

Technological Convergence: globalisation or cultural democracy?

ANNE BAMFORD:

Hello, welcome to the second of these provocative introductions.

I would like to start if I could, by telling a story that was told to me by a Chinese academic who came to work at my university in Australia. He gave me a stone that was carved with horses, wild-looking horses, horses with their hair all going everywhere and their tails all going everywhere.

The picture had the horses running around in the clouds, so I asked what the meaning of this particular image was. The image, by the way, was not painted, but carved in grey stone. He said it was from an old Chinese story and the story goes something like this: that the horses are working away in a field, very hard work, long days, and one horse looks up into the clouds and is making the clouds look like a horse's tail or a horse's mane. And the horse thinks, "I wonder if there are horses that run around up in the clouds", and so the horse gets very curious and the horse stands on its back legs trying to get up to the clouds.

Eventually, the horse tries long enough and gets up into the clouds. From up in the clouds, the horse looks down on the fields and sees the fields in a very different way than when he was down ploughing the fields. He can see a different vision. Although he can't stay in the clouds, he returns to the fields but he's filled with a different vision, a different view of those fields.

This second session could be described as the "crazy horse" session, because what we're going to try and do is to get out of ploughing the fields and to think about what it might be like to look at those fields from the vision up in the clouds. And to perhaps then be able to return and inspire those around us.

I think this is an important opportunity. I'm going to steal Shifra's call to use different terms. I think the formation of a

world alliance of arts groups is very timely, because it's recognition that the arts themselves are changing, converging and reinventing. Young people now don't see the divisions that were there between fine arts and music, between drama and dance, or between any of the forms. And they exist. You only have to look at a video clip of the latest hit song to know that there is no distinction in the mind of a young person between those different art forms.

So in this session I'm going to ask us not to make strategies but to start thinking of different songs we need to sing together, to try and compose new ideas for the future. We might ask for the help of some world alliance to choreograph very carefully the steps we need to take to dance a new dance.

I'm sure that this process will involve considerable unfolding of drama as we go along, and through these dialogues hopefully we can design some new ideas and some new futures. We also need to be thinking how we may parade the performance of ideas because the absence of business from this summit is regrettable and we need to be more proactive in that side of our work.

Finally, this session asks us to picture the future with enthusiasm and with vision.

I'm going to do it somewhat differently from Dan in that I'm going to introduce the speakers in their sort of pair of the question and the response, so that you know a little bit about the person before they speak. I'll now go to my chair to do the next bit. Thank you.

The first speaker that we have is actually coming from the UK. He's emeritus professor of music education at the Institute of Education at the University of London. Professor Keith Swanwick asks us to consider the view that the arts keep the human spirit alive and playful and he's going to focus his question about creativity and hopefully stimulate us with some playful ideas. Thanks, Keith.

KEITH SWANWICK:

I like the idea of the new song and I just wonder whether we shouldn't have some new words to go with it. We're using old words here like "creativity", "culture" and "the arts" and maybe they're not all the same thing and I want to unpick that in my question to John Steers, if I may.

In the meantime, good morning, and thank you those people who are working in a second and third language. It's a privilege always to speak in your own language and to understand that other people are having to work hard. So thank you for tolerating the English and their language.

Creativity and the arts are very closely linked --this is my question to John coming up -- in this programme. I think we have to be very careful not to conflate them, not to think that they mean the same thing. They are, after all, activities in the arts that are not creative. Think of playing a bass drum in a symphony orchestra. You start being creative there, you're in trouble. Think of the call of ballet in the ballet chorus. One step wrong and the whole lot fall over. No creativity there.

Think of the designer who's thinking of working to a plan, not his or her plan but someone else's plan. Not creativity but reproducing. Sometimes non-creative activities.

There are also those activities outside of the arts, highly creative. Think of the discovery of penicillin.

Think of the organisation of this conference. Think of the telephone interviewer -- I'm aware of this because I live with one who does it -- talking to women about their cancers, over a half hour questionnaire on the phone. The different ways of handling this conversation depending on the other person is highly creative.

Don't let the arts annex the idea of creativity. That will upset a lot of other people who think they also have a claim to be creative.

There's also negative creativity. There's a wonderful paper in the conference handbook by Mr Mok on page 104, who deals with lots of negative instances of creativity. You could be a creative torturer, couldn't you? There are such people and there are plenty of them around. You could be a creative politician who invents wonderful fairy stories in order to justify the invasion of a Middle Eastern country.

These are all acts of creation, all acts of creation, positive creation, negative creation. We have to be very careful. You can create havoc.

Let us think of positive in my question and my question to John is: this is a theory for the future. We need a theory for the future and taking up Anne's point, a language for the future that doesn't fall into this trap of singling creativity and the arts together as though they were kind of the same thing. We need to sort out our theories. Nothing so practical as a good theory, nothing such a waste of time as a bad one.

What, then, John, is the particular human value of arts, objects and events, leaving aside the matter of creativity unless you want to address it? What is the human value of these activities and is there anything distinctive about it or is it shared with other forms of discourse? Let's start with that.

ANNE BAMFORD:

Before John answers that, I would like to introduce him. It's Dr John Steers, the General Secretary for National Society of Education in Art and Design in the United Kingdom. He's also an esteemed former president of the International Society for Education through the Arts.

In John's philosophy, he says creativity is not an outcome of good education but as a means to providing good education. I'll leave it to you, John.

JOHN STEERS:

Thank you very much. Thanks very much. What you've managed to do is create panic in me. How am I going to answer -- did you notice that very craftily there were three questions there, not one? And each one of them is really worthy of a book, and of course books have been written about those issues.

I don't think we can go on ducking the issue of what we mean by creativity.

Someone said this morning that they came across a couple of hundred, at least, definitions. I did a search on the Internet recently and I certainly didn't explore all the hits I got, but there were over 2 million. Whether most of those were saying the same thing or not, I don't know, but I think we do have to try and grasp it in some way. I've come across a lot of definitions that I quite like, ranging from the very simple, that creativity is simply risky thinking, to one that I'm still wrestling with but I haven't found too many flaws in this yet and I quite like. It comes from a book by Rob Pope, a book called "Creativity, History Theory and Practice". I commend that book to you, it's a very scholarly and interesting recent exploration of creativity in many fields. What Pope says is a very tentative definition which is that creativity is the capacity to make, to do or to become something fresh and valuable. Fresh and valuable with respect to others as well as to ourselves. I think that's a reasonable starting point.

I also think that creativity can be thought of as an act, as a process, as a concept, as a strategy, even as an ideological tactic. But whether it's any one of those or if it's often a combination of those things, what it isn't is an absolute. It's not a question of being creative or non-creative. I think that it really exists on a continuum. We have to accept that you can be a little

bit creative as well as someone who later becomes recognised as a creative genius and that we're all creative one way or another in our daily lives, whether that's at work or at home, in school or elsewhere.

I think this has also come up this morning and it was implicit in Keith's question. I don't believe for a moment that creativity is the sole prerogative of the arts. Not for one minute. But I do think that they can have a particularly significant role in the curriculum in this respect. I think it is worth thinking a little bit about how that creative process manifests itself, because of the way that we operate in schools.

Paul started this morning by coming up with a rather similar list to mine, but I think I want to use it to a slightly different purpose because I think it's useful to think of creativity as a raft of multi-faceted abilities and predispositions and these are things that have to be encouraged throughout the curriculum, not just in the arts.

It's something more than a capacity for divergent thinking. I think the kind of things that we have to think about in this area are things like a tolerance for ambiguity, a playfulness with ideas, a playfulness with processes, a playfulness with materials. There is that ability to concentrate and persist, because the creative process requires time and one of the most important aspects of it is the time that it takes to incubate ideas. So that ability to persist, to keep on teasing and worrying away at an idea rather than looking for premature resolution is really, really important.

I think that creative individuals are people who are willing to explore what Julian Barnes called, very memorably, impertinent connections, and apparently disassociated ideas. There may be people who are particularly self-aware. They have the courage to pursue their ideas, often in the face of opposition. And most of all, I think they have to have the confidence, the self-belief, to take both intellectual and intuitive risks in the cause of

innovation, pushing back the boundaries of what is thought or known to be possible or in achieving new conjunctions.

It's easy enough to reel off that list and you may or may not agree with it but my question is how comfortable are we about accommodating those kind of qualities and ways of working in our schools. I'll come back to that in response to the second of Keith's questions there, which was whether we should think of the arts as one among many forms of discourse, really, with a potential for creativity. My answer to that is an unequivocal yes, but I don't think it helps us to go on trying to look for whatever it is that is unique about the contribution of the arts in education. Quite frankly, I don't think there is anything that is unique about the arts contribution. What I do think is that the arts can do some of the things we want to do much better than other areas of the curriculum. I think that's perhaps what we should look at.

If we want to look at what the special contribution of the arts have to make to a creative education, I say first of all we have to remember that the arts are concerned with the transmission and transformation of cultures. They're key to a holistic educative process.

As well as courses of study in their own right, they act as catalysts for creative application and spur to independent learning in all areas of the curriculum.

They need to be perceived as equal partners in the development of the whole child. They provide alternative modes of learning for those who are inclined towards the visual spatial or kinesthetic or whatever other intelligences you want to imagine. They nurture inquiry and independent open-ended research as core study skills. Powers of innovation, initiative and application in solving problems are central to the arts and of course they're invaluable in the world of work. To separate intellect from emotion is to neglect seriously the intimate relationship between them.

One well taught -- and that's the important thing because we need to remember that you cannot only teach badly, but you can teach the wrong things well. So when well taught, the arts are disciplined forms of inquiry through which students can organise creative feelings and ideas about experience, the world in which they live and it must be concerned with helping them investigating their own values and the values of others.

The arts can contribute, I think, very significantly to that, not least and certainly very importantly to increase cultural understanding, transcultural understanding and awareness. Maybe critical awareness, antiracism, equal opportunities, all those kinds of issues.

So the arts can lead in the development of a wide range of creative qualities and skills with wide application and value and I think that's one of the things we should emphasise.

Then there are questions around pedagogy, I think. Creativity is concerned with becoming and it's focusing on the event of becoming that seems to be critical in the teaching/learning relationship. In fact, it's really a teacher/learner relationship and that teacher/learner relationship has to change from the traditional teacher/learner role and that can be difficult in that the teacher has to put aside assimilated frameworks into which to view and organise the event, and you have to try to respond more, to a much more localised creative force.

So the arts provide a way of moving beyond or of expanding our understanding of what it is to be human because they're concerned with creating sense experiences that expand our perceptions and comprehension of who we are and what it means to be human.

That has crucial ramifications for an ethics of becoming through the arts. It allows us to challenge in question how we understand others, the world we live in and what we value. By increasing the power to become through the arts, we open up new possibilities for

becoming. All of this has direct relevance for viewing the arts as a crucial undertaking for developing cultural understanding in a world of increasingly plural social contexts.

Finally, the existing models of effective teaching and learning taking place in the arts need to be better identified and projected as models for the curriculum as a whole. I think we in the arts have got something to say to educators in other disciplines about the way we work, when we work at our best. For example, good arts teaching involves pupils and students learning in the areas that closely resemble areas of professional practice, in studios, in workshops and so on. Learners are given a high degree of autonomy, or should be given a high degree of autonomy in the learning process. They're able to make choices about their ways of working, the materials they use and the interrelation between themes and projects.

Risk and experiment -- the room to be able to fail in part of a learning process are features of much of the work and appraisal is a regular element of what goes on in a good arts teaching/learning situation.

In this respect, learning in the arts closely models the duality of imaginative and creative play, alternating with purposeful inquiry and resolution and that's the thing that perhaps is at the heart of creativity.

They're asked to express their ideas and perform in much of their practice. Their work is displayed, observed and listened to as part of a regular learning process. It's a process of assessment for learning.

They're required to maintain portfolios, accessible collections of work to which both themselves and those who are teaching them make regular reference in order to chart progress. Performance, presentation and display are features for reporting on the

development of ideas and by which progress and achievement are constantly monitored, evaluated and analysed.

If that is what we are doing in our arts education, then there's a valuable lesson there for other areas of the curriculum as well. But I think if we are to properly accommodate creativity and the arts in education, then the big message we have to take home, it's not about governments or about funding agencies or any of those things. I think what we have to recognise is that it's our pedagogy that really has to change. Thank you.

ANNE BAMFORD:

I'll introduce Mr Mekuria Abate. He is the founding member of the Eastern Africa Theatre Group. In his philosophy, he talks a lot about the importance of promoting authentic expressions of culture and so he was an ideal questioner to choose to specifically look at the topic of what are we talking about when we talk about arts and culture into the future, when we know we're dealing with a context where there is an issue of local and an issue of global, what some people are now calling, somewhat uncomfortably, "glocal" culture and arts. How we actually acknowledge that the arts taught in school is a long way from the creative practice that young people engage in outside of school and we're increasingly becoming out of date, perhaps, with where young people's own artistic and cultural expression is residing.

I would like to welcome Abate to ask the next question.

MEKURIA ABATE:

Thank you very much. As most of our colleagues were trying to give us an insight into what is creative and contemporary creative global influence or globalisation of it, I would like to point out, or my line of insight in this thing is with regard to the classical form of creative art within the discipline form, in the discipline of music, drama, literature, dance, et cetera.

But I would not like to advocate on business creativity or scientific creativity, although they are creative in their own selves. But when we really see the contemporary work today, the consumption today, we have the legacy, for example, with the classical forms of art, we have the legacy of the 60s and 70s creative revolution whereby we have even been able to have the legacy of the street culture where jazz, blues, rock and roll and all those beautiful forms of art were innovative, they were very influential. Today, when we see those legacies being promoted practically, every two or three other years in another form, with creative, with innovative approach, application, we are stuck at this moment with rap and hip hop influencing, although, of course, the global expression, the global findings of this legacy was very worldwide and we as students used to be very much influenced and also even use that material for -- to use it for ourselves as an inspiration.

Now, this form of globalisation where rap and hip hop have become stagnant and, for all I know, the West has become decadent and there is no vibrant art form that has come out to be expressive enough to be influential in the rest the world, whereas, also, the Western influence has badly brought up, influence that is for a wrong application for our young people to come out with an inspiration to create what is their own, because they have completely forget it, it has become an application, it has become a force that will make our youth forget about their own roots, as our speaker from Tanzania said this morning.

What happens now is this imposition will limit, marginalise the aspiration of the youth in our own society, in the third world or developing world, and it makes them forget even to pay attention to their own resources, artistic resources, traditional resources.

So therefore, what do we need to apply now in order to make the youth be able to realise their own resources, appreciate their own resources, be able to be creative in their own language, to speak the language of their own and to serve their own community?

I think the school, in the last advocacy would be, the school is responsible, that the youth should be able to acquire in their own rights what we ought to give it to them.

So my question would be here: in what sense, how can we acknowledge and access creativity so that the young generation would be able to acquire? This is my question to Tuula.

ANNE BAMFORD:

Thank you. We have an expert who can at least address that provocation. Tuula Tamminen at that moment then is professor of child psychiatry at the University of Tamira in Finland. She has spent her lifetime's work specifically looking at the socialisation of goals for children and presents very accurately a voice that's missing, I think, from this meeting, which is how does it affect the child, what are the issues of development of the child.

TUULA TAMMINEN:

Yes, thank you for the question. As everyone knows, this is very global and it is difficult to put into simple words.

I try to start with the first part of your question, Dr Abate. You were saying that Western culture is somehow stagnant in our culture or development or something. It associated in my mind that when human beings are developing, there are moments of this kind of stagnation, moments that development is not proceeding, and they are always before something very important happens. They are the moments when we know, we learn, now something very important is coming.

Actually, this is the feeling, what I have in many ways when I think of the broad context that we are discussing here. We are in my feeling, we are sharing a very historical point. Why do I think this? It comes from very different sources, but I want to say first that I see you as a group of people who are very important in what is going to happen. I have one provocative question concerning this

at the end of my little moment, but I first want to say that because I feel that in cultural contexts globally, there is happening something very important right now and it is so important that perhaps we all have to, in a way, be stagnant or stop before something can really happen. It has something to do with this global and local, new and traditional. But to me as a medical doctor, I think that I view this issue a little bit differently than you do. I think that in medicine the more we know about universal issues about human beings, the more important individuality and individual differences become.

So I think that we are right now when everything is getting global, the culture is all over globalising, I think that the local cultures will become more important. So we are imagining from my point of view a very important new phase where we have this global but the local cultures will become much more equally important, not only one dominating culture.

This is the second point that I feel is important, that perhaps first time in history the IT technology and modern technology is creating means where everyone can raise up their voice and can be heard on the opposite side of the world. I think that it takes time when we learn to use this. It takes time but I think that we will really be able to become more equal, more democratic world than ever before, because there are not only leaders who meet, people will meet. We all will meet. And this is possibility that the technology is creating for us.

That's another stream.

I feel that I don't see global as a threat. I see it as a huge possibility to become more local.

Many of the issues that have been discussed here today with a worrying faces, I feel that they are possibilities. They are especially possibilities for you as art educators. I think that you are one of the key group now in this big change because since

you know so much about art and you are connected with art, you will create new ways. You deal with creative issues all the time. And since you are educators, I would say that you rule the world. You can have a great impact to the generations that will grow up and rule the world, so you are really, as I think an English sentence says, "The hand that rocks the cradle, rules the world." You do that in very important area today.

To my provocative part of this little talk or answer, I don't want to -- I hope no one will be insulted, no ways, but still I feel that coming outside perhaps from your field, I thought that this would be a meeting where people are really feeling their power: We will do something now. I'm wondering, or should I say I'm shocked that during the email discussions and during here, I see so many worried faces and concerns and problems. Where is the joyful power feeling that we are in the focus of revolution?

Where is the active energy that creativeness can open up?

I know there are many reasons. I'm not a crazy horse. But still I want to ask you if we should leave the problems behind and really look at the future. There are important issues but there are huge possibilities right now, and you are the key persons to make this world a better place for children and for human beings, so use your opportunity.

To Mr Abate, want to conclude with a saying that read somewhere, I can't remember any more -- what kind of a scientist I am! -- but it says less inequality means more quality. And I really believe that if we can make all cultures, all children more equal, the quality will be better for everyone, but also the levels of qualities will come up more clearly. The hierarchy will not depend on power systems, they will depend on human resources, and that's what art can give to us.

ANNE BAMFORD:

Thank you very much. To pick up on that point about equality, the next segment of our work moves into considering access and equality as a sort of broad theme. To introduce the question, I would like to call on Veronica Baxter. Veronica?

Veronica is at the University of Kwa-Zulu Natal in South Africa. Throughout her career she has had a strong commitment to research and one of the issues she is addressing, which I think is a really important issue in the context of accessibility, is the danger that the arts are seen as being a panacea to every evil in the world. You know, if you have a problem, perhaps the arts -- we can't solve it in any other way, maybe the arts will have the answer. It was within that context that she's posing the question on access and equality.

Thank you.

VERONICA BAXTER:

On a point on order, I think I am addressing the issue of cultural diversity and I'm afraid I cheated and asked for some slides to be displayed so that we would know the basics that I consider we would need to agree upon. So I would give you a chance to read those, but what I thought I would do was to sing you a song while you read them which would put into focus what I'm going to be addressing in relation to diversity, cultural diversity.

What I want to know is how many people in this audience recognise this tune:" Hums".

How many people recognise that tune?

You're all born before the 1970s.

My next question would be how many of you think it was composed by an American? No? You've been following the news. For many, many years, it was considered the product of a 1970s American and

it was called, "When the lion sleeps tonight", but in fact over the last few years an enormous court case was fought and won, giving the rights of composition, acknowledging the rights of composition to a South African, Solomon Linda. Of course, he never got to get that recognition, long since had passed on, but at least his family were able to get rather a substantial amount of money from Disney, as I recall.

That puts into sharp focus in my idea that the notion of cultural diversity and the globalisation that is a constant feature of our lives.

Having thought that the points of agreement that you've seen on the three slides I want to move to my question, which is addressed to Amandina.

My question is: how can the local practices of diverse, unique artists be sustained, be celebrated and be developed in a world that has gone crazy for consuming iPods, Paris Hilton's recent sojourn in jail, the music of 50 Cent or Snoop Doggy Dog or whatever, where the young and old, certainly in my country, talk with some authority about the latest Hollywood celebrity antics and the merits of "Die Hard" No. 4 but a locally made movie cannot find funding to be produced; where the audiences or readership, should I say, for locally produced plays is deemed to be too small to publish them, but book shops are crammed with magazines and books advising you on how to build your own Tuscan villa; where a national arts funding board cannot find the money to produce a locally made play, but will spend a fortune on importing a production of "Fiddler on the Roof", a Broadway production.

That's the first part of my question: how under those conditions can one celebrate local and diverse forms?

If we do manage to celebrate those, how do we prevent the local, the unique, from being appropriated to represent ethnic or nationalist interests or global interests? In other words, more

ways to divide, oppress and alienate people from each other? How do we work for the inclusivity so that we can share our common humanity rather than be divided by differences of language, gender, ethnicity and, of course, coming from South Africa, skin colour? How do we sustain and develop literacy in all the art forms that exist on a local basis.

Lastly, how do we manage to use global technology as an asset? How do we harness the valuable parts of global technology to work for us rather than against us, preventing another era of colonisation or cultural imperialism, preventing that the arts become mere consumer commodities, preventing the overpowering of our local forms, resisting being numbed and dumbed down where the only victor will become that of mediocrity?

And it relates to what Ngugi said earlier, how do we collapse the hierarchies of the local versus the global?

Thank you.

ANNE BAMFORD:

Thank you very much. To respond to that question, I'm asking Professor Amandina Lihamba, who is the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences at the University of Dar Es Salaam in Tanzania. She has had a long-time work looking at the connection between human existence and, I suppose, creativity and she says the dependency of human beings is on creativity to survive and develop. We've asked her to respond to the question of diversity. Thank you.

AMANDINA LIHAMBIA:

Thank you, Anne.

I think Veronica has asked more than 20 questions in there and I'm not going to attempt to address all of them. I think those are questions for all of us to ponder. Some of them have been addressed variously by the previous speakers, but she's coming from a slightly different perspective.

I would like to start by saying, maybe responding to Tuula's observation, that some of us really come from a position of contradiction in terms of globalisation. On one hand, yes, we have fears, real fears, and I'm not sure if those fears can be left behind in the way that you sort of say, you know, "Hey, fears, stay behind."

But I think there are ways and I think what she proposes is the fact that, can we, knowing that, move on to other things?

That's the other side of globalisation and I think that has meaning in terms of fear.

How can the local be developed? Be accessed? And be sustained? First of all, the recognition that the local exists. I think the problem with the context of globalisation, we tend to believe that there are whatever we see that we of a certain group, whatever we access is actually that is the human experience and therefore that is the overall experience within and that should be the model. So that is where I think the fear arises, in terms of, well, the speaker this morning who opened our deliberations said that homogeneity or single culture, moving towards a single culture is not necessary. I mean like we have a choice.

Sometimes we behave as if there's no choice in globalisation and I think that is where there is a problem.

So on that side of the fears, where we look at globalisation as something that is trying to drive away the local, local cultures, local languages, except in those areas where it can actually harness it to profitability, to economic, political ambitions, the local is not important and not unique, it's only unique if it's profitable. That's I think on that side we have fears.

But I agree totally with Tuula that the global also offers possibilities and I think this is why we're here. I believe the teaching of the arts, where the arts do start in a way from the

local. I'm not sure whether it's in the classroom or outside the classroom, the teaching of the arts start from the global. I think it starts from the local. And in that sense then, we are looking at the children. How can we sustain, how can we develop it? I think the direction is the children. How? How do we make it possible for the children to access art and the art that starts from the local?

Obviously we are not saying that they should not access the global. Maybe in this case we work the opposite from our medical profession, that we start from the local and we open up. There are so many possibilities within the global that we can harness to enhance the local. There are dangers, obviously. There are dangers obviously.

One of the things that Veronica has said is that, well, you know, in life change is probably the only thing that we are sure of, which is true, and therefore accepting change is really one of the driving forces of life and we have to do that. The global has taught us to do that, but understanding what drives those changes and who profits from those changes is quite important.

So I think in looking at globalisation and the local, we need to look at those issues. You know, the drivers of globalisation and who profits. But at the same time looking at the possibilities, what are the openings, what are the creative openings. I'm very glad that this morning I came in before the break. I was a bit worried about the issue of creativity, but I was put to rest by the contribution, very eloquent contribution on creativity which I totally agree with. It opens up for quite a number of issues.

I think when we look at globalisation and the local, we need to look: what are the spaces that the local can harness the global? Just as the global is harnessing the local. And who benefits from that? I think we need to look at that. So that in creating curricula or looking at the teaching of the arts, and I really believe this is where part of the salvation comes from, is that the local is not only recognised but it's historically given its

right place. Because the local will also change and hopefully it will change with the kind of momentum that is driven from within the cultures rather than from the outside, even though the tensions occur.

The other issue which Veronica raises which I would like to address, as I said, I'm choosing the issues because there are so many. I would like to write a book on that. But I think this issue of the technology, which is related to the issue of the global and the local. Again, from where I come from, there are fears in terms of technology. If we are not careful, technology will divide us more if we do not make sure that the accessibility to technology is made available, is facilitated for the majority of the people. For most of us in this room, it's not a problem, we can access that, and possibly in Hong Kong, I know I'm fascinated with, you know, the type of technology that exists. But for areas in Africa and some other parts of the world, communication using contemporary technologies is a major problem still. In a way we are being divided now, we are being divided by economic classes in terms of the economy, but we are being divided by those who are into the information technology era, and those who are not. Quite a number of people are being left behind.

I'm saying in order to use technology so that it's not used as a factor for dividing or for impositions or for pressure and exploitation of other people is to make sure that the technology is accessible by as many people as possible.

I think teachers are also in the forefront of this, making it possible that technologies reach out to children, to the vulnerable groups in society, so that they can be used, those technologies are important in the lives of the people.

I didn't think I would use all my time.

ANNE BAMFORD: You've used heaps, but it's good.

AMANDINA LIHAMBA:

I think in looking to the future, as it's been said, this is an important gathering that should inspire us because sources of inspiration are very important; where do we get our inspiration, that the global and the local should actually act as sources of inspiration, but at the same time we should open up for the local to access the global through inspiration that comes out of communication and the use of contemporary technologies that are available to us but not available to other peoples and groups in society.

ANNE BAMFORD:

Thank you very much.

I knew I would have a very difficult task as a chair when you have such interesting people and they were all saying yesterday, "But what will I say for five minutes." But I also know that people in Hong Kong value being on time and also value meals, a lot. So it is important that we can try and keep our presentations, please, to the five minutes. It would be very, very useful.

Also, I know that in this session all we are doing in a way is asking a lot of questions. You do have opportunities in your small groups this afternoon to really latch on to those issues that are most important to you, so don't feel that -- I know that there'll be lots of starts of sentences and I hope it's not frustrating, and that you'll have a chance to talk about those sentences in more detail later on.

To lead into that area of access in more detail, I'm going to call upon Shanta Serbjeet Singh from India who is going to present a question on looking at these issues of access. Shanta is chair of the Asia Pacific Performing Arts Network. Through her work, she is examining the value of the arts in social empowerment and she's worked extensively in the area of stress therapy, particularly following the disaster that was the tsunami that affected so much

of Asia. I would like to invite Shanta to propose the question, please.

SHANTA SERBJEET SINGH:

Thank you. We talked a lot about language this morning, about philological issues and leading into my question is certain words that struck me as I was sitting here. For instance, we just heard about -- Tuula talked about the need to be less strained and so the word that we use for such an emotion is (Sanskrit spoken) and the holy man when he renounces the worldly life in India is distinguished by two things: the ochre clothes and his name, which must end in (Sanskrit spoken), it will be (Sanskrit spoken), (Sanskrit spoken), any but it must end with (Sanskrit spoken). It's a good pointer to being here, let's look at the positive aspects of being here. And the positive aspects of creativity, although I fully agree that creative torturers are extremely creative.

The second word that I would like to draw your attention to leading into the question to Clarissa is that certain words coming in from tradition for the arts are -- there's one word. There is a holistic stream of thinking behind using those words. Veronica told me in Swahili there is one word for dance music and the dramatic arts. In Sanskrit there is one word, (Sanskrit spoken), it expresses dance, music, theatre. So there is a certain amount of combined very, very focused holistic thinking to the arts where we are not segregating them and we are not dividing, to begin with the arts and then ourselves, along those lines.

At the same time, the third word is the one that the Greeks gave us, a very loaded word, democracy. Democracy has led me to thinking about its negative connotations. We've just had a woman chosen as president of India by lots of smaller legislators and thousands of the senior senators and it's done in the name of gender parity, it's done in the name of democracy, it's done in the name of all that's politically correct, but every segment voted through self-interest and with an eye firmly on the general elections a year away. So be it. But it's democratisation of culture that is

my question to Clarissa. Do we recognise that in our bid to end inequality in the reach of the arts, we neglect one cardinal element of artistic pursuit excellence. When we are constantly lowering the base line, are we not therefore in danger of forgetting that no great artist was created out of arts education? I'm sorry to say this. In the Hindi language, we have also the same problem. People are asked to produce more (Hindi spoken) rather than (Hindi spoken). The metaphor is about (Hindi spoken) was this great musician, musicologist, who is a legendry name in Indian musicology, but (Hindi spoken) means those who listen well. Fine, that's have the (Hindi spoken), but who's looking after the (Hindi spoken)?

ANNE BAMFORD:

To respond to that question, I would like to ask Ms Clarissa Ruiz, who is Head of Arts for the Ministry of Culture in Columbia. On a daily basis, she has to deal with the implication of artistic creation on public policy.

CLARISSA RUIZ:

Thank you. Shanta. I am very proud to receive your question and it's a very difficult question because and I prefer to read because I was writing a lot yesterday night, trying to reply to you.

For me, the issue of accessibility has to be related to two of the theories, assumptions that guide this meeting, and in general all the important planetary mobilisation for the empowerment of the artistic education. And the practices of artists or arts.

First, it is the hypothesis that all the intelligences are equals. And the second is that we understand that intelligence are not only made or generated by the brain, but that we built our knowledge through the experience of the arts.

Then, if we trust in these assumptions, we can conclude that artistic education must be a universal right and must be inserted into education for all without difference.

This is a political (indistinct word) of the principle of the equality of the intelligences. We can also affirm that artistic practice reply to our desires of all human being that can hope also to realise them. As all our needs to recognise them is to begin to transform a problem into an opportunity, to make a positive power.

Nevertheless, these assumptions or hypotheses are not shared by the societies as a main goal. The practices of art continue to be considered as a matter of few people, a special gift with natural skill born that could be or not could, alternativity, complementarity, instrumental people, but not essential. Then if we trust in the equality of the intelligence, the contrary that we must conduce to suit need that is not enough to guarantee the access, the democratisation, but we have to recognise that culture of the others, it means cultural democracy, is necessary, the capability to understand each other pass through the possibility of this equality. Each other is -- we can understand, we need to be understand. Our excellence must be understood and the belief that knowledge is a community experience is in this hypothesis or theory.

Knowledge needs the participation and the appropriation of all, so we need to trust in the equality of the intelligence.

To affirm that we are subjects of poetry or dance as we can work or operate means that the creation of new worlds are not made by a special gift subjectivities or individuals, but that they are built by communities of peers, that doesn't arise differences. Only if not made possible to hierarchisise, to make a hierarchic order. We are not Picasso or Garcia Marquez, not all the people can do that, I agree. But they are people, Garcia Marquez, that has social opportunities of development and follow their deep desire and go to excellence not as a gift but as a possibility to insert their desires into a way of freedom.

I think we have to trust in this logic and even if it is hard, and even if people that work in culture try, it's very difficult to reach the education system, but we have to share this first.

I think the excellence, as you said, will be more as a net and maybe we will not have the Beatles or rock and roll revolution, but we will have a possible world in the future.

I saw a conference in last month and they said only in Latin America, only produce the 3 per cent of the knowledge in this moment in the world and I was a little -- I said we need this accountability, creative accountability, because it's very difficult to understand why you can say that we only produce the 3 per cent of the knowledge. And Africa also. They are losing something and we are here to try to go and go through this excellence and through the democracy that you have to. Thank you.

ANNE BAMFORD:

I know I did a very awful thing to our provocative speaker, because I asked him to pose questions, which he did by email, and then I said to him, "Now, I want you to actually answer them." I thought it's one thing to pose a question and it's another thing to think of a way forward.

With that I would like to introduce Richard Engelhardt who is the UNESCO regional advisor for culture in Asia and the Pacific and is based in Bangkok. He's looked a lot at the area of creativity as a key to prosperity, but specifically he raised questions about the future of education and so I've thrown those questions back to him.

RICHARD ENGELHARDT:

Thank you very much, Anne. I just said thank you for introducing me, now I'm going to complain. I feel like one of the students of Socrates must have felt when he came and tried to get some knowledge and was only asked to answer his own questions.

But luckily, throughout the day today I have actually had some of my questions answered and I have gotten some knowledge, so at least I'm very grateful for that and I would like to thank all the speakers who have spoken before me on this because I did ask some questions about what we could envision the future of an education system that would use arts to promote creativity and with an end goal to a better society, prosperity, more equal, more just world. Of course, those are huge, big questions.

Let me just make three observations that I have had. Maybe they'll be provocative ones. I'm purposely framing them to be provocative so you might jump a little bit.

One observation has to do about policy paradigm shift. Another observation has to do with the curriculum reforms that that would entail and the third one is how we would catalyse all of this to happen.

On the policy paradigm shift, I just pick up from what everyone has been talking about, about how we have been investing as educators in the last 100 years and very specifically within the last 50 years to ensure there is education for all in the world.

We've been basically pretty successful about this. We are now looking to ferret out the pockets where education has not reach. We are looking at the failures rather than trying to find the successes, so we are pretty much looking at education for all.

What "education for all" has meant is that we now have a knowledge society. Without the success of education for all, we couldn't possibly have moved into a knowledge society, so we're talking 100 per cent education, 100 per cent knowledge in our populations and 100 per cent of skills coming from that knowledge.

This is what someone said this morning, that now there is no room in society, no jobs for people who have no skills, who have no knowledge. So we've created this kind of a society.

The corollary to this, I think, is that we have also now at a point -- and this is where I think Tuula has talked about -- we are verging on a paradigm shift, and where is this paradigm shift going? Let's call it "creativity for all" as something that is, what Clarissa talked about, something about a rights-based approach to education. I'll come back to Shanta's point about dumbing down everyone to the lowest common denominator, but the first point I would like to make is we are now at this jumping off point into which we are in a society where creativity for all is not just a luxury but a right for everyone.

That's very interesting for someone like me who's worked in UN development agencies for the past thirty years because we've been chasing this chimera of development for everyone in the world but we haven't been able to get there. Why not? Because some countries have water but not everybody. Some countries have agriculture but not everybody. Some countries have this but not everybody. And even technology, some countries have, but not everyone. But what if we have 100 per cent creativity in this world. That maybe would open the key to 100 per cent development and therefore I think the linkage between creativity and well-being of society is very direct.

That's my first idea: creativity for all as a rights-based approach to how we govern our society.

What would this mean, coming to Shanta's question, about reform of the curriculum and how do we make sure that we have -- that less inequality means more quality rather than the other way around?

Let me pick up maybe two points on this. One Clarissa mentioned and alluded to this idea of multiple intelligences and I think this is probably where we would start if we're starting to reform the curriculum. I think we start right there. There's good proof that this is a good pedagogy and we can start to restructure our curriculum according to different structures of multiple intelligences.

They're not only for streaming individuals who happen to have a propensity for one form or the other, but developing all of these multiple intelligences within each and every person.

There I think is where we come to some arts education quite directly and where we've been told two or three things that I think have been absolutely key to our understanding of this. One is the idea that arts is the food and the water and the sustenance of this creativity. The second is the idea that arts is a language, that this is how you communicate creativity, through these languages that are arts. And the other one is that in the practice of arts, and I think John made this point, that the studio idea itself of how you actually do art is a way to learn and that would have to do with the reform of our curriculum.

So from this idea of multiple intelligence as we go to use arts as a tool to get at this, but a tool that has its own end products that then are subject to evaluation and therefore we don't have to dumb down to the lowest common denominator.

The second point on this is the idea of cultural diversity. Multiple intelligences expand as you mine other cultures for other intelligences and one of the things that the 2004 report on cultural liberty says is that each of us now has the responsibility, not only the ability but the responsibility to construct our own cultures from all of the cultural knowledge we have in the world. This is what we have to impart to our children and to the students, the structuring of their own cultures from the diversity of cultural possibilities in the world.

From that, we can also think about how we would restructure the education day or the education system.

I read a very interesting article, that probably those of you who are educational reformers know much more than I do, about kinetic types of education, reflective of different cultures. Let's just

say things like an active mind, an active body is one paradigm. An active mind, a passive body is another paradigm, et cetera, and was talking about how the paradigm of passive mind, passive body seems like an anomaly to education but in fact it is for example the idea of how you learn through meditation.

So we can start to restructure some of our education through these different cultural education paradigms that we can learn about and use as we try to approach this.

We'll move very quickly onto this. The implication of all this is that we have to invest very heavily in teacher education. Within this, I would say that we have to take a proactive stance. Americans like to call it affirmative action in education, where if we want to have change, we have to aggressively go out and make that change happen, we can't just sit and wait for it to happen. I think that very much is within the cultural climate of today, whatever end of the political spectrum you're on, people are tired of waiting for change to happen, they're going out to make it happen and it doesn't matter whether you're President Bush or whether you're a Taliban or whatever you are, you're tired of waiting for things to happen and you're going out to try to make them happen and this is the kind of an era that we're living in and I think you were reflecting on this, saying, "I wonder why is everybody passive in this meeting, why aren't we going out there and trying to create a revolution?"

I would like to echo that sentiment. I grew up in various kinds of revolution and I had the privilege of living in China during the cultural revolution and we're talking about cultural revolutions here so let's maybe look at how we could move forward with revolution and particularly revolution in teacher education in this case. We're going to need many more teachers if we're going to go into these multiple intelligences and cultural diversity, we are going to have to source our teachers from many ways, but I think one of the most important things, one of the most important take home ideas I have from reading the papers, and I can't remember,

maybe it was you John, maybe it was you Keith, who made the observation that if we are going to deal with the diversity of children at the individual level, we have to have pedagogies which develop their own creative not have them act out the creativity of their teachers. I think that was a very important observation and I would like to underscore that.

Finally, in all of this, I would say that this access to technology as what you have brought up, is certainly not, again, a luxury but an imperative. It's part of this rights-based approach to it. We have to ensure it, we have to invest in it and, as Mr Kim said this morning government has to be involved in this because the only reliable source of long-term sustainable intergenerational investment in this is going to come through government revenues.

That may not be very popular, but I think realistically, if we're going to have a 100 per cent creative society that means 100 per cent access to all of this knowledge and technology, it's something we're going to have to invest in through our tax base for some time to come.

But if we do that, we very well may achieve this very brave goal of 100 per cent developed society, develop through the creativity of the human mind.

ANNE BAMFORD: Thank you. Our last question and answer issaying let's take this in our hands and let's move forward with it. I know it's starting to get to lunch time and your stomachs are telling you that. We will be about ten more minutes for the planners, I think.

I would like to call on Dr. Victor Fung who is the Professor of Music Education at the University of South Florida who has spent a lot of his time on the work of assessment and accountability, but also picking up on the point that Richard raised which is the basic human rights that are contained within creativity, is it core

as is water and education and a number of other issues to being human?

VICTOR FUNG:

As a music educator I have been to many meetings of museum educators and arts educators and in these meetings I have heard a lot of wonderful ideas, marvelous thoughts, great theories and brilliant ideas and important research findings all of which support the value of the arts in education and the importance of the arts in life in general.

I would like to borrow a sentence from Amandina earlier when she spoke about accessibility. She said for most people in this room there's no problem. Well, I think in a lot of these meetings when we hear about these ideas we have no problem either. But I think the problem is for people who are outside of the arts education community, we need the parents, we need the business people, we need the administrators, school principals, government officials, we need all these people to hear these messages. So the question is: what can arts educators do to communicate to people outside the arts community to the general public, maybe even change their minds so that they also understand the importance of the arts in education, the value of the arts in life? Thank you.

ANNE BAMFORD:

That probably is one of the most important questions we're faced when we saw that we didn't have those other people here at this meeting. To try and hopefully she'd some light on that, a difficult task at this time, is Dr Max Wyman. He's a writer and author of *The Defined Imagination, Why Culture Matters*. He's also on the Canadian commission for UNESCO and I suppose has spent his lifetime work examining the contemporary dilemmas faced by the arts and cultural policy. We thought he was a good man to ask some advice on this one. Thank you.

MAX WYMAN:

Thank you, Anne and thank you for the question, Victor.

I'm an outsider and a writer, I'm not a teacher, I'm not an educator, I'm not one of you. I am a writer and what I do as a writer is I synthesise ideas and thoughts and things that come across my desk and my head and I have been listening to all these debates here today and in previous meetings, (indistinct word) consultations (indistinct words) and I keep hearing everyone's coming up against barriers. We have a barrier with educators, we have a barrier with business, we have a barrier with politicians, nobody understands. I recognise that. So when Tuula talks about the mood of, almost, acceptance here, I recognise that too, people become very discouraged because we all believe passionately in what we believe in and I think we all agree on the central themes here, but we seem to have no way to push beyond those barriers.

What I'm trying to do is start a revolution. The revolution that we were talking about, that Tuula wants, that Richard wants, and I think we do it by going to the streets. Not the streets that we know, although here's a thing. If you were to go outside this building right now and ask anybody in the street what the arts or artistic creativity meant to them, you would probably get a blank stare. We understand but it's inside the cathedral that we understand and we have to throw the doors open -- we have to tear the cathedral down and let the thing be there for everyone because it belongs to everyone and we have got to let them know it belongs to everyone. We do that by going out and using the tools of today.

This is going to be a problem for a lot of people to accept because what I'm proposing is that we start a web campaign, not just any old web campaign but we actually recruit the youth that we teach and we talk to, that we get our teachers that we work with, that we get our parents to post their ideas on the web to start a discussion. There's been an awful lot of debate about the value of the bloggersphere that's been developed on the Internet. People talk about how blogs are useless because they're filled with personal information with misinformation, Wikipedia is the worst thing possible because it's filled with misinformation but people miss

the point that the Internet is a new form of debate, a new form of communication.

If you go onto the Internet and scurry around, you can pick up an idea here, half an idea there and pretty soon you have a sense of what the community is feeling.

It's a different means of connection.

It's totally new to us and we're just beginning to understand the value of it. Yes, a new book in Britain came out this week about how -- it's called *The Cult of The Amateur*, how today's Internet is killing our culture.

Well, it is and it isn't and I think it's up to us to use those tools. Challenges (indistinct words) thought, scary thought because it means that we essentially give over control of the debate to the people it really affects, which I don't think is a bad thing. We need to bring in the public, the general public, the politicians, the bureaucrats, the teachers, the parents, the kids, we have to get everyone talking about this because until we build public will, we will not get the political will that will allow Mr Kim to persuade his government that this stuff is important. And everyone else to persuade their governments that it's important because governments respond to what the problem wants and we have to let the public know that they have a treasure here that they don't recognise yet. We know the value of this stuff. We have to get the word out and it has to be seen as something that belongs to everybody. It's not Rapunzel stuck in a castle, beautiful but remote, it belongs to everybody. We do that by going out onto the Internet.

I want to challenge this new association, this new alliance, as part of its advocacy strategy for the future to begin to put together over the next year between now and the next meeting to strategise -- I'll help -- a programme where we use the Internet in an entirely new way to (indistinct word), if you like, to get out our message about what is really important about these things that we've talked

about today and everyone has some really valuable points to make about cultural diversity, about the importance of the local, about the importance of creativity in learning. Nobody mentioned spiritual, or somebody just touched on spirituality, it's another important element of artistic creativity which sets artistic creativity aside from scientific creativity.

Well, that's beside the point.

We need to use the Internet. Let's get kids to post. We'll not own it any more. Let's get people to tell us their stories. We tell stories to make sense of the world. We always have. Every culture tells stories. The aboriginal cultures in Canada, where I come from, are filled with stories that explain the world. We tell the stories about what is good about what we do. I can tell you a dozen stories right now about success stories of using the arts in education that are quite unconventional, they're not to do with a basic pedagogy -- we shouldn't use that word -- pedagogy is not a word to use on the Internet when we're talking about this stuff or performativities, all that sort of that thing.

We come out of the stratosphere into the bloggersphere and we do it with good will, with generosity, we want to share so we share our stories. Maybe we have a global competition for the best stories or the best videos or the best -- people post on YouTube -- you can see Ken Robinson on YouTube talking about this stuff. It's important that we recognise that we are in a new way of communicating and we have to use it.

Post to YouTube, have an international competition which is judged by the international community so we have a voting system where anyone in the world can vote for the best posting, the best story, there are stories about northern British Columbia where schooling has been transformed by locating creative activity within the school system that's based in the local knowledge -- stories that are out of Tucson, stories from around the world about how creativity transforms education. Have this competition. Begin to open up the

argument and build up the revolution in the streets, the new streets, the electronic streets where it belongs. Let the people know what a treasure they're losing and not using. That's my challenge to everyone here: I would like to challenge you to come up with one story you know about the way that creative activity in the schools has transformed the experience and the product of the children. Within the next year I would like to challenge the alliance it to put together a programme that really takes our message out.

We have to be confident, we have to be strong and I feel this passive, "Oh dear we can't deal with this stuff because we can't get (indistinct words), the bureaucrats hate it, the teaches fear it." Break it down, give it back, say, "This is yours" and see what comes back. I think what will come back is a remarkable surge of public good will and out of that will come political good will and we'll have the revolution within the system within ten years. Thank you.

ANNE BAMFORD: On that revolutionary note, I would like to get you all to once again thank both our excellent questioners and our provocative respondents, please.

As I mentioned before, after lunch you will have an opportunity in your smaller groups to hopefully pick up on many of these issues.

Lunch runs until 2 o'clock and then I'm told there will be buses at 2 o'clock promptly to take you to Bethanie where our afternoon session will continue there.