

Arts Education: from pedagogy to sustainable futures?

DAN BARON COHEN:

I would like to say to everybody, it's wonderful that we have so many people from Hong Kong to join a very diverse and distinguished group of experts and people who have come from all over the world to raise many questions towards the advocacy of the arts as part of our education throughout the world.

I would like to thank, again, Mr Tsang, the Secretary for Home Affairs, and I would like to introduce you to the different people who are already coming onto the stage. Let me tell you who we are bringing onto the stage. Mr Jooho Kim is here. May I present Mr Kim. He's the president of the Korean Arts & Cultural Education Service.

Dr Rathna Kumar, the artistic director of Samskriti, Society for Indian Performing Arts. Presently living in the United States. Mr Kim is from Korea.

Prof Shifra Schonmann here, the head of the Laboratory for Research from the University of Haifa in Israel.

Prof Ngugi Wa Thiong'o, the distinguished Prof of English and Comparative Literature at the University of California in Irvine, USA. From Kenya.

Ms Ada Wong, the Chair of the Hong Kong Institute for Contemporary Culture.

And Mr Paul Collard from Creative Partnerships, UK.

Here you can see six provocative keynotes, people who are going to respond to questions from the floor but from keynote speakers equally as distinguished who have been preparing in dialogue with these people. Dialogues dealing with the key questions that concern the advocacy for the arts.

I'm going to ask them to identify themselves. Mr Allan Agerbo, vice-president of the European Performers House in Denmark.

Dr Michael Day, a member of the Executive Board of InSEA, professor emeritus, and former chair of visual arts in the University of Bickham Young, is that how you pronounce it? Where is Michael?

Professor Penina Mlama, the executive director of the Forum of African Women Educationalists from Kenya and professor of theatre arts at the University of Dar es Salaam.

Dr Dalia -- I need some help on the pronunciation of her name -- Siaulytiene. How do you pronounce your name? Chief Officer of Arts Education and Arts Projects at the Ministry of Education and Science in the Republic of Lithuania.

Prof William Sun, vice-president of the Shanghai Theatre Academy in mainland China.

And I believe Professor Graham Welch, the last of our distinguished questioner key notes. Chair of Music and Education and Head of the School of Arts and Humanities at the Institute of Education in the University of London, United Kingdom.

You are now witnessing our first attempt to create a dialogic keynote. That's to say 12 distinguished speakers from outside our own areas of drama education, music education and art education, education through art, where possible, the people who are raising key questions about how we can improve our advocacy of pedagogies that can create sustainable futures.

I want to tell you a little about how we intend to work today, so that you can understand your role as part of this dialogue. It's quite an unusual and very creative format. It's an attempt for us to move beyond formats which we all come to expect when we remain passive, listening to very capable people, but often without a role ourselves to intervene in the discussions and share our own questions and expertise.

We're going to begin with a question from the floor, which will be received by one of the provocative keynotes, the people who will be provoking you to rethink the arts, or to see the arts in different ways, as instruments, as languages, as potentials for building

new pedagogies and new cultures, as well as for affirming the cultures that define our histories and our identities.

After we have had a dialogue of perhaps five minutes, seven minutes, there will be an opportunity for these two people to exchange further ideas and if there is an opportunity for you to come in, I will bring you as the audience to ask a question to either the provocative keynote or the questioner keynote inside the auditorium.

We will then hear another dialogue in a similar form, and after this second dialogue, I will invite you to turn to people beside you, inside the audience, to begin to share questions and ideas and again to begin to look at possible ways in which you can see the arts might be used inside your own lives.

We will have six dialogues and at the end of these six dialogues, providing we have time and providing the dialogues don't become too provocative and too unpredictable, I hope to bring you, the audience, back into this process so that you can conclude with your own questions and reflections.

So this is our first public open dialogue, to open the Asian Cultural Co-operation Forum and to look for effective ways of advocating the arts for sustainable futures.

I'm going to sit in the middle of this panel over here.

Now may I invite William Sun to give us the first question to Rathna.

WILLIAM SUN:

Good morning, provocative speakers and my fellow audience members. We'll find out how provocative they'll be.

I'm a theatre person so my focus is mainly in theatre in education and being a professor and administrator and traditionally a lead conservatory training for professional artists. The issue that

concerns me most is professional theatre versus educational theatre.

Here is my question for Dr Rathna Kumar. Compared to professional aesthetic theatre, educational theatre is often simpler, flatter and more concerned with its utilitarian functions. As we reduce the richness and layered characterisation of traditional theatre, are we encouraging our students' creativity or are we showing them something less creative? Should we or can we try to find or create a theatre that is both aesthetically sophisticated, satisfying and educationally useful?

Thank you.

RATHNA KUMAR:

First I want to ask you why do you say "versus"? Like there's a competition between professional theatre and educational theatre.

I don't think that there's any versus, this against that. In my experience, I'm a dancer, but then dance has theatre in it, so I think of myself as part of what you are doing, too.

I have not seen theatrical productions in schools or in colleges being any less creative because they are being performed or produced by non-professionals. And certainly they are not flat. I would like to know the exact -- your idea of what is "flat", but I do not consider them flat in any way because they are educational theatre.

And, I think, within the confines of educational theatre, there's ample scope for creativity. It depends upon the educators and how much they are involved with what they are doing and how much of a response they can get from their students. But there is, I have seen, extraordinary performances by school and college students, trained by teachers, not all of them professionals, with excellent results. So I do not agree with you about the simplicity or the very flat productions.

I do not know if that is what you were getting at, because I certainly do not feel that professional theatre is in any way against educational theatre.

They're just two separate things. Professional theatre is for entertainment. Educational theatre is for encouraging students to give them knowledge and to draw them into theatrical experience.

DAN BARON COHEN: William, do you want to return?

WILLIAM SUN:

Can I respond to your first question about my wording of professional theatre versus educational theatre? The reason I put it that way is because my students, as well as many, many students studying theatre for a major at colleges across the world are faced with a choice between becoming a professional theatre artist and becoming a school teacher. Right? So my question is really to provoke all of us to find a way to define a general concept in the society that those who cannot make it in the professional world go to teach. Can we find a way to define that concept? Thank you.

DAN BARON COHEN:

Rathna, would you agree that many theatre educators or many dance educators opt for that because they cannot sustain their own future as a professional and that their first real aim, their first love, is to be a professional and they are not really as motivated to enter the classroom with their skills?

RATHNA KUMAR:

I'm sure when they join they know it's a risk they are taking. And I'm sure most of them do know that there is a choice, ultimately, that if their dream of becoming professionals is not realised, that they do have another profession that they can take up.

I do not know how many of them do that reluctantly, because I know that teaching is a kind of vocation in itself and those that choose to teach, unless they're doing it as a very desperate measure, they will be taking their knowledge of what they have studied with them to the schools.

DAN BARON COHEN:

William, how are you dealing with this kind of prejudice? How are you dealing with this kind of difficulty inside your own Shanghai theatre academy?

WILLIAM SUN:

I have difficulty persuading my students to become school teachers because they think they are the top notch future professionals. That's why I'm asking this question, hoping to get some advice from your experiences.

DAN BARON COHEN:

May I ask any of the people up here on the stage, do you have any particular view on this dilemma that William is facing and although Rathna clearly values both the two expressions of the arts, both as professionals and within education, would you give William advice or do you see anything related to this?

NGUGI WA THIONG'O:

First of all, we should make a distinction between professionalism, which means living by your art, meaning that you are employed in, say, an acting company or in a music orchestra, you know, and you live by performing, and professionalism, which means you are striving for the best, the highest possible, okay?

So even though somebody may not be employed in, say, a professional music performance where he or she earns a living by her performance, nevertheless, when they go out to direct a play, to perform a play or piece of music, you know, or any other visual expression, we encourage them to strive for the highest possible in terms of artistic expression so that professionalism in performance and professional in performance is not only there in the paid or in assemblies where people are paid to perform.

DAN BARON COHEN:

Okay. Now this is interesting because this is bringing in another perspective from a very different culture and a very different continent, which shares with us the important difficulty of valuing the arts, not as hobbies but as languages, cultural languages and pedagogical languages. This has been debated over the last few days in the Ideal World Congress, how can we transform the perception of arts in education not as something which is an expression of failed professionalism but as a choice, as an option.

Can I ask Allan, can you bring us in with another question, because I think your question is going to pose the same challenges but in a very different perspective as a person who's creating an alternative in practice.

ALLAN AGERBO:

That's true, it's in the same field, but anyway it's also completely a different field. So good morning, everybody. Here we are in the metropolitan of trades, enterprise and business. And that is also a motivation for my question, because I'm curious to ask Ada Wong about how art and business co-operate here in Hong Kong. Maybe more in a mutual and crossover way.

In Denmark, in 2001, the Danish Ministry of Trade and Industry and the Ministry of Culture stimulated a process where art and business work together. It was in a mutual report they called the Denmark's creative potential. In the report, the report states, among others, that "priorities and competences like resourcefulness and creativity from the art worlds may well prove valuable resources for Danish business and industry."

Of course, it's a slow process to make it happen in the reality. But you see things happening slowly, like in the Copenhagen Business School, you see in the Centre of Arts and Leadership that artists are employed and you see that artists in Denmark on their (indistinct words) right artist and art-based business coach or art in business facilitator or art-based business innovator.

So my question to you is: what is the situation in the metropolitan of business, Hong Kong?

ADA WONG:

Thank you, Allan. I think if you look around you, I don't know who is from the business sector here. Anybody from the business sector here in the audience? Gosh. Nobody raises their hands? So I think, you know, Allan, now you can see that we have this world creativity summit and this is, I think, a very exciting dialogue for all of us, but we don't really see any business participation. I think this is the sad thing in Hong Kong and I think there is still quite a wide gap between business and the arts. If I can pull the government in, also between business, government and the arts.

I think the gap is very wide. There is a lot of misunderstanding.

So I actually hope that we can learn from Denmark, you know, as to how you can close the gap, close the understanding gap.

I know a lot of business people. They think that the arts community needs money, so all they're saying, "Okay, now you come to me, now you knock on my door, it is because you want sponsorship."

But there is no deeper dialogue than collaboration, let alone partnership, after the initial sort of monetary relationship. It is quite ad hoc. I do believe that in the 21st century there must be a deeper collaboration, a better partnership between all these sectors. I'm quite happy that there are a number of people from Denmark here in the audience, apart from you Allan, there is Olaf and there is Ufa here also.

Denmark is supposed to be a very creative country. How do you overcome this gap with your business sector, have more of an understanding and concern of the development of the arts and of creativity? Can I throw the question back at you?

ALLAN AGERBO:

Of course it's a difficult thing to stimulate. I know that a lot of the initiative is from the artists. Of course they see also a way to have the recognition, to have an income and participate in society from another angle. So it's true that the business and the trade world is more passive.

So again here you'll see the initiative is, I think, from the artists, from my experience, but it's stimulated through the initiative, through the report, from these two ministries. I think that is an unusual report to have. I think that maybe Ufa can also explain a bit about how he thinks it's working, because your company that you are managing, the KF (indistinct word).

They were giving the opportunity to be the kind of a platform to stimulate meetings between art and business.

Can you comment on that Ufa or is it too much to ask?

DAN BARON COHEN: Where is Ufa?

UFA:

I didn't expect this. My standpoint is maybe a bit unclear on this question, because it's true that this report came out and I really like the report from Denmark, but honestly, I also think it's a bit superficial if you see what is actually happening in the daily practice in Denmark.

We have all these nice words, really nice buzz words about the business and art should co-operate, but if you come down to the bottom line, it's again very much from the business point of view and not the artist point of view.

I think there is a kind of a disrespect from the political parties in the Danish parliament towards actually the values of art and creativity as shown. So art and creativity is used but it's only valued if it gives a surplus under the bottom line. I think that is the chance for all of us to rebuild a deep dialogue between the business world and the artistic, creative community. It's a chance for both partners.

So I would really like that -- put your focus on this report because it's a great report, but it's also a bit lip serving by the politicians. Sorry to say that.

DAN BARON COHEN:

Can I ask Ada to come back in response to that because you have experience in this area of trying to motivate the business community to form alliances with artists.

ADA WONG:

Yes, I have my experiences, but sometimes those are not very good experiences. I agree with Ufa. I think rather than relying on a government report, I think why can't we rely on educational institutions? For example, why can't business schools produce creative entrepreneurs, who are sensitive to the needs of the artistic world?

I do believe that in a lot of business schools in Europe and in the UK, they are doing that. They are -- you know, the two majors altogether. But in this part of the world, it's still quite a novel thing and not practiced enough.

On the other hand, those who are art majors, whether it's music or design or whatever, could there be more elements of business, you know, in the curriculum? I do think that with this crossover, might produce a better understanding of the different sectors which are really necessary for the 21st century.

DAN BARON COHEN: Thank you. Yes, Allan?

ALLAN AGERBO:

I think one key question could be: does a specific art creativity exist? Is an art creativity -- where does it differ from, let's say, scientific creativity? Where are the differences? What is the specific art creativity?

ADA WONG:

This is a different question. I do believe art creativity is different from scientific creativity. Art creativity I think relates to the human, it's about humanity, it's about touching people. I do believe that in the business world you do need this arts creativity. Is that what you're talking about? Anybody else want to --

DAN BARON COHEN: Can I invite the panel, does anyone from the panel here on stage want to respond?

PAUL COLLARD:

Just a comment about the business and the private sector. Creative Partnerships' basic practice is to put creative professionals into schools in long-term relationships and to date, we've directly contracted around 5,000 creative professionals who have worked in schools. 40 per cent of them came from the private sector, never worked in the public sector before at all. All the evidence is that having worked in this way in schools, they have gone on to work with us in cultural institutions in different ways.

Maybe one of the things that you as a group have is actually the way into business, because by starting off with them engaging with creative practices in schools, it may introduce them to the way of working which will lead them on to work in other ways.

DAN BARON COHEN:

Thank you. I would like to thank the four keynote speakers, provocative and question speakers, for these first contributions. We have two key difficulties here in terms of advocacy. We know that we need to transform the pedagogies inside our schools, to build pedagogies for the 21st century. We want to include the

arts as languages and as pedagogical tools. At the same time, we know that motivating people, motivating skilled artists to enter the schools is a challenge. They don't feel that it has the cultural status or the artistic status which is equal to being a professional.

At the same time, we know that we have to also deal with parents and with young people who don't see the arts as useful or don't understand the arts as cultural resources and don't see that as part of the development of waged and respected positions within society. This is a particular difficulty as well for us as advocates, because we need parents and young people to understand that our proposals are rational, are useful socially and are sustainable, that people can have a sustainable life and make a living through this kind of area.

Let's turn to you, the audience, and give you two or three minutes just to talk among yourselves. We'll chat here. Have a small dialogue if you want between yourselves about these key questions: are parents and young people really interested in understanding these arguments and can you see ways in which artists and educators and industry might work together in order to build the new educational paradigms that we are looking for in the 21st century?

RATHNA KUMAR: Can I say something?

DAN BARON COHEN: Sure.

RATHNA KUMAR:

I live and work in the United States and I'm a teaching artist with an extraordinary organization called The Young Audiences. Every city has one, Young Audiences of Houston, of Boston, of different cities. I'm a teaching artist with the Young Audiences of Houston and Southeast Texas.

This is an organisation that brings professional artists from the city and brings them to work, to teach workshops, do residencies in different schools, six-week residencies, work with teachers and with students and train the students to do maybe visual art, dance, theatre, music, and brings out the creativity in the children by giving suggestions, ideas, maybe teaching.

For me, for instance, I would be teaching them hand gestures and movement and then give them a piece of music and finally allow them to create an improvisational piece with a theme of their choice. So we do bring out the creativity. The professionals are being brought in to work with educators and with students and the Young Audiences also brings in businesses too, so we're talking about everything we spoke right now, brings in businesses to invest in these programmes.

They have not gotten too much money because it's very difficult to make businesses believe in this, but they have attained quite a bit of success after a long struggle to make an investment in this organisation. So now they're able to sponsor many more schools and it is spreading this message.

DAN BARON COHEN:

This is perhaps an example of good practice or of a case where you have been effective. But there is a broad concern about whether the creativity and the arts broadly are being invested in to make economies more competitive and more competitive economies don't seem to offer any promise of a sustainable future. The exploitation of resources and the difficulties of making sure that societies and communities can sustain themselves.

So let's turn to you, the audience, two or three minutes for you to reflect on whether these pedagogies are possible, how we will advocate them and can they lead to sustainable alternative futures for our planet.

Please take this moment to talk to one another, the person beside you, and I'll call you back to the next speakers in a moment. If you would like to chat as well?

(General Discussion)

May I call you back to the dialogue. Let's begin the third dialogue here. I am going to ask the questioner or the provocative respondent to be even more focused and even more provocative. We want to raise the temperature of this debate.

We have heard from scientists that we really need to act with great confidence if we're going to change the way people learn and think about themselves and their capacities in the future. I would like to ask Michael -- where is Michael? Can you hurl a very provocative question, please?

So Paul -- both of these people have worked very closely with governments in the formation of policy and they both have experiences that we need to take seriously.

MICHAEL DAY:

Before I do that, I was provoked by William's question which has to do with, in my field, visual arts, artists or teachers. Which way. There's a saying that's false, and the saying is: those who can, do; those who can't, teach. That is a false statement and our students that we work with realise that very early because they have a choice in their educational track very early and the preparation to become a teacher is just as intense, but different from the preparation to be a visual artist. So we say those who can, teach.

The question I have for Paul is: is there an educational crisis in general education? And if so, what can we do about it with respect to the arts?

Now, I have to elaborate just a little bit on this. There are many sincere, dedicated, long-time educators and psychologists who are critical of the current contemporary education system which was developed in many ways in the 19th century. They point out that the students of the 21st century have very different daily experiences. You can imagine even just looking at visual culture and popular culture and electronics, how different the experience is for the students of today as they approach an education system that was developed maybe centuries ago.

There is another criticism that the system serves fairly well the top 50 percentile, but often not so well for completion and success the lower percentile, 50 or lower.

Paul, you have a lot of experience and a lot of success in what you've been doing in the United Kingdom, so I've written my question here to make it succinct.

Do you agree that this crisis exists and, if so, what are your views for improvement of the traditional education system and the traditional curriculum? What place should the arts occupy in an ideal system and why?

PAUL COLLARD:

Thank you, I'm glad I had an hour and a half to answer that question.

I do agree there is a crisis in education and what's important about this is a minister in the British government said to me the other day when I was having lots of ideas of how he could spend all his money, he said that government can do many things, but it only ever has the time and resources to do the urgent and necessary. I think if we're going to persuade government that there are things that we do that they should support, then we have to persuade them that it is urgent and necessary.

I think there are reforms which are urgent and necessary, if, certainly in terms of British society, it is going to survive at all.

I live ironically in a converted school house which was the school for the small rural community in the north of England in which I live from the 1830s until the late 1970s. And you have a very strong sense when you're there and you look across the fields and farmhouses and so forth that are outside, that in the 19th century, for the young people growing up there, their only contact with the outside world was through that school. That was the only place they could find out what happened in the rest of the world. There was no radio, no television, no books, no visitors, no anything, and they went to those schools in order to get some sense of the knowledge of what happens out there.

Therefore, the educational paradigm which we developed at that stage was essentially around sharing some knowledge, giving the children some knowledge before they go back to the fields or the other things that they do.

But it was essential to that paradigm that actually it was only about educating the few. That was the principle. If 10 per cent came out of the whole public education system, that was as many people you need for the Civil Service, to be doctors and lawyers, and then maybe another 20 per cent to be secretaries and clerks, and the rest it didn't matter, if they'd learnt a little bit, that was fine.

As we move into the 21st century, what everybody is telling us is there is no future for young people without skills and education, there is nothing for them to do, quite literally, in western societies. When you look at the state of education in Britain today, where at 16, only 47 per cent of young people get the basic qualifications including English and maths, so over half our young people fail to meet the basic qualification, us having spent 60 billion pounds a year, 100 billion dollars on educating them. That is absolutely astonishing. Would we tolerate a health service where only half of the people who went to the doctor ever got

better? There's a big problem here. But we tolerate an education system where you can go from the age of 4 to the age of 16 and after those 12 years come out with nothing and that is astonishing.

If you think about education, there's an image in classes all over the world at the moment, it's the same, there's 20, 30 or 40 children sitting there, a teacher at the top of the class, the teacher tells them some stuff, they learn it off by heart, they do a test, they regurgitate it and then they're educated. It's not different anywhere you go in the world. It works for 10 per cent of the kids. It fails for 90 per cent of kids and therefore we have to fundamentally restructure that if it's going to work at all.

The children who start in school today are very different from those children who started in my house in the 1830s. They arrive with an incredible drenching inexperience and knowledge but almost no capacity to digest that. In the early years in school, they wonder about it and when I go into secondary schools, I don't see stupid kids, all these kids who fail, I see angry, frustrated, demoralised, demotivated kids, for whom education is simply not providing the answers of how to cope with this incredible deluge of knowledge and information and experience which descends upon them.

Ever since human beings have existed, we have used the arts in order to manage experience and to digest it. That is what has been fundamentally about for us. If that is what takes place in art, it is what is most desperately needed in school at the moment. That is the thinking, the way of thinking, the skills and the behaviours that we are trying to develop in young people so that they can cope with the incredible overbearing richness of the 21st century, so that all those opportunities and all that knowledge and experience that comes to them can be managed by them in some way.

Unless we are able to do that, we will continue producing people who are simply unfit to survive in the 21st century, through no fault of their own, but because we fail to devise an education system which was capable of developing in them what they need.

But there is a word of caution about this, that I would like to say about the creativity, picking up on this question. We talk a lot about creativity, we talk a lot about creativity in Creative Partnerships and what does it mean and we talk initially about a whole series of activities which are seen to be creative. And clearly painting and music and drama and so on and so forth are creative, are seen to be creative, but that gets increasingly stretched as you move across and that hairdressing becomes creative and design is obviously creative and even being an estate agent, a realtor, is creative or an accountant. None of us want accountants who add up the money and pay the taxes we owe, we want creative accountants who don't do any of those things and find ways out. In fact, the word "creative", becomes a behaviour, not an activity in itself which we apply loosely to more or less anyone and in fact there's nobody out there who doesn't want to be called creative anymore, virtually everybody wants to be creative. That's what they want to be. And it actually becomes a moral value.

When you sit and talk about the behaviours that we regard as being good behaviours in creative practice, like taking risks or making confident decisions, having lots of ideas, listening well, working in teams, being PC, being resilient and so forth, you begin to think none of those really have anything to do with creativity at all, those are just nice behaviours.

We did an event the other day with the Royal Shakespeare Company. We were talking about creativity. It was a two-day seminar and Michael Boyd, the artistic director of the Royal Shakespeare Company, came and joined and spoke to us and he was talking about the rehearsal room as, if you like, the metaphor of the creative space and the words that he used around that were around trying to create an atmosphere and air of trust, of generosity, of alertness, of permissiveness. And these words like trust and generosity, you kind of think if you added and don't murder your neighbour and steal their sheep, you would have the ten commandments.

This whole series of behaviours that we've begun to identify, is a secular society coming to terms with trying to have a set of behaviours which we admire and respect and wish to inculcate in

everyone, but is actually taking us dangerously away from actually what it is that the arts really do and really contribute.

Whilst at one level I think it is attractive to us in talking to politicians to be as loose in the meanings of a lot of these words, actually the trouble is that lots of other people use the same words as well. Sport is terribly good at team working, persistence, resilience, making confident decisions, taking risks and so forth. And unless we can actually go back and define what it is that the arts really contribute, then we will be undermined and will not be asked to make the contribution that I think is fundamental that we bring that nobody else does.

DAN BARON COHEN:

Thank you Paul. I think it could be that Penina Mlama from Tanzania will be able to give us a very, very interesting perspective from a completely different region. I mean it's well-documented the crises or the crisis within education, let's say, within the so-called developed world. We know that, for instance, young people inside Britain are the unhappiest in schools in Europe. There are examples of outstanding practice in Finland and other parts of Europe or northern Europe, or in the Nordic countries.

But can we have a perspective from you, Penina. Your question as well but your perspective which may completely change our understanding of what is crisis and what are the needs of the 21st century as a person working from within the African perspective?

PENINA MLAMA: Thank you very much. As he was talking, first of all, I was reminded that in the last year, in Tanzania, the word for "artist" is "(African spoken)" but in the last year for some reason the word has taken a new meaning, so now if you do anything related to subversive creativity, you are called a "(African spoken)". So now the artist, the proper artist, is called a "(African spoken)", the con man is also called a "(African spoken)". So that

is really a challenge and I was really fascinated by the way you put it.

In terms of what is happening in my part of the world, we have seen that there have been rapid advances in information and communication technologies which have led to unprecedented developments in the potential for artistic productions to reach global audiences. Because of that, this has given a big boost to commercially motivated, popular art which can now reach global audiences in a matter of seconds. So young audiences are being affected by this global dominant art every minute, every second.

One consequence of such development is the fact that stiff challenges are posed by this popular art to the pedagogical value of artistic creativity. The power of educational art to influence societies' cultural identity is diminishing while popular commercial art is becoming globally dominant.

But the other serious consequence, especially for our young artists, is the alarming tendency for the young artist to copy artistic productions of the globally dominant artists. More and more, they are losing their ability to create themselves, so I wanted to pose a question which I hope Shifra will be able to answer and share her experiences as a person who has worked extensively in the area of art and education.

In this situation which I have just described, as educators, do we have the power to change schools? To change education systems in such a way that they can develop and nurture artistic creativity from which the young generations can actually produce original works of art and in that way somehow influence or shape the cultural identities of their societies?

SHIFRA SCHONMANN:

Thank you for the question, Nina. You want an honest answer. Could we as arts educators change? The answer is no. I don't believe that we can. But yet, I would add, I can whisper "yes", a small

"yes". So how I go between the big "no" and the whispering "yes"? From a realistic point of view, I don't think that we really can make the change. I go to Shakespeare's time and one of his biggest, famous monologue, "As You Like It", "All the world is a stage and people are players". In the citation he mentions seven ages and then what struck me most is the second age. He tells us about the schoolboy and then he says "Then the whining schoolboy with his cattle and shining morning face creeping like a snail unwillingly to school." Shakespeare's word, "Creeping like a snail unwillingly to school", and I wonder how come for more than 4,000 years, the boy is keep on crying, going unwillingly to school.

Schools in Shakespeare's time were not like our schools. All the system changes, the curriculum changes, if there were any curriculum, everything changes and still what we have done. And if I go to our days to citing knowledgeable researchers like Seymour Sarason who wrote a beautiful book "The Culture of Schools and the Problem of Change", and the big conclusion that he had, that the more school change, the more they stay the same. So what chances do we have as art educators between these big prominent ...

Now to the second part of your question about the creativity and originality -- creativity, we just heard from Paul, I tend to go after you with what you have said and to say like this: I don't know what do we mean by the word "creativity". I think that if you will ask every each of us here all what is creativity, then we have completely different language.

I have selected about more than a hundred different definitions that I can point off the research what is creativity and some of them are even contradictory in terms between them. So I know that Larry and Laura, great researchers, was sitting here and Haught, are doing great research following UNESCO last conference about creativity is our hope. It was last year. No, creativity is not our hope. If we build the illusion and go after it, then we will come I think so the way you tried to put it.

So where it leads us, we are educators, we must have some kind of hope. I think it goes to the way we interpret the word "creativity"

and other words. It basically goes to the language that we speak, we need to speak another language.

That's going now, Penina, to the second part of your question and to the second part of my answer, the "yes", the whispering "yes" one. How we are going to do anything, to change the language that we use, at least to try. Then you yourself while speaking to us, you said, "We have cultural languages, we have pedagogical languages." You didn't say we have art languages and that's most important that you missed it, because many conferences and many books and many delivers of any -- we don't speak the art language. The art language is the forgotten language. We need to go back to the art language and the more we would speak about terms like -- you use terms like we have strategies and tactics and targets and we need the power of the art, the power of the art, to empower. This is very strong military language.

I wish whenever each of us say "power", "empower", "tool", "target", just delete it and try to find do we have words? Do we have it? We have to find them. So I believe that if we will try to find our own language, the arts languages, and maybe we will do it during the conference, we might.

I have no illusion after the context giving you of Shakespeare and Seymour and the reality we live in, but still, maybe this will be one hope.

I would like maybe to finish -- someone told me a beautiful, beautiful Chinese proverb. It's about a grandfather who hold his grandson on his knees and it is something like he say to his grandchild, "Remember that the soul would have no rainbow if the eyes had no tears."

So I connect it to the tears of the Shakespeare little boy. If we will be able, with our language, because I believe that language conduct deeds. The metaphors that we live by influence our deeds. If we will delete the bad words from our language, maybe we will be able to turn the tears of the Shakespearean boy's to the tears of the Chinese grandson boy that want to build the rainbow in the soul. So that would be my reaction.

DAN BARON COHEN:

Thanks very much. Now that sensitivity to language and to military metaphor and everything is very, very understandable coming from the Middle Eastern context, a great sensitivity to the importance of advocating not in terms of languages of confrontation or combat, but languages of invitation and of collaboration.

Very interesting as well that you've talked about artistic languages, because these are crucial not just to the expression and the reflection through our creative capacities and reflection of our creativity, but also of our motivation inside the classrooms.

However, I think Penina has asked a question which we now need to give to the audience for two or three minutes which needs to be addressed as well, which is the extraordinary impact through the new technologies, micro-technologies of communication, which transmit global dominant cultures and the question of how the classroom, the teacher, the artist, the school, is situated inside that globalisation process, which, as you say, there may be cultural richness inside Tanzania and in South Africa, but there is the constant pressure to copy, to define yourself in relation to dominant cultures or dominant values that are transmitted culturally.

An important intervention in terms of the artistic languages that can be so useful in transforming and sustaining motivation in schools but still an outstanding question about the impact of cultural domination of global cultures and how we as artists and teachers should respond to that in our century.

Two minutes for you to turn to the people beside you to reflect on this debate and to also look at these unanswered questions that will appear in the next and final part of our dialogue.

(General Discussion)

Excuse me, everyone, I think there are perhaps hundreds of dialogues which are now in action. We have seen here in the panel that there are hands shooting up in different parts of the auditorium with

people now wanting to either give examples from their own experience or to raise further questions.

Here on stage, there is also a desire to raise new questions about the relationship between arts education and cultural diversity and to identify what is specific about each region. We have a chance over the next 36 hours to take this deeper, but let's continue for the time being just to map the different challenges and different dialogues that are taking place in the world today. And then we will listen at least to one or two questions from the audience.

Can I ask Dalia to pose your provocative question to Ngugi on stage.
DALIA SIAULYTIENE: Thank you very much. My question will turn again to formal education system because I have been working there for 30 years already. During discussions, during our dialogues, we very much agree that contemporary children and young adults live in the environment very much intensive and very much rich with artistic creation. Drama, music, dance, visual art, easily accessible on TV, via Internet, press. Formal schooling institutions find themselves in the situation of constant competition. Constant competition with the contemporary colourful world and at the same time, declares that they prepare young people for the future.

So there are still doubts where the creation of Madonna, for example, can help learn mathematics and how much Hollywood production helps to develop memory.

Should formal education stay in this competition and how long it should last? And can they work together for mutual enrichment?

DAN BARON COHEN: Thank you.

DALIA SIAULYTIENE: Professor Ngugi, can you answer to my question?

NGUGI WA THIONG'O:

I'm not sure I can answer the question but I will try to respond to your provocation. I happen to live -- actually, I'm teaching at the University of California, Irving, which is only a couple of miles away from Hollywood.

But by way of responding to your question, first of all, I want to talk a little bit about how we view the arts in the relationship to general society. Take the four things or the four realms which are important to our being artist. The body. We feed the body, don't we, food, water, like the water I've been drinking right now, okay? So the body needs food and water for it to function to create other things.

But there's also the realm of the mind, ideas. If we don't feed the mind with ideas, it shrivels or narrows its field of application, if you like.

The third realm, very important, the realm of the spirit. We hear of the realm of moral being and here we have religions, religious rights of all our society is without those kind of rights and so on, that somehow rather cater to that indefinable area of the spirit, if you like. Although there may be many conflicts in that.

But there's another realm, which we may take for granted, but it's almost impossible to live fully where there are realms without that, and that is the realm of imagination. Imagination. We imagine, even architects have to imagine the shape of a building before they realise it, they imagine the shape, and how to put down on paper before it is realised in practice. Even the skyscrapers we see here have been imagined before they are put down. I cannot think even in the area of science where imagination does not play a role. In the area of business where imagination does not play a role.

Now, what is the food and water for the imagination? The earth in general constitutes the food and water of the imagination, although they are also products of imagination. If we starve the body like when there's famine and so on, there's an outcry, you know, all over the world, starvation, whatever. We have seen pictures

in prison camps where they are starved, show their ribs coming out and where there's famine and so on.

If we in the realm of the spirit, if you stop religious texts or whatever, there will be war because you're stopping the food of the spirit as considered by those people, okay?

And of course, what about ideas? When people like intellectuals have been put in prison, they're punished by having books and other things to do with ideas taken away from them. What about imagination? It seems to me we are content to starve the imagination without an outcry. We say it's all right to starve a child of the means and the food of the imagination in school by denying them access to arts and so on, and we think that's okay. So we are shriveling that which needs constant feeding to enlarge its capacity whether in business, in science, in government or anywhere else.

That's one thing. The other thing is the way the arts, imagination, what qualities of the imagination, is bringing things and processes together, almost like dreams sometimes, which yoke different things together, to show possibilities.

So in the same way, when we come to education of the arts, for instance, this distinction falls in between the popular, the glamorous and so on, you know, the popular and the classical, we should be very careful about creating divisions which are so neat.

On the contrary, we show connections and the most important thing for students, for all of us, is always to start with where one is. Okay.

If a child, for instance, say music, if a child gravitates towards the guitar, let that be the starting point before you go to the piano, but don't say, "You cannot touch the guitar because the piano is there".

But maybe the starting point is the guitar, maybe the starting point is the appreciation of Madonna and from Madonna you go to, where, other areas of the arts. Adding, adding, you know. It's this separation that I find not in fact consistent with the character

of arts because arts is always adding, is always connection, is always showing possibilities and so on and so forth and so forth. Let us not separate, there is a connection between all those processes and the connections which the arts, as a whole, whether sculpture, music, theatre, literature, have to show.

Lastly, I would be amazed for me to finish without mentioning the question of languages. We live in a world of hierarchies, where society is in terms of that my health is only health if I pass on my leprosy to another person. My cleanness is only cleanness if I pass on my dirt to another person. So the person who is clean by passing on his dirt to another person, we see them as being superior and elitist and having rights and so on. The same process we see it in languages and cultures where some are seen as hierarchically superior to others. And they are privileged, they are privileged.

Say the dominant language is the West, like English, French and so on. They become so dominant and other languages, for instance, you know, are made to become beholden to them. It's not surprising, responding to Penina's question or comment, that if you start by making people be embarrassed about their languages or their immediate cultures, it's not surprising then that they look up to that which is furthest removed from themselves, even if it's Hollywood while I live in a village in Kenya.

So we need to restore, to remove this hierarchical view of languages and think in terms of network of languages, network of cultures, network of communities, instead of hierarchy.

And I believe this would go a long way towards answering some of your concerns and some of the concerns which have been raised in the previous questions and responses here.

DAN BARON COHEN:

Thank you very much for that reflection.

I think we can pass from that supremely philosophical and panoramic perspective on the relationship between the imagination, artistic languages and the development of culture to a person who wants to pose a question about, well, what happens if governments recognise this? And they are prepared to invest in this? Can this be implemented inside schools and in informal places of learning?

Where is Graham? Would you like to pose the last question to Jooho, because Korea has already taken certain initiatives. But as Paul has indicated to us, a government can invest a hundred billion dollars in education without being able to meet or realise its aims.

GRAHAM WELCH:

Thank you very much. I began the morning with a kind of clear idea of a simple question, but of course listening to all of this discussion, one's mind goes on in lots of different tangents. I suppose I would like to preface my comments by a thought of the discussion that's emerged so far, is that if we're not careful, we ghettoise art education, we make it exclusive, we use language in which we define ourselves as different from others, that art, whatever this thing is, can be defined, it can be rarefied, and it's something we have that others don't.

Because of that, there is a weakness in them and a strength in us.

I think we have to be more aware, I think, that in order to solve whatever the problem is, if there is a problem, that the problem should begin with us. We are part of the problem, not necessarily the solution.

That's a preface in thinking about the research that I've done with my colleagues, the things that I read from the world of neuroscience, for example. Part of the human condition is to be creative. We are designed -- the way that our minds work is to actually make sense of the world, to build links to develop, to imitate, to grow, to share, to go off on tangents. This is part of what we are as

humans. So does a government or a national agency have any role in this development?

Why not just leave us alone?

DAN BARON COHEN: There is a provocative question.

JOOHO KIM: This is absolutely unfair that talking about the boring things, everybody thinks that government is a boring notion.

DAN BARON COHEN: Is this being amplified?

JOOHO KIM:

Provocative. I was just saying that this is quite unfair that at the last part of a presentation.

But anyway, I'm neither a government officer nor a practitioner. On my one arm's length distance, I have a government and the other arm's length, I have practitioners, so if I may say, I'm in the right position to talk about the role of the government.

In our experience, Korea, the Korean government played two significant roles in enhancing art education in Korea. One was mediation and coordination with different sectors, different sections of the government, for instance, education, of course, and welfare and defence and justice, gender and even juvenile probation.

I think this kind of intervention -- I mean, administrative intervention with other sectors of government, enhance the awareness of policy maker level and the standing on art education.

The other aspect of Korean governmental case is its framework of institutionalisation by legislation of Art Education Supporting Act, in collaboration with National Congress. I must say this is a rather aggressive intervention from one policy to another.

But cultural policy have proved quite effective in broadening awareness and as well as raising awareness and broadening access of the general public to art education.

I'm quite sure that as professor Anne Bamford all the time warned us, that bad art education is even worse but bad policy is even more worse. I'm quite sure of that. I had a very bad experience exactly two weeks ago, I was invited to speak right in front of 600 non-art teachers who was appointed by the authority to an in school administrator as -- who's taking care of art education in school.

So everybody in the auditorium was unhappy because they have extra job to do and right before me, one practicing artist was giving his lecture about his life-long experience in creating, but half of the students, almost half -- no, not students, teachers, was falling asleep and even some was bullying. My turn was just right next and I was called on the platform. So I was really, really embarrassed. So I was asking to them, "What am I supposed to do? What do you want from me?" One of the teachers stood up and said to me, "Make it short."

This was really a bad aspect of the policy, not considering the speed and if the schools or teachers is not ready to go, we can -- well, simply enforce them to teach art and take the art curriculums in schools.

So we have good interventions and bad interventions as well, but I might have to insist the government will be the only sustainable partners in terms of finance, in terms of modernisations, considering the changing world of business. You might have to consider the government and reconsider government, the role of the government in art education. Thank you.

DAN BARON COHEN:

I think that the questions that have begun to emerge in the auditorium will feed into our second open session, but I want to try and give a very brief summary as a way of thanks to these 12 speakers, these 12 keynotes, who have given us an understanding of some of the key debates today.

We recognise good art education. We know the effects, we know the arguments for it. We also know that bad art education is extremely destructive and may be far worse than no arts education at all.

We have heard that the status of arts education inside our arts schools and arts academies is still very low, and if we want to develop new kinds of learning and education, we need people going into arts education or training as arts educators with motivation.

We know that we have an enormous task to persuade parties, teachers, directors of schools, not just students and arts academies, about the importance of arts education or of the arts as human languages in order to create sustainable communities and sustainable futures, because they are thinking in terms of the survival of their children or of their own sustainability.

We have significant questions about how artists, cultural producers and teachers, institutions that use artistic languages, can partner with business in such a way that everything is not directed towards productivity, profit and the creation of more competitive economies.

We need to think deeply about the language of advocacy so that we are inviting, we are building partnerships which are consist with our pedagogical values and pedagogical aims.

There is a recognition being called for that the arts are the food of our imagination and that without our imagination, no creativity and no self-respect and no self-determination is possible.

Finally, the concern about the institutionalization of creativity and the risk that even with good policy there is a danger that

artistic languages, creativity and artistic production will become reduced to outcomes, tests and become banalised, become reduced simply to statistics and the attempt to resolve educational needs without transforming the pedagogies that they will need for the 21st century.

We have heard six dialogues. There are certainly hundreds of dialogues that are just beginning between friends and between new friends inside the audience. Let's take a break before the second open dialogue, but please note the questions that you have already begun to define so that these can be fed into our second open dialogue on globalisation and technological convergence.

Please thank, everyone, the 12 speakers who you've heard today.

We will begin the second open dialogue, the second public session, at 11.30. Thank you very much, everyone.