis* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011); Elsie Paul, *Written as I Remember It: Teachings ("ems ta?aw) from the Life of a Sliammon Elder* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2014).

³³Marianne Ignace and Ron Ignace, *Secwépemc People, Land, and Laws* (Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2018), 136.

³⁴Atleo, *Tsawalk*, 3.

³⁵Atleo, *Principles of Tsawalk*, 43.

³⁶Tanya Talaga, *All Our Relations: Finding the Path Forward*. CBC Massey Lectures Series. (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2018), 59–60.

³⁷Marker, *Geographies*, 235.

³⁸Philip Alpers, "What Should One Expect from a Philosophy of Music Education?" *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 25, (1991): 215–42. David Elliott, *Music Matters: A New*

Philosophy of Music Education (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). David Elliott and Marissa Silverman, *Music Matters: A Philosophy of Music Education. 2nd ed.* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2015). J. Scott Goble, *What's So Important About Music Education?* (New York: Routledge, 2010). Thomas Regelski, "Social Theory, and Music and Music Education as Praxis," *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education* 3, no. 3 (2004): 2–52.

³⁹Christopher Small, *Musicking* (Hanover: Wesleyan University Press, 1998).

⁴⁰Rubén Gaztambide-Fernández, "Why the Arts Don't Do Anything: Toward a New Vision for Cultural Production in Education," *Harvard Educational Review* 83, no.1 (2013): 226.

⁴¹Beverly Diamond, *Native American Music in Eastern North America: Experiencing Music, Expressing Culture* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008). Robert Leavitt, "Language and Cultural Content in Native Education," in Marie Battiste and Jean Barman, eds., *First Nations Education in Canada: The Circle Unfolds*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1995). Styres, *Pathways*, 2017.

⁴²Sandra Styres, in *Pathways*, capitalizes the word *Land* to honor Mother Earth "as a sentient and conscious being" (38). She capitalizes the word in order to distinguish it from simply a place or "a physical geographic space" (49). Rather, "Land [is] a theoretical and philosophical concept compris[ing] circularity, understanding of self-in-relationship, language, storying, and journeying as a central model for interpretation and meaning making" (38). We elaborate on this conception on p. 17.

⁴³Leavitt, "Language and Culture," 133.

⁴⁴According to the worldviews of many First Nations, all matter—including rocks, plants, trees, animals, and humans—is sentient or alive, and all entities are imbued with spirit. See Prest and Goble, "Toward a Sociology of Music Education Informed by Indigenous Perspectives."

⁴⁵In *The Potlatch Papers*, Bracken meticulously tracks the ways in which the feasts organized by various First Nations across British Columbia were all inaccurately subsumed under the term *potlatch*. "While 'potlatch' . . . belong[s] to a jargon belonging to no one in particular, the dictionaries define . . . [it] as practices common to all of the coastal First Nations. When the law borrows these Chinook [trade language] terms to name acts that have different names and take different forms in different communities, it reduces the diversity of the coastal First Nations to an unbroken sameness" (111–2).

⁴⁶Catherine Bell, Heather Raven, and Heather McCuaig, "Recovering from Colonization: Perspectives of Community Members on Protection and Repatriation of Kwakwaka'wakw Cultural Heritage," in Catherine Bell and Val Napoleon, eds., *First Nations Cultural Heritage and Law: Case Studies, Voices, and Perspectives*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008), 46.

⁴⁷Richard Overstall, "The Law is Opened: The Constitutional Role of Tangible and Intangible Property in Gitanyow," in Catherine Bell and Val Napoleon, eds., *First Nations Cultural Heritage and Law: Case Studies, Voices, and Perspectives*, (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008), 92–113.

⁴⁸John Borrows, *Canada's Indigenous Constitution* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010), 94.

⁴⁹Bracken, *The Potlatch Papers*, 37–8.

⁵⁰Ibid., 101.

⁵¹Ibid., 66, italics added.

⁵²Ibid., 120. Also in Joseph Gosnell, “Speech to the British Columbia Legislature,” *BC Studies: The British Columbian Quarterly* 120 (Winter 1998–99): 5–10.

⁵³Graham, “Heralding the Other,” 150, italics added.

⁵⁴Deborah Bradley, “Music Education, Multiculturalism, and Anti-Racism,” 3.

⁵⁵See Marie Battiste, *Indigenous Knowledge*, 16. See also Verna St. Denis, “Silencing Aboriginal Curricular Content and Perspectives Through Multiculturalism: ‘There are Other Children Here,’” *Aboriginal Policy Research Consortium International, Paper 268* (2011), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10714413.2011.597638>

⁵⁶Dwayne Donald, Florence Glanfield, and Gladys Sterenberg, “Culturally Relational Education in and with an Indigenous Community,” *In Education*, 17, no. 3 (2011): 72–83. See also Styres, *Pathways*.

⁵⁷Bradley, *Music Education*, 8.

⁵⁸Ibid., 13

⁵⁹St. Denis, *Silencing*, 312.

⁶⁰Government of Canada, *Statement of the Government of Canada on Indian Policy* (Ottawa, Indian and Northern Affairs, 1969), Accessed June 19, 2019, <http://publications.gc.ca/pub?id=9.700112&sl=0>

⁶¹Harold Cardinal, *The Unjust Society*, 2nd ed. (Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre, 1999). The first edition was published in 1969 by M. G. Hurtig Ltd.

⁶²St. Denis, *Silencing*, 311.

⁶³Sefa Dei, *Critical Perspectives*.

⁶⁴Ibid., 308.

⁶⁵Ibid., 313.

⁶⁶Gloria Ladson-Billings, “Toward a Theory of Culturally Relevant Pedagogy,” *American Education Research Journal* 32, no. 3 (1995): 469, italics added.

⁶⁷Geneva Gay, “The What, Why, and How of Culturally Responsive Teaching: International Mandates, Challenges, and Opportunities,” *Multicultural Education Review* 7, no. 3 (2015): 124, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/2005615X.2015.1072079>

⁶⁸Angelina Castagno and Bryan Brayboy, “Culturally Responsive Schooling for Indigenous Youth: A Review of the Literature,” *Review of Educational Research* 78, no. 4 (2008): 941.

⁶⁹Carlos Abril, “Toward a More Culturally Responsive General Music Classroom,” *General Music Today* 27, no. 10 (2013): 6–11. See also Vicki Lind and Constance McKoy, *Culturally Responsive Teaching in Music Education: From Understanding to Application*. (New York: Routledge, 2016).

⁷⁰Battiste, *Indigenous Knowledge*, 16.

⁷¹Jo-Ann Archibald (Q’um Q’um Xiiem), *Indigenous Storywork: Educating the Heart, Mind, Body, and Spirit* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2008). See also Styres, *Pathways*.

⁷²Donald, Glanfield, and Sterenberg, “Culturally Relational,” 76.

⁷³Ibid., 77

⁷⁴Django Paris, "Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: A Needed Change in Stance, Terminology, and Practice," *Educational Researcher* 41, no. 3, (2012): 95, DOI: 10.3102/0013189X12441244.

⁷⁵Teresa McCarty and Tiffany Lee, "Critical Culturally Sustaining/Revitalizing Pedagogy and Indigenous Education Sovereignty," *Harvard Educational Review* 84, no. 1, (2014): 101.

⁷⁶Saroj Chawla, "Linguistic and Philosophical Roots of Our Environmental Crisis," *Environmental Ethics* 13, no. 3 (1991): 253–62. In using the word *influence* (rather than *determine*), Chawla is aligning her claims with the "weaker form" of the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, according to which language is not necessarily determinative, but does provide constraints in some areas of human cognition, allowing that other cultural factors also contribute. See Laura M. Ahearn, *Living Language: An Introduction to Linguistic Anthropology* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 69–71.

⁷⁷Chawla, *Linguistic and Philosophical Roots*, 254.

⁷⁸Aleksandar Janca and Clothilde Bullen, "The Aboriginal Concept of Time and its Mental Health Implications," *Australasian Psychiatry* 11 (Supplement) (2003): 40–1.

⁷⁹Chawla, *Linguistic and Philosophical Roots*, 261.

⁸⁰See Christopher Small, *Music of the Common Tongue: Survival and Celebration in African American Music* (Hanover NH: Wesleyan University Press, 1987), 16–17. See also J. Scott Goble, *What's So Important about Music Education?* (New York: Routledge, 2010), 98–101.

⁸¹Chawla, *Linguistic and Philosophical Roots*, 254.

⁸²Ibid., 262.