Consensus

Volume 37
Issue 2 *Faith and the Arts*

Article 2

11-25-2016

Interfaith-Cross-Cultural Improvisation: Music and Meaning Across Boundaries of Faith and Culture

Gerard J. Yun

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus

Part of the Ethnomusicology Commons, and the Practical Theology Commons

Recommended Citation

Yun, Gerard J. (2016) "Interfaith-Cross-Cultural Improvisation: Music and Meaning Across Boundaries of Faith and Culture," *Consensus*: Vol. 37: Iss. 2, Article 2.
DOI: 10.51644/HKSK3848
Available at: https://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol37/iss2/2

This Articles is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consensus by an authorized editor of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact scholarscommons@wlu.ca.

Interfaith-Cross-Cultural Improvisation: Music and Meaning Across Boundaries of Faith and Culture

Gerard J. Yun[1]

> *It really boils down to this: that all life is interrelated. We are all caught in an inescapable network of mutuality, tied into a single garment of destiny. Whatever affects one destiny, affects all indirectly.*
>
> Martin Luther King, Jr., 1963, p. 211

Introduction

Interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation was born out of a need to engage community members across a broad range of local cultural and faith-based groups for a specific event. These groups included local Jewish temples, various Protestant and Catholic churches, and First Nations drummers and singers, with several other sub-groups included within two university communities. In its decade long history, Sing Fires of Justice (held annually since 2006 in Kitchener-Waterloo, Ontario) has brought together people defined by a plurality of cultures, faiths, and musics to address issues of social justice through the spoken word and music in a pseudo-liturgical, public concert-like forum. Interfaith-cross-cultural improvisations were, at first, experiments in choral music-making designed to answer the question "what are we all going to sing together?" in a situation where participants identify with wildly different cultural backgrounds and faith practices.

Interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation is a form of group, participatory music-making where musical ideas are shared in a common negotiated musical space. These ideas stem directly from the musical cultures and systems of the participants. But, through combining, blending, and mixing of musical ideas the improvisation takes on a life of its own. What results is less a culturally hybridized musical product and more of a commonly shared musical experience. This experience is extemporized in the moment and addresses the realities of common purpose in a situation of obvious differences in a musical way. Please listen to this sample of an interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation taken from Sing Fires of Justice, 2016. You are invited to leave it running in the background while you read this article: https://youtu.be/IcOwxixlYw8.

I liken this form of improvisation to early airplanes. Many of these early machines while on the ground looked as if there was no way they could fly. They were heavy, bulky, and to the uninitiated, produced fear and anxiety. The same observers seeing the machines in the air would declare them amazing, graceful and beautiful. Like those early aircraft, interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation does not seem like a viable musical undertaking. There are simply too many differences, too many people involved, and no one has "control" of the outcome. Yet, these group improvisations, typically involving over a hundred

[1] Gerard Yun teaches courses in community music, music and meaning and social justice, and directs musical ensembles in the Faculty of Music at Wilfrid Laurier University and the program for Global Citizenship at the Waterloo Lutheran Seminary.

participants, have proven to be inspiring, meaningful, transcendent, and beautiful to participants and observers alike. "Improvisations across differences," as I sometimes refer to them, draw their efficacy from the nature of group singing itself, their ability to encourage states of *deep play*, the extemporaneous and free quality of improvisation, the human quality of *ubuntu* [togetherness in Zulu], and the ability to create and hold safe space for negotiation, creation, and discovery. It is *ethical music space*.

This particular improvisation project involves the participation of Jewish cantors, Christian church choirs, Arabic singing, a First Nations song/drum group, as well as chant, the pipe organ, and Zen Buddhist meditation flute (shakuhachi). The musics are added one after the other, layering increasing the density of the musical texture as the work progresses. Note that the individual musics remain clear, their cultural and musical distinctness is in no way compromised or neutralized in favour of another music. Yet, what begins as a sort of contested musical exercise, quickly blends into something more unified, co-created, collaborative.

Interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation is communal music making at its best. The first encounters with the art form are almost mystical as group discovery of the many possibilities and solutions inevitably leads to moments of wonder and beauty. Yet, there is no conventional musical direction or pre-scripting. It is the participants, in the experience of their connectedness and with a sense of play, that explore and develop these musical solutions themselves. What follows is not a "how to" of improvisation. There simply is not enough room to encompass that information here. Rather, this article explores the greater points, rationales, and aspects of this unusual, but remarkably effective and thought-provoking emergent art form.

Group Singing, Social Cooperation and Empathy

Differences in today's post 9/11 society are increasingly perceived not as political or national but as cultural and, with intense reactions, as religious. This makes the work of interfaith dialogue urgent and crucial (Toro, 2009). Add to this, Canada's national identity as a multicultural society and the current wrestling with First Nations rights through issues raised in interviews about the residential school system and a host of other injustices raised as part of Truth and Reconciliation (Canada Truth and Reconciliation Commission, 2015; Laurila, 2016). We also face urgent, internal, cross-cultural issues with the influx of immigrants and refugees. Where do the arts, specifically music, often referred to as a "universal language," (Cohen, 2015) serve in these external and internal interfaith-cross-cultural issues? Interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation brings to interfaith dialogue the opportunity to reach across the perceived differences of belief and cultural practices to create connection.

Humans are deeply connected, social beings and among the art forms that people create, group singing has an ability to embody, reflect, and inform this connection. This is reflected in the massive volume of congregational songs associated with a variety of traditions, the amount of written chant and choral music, and the sheer number of life events that include group singing – church services, festivals, funerals, weddings, birthdays, pub gatherings, etc. Group singing has probably been practiced as long as human society has existed and it is not a stretch for us to imagine that in many settings it was largely unscripted,

https://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol37/iss2/2
DOI: 10.51644/HKSK3848

people learning songs together, blending voices, listening, and adapting to one another's music while supporting those around them – in other words, improvisation.

The connectedness and empathy experienced in group singing may be part of our evolution as a human species. Steven Mithin (2012), an evolutionary biologist, proposes that humans sang before they developed the ability to speak. It is evolutionary biology that translates the philosophical concept of connectedness into social cooperation. Mithin examines ideas of both language and musical development in forming his own hypothesis around group singing. He proposes that this "language of singing" was more complex than we hear in non-human primates today and he characterizes its main features as holistic, multi-modal, manipulative, and musical. He calls it "Hmmmm" for short. He effectively argues that this early form of group singing laid the foundations of our greatest evolutionary advantage -- social cooperation:

> . . . hominids lacked both the cues of language and material symbols to help resolve their social dilemmas over whom to trust and whom to exploit. . . .As a consequence, those individuals who forged a group identity by shared 'Hmmmm' vocalizations . . . would have prospered. Joint music-making served to facilitate cooperative behaviour by advertising one's willingness to cooperate . . . (Mithin, 2012, p. 217)

He explains that singing together signaled the willingness to cooperate, the intent to participate in a group and led to a breaking down of separations and gave rise to new collective identities. Early singing supported the formation of community. Like Mithin's "Hmmmm" language, interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation's efficacy lies not in the aesthetics of the sound it produces but in the clear signalling to its diverse parties to participate – a powerful signal of the intent to cooperate.

As important as this intent may be, participation in improvisation moves beyond this into a realm of musical dialogue and cooperation. It begs the question, does group singing instill social action, sway belief, or in fact do anything that has to do with making a difference through interfaith-cross-cultural dialogue? This inquiry is part of a more fundamental question that explores the relationship between music and faith. It is usually framed as a statement, something along the lines of "music makes people believe" or "music calls us to action." Ethnomusicologist, John Blacking (1973) in his landmark work *How Musical Is Man?* suggests otherwise:

> Music cannot change societies, as can changes in technology and political organization. It cannot make people act unless they are already socially and culturally disposed to act. It cannot instill brotherhood, as Tolstoy hoped, or any other state or social value. If it can do anything to people, the best it can do is to confirm situations that already exist. (p. 107)

Similar to other elements of ritual, music functions to make the implicit explicit. That is, to bring into awareness states which already exist.[2] In interfaith improvisation our fundamental, underlying connectedness is brought into awareness as the experience of empathy. Martin Heidegger in *Being and Time* posits that interconnectedness already exist as part of being human and empathy is the sense of that connection coming into awareness:

[2] This is a broad definition of ritual found in a number of works on ritual and liturgical studies in both anthropology and religion. An excellent discussion of the topic appears in the context of liturgical studies in Wolterstorff's (2015) *The God We Worship: an exploration of liturgical theology*.

> *Dasein* [German for "being-there"], as being in the world already is with others. "Empathy" does not first constitute Being-with [German: *mitsein*]; only on the basis of Being-with does empathy become possible: it gets its motivation from the unsociability of the dominant modes of Being-with. (Heidegger, 1927/1962, p. 162)

Heidegger uses "*dasein*" to mean the human awareness which encompasses self-awareness as well as awareness its relationship to others, while "being with" [*mitsein*] refers to the ontological characteristic of human beings collectively. We exist amongst and as a part of other human beings and empathy is the sensation of preexisting connection coming into awareness, a connection that is innate and fundamental to the nature of being human. Although, we are not always cognizant of this connection. Group singing, and in particular group improvisation, reawakens our awareness and the sensation of connectedness. Empathy allows us to experience the joy and easy company of our connections in a safe space. Stated simply, group improvisation awakens empathy.

Improvisation: Meaning and Context

Group singing is important to group participation. Hymns or songs with precomposed texts and notes are the most common answer to the question: What are we going to sing? With prescribed or pre-scripted compositions the sonic outcome is clearly spelled out. The roadmap is clear. Despite the negatives associated with improvisation – namely fear of not knowing, fear of judgment, and failure – the nature of improvisation as a musical practice makes it compelling in situations of cultural and religious differences.

Interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation is not preplanned, composed, choreographed, directed, conducted, or written down. It is a sort of blank, level playing field where one culture does not dominate or seek advantage of language, setting, or composition over another. Through the participation of living members of cultures and groups, it avoids cultural appropriation, mimicry, imitation, cultural exoticism, and "compositions in the style of . . ." – the complications and pitfalls of cross-cultural music making with Western mediums (choirs, orchestras, bands, opera, string quartets, etc.) for the past several hundred years. The act of interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation short-circuits the Western colonial power structure as it manifests in music where one musical form dominates another. It loosens and makes more porous the closed form tonal structures of Western melody and harmony – the inevitable progression from tonic to dominant harmonies and back. It avoids the power arrangements of composer, arranger, publisher, retailer, and consumer thus breaking the monetization chain of music creator, producer, and consumer. It even brings musical ownership into a very grey area. While a soloist may be able to copyright a recording of her own musical improvisation (if she can claim clear ownership of the sounds, notes, and rhythms she utilizes), in group improvisation and in particular interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation it is likely impossible for any one person or group to claim ownership over the entire artwork. Such musical events are incredibly difficult to list on a concert program as there is no name for a composer or arranger, no such listing as "South African Traditional" or other clear cultural identifier. Without the conventional proxies of context, improvisation becomes its own context where meaning is generated within the musical experience itself.

That is not to say that hymns and Western melodies are not used in cross-cultural improvisations -- far from it -- but, simply that one cannot assume that their meaning in their original or home context is transferable to the improvisation. In a context where we are

DOI: 10.51644/HKSK3848

amongst "others" (those outside of our cultural group), meaning shifts sharply away from the limited beliefs, values, and experiences of one group. This is opposite of the way I was educated in the interpretation of formal Western music. In the Western conservatory the origin of the musical work determines much of its meaning. As the composer is seen as the original source of the work, so the "composer's intentions" are paramount in understanding the meaning of the music. These "intentions" are expanded to include historical and cultural settings, nationality, in short anything to elucidate the origin of the work. For example, a hymn is composed by someone in an act of devotion and faith. As we understand it in this vein of thinking, the hymn's meaning is tied to the belief system of the composer. If works, such as Gregorian chants, are claimed to be the works of God then no matter what their use or who sings them, their meaning, their value, is tied to the belief system centreing around God. Interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation creates a new context for such pieces, a context of "others" who are working together to bring empathy to the fore with musics. But how does this context or new sense of space influence meaning? The nature of togetherness as described in the term "*ubuntu*" may help explain what happens in these group improvisations.

Ubuntu is a South African word that has captured the imagination of world leaders, activists, and innovators (Battle, 2009). *It* embodies the concepts of compassion (caring), community (togetherness), and empathy (connection). *Ubuntu* helped to shape the theology of Nobel Peace Prize winner and anti-apartheid activist Bishop Desmond Tutu (1999):

> *Ubuntu* is very difficult to render into a Western language. It speaks of the very essence of being human. When we want to give high praise to someone we say, '*Yu, u nobunto*'; 'Hey so-and-so has *ubuntu*.' Then you are generous, you are hospitable, you are friendly and caring and compassionate. You share what you have. It is to say, 'My humanity is inextricably bound up in yours.' We belong in a bundle of life. (p. 31)

According to Tutu, *ubuntu* means that we are bound together as humans, we are connected as in Heidegger's *mitsein* [being-with] and as we are together the best qualities of our humanity emerge. This is succinctly stated by Nobel Peace Prize winner Leymah Gbowee (2012) who translates *ubuntu* as "I am what I am because of who we all are."

Interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation is a gathering in the field of "others." We would understand if a participant wanted to hang on tightly to the musical ideas and ways of doing and being (ontologies) of his original group – doing it the way it has always been done. Or if she wanted to simply withdraw from the improvisation out of fear or anxiety. But, in practice these things rarely happen. The concept of *ubuntu* helps to define and shape the musical space of these improvisations. In this shaping or altering of the space, the idea of *ubuntu* informs the very context, the social fabric of the musical exchange, creating an environment where anxiety and fears fall away and where empathy, the awareness of connectedness, inevitably rises. Within that space musical ideas are shared, morphed, adjusted, altered and transformed almost instantly without direction and without pre-scripted instructions. Fear and judgment give way to play.

Group Improvisation as Deep Play

Music as an activity, rather than a noun, or "musicking" (Small, 1998) is certainly a pastime for many and as such, it is considered a form of play. The playful aspect of music is

obvious during improvisation. In common parlance, play is the opposite of work. Work is serious stuff, whereby the essence of life's value translates to social status and meaning. Play, on the other hand, is nonessential, a pleasurable pastime, perhaps an enhancement of life, but certainly not the core of it. Psychotherapists and other scientists have framed another way of thinking about play. They acknowledge its importance to the developing child, but also to the healthily functioning adult within the complex social structures in which we have evolved, and indeed as a necessary component in the development of higher intelligence. Behavioural psychologist, Peter Gray (2009) frames this in studying hunter-gatherer societies:

> Play and humor were not just means of adding fun to their lives. They were means of maintaining the band's existence – means of promoting actively the egalitarian attitude, intense sharing, and relative peacefulness for which hunter-gatherers are justly famous and upon which they depended for survival. (pp. 476-477)

In short, play is essential for survival. A necessity for group cohesion, collaboration, and as a way overcoming tendencies towards individual competition. This is how naturalist, Diane Ackerman (2012), describes the nature of human play:

> [Play] is its own goal, which it reaches in a richly satisfying way. Play has its own etiquette, rituals, and ceremonies, its own absolute rules . . . Above all, play requires freedom. (pp. 6-7) . . . [Play requires] daring, risk, concentration, the ability to live with uncertainty, a willingness to follow the rules of the game, and a desire for transcendence. (p. 9)

Ackerman is saying that play is something more than just a social wheel greaser. It has in it a bit of the transcendent, or otherworldliness. It has its own rules and requires a frame of mind akin to that of improvisation – risk, daring, living with uncertainty. She goes on to describe another level of play that goes beyond the forming of social skills or the joyful absorption in a pastime. To her, play also has qualities of deep meaning we associate with the sacred. She calls this "deep play"[3]:

> But there is a deeper form of play, akin to rapture and ecstasy, that humans relish, even require to feel whole . . . Deep play is the ecstatic form of play. In its thrall, all the play elements are visible, but they're taken to intense and transcendent heights . . . some activities are prone to it: art, religion, risk-taking, and some sports. Deep play always involves the sacred and holy, sometimes hidden in the most unlikely of places. (Ackerman, 2012, p. 12)

In Ackerman's deep play, normal perception is replaced by an ecstatic, joyful intensifying of awareness. This is similar to the way flow states are described in modern psychology (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990), as well as descriptions of meditation and prayer states. She does not mask deep play's close relationship to religious experience, reminiscent of Rudolf Otto's description of the numinous.[4]

---

[3] The term "deep play" was coined by utilitarian philosopher, Jeremy Bentham (1748-1832), who defined it as an irrational game where one stands to lose far more than than they stand to gain. Ackerman's "deep play" hybridizes Bentham's phrase with ideas about play from *Homo Ludens* (1938) by Dutch anthropologist, Johan Huizinga (1872-1945) (Ackerman, 2012, p. 18).

[4] Otto first described the religious experience as *numinous* in his 1917 publication *Das Heilige* which appeared in English under the title "*The Idea of the Holy.*"

DOI: 10.51644/HKSK3848

Participants in interfaith-cross-cultural improvisations attest to the transcendent, ecstatic nature of the experience as well as the "on the edge" almost fearful aspect of participating -- fear of giving up of the sense of self and the "self-consciousness" that goes with it. To once again quote Ackerman (2012): ". . . All people play . . . but some fear its apparent loss of control. A voice inside them warns not to give themselves up to the nonrational, even temporarily, or they might go insane. Or *appear* that way -- then what would the neighbors think?" (pp. 118-119).

This sense of giving up of individual self and moving into a larger less "self-conscious" state is at the heart of the improvisational experience. Improvisation as a sort of creative divine play is echoed in Nachmanovitch's (1990) work about improvisation in music and in life:

> There is an old Sanskrit word, *lila,* which means play. Richer than our word, it means divine play, the play of creation, destruction, and re-creation, the folding and unfolding of the cosmos. *Lila*, free and deep, is both the delight and enjoyment of this moment, and the play of God. (p. 1) . . . Creativity is a harmony of opposite tensions, as encapsulated in our opening idea of *lila*, or divine play. (p. 12)

With this description, Nachmanovitch manages to locate the musical act of improvisation, an act of creativity itself, squarely in the centre of both play and sacredness. As *lila* – divine play – musical improvisation takes on the joy, freedom, transcendence of the mundane, and creative / re-creative aspects of Ackerman's deep play.

Improvisation as Ethical Music Space

Interfaith improvisation can be experienced as deep play that gives rise to empathy and acknowledges connectedness and community, because it generates a form of ethical space. That is, a space specially suited for these experiences to occur. Ethical space as described by Roger Poole is a space divided by difference, where even the slightest actions have ethical repercussions. In his book, *Towards Deep Subjectivity* (1972), Poole illustrates ethical space by describing a photograph taken during the Russian occupation of Czechoslovakia:

> Three Russian soldiers and four Czech citizens are sitting on park benches in Prague. The time is late summer 1968. The three Russians sit in a row, staring before them. One of them has leaned his weapon casually against his knee. Further along the bench, two Czech citizens are bent forward, staring at the ground. At right angles to the Russians, a young man and a girl are sitting. Both of them are looking at the Russians. Both are immobile, reflective. (p. 3)

This is a tense scene from the Soviet era. The people here are Czech in a Czech park. It is the Russians who are outsiders, their status as Soviet soldiers, and the presence of the gun that make the power relationship tense. The Russians are seen as invaders by the Czechs who feel that this park is theirs. Body positions, eye contact, proximity, etc. all come into play as the ownership of the space is contested, divided by the differing intentions of the two different groups. This divided space, occupied physically by the two very different groups is what Poole describes as the ethical space, where each and every action has ethical weight and implications:

> The space spread out before the protagonists of the drama is ethical space itself. Meaning and interpretation belong together inseparably. Anything which visibly has a meaning is in the same instant invested with an interpretation by each and every onlooker . . . There can be no flaccid action, no action which is not immediately imbued with an ethical ballast . . . Interpretation will always be instantaneous. (p.6)

Within ethical space every act is observed and interpreted immediately. And any act is thought to embody intentions. The highly magnified and sensitive nature of ethical space is precisely the nature of interfaith improvisation. Every action, sonic or otherwise, has immediate weight and is received and interpreted at the same time, seemingly by everyone involved. But that is not a complete picture. There is also a sense of neutral ground, a place for negotiation, a meeting place within musical improvisation that nicely parallels an update of Poole's original conception of ethical space.

Ethicist, Willie Ermine uses Poole's concept of ethical space to characterize the engagement between Aboriginal peoples and the Canadian government -- two very different groups, with different perspectives, and historically at terrible odds with one another. Whereas Poole is keen to describe the weighty and contested nature of ethical space, Ermine (2007) sees solutions for cooperation within the ethical space where differences can be negotiated. He sees that in the imagining of this space born of difference there can be a neutral ground:

> [The] idea of the ethical space, produced by contrasting perspectives of the world, entertains the notion of a meeting place, or initial thinking about a neutral zone between entities or cultures. The space offers a venue to . . . assume a position where human-to-human dialogue can occur. The ethical space offers itself as the theatre for cross-cultural conversation. (p. 202)

Poole's version and Ermine's version of ethical space feel quite different, one highly tense and contested, the other as a place for human to human dialogue, free of preconceived or pre-scripted notions. Ermine is also characterizing two groups with widely differing world perspectives and cultures. The differences between settler and Aboriginal perspectives does create a seemingly uncrossable chasm of cultural difference. Yet, Ermine sees this large gap as a place to create partnership.

The held, negotiated, music space created in our interfaith-cross-cultural improvisations at Sing Fires of Justice in Kitchener-Waterloo works as both authors describe. In my own experience, at the outset we often begin with Poole's tense, contested space – anxious, apprehensive, eyes cast downward or desperately seeking a neutral, uncontested direction. Gradually and at first tentatively, we move towards collaboration, shaping the space to resemble more of what Ermine has envisioned as ethical space. It works across diverse music forms with deep structural and cultural differences and seems the richer for it. Interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation allows ourselves and our "others" to stand distinctly with one another in ethical space, where each note we sound or non-sound we make signals our intention to partner together or to simply be there with one another. Bodily presence, eye contact, facial expressions, all communicate in the intensified ethical music space of these improvisations. The musical ethical space is not so much a place where mistakes are forgiven but where what perhaps sounded like a musical error becomes the very solution for a way forward together. Because of the intensifying nature of ethical space, improvisation becomes a place of rich promise and deep meaning.

DOI: 10.51644/HKSK3848

Conclusion

Interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation is an unusual, emerging art form that engages participants from widely different cultural, faith, and musical backgrounds in a negotiated, ethical music space. The improvisations are true extemporizations with musical ideas generated by participants and encouraged by a facilitator in real time, across perceptions of palpable difference. What is deeply compelling about this unique form is that it works at all. These improvisations engage large numbers of participants from widely different cultural and faith practices. Yet, they inevitably succeed as both works of performance art and communal experience.

Evolutionary biology tells us that in the act of sounding together, participants signal their intent to engage in collaboration. What follows intent is movement towards a state of deep play, what writers have called *lila* – divine play, creation. This occurs within a negotiated, ethical music space where moments of discovery and experiences of connectedness are informed by empathy and ubuntu, where personal identity and group identity shape and redefine one another (I am who I am because of who we are together, now in this space). While defying musical power relationships tied to ownership, monetization, and authoritarian structures, interfaith-cross-cultural improvisations work because of the very differences that participants bring to the space itself. Yet, as a music, it does nothing more than joyfully remind us of what is already present: our willingness to engage with one another, our innate connectedness, and our shared humanity. By revealing to us that we are naturally creative, problem-solving, interactive beings, interfaith-cross-cultural improvisation becomes a hopeful and transcendent music practice, whose success lies in the very intent to engage one another in a meaningful, ethical, and moving way, while playing together in the experience of our inevitable connectedness.

References Cited

Ackerman, D. (2000). *Deep play*. New York, NY: Vintage Books.

Battle, M.J. (2009). *Ubuntu: I in you and you in me*. New York, NY: Seabury Books.

Blacking, J. (1973). *How musical is man?* Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press.

Cohen, C. (2015). Music: A Universal Language? In Urbain, Oliver (ed). *Music and Conflict Transformation : harmonies and dissonances in geopolitics.* (pp. 26-38). New York: Toda Institute for Global Peace and Policy Research.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1990). *Flow: the psychology of optimal experience.* NY: Harper & Row.

Ermine, W. (2007). The ethical space of engagement. *Indigenous Law Journal*, 6(1), 194-203.

Gbowee, L. (2012, March). Unlock the intelligence, passion, and greatness of girls [Video file]. Retrieved September 3, 2016, from TED: http://www.ted.com/talks/leymah_gbowee_unlock_the_intelligence_passion_greatness_of_girls.

Gray, P. (2009). Play as a foundation for hunter-gatherers. *American Journal of Play*, 1(4), 476-522.

Heidegger, M. (1962). *Being and Time* (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell. (Original work published 1927).

King Jr., M.L. (1967). *A Christmas sermon on peace.* In J.K. Galbraith, P. Goodman, J. Jacobs, E.W. Kierans & M.L. King Jr. (2007). *The lost Massey Lectures: Recovered classics from five great thinkers.* (pp. 209-221). Toronto: House of Anansi Press.

Laurila, K. [First United Church]. (2016, June 19). Reconciliation Message [Video file]. Retrieved September 3, 2016, from https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=P40dRIBJX58.

Mithen, S. (2005). *The singing neanderthals: The origins of music, language, mind, and body*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
Nachmanovitch, S. (1990). *Free play: Improvisation in life and art*. New York, NY: Tarcher/Putnam.
Otto, R. (1950). *The idea of the holy* (2nd ed.; J.W. Harvey, Trans.). London, England: Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1917).
Poole, R. (1972). *Towards deep subjectivity*. London, England: Penguin Press.
Small, C. (1998). *Musicking: The meanings of performance and listening*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press.
Toro, C. Eduardo Vargas (2016, September 3). The Importance and Purpose of Interfaith Dialogue in Global Affairs [Web log post]. Retrieved September 3, 2016, from http://irdialogue.org/articles/the-importance-and-purpose-of-interfaith-dialogue-in-global-affairs-by-sara-reef-and-c-eduardo-vargas-toro.
Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. (2015). *Honouring the truth, reconciling for the future: summary of the final report of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada*. Retrieved November 1, 2016, from: http://www.trc.ca.
Tutu, D. (1999). *No future without forgiveness*. New York: Image Doubleday.
Wolterstorff, N. (2015). *The God We Worship: an exploration of liturgical theology.* Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdman Publishing.

DOI: 10.51644/HKSK3848