

**Sir Ken Robinson's Keynote Speech
to the Music Manifesto State of Play conference
on the second day of the event
January 17th 2007**

Section One: Introduction, warm up and anecdotes

Thank you Marc. Good morning. How are you doing? It was great yesterday, wasn't it? That's what I was told.

I arrived in yesterday from California, where I now live. So there. And you don't. (Laughter)

Have you been to California anyone? I live in Los Angeles now. Has anybody here been to Las Vegas? It's fantastic, isn't it? How about the Venetian Hotel? Yes? If you haven't been to the Venetian Hotel, go. That's my advice. It holds about 20, 000 people and it's a replica of Venice inside. There are gondolas on the first floor, really, and a canal. I've been to Venice, and The Venetian is better. (Laughter) It is. It's more authentic, I feel. And it doesn't smell.

Anyway, I was there a while ago and I was speaking at a conference for an information technology organisation. It was a 2-day conference and on the first morning the introduction was given, the keynote that is, by a juggling group, I thought it was fantastic, called the Passing Zone. I thought it was great. They are a group of extreme jugglers. They juggle chain saws, that's extreme isn't it? Now, I think, there are two of them. There used to be eight you know, (laughter) but they're not terribly good, frankly.

I was giving the keynote on the second morning. I don't do that - I don't juggle much, really. So I said, "Well how am I going to get on?" And they'd figured this out. They said, "We've got a musical introduction for you", which seemed relevant for today. They had this theatre group; do you know 'Stomp'? Well 'Stomp' introduced me. So at 8 o'clock in the morning there are 1500 delegates in this big Las Vegas ballroom. I was backstage, waiting. And the door burst open at the back of the auditorium and 'Stomp' came bursting in, about 12 of them, you know, beating the drums and doing the whole thing. It woke people up and it was fantastic.

So, I was backstage and for about ten minutes as they progressed towards the stage, beating the drums. I think there were about ten drummers and these two beautiful girl dancers in leather bikinis. And, anyway, for the last two minutes of the performance they started to chant my name. Honestly, they started to chant, "We'd like to introduce Sir Ken Robinson", beating rhythmically on these drums. I won't try and do it for you. And then as this thing reached its crescendo, the two girls ran of stage into the wings, grabbed me, pulled me into a spotlight and threw confetti all over me. Seriously.

Well, this is unusual, isn't it? It's an unusual way to start the day. It is. It's a good way, don't mistake me, it's a very good way to start the day. But it's unusual. Anyway. I mention it for several reasons. One is that although I thought that Mark's introduction was OK... (Laughter and applause)...I've had better, frankly. That's all I'm saying. It's obviously a cheap conference. (More laughter.)

Section Two: local and global proof that the ideology current systems of education are based on is 'completely bankrupt'

Anyway it's actually great to be here in the Roundhouse. I had an office in Camden Lock for about four years. We ran a magazine there called Arts Express that some of you might know and I lived in Camden for years. So it's great to be back here. I used to come here in the 1970s and I was talking to Paul Roberts and Ruth McKenzie and we saw 'Epsom Downs' here in the early 70s and the 'Grand Magic Circus'. For those of you who don't know this place, I know Alan Johnson mentioned something, this is a great place to be meeting. This was founded as an arts centre, as you know probably if you've read the history, by Arnold Wesker. It was called 'Centre 42' and it was named for a TUC resolution, Resolution 42, which aimed to commit the TUC to promoting arts provision for everybody, which is the proposition really that's before this group and what the whole Music Manifesto is all about. So I think it's a great place to be gathering.

So I wanted to congratulate firstly everybody involved with the Music Manifesto. I think it's a fantastic achievement to have got to this point. And particularly Marc and all the various chairs who have steered this thing through. At the moment it's a roadmap and it's really important that people gather round the agenda, and change it if you think so. I also wanted to congratulate Musical Futures for all the work they have done, particularly for the work on pathways with Dave Price who's been leading that, and Claus Moser. I think that's a great move forward. And the whole Creative Partnerships programme; I want to say a few words about as well.

I say all this because it's important to recognize that this, and all the events and all the initiatives happening now in 2007 haven't come out of the ether. You know they stand in a tradition, a difficult and troubled tradition, often truthfully (and it's an overused word) I think of struggle against public policies in education. And it isn't recent. It goes right back to the roots of formal education. So I think it's important to see the historical context of what's happening here. And I want to say a few words about that and to set a frame around it because there's a lot that will be said and has been said yesterday about music in particular. I really want to relate the agenda of this conference to some larger issues, as I see them, about the whole of education. And really to say that this is great, but it will not be enough if music education is seen as just an enrichment of the current ways of teaching people. And often I think governments see it that way, it's a way of making things kind of more humane. The real issue about music education, and creative education more generally, is not enrichment but transformation. It seem to me that what we

have to press for now is a radical change in the entire way in which we educate ourselves and our children. And this is one of the major straws in the wind, but I don't think we should settle for it.

If I had to boil it down it's this that most of our education systems are rooted in ways of thinking that properly belong in the 19th Century not the 21st Century, sort of top and bottom. (Applause.) Right, I'm going now. I'm not going to improve on that, frankly. (Laughter) No, top and bottom. And the issue here is to challenge the things that we take for granted in education. I want to come onto that. I have a lot of interest in creativity but to me creativity is really just a metaphor. It's a metaphor for a different way of conceiving of human capacity to the one that really permeates formal systems of education. So I think that really we ought to be promoting creativity systematically through education from kindergarten through to the end of life. But we also have to be more creative in the way that we do it. We also have to call on our bureaucracies to be more creative and we need to be more creative in the way we think about it. So I just want to speak to that, for about four or five hours if that would be ok? But I want to say a few words about the context, what the priorities are, as I see them, and what some of the strategies are.

As I mentioned... did I mention that I now live in California? (Laughter.) Ok, I moved out there five and a half years ago with my family and it's very interesting to compare what's happening out there with what's happening in Europe and particularly in the UK. So the first thing I want to say is that all the things we are trying to contend with in the UK have a local character but a global significance. Every country on earth is trying to figure out the equations that we're trying to solve here in the UK. And there are very specific reasons for it. In America, for example, there is a national reform movement in education, which is spearheaded by an a piece of legislation that all the parties signed up for, spearheaded by George Bush, and it's called, 'No Child Left Behind'. Now I was told when I went to America that the Americans didn't get irony...(laughter)... they do, really, they get irony.

'No Child Left Behind'. Think of the National Curriculum Education Act in 1988. 'No Child Left Behind' has a very strong focus on literacy and numeracy, standardised testing, on penalising schools that don't hit the right targets, and on comparing schools through league tables and gearing funding to the results. Does this sound familiar, in any way at all? No Child Left Behind is actually leaving millions of children behind. Though of course that's not so attractive a name for a piece of legislation is it really, you can see that. 'Millions of Children Devastated'. Doesn't play quite so well in the Congress frankly. But we had the same thing in 1988 with the Education Act.

Now let me go straight on this. I believe firmly we should have national frameworks for education and a national system of accountability. I always believed we should have a national curriculum in England, and a different one in Wales of course and in Scotland and in Northern Ireland. I never had a problem about a national curriculum. I had a problem about this national curriculum, and particularly some of the ideological infrastructure that pins it. My sense of it is that most governments work in a gradualist way and they

resist almost tooth and nail, no matter what they say from public podiums, they resist tooth and nail the real significance of the arguments that are embedded, for example, in the Music Manifesto, which is about a different concept of education. And I, as Marc said, helped to put together a strategy about ten years now called 'All Our Futures', which was a response to speeches Tony Blair was making about promoting creativity. And I thought that this was great. He was talking a lot about creativity and the twenty-first century and I thought this was important. The sense of it was that the strategies he was putting in place weren't entirely appropriate. For example he, through Ofsted, focused very sharply on literacy and numeracy. You remember Chris Woodhead I imagine, do you? That didn't seem to me a good idea, reappointing him.

I'd worked for a long time in the arts and I felt there was a really historic opportunity in this new administration to promote this other concept of education, but it was a radical shift, and I didn't feel it happened. And the irony was that the government kept talking about creativity and innovation for good reasons, which I'll touch on later. So I was in touch with the government. Jude Kelly and I made some approaches to the government at the time and said, if you're serious about creativity let's be serious about it because the current system of education does not promote creativity. I think it's important that we understand it was never intended to be that way. It's not an accident that it doesn't, it was never meant to. It was meant to do something else. But I felt that if we were now to engage in a creativity agenda then we had to look, root and branch, at how we were doing it.

So we were in touch with them and essentially we said two things: if you're serious let's be serious. We have a literacy strategy, let's have a creativity strategy. And if you're not serious then stop talking about it, because it's confusing everybody. You're saying you want to promote creativity but education actually kills it stone dead in most people, does it not? And nobody intends it by the way. I've worked in education most of my life, particularly in the arts, but more generally now in the field of creativity. People don't try to kill creativity; teachers don't want to do it. I work a lot with teachers and I am from an education background. People don't set out to do it. They just do it. It's not intentional. It's not intentional, but it is systematic. So part of it means we have to look at systemic change to make it work. So we set out these ideas in a report called 'All Our Futures', which some of you I am sure will know. (I was delighted by the way that Paul Roberts was asked recently to do a review of creative provision in schools and if you haven't seen his review, the creativity review, the Roberts report, please do because it's full of great material I think about how to take this agenda forward, and I'll come back to that in just a minute).

But the essence of it to me is this: there are three propositions that I think we have to hang onto. One of them is that we are all of now worldwide engulfed in a revolution, and it is a full on no nonsense revolution. It doesn't matter whether you live in America, Europe or Asia or Central Europe or South America, it's affecting everybody and it's global in character. Every education system on the planet currently is in the process of being reformed. And there

are two reasons: one is economic (everybody's trying to figure out how we educate people to fit into the economies of the 21st century); and the second is cultural, you know, how do we engage our young people and all our populations in a sense of cultural identity, while participating in globalisation? And it strikes me as very interesting that within this globalisation trend there are two almost contradictory movements towards greater participation in global culture, and the second is localisation, moving more and more in the direction of reasserting local identity.

I don't know if you saw the debate last night on BBC2 about Scottish independence? It's not a coincidence that for the first time in modern history the United Kingdom is considering breaking up into four regional units. I mean what was going on in Central Europe recently, what were the events in France about recently? The whole struggle for French identity. Part of this is to get a sense of history and time frames. I don't know if you recall but Zhou Enlai when he was the Chinese Foreign Minister was asked in 1949 what he thought had been the impact of the French Revolution on Western civilisation? And he said, "It's too soon to say." (Laughter) I thought that was great. It was too soon to say. And actually he was right. I mean what were the events in France over the past couple of years except the long, rolling effects of the French Revolution on national identity?

So, it's about cultural identity and it's about economic change and these two things to me are connected, which is why I believe our current systems of education are inept. Most national governments seem to believe that the way we meet the future is to improve what we did in the past. And you see that as the principle instinct of the Education Reform Acts in the UK. Let's have a bit of embellishment, let's have some enrichment, but let's not lose sight of the fact that it's all about literacy and numeracy and raising academic standards. And I believe that that ideology is completely bankrupt.

Section Three: how technology and demography are changing everything

If you think of it, the whole process of formal education, the one you went through and the one if you have children that they are going through, is predicated on the idea of university entrance. It's like the whole thing is a long process of getting to university. I was at a meeting recently in Los Angeles (where I live now!) and there was a report circulated and the title of it was 'College Begins in Kindergarten'. Now it's well intentioned, but it's appalling isn't it, this idea? I remember somebody saying recently that the chap who started The ARC (Academic Research Consortium) in Dublin said that we always treat children as if they are unformed adults. And actually they are children. A 6 year-old is not half a 12 year-old, it's a 6 year-old, and that's all they know so far. It isn't about getting to college it's about fulfilling what they have and there are really three things I'll come to mention that.

But let me just speak quickly to the revolution. There are two drivers of change that are changing everything. The first is technology. If you haven't

been to the Creator's Bedroom yet, I hope you do go. The thing is that most of us now in this room I guess, most of us, live on one side of a cultural divide. A guy called Marc Prensky wrote about this recently. He talked about 'Digital Natives' and 'Digital Immigrants'. What he means is, if you're over 25, certainly if you're over 30, you were born before the digital revolution happened. So we've learned digital culture kind of second hand, haven't we? You know, we speak it, falteringly like most of us speak French, you know we do a bit of PowerPoint, we do emails, and we have a PDA and feel groovy. We think we are on the leading edge of something rather interesting.

But can I ask you, how many of you here have got teenaged children? (Many hands raised in the audience.) That's a lot of you, isn't it? Well, my daughter is 17. My son is 22 now. They live in a different world. They speak digital. Because they were born after this thing started, so they grew up speaking digital, and they have a facility with it that is quantitatively different and qualitatively different from people of my generation and anybody over thirty.

How many of you can I ask you have got a page on MySpace.com? Now, am I right, if this were a roomful of 20 year-olds, most people would have their hands up? Am I right? Would you put your hand up if you're wearing a watch? Now have a look around. Look at who's wearing watches. Most people under twenty, not everybody but most, don't wear watches. It's a very interesting cultural division. And they don't wear watches because they don't see the point of it, am I right? Why would you wear a watch? Number one, the time is everywhere. For people under twenty it's on their mobile phones, it's on the television, it's everywhere. They don't know why we're wearing these clunky things. And secondly, it only does one thing. (Laughter in the audience.) What's the point? Isn't that right? You can't talk to it, you can't download to it, you know, it just gives you elbow strain, what's the point of it? Well, we didn't know that. We go around looking for groovy watches.

The other word that's been applied is 'screenagers'. Most of the emergent generation live in front of screens and they take that for granted. This is the thing, it's about what you take for granted. And the new generation takes digital culture as read. And we're all a bit self-conscious about it. It's why we have to have a dialogue about this that isn't just about the grandees and the bureaucrats, because they don't live in this culture.

I'm doing some work in Oklahoma at the moment and I had a meeting recently with the heads of the Chickasaw Nation. It's great this, I'm going back to meet the heads of the Shian, the Apache, the Sioux and the Arapaho. Who knew? I'm going to talk to them about this whole innovation strategy we are having throughout the whole of Oklahoma. Somebody told me a story when I was last there as an illustration, which seemed to kind of get something. There was a fish swimming along the river, early morning, an old fish, and two young fish went past it. And the old fish said, "Good morning, how's the water?" There were blank expressions from the two young fish. And as they swam off, one turned to the other one and said, "What's water?" I love that, don't you?

The point about it is that if you are immersed in an element you don't know that you are. If you're a fish in water you don't know you're in water. This is the thing with ideology. It's the things you take for granted that are the most pernicious. We don't know we think these things. And, by the way, people in the new generations look upon digital culture as just a utility, a facility like oxygen, they're not self-conscious about it.

But my point is this: children starting school this year, think about this, how many of you have got children that have just started school? Or grandchildren, come on? Do you mind waiting outside actually? (Laughter) Well, think of it, children of five who started school this year will be retiring round about 2070. Now think about that. Nobody has the faintest conception what the world will look like then, do they? Do you? If you do then come up here and do this for me! Nobody does, truthfully. And part of it is that new technologies, really transformative ones, do change everything. The information networks are doing that currently, but it's far from over. All the things that people now think are edgy and groovy will at some point be in the Design Museum. And your children will look back at you and like you are troglodytes. "I can't believe you had keyboards! Mobile phones? How interesting." Because one of the driving forces of change now is nanotechnology, which I won't beat on about, but there are things coming down the pike (*idiom meaning happening or appearing*) which are even more transformative than the things we think have already changed everything.

For example, we are heading to a point I am reliably told by a guy called Ray Kurzweil, which is referred to as 'singularity'. Singularity is the point at which information systems merge with human consciousness. Now at the moment, every computer on earth shares a common characteristic: none of them, no computer anywhere, comes within a shout of the computing power of the human brain, none of them. But there will come a point when they will, when you will be sitting in front of a laptop let's say, which will have the same processing power as the human brain, as your brain. Well, how's that going to feel? When you are sitting in front of a computer that is as smart as you are. And you give it an instruction, and it hesitates (Laughter) and says, "Well, I don't know, have you thought this through?" (More laughter) "It's not clear to me that you have quite frankly."

We are almost at the point where we will be able to use our own bodies as broadband receivers. We are electrical systems and there will come a point in the not too distant future, I am told, where if we connect the new generation of computers to our own bodies in some harmless way, some non-intrusive system, then our bodies will act as a broadband receiver. So you won't have to look for a hotspot in a hotel anymore. (I mean you may choose to, for your own purposes (Laughter) but you won't have to!) And I'm told when this happens that it should be able to exchange files with somebody just by holding hands. Or whatever method you prefer, it's entirely up to you! (Laughter) It all depends on the size of the file probably, I don't know. (More laughter)

But we're taking all the stuff now as the final word in technology but it's very far from it. The other thing of course is that we're now in another iteration of technology, something quite new in the last couple of years. We've now moved into a whole new space of user-generated content, of so to speak 'social media'. Most of us, people of my age, were brought up on the receiving end of cultural products. The thing about the internet now is that it makes everybody a producer and a contributor, and a co-creator of cultural products. That's completely different. Just look at the phenomenon of downloading and how quickly that's proliferating. So any music strategy has to engage with what's happening, not just with the gadgets, but with the effect of the gadgets on the culture.

The second is demography – population growth. The population of the earth has doubled in the past thirty years. In 1800 the population of the earth was one billion, in 1930 it was two billion, in 1970 it was three billion. So it took the whole of history to get to one billion in 1800, in 1930 when Noel Coward was doing his thing there were two billion, so the next billion took a hundred and thirty years, in 1970 when this place (the Roundhouse) was starting to thrive, there were only three billion people on the earth when this was 'Centre 42'. There are now six billion people on the earth and it's heading towards nine billion.

But it isn't happening evenly. The real growth is in the so-called emergent economies. The growth rate of populations in the developed economies, this one, America, Western Europe generally is declining. The renewal rate for populations is about 2.1 births per mother. And you know that's not typical anymore. People have one or no children increasingly. So traditional populations are in decline. I'm told that within the foreseeable future on present projections for example, Europe as we know it, the traditional populations of Europe, the established ones, could become extinct, because we're not having enough babies. We're practising. (Laughter) But we're not having enough babies, generally.

Think of some of the cultural implications. There are currently 6,000 languages spoken on earth. Three thousand of them are not spoken by children. So it means within a generation 3,000 of them will become extinct on the earth, along with species and so on.

The real growth in population of course is in Asia, South America, parts of the Middle East and parts of Europe, not this part of Europe. In the emergent economies we're expecting an increase in the workforce in the next fifty years of 1.2 billion people and what's interesting of course is that they are all 'digital natives', they're all at home with this new technology. So it has profound implications for how we think of economic growth, economic change and so on.

Section Four: how C19th views on education and intelligence still dominate today

There are two truths about the world our children are living in and the one we are living in: one is it's increasingly complex, and the other is that it's increasingly diverse. So issues of culture and identity are really centre stage now. America just went through the 300 million population mark, but it hasn't done it through birth rate, it's mainly through migration patterns from South America. Where I live now, in Southern California, increasingly now the population is Hispanic, I think it's about 20% of the total population of America. So there's a huge cultural mix as people move around using the new technologies and also exchange cultural ideas and values. Our kids live in multiple spaces.

I found a quote here (if I can just put my hand on it) about British culture, which I rather liked. I saw it on the internet. It says that these days, 'Being British is about driving a German car to an Irish pub for a Belgian beer, then on the way home grabbing an Indian curry or a Turkish kebab to eat sitting on Swedish furniture, and watch American programmes on a Japanese TV. And the most British thing of all? Suspicious of anything foreign!' (Laughter)

There are big shifts as well in birth rate. There are currently 145 babies born every minute on earth, that's 9,000 an hour. So by the time I've finished there'll be another 9,000 lives on the earth, that's 200,000 a day. This is the new generation that's coming through. But they don't have equal opportunities. A girl born in Japan this year has a 50% chance of reaching the age of 90. A girl born in Afghanistan has a 25% chance of not seeing her fifth birthday. The life expectancy of women in Botswana is 38. The life expectancy of women in Los Angeles is 83. But they look 38. (Laughter) At least, from the neck up. (More laughter)

So there are huge shifts in the culture and in the demands on our sense of identity, on how we communicate and how we connect. And we're trying to engage in all of this with an education system that was designed in the 19th century. And the assumption is that we just have to do it better, which is why politicians keep talking about 'getting back to basics'. Well I wish they would. Because the assumption is that the basics are what was basic when they were at school and that system had a number of features, it's the one that we inhabit: one, there is a predominant emphasis in the system on a certain type of intellectual activity – academic ability. Academic ability is terribly important, but it is not the whole of human intelligence. Most of human culture would never have happened if all we had was academic ability. I mean the capacity for deductive reasoning and for verbal propositions. Most of culture would never have happened on that basis. But all other forms of ability have always been marginalised or, at best, seen as remedial. So, there is something at the heart of this.

The second is there an epistemology in education that is faulty. What I mean is the conception of knowledge that lies at the heart of our education system is bankrupt. There are two big forces that shaped public education. If you

think about it there were no education systems until really the 19th century, no public systems of education paid for from taxation. These systems that came about, deliberately, as acts of policy, were essentially designed to meet the needs of the industrial economy. Which was an economy that required most people to do manual work and a small proportion, less than 20% to do bureaucratic work, to work in offices, to do what my family used to call 'head work', you know, to work in suits and sit behind a desk. So there is a sense of economic utility embedded in the system, which is why by the way, the arts have always suffered.

In every education system on the earth the arts are at the bottom of the heap, every one. And in the arts by the way there's another hierarchy. Art and music normally have a better time than drama and dance. Dance is really at the bottom of the heap in most public systems of education and one reason is economic utility. There is a view that some subjects are more useful for getting a job than other subjects, isn't that true? You could put it another way. In this country we talk about 'core' subjects and 'foundation' subjects, which was an invention of Kenneth Baker, one day in the back of a taxi. One day in 1987 Kenneth Baker was trying to resolve a public debate with Margaret Thatcher and he came up with the idea of core and foundation subjects, you know English, Maths and Science, the arts and humanities. And within no time at all people were walking around talking about core and foundation subjects as if these had come off the mountain. You know Kenneth Baker had descended from Mount Olympus with two stones... (Laughter.) One with three subjects on, and one with seven. And there is a view of course this answered to some natural order of things. It does not answer to some natural order of things.

But there is a view that there are 10 subjects and three of them are really important and seven are less important. In other words the curriculum is based on the idea there are useful subjects and useless ones. And music is among the useless ones, currently. That's the way it's conceived.

So it was designed in the interests of the industrial economy but it was built in the image of the Enlightenment. There is a view of knowledge and intelligence which we owe to the growth of the scientific method and particularly the interests of the universities in the 19th and 20th century, that really intelligence is that form of thinking which can be rendered into verbal and mathematical propositions in a linear and deductive way. And I think it is and was always an impoverished view of intelligence. But one reason the arts suffer is economic utility and the other is because they don't answer to the dominant view of intelligence. Really smart people are good at academic work and they may also be good musicians. But people who are just good musicians are not thought to be among the high achievers. And that's embedded in the culture of education. And it's that that I want to try and root out because it's become taken for granted.

Section Five: a call to resurrect education so that children can have THEIR ways of thinking developed and THEIR best forms of intelligence promoted

I think the big enterprise for us now in this phase of the development of education is to publicly and systematically challenge the assumptions that are taken for granted in public policy for education. The thing is it's difficult to know what it is that you take for granted. And the reason it's difficult is because you don't know what it is. Because you take it for granted.

Let me give you an example of something that most people take for granted. You may or may not. How many senses have you got? This is not a trick, how many have you got? (Gestures to audience to respond) Five? Do I hear six? Dozens. What are the five – tell me if I miss one - taste, smell, sound, hearing, touch? What's the sixth? Intuition, thank you. That's our general way of looking at it, isn't it? There are some dissenters, which I am pleased to hear, but mainly we think there are five senses, and a sixth one. The five senses we mentioned are of course real senses, we have organs that do it. We have eyes, ears, noses, tongues and fingers. Intuition, which is commonly rolled in as the 'sixth sense' is a bit different because we don't have an obvious organ that does it, do we? It's a kind of 'spooky' sense, that girls have more of. (Laughter) So, we've got five real senses and a spooky one.

There was a great book out recently called Culture and the Senses by a woman called Kathryn Linn Geurts and she challenges this. She is an anthropologist and she worked with a group in south eastern Ghana called the Anlo-Ewe tribe, you can check it online. I always feel sorry for marginalised ethnic groups because they seem to be stalked now by anthropologists, don't they? It's like the standard family unit is three children and an anthropologist (Laughter) who sits there writing down what people are eating for breakfast. Anyway, she became aware as they talked that did not believe they had five senses, they hadn't thought of that, of having five senses. And when she pressed them (and this is how the book came about) they said to her, "Well, what about the other one?" And she said, "What do you mean, the other one?" And they said, "You know, the main one." Now this is the sense that you've got, that we've all got because we're human beings, but we don't normally list it. You may think of it now. Do you know what this is? I'll tell you to save time. Balance, our sense of balance. Now this is a real sense. We have an inner ear that deals with it, and it can get messed up, as it may have done for some of you after Hugh Masekela last night when you went to the bar? (Laughter) If the sense of balance is affected you know the effect it has on you. You know what it's like if you or your children have ear infections. The sense of balance is completely critical to our life, our being and our sense of humanity. Without it you couldn't have got here this morning and you couldn't leave at the break. It's fundamental. We all have it but we don't commonly list it. We don't list it not because we haven't got it but because we've taken it for granted that we have five senses, not seven. And we take it for granted because it's been said so often that we don't think about it anymore.

This place, the Roundhouse, was a centre for radical theatre in the 70s. Bertholt Brecht's plays were often performed here. And Bertholt Brecht said this, he said, "As soon as something seems the most obvious thing in the world it means that any attempt to understand it has been abandoned." The job of the arts is to question the things that we think are obvious, the things we take for granted.

Now actually if you speak to physiologists they'll tell you, as someone said over there, that you have dozens of senses – sense of temperature, sense of pain, sense of appetite, all these things without which you couldn't function in the world. But we take it for granted that's all we have, because it's been said so often. Now we take for granted in education, often, that there are ten subjects, three of them are really important, seven of them aren't quite so important. They all have to be taught separately, and there are some other things that we take for granted.

One is that education is something that happens primarily to young people, from birth. You know, that's the important bit, it's kind of front-loading. The second thing about education that we take for granted is, and this is also implicit in our system here, is that the most important thing that children have in common is their age, when it comes to educating them. I remember David Hargreaves, who's been advising 'Musical Futures' was advising us on a project I ran in the eighties called 'The Arts and Schools' and it was at the time when they'd just announced the idea of Key Stages, which I think are rather random points in a child's journey through life. But David was saying it was interesting how quickly these key moments which were meant to be points of assessment became thought of in the education system as key stages of biological growth. You know, Key Stage 1 is a distinct phase of biological growth, Key Stage 2 is yet another one. It's complete nonsense of course as an idea, but it took root in the culture, these key moments that we have to attend to.

If you think, if you run this through the current system, when I say it's modelled in the image of industrialism I mean it. For example, we educate children in separate facilities like factories. There is a linear assumption, there is a product at the end, they come out of education and they go into some pre-destined route. Nobody does, by the way, but it's an assumption we've always made, it's a linear planning model. Thirdly, it's run by specialists. You know, I do French, you do geography, you do history in the secondary school. We all do our little bits, you know I put do the fascia, you put the trim on. The most important thing that kids have in common is how old they are, it's all about the date of manufacture. You're eight, go off with all the other eight year-olds, you have so much in common. Well they don't. Anyone who's got kids knows they're all utterly different. Some children of five are way ahead of kids of fifteen. Some kids of fifteen are way behind people of twenty. You know, but we insist on grouping people by age. It's a taxonomic epistemology.

One of the things that also grew up with education is the Museums Service and the encyclopaedia. And you'll know with all these things the instinct was to categorise and organise things almost mechanically based on what was seen to be their dominant characteristic. So if you go to the Natural History Museum you can go into a room and it's a room where all the butterflies are kept. Then you go into a room and it's where all the spiders are kept, and then a room where all the beetles are. And they are all arranged in showcases, pinned according to their size and colour. Well, it's a way of seeing them. But it's not how they exist in nature, is it? You don't get butterflies flying round in formation, the small ones at the back and the large ones at the front. (Laughter) What I mean is it's an intellectual device for trying to organise our understanding of them, it's not what they are.

I remember upsetting a philosopher some years ago by quoting what I thought was a great comment. He didn't in fact say it but I'd heard the expression that "aesthetics is to artists what ornithology is to birds". And I rather liked that as an idea. You know organising art into movements and looking for aesthetic categories is what philosophers like to do. It's not what artists do, artists get on and do their stuff. If people can't think of the right categories, that's their problem. Birds aren't consciously being swallows, they're just doing their thing.

But our education system is based on a taxonomic view of subjects of intelligence, it's rooted in there. And what I want to argue for is something different. I think now there are four major priorities for education reform which are to some extent I think reflected in the work of Musical Futures, Creative Partnerships, in Paul Robert's review, the work we did in 'All Our Futures' and the Music Manifesto.

The first of them is 'personal'. Education has got to get back to recognising that education is about individual children, learners, adults. The whole thing is about facilitating individual growth and development. There is no other basic premise for education than that learning happens in the minds of individual people firstly. It interests me that we're making a great deal now about 'personalised learning' and I'm pleased that we are. But what's the alternative anyway? Depersonalised? Impersonalised? Well, actually, yes. Because the Education Act set out to promote rigorously 'impersonal' learning. You know the assumption was the most important things about education were the programmes of study and forms of assessment. Children in schools were kind of incidental to that, they were just the clients.

Recognising that learning is what happens through a personal act of commitment is really what everybody who's concerned with education should recognise. Nothing happens except that it happens within the mind of a living thing, a living person, and personalising learning is about recognising that there is a bigger conception of intelligence than has ever been made public through education. We know three things at least about intelligence, I believe, at least these: one is that intelligence is diverse; everything we know now about intelligence speaks to this that we think in all the ways that our senses make available to us, however many of those there happen to be. We

think visually, we think in sound, we think in movement, we think musically, we think in abstract terms, we think in mathematics, in words, in a multiplicity of ways.

Intelligence is hugely and richly diverse. We have chosen in public education to make a hierarchy and to prioritise and to leave out some ways of thinking because of a dominant ideological preoccupation. We need to resurrect education around the idea that children are entitled to have their ways of thinking developed and their best forms of intelligence promoted – it's tremendously diverse in its character.

The second thing about intelligence is that it's dynamic. The human brain is intensely interactive. If you look at magnetic resonance imaging you'll see that the brain lights up constantly in all sorts of interesting ways. It's not just left and right hemispheres. The whole of the brain is engaged all of the time but in different patterns. There is by the way some evidence that there are some gender differences here which twenty years ago we were all terribly sensitive about. But I think we can all look them in the face now, can't we? That people do think differently from each other and there are some broad gender differences. For example, women's brains seem on the evidence to be much more interactive, more matrical in their patterns of thinking. I think possibly it helps to account for the fact, not always but typically, women tend to be better at multi-tasking, certainly in my experience living with men and women this seems to be the case. Not always, but typically.

Women's language centres seem to be more dispersed, more parts of a woman's brain are used in speaking than in men. Women use more words in a day, according to the research. You may have spotted this, I don't know. (Laughter) There's a lot of research out there. But I was reading a paper about this recently. It does help to explain some of the tensions if you are in a mixed sex partnership. I mean I've been married now for 25 years and I know this, and I've canvassed a lot of friends' opinions as well. If you're in a mixed sex partnership, by the evening when you're having a meal, most men have kind of used up their words. (Laughter) You know what I mean? They're kind of talked out. Whereas most women are just kind of kicking in, they have a way to go yet, they are not done. And often men misunderstand why women are speaking. (Laughter) They do, I've talked to a lot of my women friends about this. Women will often talk about issues that have happened in the day, or problems they've got, not to solve them but just to get them out, just to kind of walk around it. Whereas men are kind of in executive mode by 7pm. They're looking for bullet points. (Laughter) Aren't they? So they can go and watch the television.

I used to teach philosophy and one of the questions in 'empiricism' was if you didn't witness something, can you know it happened? If you didn't actually see it happen, if the senses didn't support it can you be sure. You remember the old hoary thing, if a tree falls in a forest and nobody hears it, can you be sure it made any sound? The answer by the way is, 'Yes, don't be so ridiculous'. (Laughter) But we were paid in universities to spin this out for several hours and so we did. (Laughter and applause) I saw this t-shirt

recently in San Francisco and was going to buy it. It said, 'If a man speaks his mind in a forest, and no woman hears him, is he still wrong?' (Laughter)

So it's intensely dynamic. And the third thing is that intelligence is distinct to all of us. We have tended to adopt a single measure for intelligence, it's all about IQ, it's all about academic ability when truthfully we all have a profile of intelligence, we have relative strengths. Some of us are tremendously good at music, some of us are tremendously good at maths, or both, but not terribly good at other things that other people are strong at. Often brilliant people pass through the whole of their education unaware that they are brilliant because the thing they are good at was neither looked for, cultivated or respected during the formal system of education.

I'm writing a book at the moment, which is about how people discovered their talent and many people only truthfully discovered their talent once they'd recovered from their education, once they'd got out of it. That was particularly true of this country and people who'd failed the 11-Plus. One of the things that Dave Price did before Musical Futures was helping to design the curriculum for LIPA, the Liverpool Institute of Performing Arts, which is I think a great institution. I was back there recently. Because I'd helped them a bit in the early days I got an honorary degree from them and got to meet Paul McCartney who I know Dave knows well. I've met him a few times. So Paul McCartney, or Paul (Laughter) as I like to call him, were hanging, in a post-Beatle way, at LIPA, and I spoke to the students after I got this degree, and he spoke afterwards. I was talking about how people often don't discover their talents and he said he went through the whole of his education in Liverpool from primary to secondary school, and nobody ever suspected he had any musical talent. Paul McCartney. He has some doesn't he?

I did a series of workshops recently with John Cleese from Monty Python working with people around San Francisco, and he said he went through the whole of his education from kindergarten to Cambridge and nobody ever thought he had a sense of humour. John Cleese. So it's distinct, it's dynamic and it's diverse.

Section Six: how personalised learning and cultural education are absolute priorities to develop the creative thinking, capability and confidence of each child

Personalised learning to me is axiomatic. It's to me like having personalised clothing. Why would you not recognise that the skill of education is to mould your teaching to the ways in which people learn, and that you try to cultivate their particular individual strengths and uniqueness. Now the reason it doesn't happen is that the current system was predicated on the idea of conformity. In future we need to develop three things in children: one is creative thinking, their capacity for new ideas which are of value; secondly capability – they need to recognise their strengths, which are unique to them; thirdly confidence. I have lost track of the number of people who are still suffering a crisis of confidence because they didn't do well at school. And it

wasn't always their fault, it was often the fault of the system that didn't even look in their eyes to see who they really were. And confidence is one of the greatest characteristics that we can help this emergent generation to develop. I don't mean self-righteousness or cockiness, I mean a sense of who they are.

The second big priority to me is culture. Andrew Peggie wrote a very interesting piece recently in which he said can we please stop talking about 'youth music'? I agree with him. I think we should stop it. Let's talk about people rather than categorise them by their age. One of the great problems we have now is that we have atomised people in the way that we educate them. I think it's desperately important that we promote personalised education, but not in isolation. We live and grow as part of reciprocating communities. We are who we are partly because of who we spend our time with. We think the way we think because of the time we live in and the cultures of which we are part and the people who influence us. Very little of what we think is unaffected by culture.

Cultural education now is an absolute priority. I mean God knows we have enough of a problem to illustrate it. We have now in one of the most connected societies in any history of the earth, the most connected, but it does not seem to be contributing in any way to a net increase in cultural understanding, does it? We need to recognise that young people, all of us, grow up as part of reciprocal communities. The issues here are: developing a sense of identity, who they really are, who they could be. Secondly developing a sense of understanding that other cultures often see things differently and behave differently, and thirdly cultivating a sense of cultural respect that these differences are valid and may be worthwhile and we should and get along with them.

Now to me this is a huge part of the diversity agenda. There's not time to talk about this but when we did 'All Our Futures' we called it Creativity, Culture and Education. Very little happens in the field of creative development that is not somehow rooted in cultural knowledge and understanding. To me cultural education is something we should focus on, interrogate, be explicit about and say how we are going to do it. If we continue to abstract people from the community and treat them as if the most important thing they have in common is how old they are, we miss some of the most important opportunities that education makes available.

The third priority to me is economic. It was always fashionable for people to say that education has nothing to do with the economy. It does, we know it does. Everybody who has children assumes education will help their children to become economically independent to contribute to the world around them and to contribute to the growth of national wealth somehow or other. Everybody wants that. I mean I do. I want my children to be financially independent. I can't tell you how much I want my children to be financially independent! (Laughter) But it's how do we get there?

The fact is that most of us were educated on the basis that if you got a university degree you would get a job for life, you'd be set. It is not true,

anymore. This is one of the fundamental shifts that's happened in our lifetime, my lifetime. I left college in 1972. I was born in 1950. I know you don't believe that (Laughter) but it's true. But I live in LA. I've had work done. (Laughter) I know I look like a strapping 18 year-old but it's an illusion. When I went to school we were told a story, which was that if you worked hard and did well and got a university degree you'd have a job for life. That's not true now. I left college in 1972 and the idea then that with a university degree you would not get a job was preposterous, wasn't it? If you left university with a degree and didn't get a job it was because you weren't looking for one, or you didn't want one. And I didn't want one! (Laughter) When I left in '72 I was dumb. You have to cast your mind back there. I was at the time channelling Robert Plant, you know, in a rather groovy way if I don't mind saying so myself. I was looking good. And I didn't want to get a job. I'd been in education all that time. I wanted to find myself. So I decided to go to India, where I might be. (Laughter) I didn't get to India, as it turned out. I got to Camden (Laughter), where there in fairness a lot of Indian restaurants. (More laughter) I hung out here. But the idea you wouldn't get a job with a degree was preposterous.

It's not preposterous now. There are kids leaving university today with degrees, doctorates, who cannot find work in the field for which they are qualified. And it's not because standards are falling. I don't know if they or they are not truthfully. I don't think anybody does. There's a lot of rhetoric around it but what I do know I worked at Warwick University for twelve years and I know this, that teenagers these days work a lot harder to get to college than we did under a lot more pressure. They work a lot harder when they are there to graduate with a good qualification, and when they get out their degree isn't worth half what it was worth twenty years ago. That's just a fact and that's true wherever you go in the world and it isn't because standards are falling it's because the whole foundation of the world economy has shifted beneath our feet. We are increasingly moving into a knowledge-based economy, one where innovative thinking, flexibility and adaptability are critical fundamental basic skills. Kids retiring in 2070 will be going through life experiences that we cannot anticipate for them. The best we can do is not prepare them for the 19th century but to get their spirits up and their confidence up and their creative capacities up so they can generate this world and be part of it. That isn't some peripheral objective of education; it's a core objective of education. And what I'm concerned about is reconstructing education around those sorts of things.

Section Seven: setting the agenda to connect culture, communities, commerce and education in a revolutionary shift to a more 'vivid, personal and uplifting education'

Now these are the things I think have to happen. Really we can think of education in four related areas: the curriculum, teaching, assessment and there's a fourth which I'll come to. In the curriculum we have been brought up with a hierarchy that is unquestioned, we have to question it. There is no economic, conceptual, humanitarian or intellectual basis for distinguishing

between the relative value in the growth of individuals of the sciences, humanities, sports, the arts and languages. Some of the most creative people I know are scientists. Some of the most innovative people I know are technologists. Some of the most rigorous and objective people I know are painters and dancers. We have allowed stereotypes to grow up around education, such that we keep these disciplines apart and then we divide them into a hierarchy. I think we have got to fundamentally reconstruct the curriculum in schools and then into universities, recognising firstly that these are equal domains in terms of their cultural individual importance and we have to resurrect the dynamism between them. Most creative thinking happens in the dynamism between them; most creative thinking happens in the interstices between of different ways of approaching a problem. You know, mathematicians think visually, dancers think mathematically, we should allow them to do that. We need more dynamic systems in the curriculum.

The key word here for the curriculum is leadership. We need school principals, university heads and we need politicians to understand the shift that's happening and promote it rigorously and with vision. It isn't just about fixing the present system. To me this is like trying to make a better steam engine, when most people are now driving around on warp engines. We need to rethink the curriculum.

The second is pedagogy. Great education comes through great teaching, whether it's self-teaching or teaching other people. Pedagogy if I had to put my money anywhere in education reform it would be on the training of great teachers, and the involvement of great artists, musicians and other professionals in the process of education. We cannot overestimate the importance of increasing the passion, the expertise and the skills of the people who work with our students. And music education can be in the vanguard. You also know that music education for a lot of people was a complete turn-off. Not because music turns them off but because bad teaching turns anybody off anything. So we have in all our disciplines to recognise that the future depends upon professional development. You can have the greatest curriculum framework, the best standards you can articulate, but if you don't have the people who can make those things come alive in individual minds the whole thing is just a paper exercise.

The third thing is assessment. Assessment is one of the great problems for us just now, and the reason is that often these sorts of disciplines are assessed by inappropriate criteria using methods, which simply don't work. They're designed for something else. Somebody once said that art is not a prediction it's a surprise, and often young people of all ages will produce great work in the arts, which you didn't expect. We have to have ways of assessing that work which subjects them to real rigour, public accountability, but we should not assume that means just the regular form of standardised testing. We've spent a lot of time trying to figure out the best method of standardised testing in some disciplines. I think one of our big agendas now is not to wait for somebody to tell us how to assess music but to tell them how we do it, and to get that on the statute book.

Paul Robert's review talks a lot about 'Creative Portfolios'. We did as well in 'All Our Futures'. Assessment is an issue that we really have to get better at. Otherwise people will assess you, and if you don't take control of this agenda you will be judged, and probably you will be found wanting because you will be judged by inappropriate criteria and by poor methods.

The fourth thing is partnership. Schools cannot do this on their own. Not schools, not kindergartens, not universities. Education is a community enterprise and it has to be seen that way in the future. It's a cultural process, an economic process and it's a personal process and it means many people getting around it. I work a lot with cultural organisations around the world, I work with businesses and I work with education systems. I'm doing a whole reform movement now with education in the States, we've been working on arts initiatives over there. This isn't because I haven't got anything to do, it's because these three areas, culture, commerce, education are inherently tied together in their mutual fortunes, and we have to connect them. People in education have to work with people in the cultural sector who have to work with people in the business sector on a common agenda. When I work with Fortune 500 companies interestingly they all get this argument. The great irony for me is they don't want this narrow form of education. The irony is the politicians are enforcing this narrow view of education in what they perceive to be the interests of the economy. You speak to people who run the economy and they don't think so at all. So seeing education as a partnership enterprise is really tremendously important. It's why the Musical Futures' emphasis on musical pathways is very important. It's about co-ordination. It's why the Creative Partnerships programme I think can be so groundbreaking and Ofsted is now saying good things about it and I think that's a good thing for all of us.

So it's about the curriculum, which is about leadership, it's about pedagogy, which is about training, it's about assessment, which is about rigour and it's about partnerships, which is about co-ordination.

Finally, I just want to say this. There was a great book written a while ago by Michael Polanyi called 'Personal Knowledge', he's a tremendous philosopher and you should read him some time. He talks a lot about the creative process in science and he makes a distinction in the book between two forms of awareness. Of course there are many forms of awareness but he talks about these two: he talks about focal awareness and subsidiary awareness and what he means by this is if you're involved in any task you're aware of it on at least two levels, focal and subsidiary. So he says if you are knocking a nail into a piece of wood, the focus of your attention is the nail but in a subsidiary way you are aware of all kinds of other things like the weight of the hammer, the arc of your arm, all these other things that you need to be aware of to do it. If you're playing the piano you need to be thinking about what the music but aware of what your fingers are doing. And it's important to get it the right way round. If you suddenly start focusing on what your arm's up to you'll probably miss the nail. If you start getting obsessed with your fingers and forget the music, you'll stop playing.

I think we have a job of work to do to recalibrate our attention in education. Politicians talk a good game about music, creativity, the arts but we know there is a huge gap always between the rhetoric and the reality. Now it's not always their fault. There are visionary politicians, there are visionary politicians, there always have been. But there is an inertia in public administration that doesn't like this kind of thing, it's untidy. And we have to get people's attention recalibrated. We have to get people's attention focused on what the real priorities are in education. What's happened is we have become focused on the things that should occupy our subsidiary attention: testing, accountability. All these things are important but they are only important in so far as they cultivate what we're really interested in which is a more vivid, a more personal and a more uplifting form of education for all of our children and for all of our people. We have to get that attention recalibrated.

I want to just give you a final example. I said I'm doing some work in Oklahoma and Oklahoma has a whole literacy programme for kids, early years literacy programme, and it's a great success. You can check it out online. I was talking to the Governor of Oklahoma and his wife and they told me of this example which I loved because it seems to me it's not a musical example but it shows how you can get results by rethinking the category.

All the early years schools have to provide for this literacy programme. There's one school in Oklahoma in Tulsa, in the Jenks school district and they were required to provide this literacy programme for young kids but they didn't have room for it. So they spoke to a retirement home across the street called the Grace Living Centre and they asked them if they could possibly provide some space for this little literacy programme they had going? And they said, "Sure, we can do that." So they moved a class of children, 3-5 year-olds across the street to the retirement home and they created some space in the foyer of the retirement home for the early literacy programme. Over the first couple of weeks they were teaching these kids and getting on quite well and they said that they found over the first few weeks that members of the retirement home, who were seventy and up, had to walk through this foyer to go and get their lunch and other bits and pieces. And one by one they stopped to just take in what was going on and they took an interest in it, and one by one they asked if they could participate and the teacher said, "Yes, please do, help."

So they set up something called the Reading Buddies programme. These men and women each took one of the children and sat with them for an hour while they read to them. Well the first thing that happened is that these children are performing about 5 years above their reading age because these people are helping them do it, they're getting this one on one attention. They have a little graduation ceremony by the way, at the end of the year, where these 3-5 year-olds cross the stage and graduate to Kindergarten, which I think is great. But what they've also found is that medication levels at the home have fallen through the floor. The members of the retirement home are literally coming back to life and living longer, and not taking medication, because their spirits have been revived. They have suddenly got a new

purpose in their life and they are literally living longer. That wasn't part of the literacy programme, but it's one of the astounding effects of the literacy programme, and it's not difficult when you think about it, is it? Suddenly these people who thought their lives were over and they were just waiting to die, have found that their experience is being validated again. These children are saying to them, "So what was it like when you were five? What was it like in Oklahoma when you were a kid?" "What do you mean you didn't have televisions?" So they are entering into this whole dialogue with these children that has revived them. And the children, by the way, are learning that occasionally one of the 'Reading Buddies' doesn't come back again, because they've now gone as well. So they are learning powerful lessons about not just reading, but about living in a community and the richness of intergenerational contact.

All of those things tend to be betrayed by the mechanistic structures of education. And what I want to argue for finally is this; that education is not a mechanical process. Our systems are mechanised, they're systematised in a kind of bureaucratic way, but education is a social process and in that sense the better metaphor is ecology. Nobody else can make anybody else learn anything. You cannot make them. Anymore than if you are a gardener you can make flowers grow, you don't make the flowers grow. You don't sit there and stick the petals on and put the leaves on and paint it. You don't do that. The flower grows itself. Your job if you are any good at it is to provide the optimum conditions for it to do that, to allow it to grow itself. I think it's exactly the same way with human spirits. We can allow them to grow or we can deaden them. And God knows we know enough about how to stop them growing to know how to stop them growing. If we could reverse some of those processes I think we'd see all kinds of things start to flourish.

To me the ecological issue is very powerful because we have now known for thirty years that in the natural world it's diverse it's dynamic and there are synergies between organisms on which they mutually depend. It's exactly the same way with human beings. We depend on each other for our mutual growth and survival. Education tends to atomise things. I did a session recently in Los Angeles with a guy called Deepak Chopra and he quoted Jonas Salk, who invented the polio vaccine in 1954. But he made a comment a while ago that was reflecting on the trajectories that human societies and animal societies have been on. What distinguishes us from all other species is our capacity for imagination and creative thinking. It's responsible for everything that's ever been achieved by human beings. And it's now brought us to an abyss. You're all following the global warming argument; this is a perilous time that we live in culturally and economically. Our only way forward is to cultivate the one thing that got us into this mess in the first place: which is imagination, creativity and the capacity for innovation. Jonas Salk said something interesting. He said, "It's interesting to reflect that if all insects were to disappear from the earth, within fifty years all forms of life on earth would perish. We depend on them that thoroughly. But if all human beings were to disappear from the earth within fifty years all other forms of life would flourish." Because we've now become the problem because of the very thing

that is now on the table, the need to develop our capacities for innovation, creativity and far-sightedness.

Will the Music Manifesto save the world? No, not on its own. Will music save the world? No, not on its own because music itself doesn't redeem anybody, it's how it's taught and for what purpose it's promoted. But can it as part of some broader movement do it? Yes. There's a Dance Manifesto, you should be making common cause with them. There have been people for generations pushing for a richer, more progressive, more child-centred education and there are people all over the world trying to do this and you should make common cause with them. I think the Music Manifesto and all the things we've been talking about are important as part of a bigger, revolutionary shift in education. And it's happening. I think history is on our side. Things are moving in this direction. We should help our politicians, we should help the bureaucracies but we shouldn't depend on them. It will come from meetings like this, from people who are doing the work, setting the agenda not being subject to the agenda. That's why this shift is happening in the first place. And if we have forms of education that lift people's spirits, which open their hearts, which make them commune with other people on issues of value and taste, and which give them confidence, we may not be able to predict the future but at least we'll have a sure hand in creating and making it one that's worth all of us having. Thank you.

References:

All Our Futures: Creativity, Culture and Education (1988) – Sir Ken Robinson

Out of Our Minds: Learning To Be Creative (2001) – Sir Ken Robinson

Nurturing Creativity in Young People (2006) – Paul Roberts

Digital Natives, Digital Immigrants (2001) – Marc Prensky
(Available to read at: <http://www.marcprensky.com/writing/Prensky%20-%20Digital%20Natives,%20Digital%20Immigrants%20-%20Part1.pdf>)

The Singularity Is Near: When Humans Transcend Biology (2005) – Raymond Kurzweil

Culture and the Senses - Kathryn Linn Geurts

Personal Knowledge: towards a post-critical philosophy (1974) - Michael Polanyi

Musical Futures, Dave Price, Claus Moser (Lord Moser)
www.musicalfutures.org.uk

Creative Partnerships
www.creative-partnerships.com

Ruth McKenzie, Director Manchester International Festival
www.manchesterinternationalfestival.com

Andrew Peggie, composer and writer
http://www.britishacademy.com/index.php?option=com_memberprofile&task=view&id=31&Itemid=84&pContactID=2048

Academic Research Consortium (ARC) Dublin

Sir Ken Robinson's official website: www.sirkenrobinson.com

ENDS