CREATIVITY AND THE ARTS IN THE CURRICULUM UNDER NEOLIBERAL REGIMES

Janet Mansfield
University of Auckland

This paper looks at the nature of aesthetic production in the discursive texts of neoliberalism. It examines what the political and economic responses to market turbulence have been in the aesthetic political economy of New Zealand and the ways in which market disruptions of the social order have impacted upon the arts in education and discourses of creativity. I argue that the arts in education have become esoteric zones for an elite. The neoliberalising of creativity through pragmatic and instrumentally rationalised educational goals has proletarianised teacher education and education in general and left the arts truly disembedded from education. Their re-embedding is superficial and contingent under the 'literacies' resolution. An 'industrial' curriculum in every way fit for a 'worker' is now present for teachers and students, such status being inscribed between the lines of fine print within the *New Zealand Curriculum* (2007). Under such conditions of censure as discussed by Grierson and Mansfield (2004) and Mansfield (2005b), a functional and generic arts literacy—with the likelihood of complexity, multiplicity, and difference being worked towards, in, and through the arts in education—has been further endangered. 'Improvement' and increasing professionalism for teachers, it seems, means improved compliance and obedience.

Introduction

By way of introduction, I adopt a questioning stance. I ask what violence is enacted on human subjectivity (see also De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003: 142) when policies reduce creativity and the arts in both teacher education and the school curriculum to privately acquired 'talents' for the few, when creativity, the creative subject (body and spirit) is squeezed into a grid of performativity to serve notions of capital accumulation and exchange, and when instrumental logic and market rationality is applied in the arts and aesthetic production?

To what extent do hegemonic approaches to research represent collusion with neoliberal regimes of power, when such approaches demean the authenticity and value of philosophically and critically inclined, qualitative, arts research? Art education research has long been hampered by positivist world-views about legitimate forms of research and processes by which various forms of artistic phenomena may be known. At official levels an instrumental rationality has operated, and research, which offers to test the claims, for example, that the arts improve 'performance' in other 'important' areas of the curriculum (using 'evidence-based' empirical data) to justify these truth-claims, is more likely to be funded. Yet critical scholars (Grierson, 2000; Mansfield, 2000; Lines, 2003; Naughton, 2007; and others) have fought to resist this instrumentalisation of knowledge and have sought to investigate more complex forms of understanding and knowledge production—knowledge and philosophy, which despite its defiance of measurability may affect warmly the climate of teaching and learning. Musical

thought processes, for example, are performed in research and practice via "the melody of the event" (Lines, 2003) in music of the moment, with such forms of knowledge taking account of "the affective, the emotional, signifiers, the unconscious" (Kincheloe, 2006: 223). These understandings are placed beyond or external to the parameters of dominant ways of producing knowledge via scientific inquiry. Grierson explains this well:

> Knowledge becomes apparent through processes of affective thinking and action and the creative outputs are generally open to the participatory and discursive meaning-making processes of viewers, readers, listeners, or audiences. The subject and object of research cease to be divided through these creative processes, which may be discursive, heuristic, phenomenological, imaginative, aesthetic, perceptual, relational. Epistemological and ontological questions are formed or addressed either implicitly or explicitly as tacit knowledge manifests in codified domains of creative practice (Grierson, 2007: 2).

What particular forms of academic leadership, we may ask, are complicit in the erasures of such artistic forms of research, and what is the level of awareness of such instigators? University faculties of education under neoliberalising constructions of knowledge become implicated in a reductive process whereby the arts are submerged within other departments. For example, primary teacher graduate students now cover 'The Arts' as one third of a paper that also covers Health, Physical Education and Learning Languages (Bolwell, 2009, pers. com.); "the arts programmes in the one year Primary Teacher Diploma have been reduced to one third of the time they were allotted five years ago" (Bowell, 2009, pers. com.). Further, in The University of Auckland, Faculty of Education, the compulsory time allotted to the arts in primary teacher education since the instigation of the School of Language, Arts and Literacies, has been reduced to seven and a half hours within a three year Bachelor of Education degree.

Aesthetic production under neoliberalism (hegemonic globalisation)

This section examines aesthetic production under neoliberalism and looks at ways contemporary aesthetic production in education can be understood in terms of wider (especially institutional) reactions to neoliberalism. David Craig writes of some of the ways in which market turbulence has been "embedded" and "disembedded" in New Zealand's cultural and political economy, the strategies governments have used to try to "control the vicissitudes of the global market, and its tendency to break out of those controls through successive periods…" (cited in Lynn, 2007: 20). Considering both artistic and political economic responses to market induced turbulence in New Zealand, Craig employs the work of political economist, Karl Polanyi who, using a cultural approach to economics in the 1940s, examines "the social, political and economic context in which artists find themselves" (Craig, 2007: 32). He points to Polanyi's conception of the

> 'double movement', a historical progression within which, in the first part of the movement, markets disrupt social orders, 'disembedding' economic transactions from their social settings and causing social, cultural, political economic turbulence. In the second part of the movement, parts of society react against markets, and seek to 're-embed' them in the social order, using formal regulations, conventions and institutions, alongside territorial (national, regional) framings (Craig, 2007: 32).

In this scenario, artists, and the arts in education, and education generally, are irrevocably entangled in these disembedding and re-embedding processes. Craig describes the embedding of market liberalism in national and international security structures in the thirty years following the 1940s. International institutions such as the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), the United Nation (UN), the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and "national policies such as the Keynesian welfare state and Muldoon style economic management" were thus set up. However, the closure of the 1970s saw turbulence rearing its head again, "in a new round of market-driven 'dis-embedding' and disruption we call neoliberalism and globalisation" (Craig, 2007: 33). For Polanyi, "economic, social and cultural history" is seen "as a series of lurch progressions, wherein institutional and territorial frames" are perpetually "reconstituted through relations with turbulence-inducing markets" (Craig, 2007: 33). Such macro-movements are regarded by political economists as "a bottom line", and "as such they resonate through other fields including the cultural production we call art" (Craig, 2007: 33), and, I suggest the arts in education. Market turbulence is embedded via institutional changes, which mutate to embed further layers of market turbulence.

I suggest parallels in education between the "shallow and highly contingent" "temporary resolutions" artists form with institutions, "including access to temporary alcoves, platforms and assemblages" in which they "hop from temporary economic platform to platform" (Craig, 2007: 39) and the partial solutions offered to schools. The latter includes, for example, canned music for school musical shows, quick-fix school art fundraisers re-inscribing the commodity nature of art, token generic arts curriculum space, temporary artists' residencies in music or art to overcome a lack of teacher training in the arts, and short-term funding of travel allowances for itinerant music teachers, etc. In this vein, the curriculum documents, the arts in schools, art institutions, universities, are reconstituted through turbulence–inducing markets. The arts in education are now, in Polanyian terms, truly disembedded from education and their re-embedding becomes superficial and contingent under the "literacies" resolution. A certain feebleness is reflected in the likelihood that arts literacies will be enabling to the arts given their reduced circumstances. The reductions appear as local policy responses to hegemonic globalisation.

According to Santos:

> hegemonic globalisation was constructed by conventional social science (mainly classical economics) as a naturalised non-political, scientific picture of society and social transformation. At a much more general level, modern western science, by disqualifying alternative knowledges has, for a long time, been part of imperial designs. The dark side of the triumphs of science is littered with epistemicides (Santos, cited in Dale & Robertson, 2004: 158).

Whereas in the past, elitist discourses of 'talent' were evident in curriculum documents (see Mansfield, 2000), now it seems that the 'untalented' masses are being actively produced via restructuring impulses of curriculum policies and teacher education, which virtually absent the arts. These are the "epistemicides" of which Santos speaks. What is the manifest and latent meaning of such blatant diminishing of the arts in teacher education—the enactment of such a lopsided vision? Is it the retrogressive reassertion of an industrial curriculum as an education for the working classes as a working class teacher education, something we,

after Dewey's vision of the education of the "whole child", hoped we had moved beyond. Santos names such action, as the "sociology of absences" (see Dale & Robertson, 2004: 158-159). Is this a return to the days when surplus child workforce of industrialisation in the latter half of the nineteenth century was "housed" in public schooling, providing children with skills, "cultural integration, and a cooling out of expectations" (Willinsky, 2005: 100)? Willinsky (2005) and Semetsky (2003) point to the difficult and awkward relationship public schooling has always had with the economy, and to Drucker's warning of "the dangers of a new class conflict" (Willinsky, 2005: 100). Hargreaves draws attention to the picture of "poorer schools dominated by performance training sects while creative communities blossom in wealthier areas" (cited in Willinsky, 2005: 103). Felicity Haynes too, points to the Singaporean policy-makers' encouragement of "independent thinkers, artists, innovators and entrepreneurs especially amongst elite students" (Haynes, 2007: 1).

Santos refers to "epistemicides" of "hegemonic globalisation" (Santos interview in Dale & Robertson, 2004: 158-159). These "silences, unpronouncabilities, and absences" abound under neoliberal, globalised education policy. Music education, along with education in the arts generally has fallen prey. Officially sanctioned curriculum policy comprises an active production of the unmusical masses, via the politics of knowledge that suppresses, disqualifies and marginalises (makes absent) music and the arts as important knowledge (for example, the limiting of research regarded as 'relevant' or lacking in 'accountability', the subtle silencing of dissent via funding strategies for philosophical, creative and interpretive research while 'obedient' researchers using the politically legitimated vocabulary of reform are funded in research contracts, the reduction to literacies in generic arts, the demise of the Advisory Services).

Neoliberalising discourses of creativity: interrogating the 'Literacies' text

Curriculum writers have validated as knowledge the notion of literacies in the arts. This is the discursive context of creativity in the New Zealand curriculum. How is creativity represented in the discursive context of literacies? What is its discursive position? Elizabeth Grierson notes that, "questions of the accumulation of value and exchange are crucial for understanding creativity as a cultural value proposition in a global age" (Grierson, 2006: 4). What is important here too, is a reminder of the fact that the dissemination and diffusion of policy is value and principle-laden. Practices and techniques and language within policy may appear politically and ideologically neutral or objective while, in fact, their derivation is from particular political and ideological belief systems. The enhancement of power, influence and status of particular groups may be at the heart of political implications of such systems. "Paradoxically, depoliticising or de-ideologising policies, practices, techniques is perhaps one of the most insidious and effective ways of promoting and advancing particular interests and ideologies, especially those associated with business, capitalism, and science"' (Bührs, 2003: 87, cited in Irwin**,** 2007: 10). With this in mind let us examine the text in which the arts and presumably, creativity, appear.

Documenting notions of official knowledge, *The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2000) gave a significant profile to the concept of literacies especially the notion of "Arts literacies". These were major categorising frameworks through which modes of knowledge in the arts were to be realised. The more recent document, *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007) reduces the profile of the notion of "Arts literacies" in that they are no longer visible as major naming categories. However, the metaphor of the

arts "languages" as "literacies" is still present within the fine print in each of the arts areas (see Ministry of Education, 2007: 20). Literacies are still immersed within the psychological developmentalist and skills discourse reminiscent of *The Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 1993), and the 2000, 2006, 2007 Ministry of Education curriculum documents (see above; and Mansfield, 2000). The most recent curriculum document states that it is

> [t]hrough the development of arts *literacies* that students as creators, presenters, viewers, and listeners are able to participate in, interpret, value and enjoy the arts throughout their lives... Within each [arts learning area] students develop *literacies* as they build on skills … Specialist studies enable students to contribute their vision, abilities and energies to art initiatives and creative industries (Ministry of Education, 2007: 20, italics added).

'Literacies' and 'creativity', so defined in the individual are riddled with neoliberalising pursuits, with values and goals that are far from neutral or objective. Ruth Irwin writes of a "cohesive discursive world view" generated via the "vector of pan-global organisations", and that transfers ideas between nation states in the "political pursuit of hegemony" (Irwin, 2007: 10). Literacies in fact are linked discursively with prevailing discourses of sustainability in market and environment. Market, argues Irwin, is now embedded in the meaning of education. In the global knowledge economy, via such ideological assumptions 'literate' people with 'multiliteracies' are being constructed and framed as "standing reserves" or human resources (see Heidegger, 1977; Marshall 2000; Mansfield, 2003, 2005a) for educational capital production or, as some critics argue, knowledge capital (Peters & Besley, 2006).

To reiterate, depoliticisation of issues about international equity, globalisation and capitalism are strategies for producing policy consensus**.** The creative subject, the entrepreneurial and 'innovative' individual is thus presented as neutral and apolitical (see De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003) and, by implication, as 'literate'**.** Literacies and multiliteracies have become part of the "pan global rhetoric" (Irwin, 2007: 8) for dealing with educational issues under the governance of globalising nation states. The idea of literacies has been extracted from its roots in written languages and redeployed in what Irwin names as the "neoliberal lexicon of market metaphors" (Irwin, 2007: 8).

How do the discourses of creativity in the *Draft Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 2006) position, frame, and enframe the arts? When "enterprise administers creativity" (Heraud & Gibbons, 2007: 1) and education is scripted to serve capital, then the nature of creativity changes. What is its nature in the global, aesthetic, political economy? Responsibility is placed upon the individual to be creative and to be able to change form, constantly—"reselfing" (Wexler, 2000 cited in Hartley, 2003: 14). Hartley points to Melucci's insight:

> A world that lives by complexity and difference cannot escape uncertainty, and it demands from individuals the capacity to change form (the literal meaning of 'metamorphosis') whilst still continuing to be the same person. …. (Melucci 1996b, p. 2, italics in original) (Hartley, 2003: 14).

"The constant recreation of the self (Wexler, 2000, calls it 'reselfing') implies that education for (re)creativity and reflexivity becomes important for dealing with the uncertainties of

postmodernity…" (Hartley, 2003: 14). Hargreaves' picture of poor schools locked into "performance training sects, while creative communities blossom" (Willinsky, 2005: 103) in wealthier areas, indicates just how far equality and human rights are from the business agendas of organisations learning collectively in pursuit of continuous improvement in order "to respond quickly to their unpredictable and changing environments" (see Willinsky, 2005: 103). The continuous improvement discourse applied to schools is linked discursively with continuous capitalist accumulation and profit.

Following a Polanyian analysis (see Craig, 2007), the *Draft Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 2006) with its (particular) discourse of creativity via arts literacies presents and represents a neoliberal policy intervention by capitalist institutions to embed the next level of market turbulence (see Craig, 2007). Globalised economic policies have neoliberalised creativity, which has a new respectability. The aesthetic has been instrumentalised (see Hartley, 2003: 14). Creativity now includes responsibility and rationality, "busnopower", "busnocratic rationality" (Marshall, 1994, cited in Devine & Irwin, 2005: 323-324). The creative individual artist of liberalism stereotypically pictured as perhaps, emotional, hysterical, insane, non-rational has been left behind in the new rationalities of a global political economy, and the discourse of creativity has been co-opted, appropriated, by discourses of calculation and control (see Grierson, 2007: 1-3).

What is longed for by neoliberal architects of education is a certain kind of pedagogue: teachers and their pedagogy are expected to participate in the construction of an imaginary "economical utopia" as "an invisible city that we long for, that we manipulate and that in some way inhabits us, both physically and metaphorically". This is "a city that lives in our pockets and our wallets" (Lynn, 2007: 26). In this vein, school art shows, in the frenzy of survival-bound capital accumulation, rescript art, and art education, serve as the creative output of what Lingard, Hayes and Mills (2003: 399) term "productive pedagogy". Through this art education becomes a matter of the mere display of child 'artists' and their work, for which parents compete and purchase. In this process the site of creativity is subverted and discourses of the creative and expressive are appropriated for economic purposes.

The political is used via curriculum to construct both the producing and consuming subject. The constantly made-over "self" (Bauman, 2000, in Hartley, 2003: 7), a perpetually up-graded identity for teacher and student, becomes a focus in education. The public space is full of individuals claiming not a "just society" but the "rights to difference" (see Hartley, 2003: 14) and the enterprise ethos constructs in consumers the need to be *au fait* with their emotions in order to make the best choices of products that express themselves individually and meaningfully. Compulsive consumption becomes the panacea for the anxious bored and depressed person (see James, 2007). Desire is constructed by discourse and we can see how corporate advertising builds emotional connections (desire) between private interests (conglomerate interests) and the public interest. It then becomes in the public interest to have a healthy economy peopled by creative individuals and creative producers (see Smiers, 2003). The trickle down effect of the social control of the transnational conglomerates and their global monoculture is felt through curriculum discourses of creative skills—these being the policy detail of political production of forms of subjectivity. The site of creativity has shifted from the arts, once held to have a monopoly under the discourse of the creative individual artist (one with a creative psychological trait) to an economically instrumentalised creativity via technology, innovation

and industry. Creativity, in curriculum suffers a new form of "legitimation crisis" (Habermas, 1976) represented firstly by "generic" arts, which are difficult to define and categorise, and secondly, by "literacies" (see Ministry of Education, 2006, 2007). Both these forms of reduction are now institutionalised and embedded in curriculum documents as the governance of market deepens and education is further appropriated by national economic performance.

Seduction, identity and the acquisitive capitalist: from 'I am' to 'Who am I?'

David Hartley (2003: 12) argues that production and consumption combine to produce an "aestheticization of the economic", which occurs within the "sphere of production as well as in the circuits of exchange and consumption". In this vein, Grierson (2007: 3) refers to "globalised commercial needs of endless consumption devoid of ethical considerations". Exclusion and despair may also result from an inability to buy into this world creating a path that may lead to violence and terrorism, sources of identity associated with racism, nationalism, and religion (see Hartley 2003). In such fragmentary conditions, the recognition of complexity and diversity, and the ability to deal with them, becomes an imperative of cultural education, rather than a shared vision of and for the world. Postmodern philosophy, as it embraces discourses of difference presents a fragmented and radically de-centred subject, which replaces the essentialist subject of modernism. In postmodernity, "Who am I?" supplants the modernist "I am".

The profile of creativity has without doubt increased now that its site has shifted to technology and industry and its nature has changed. The creative mantle of enterprise, innovation and production cloaks the new knowledge society. These are watchwords in the revamped cultures of performativity. 'Creativity' and 'performativity' become interchangeable as the "liberal individual is dragged into the 'enterprise frame'" (see Grierson, 2006: 5). Global economics has seen art, music and creativity affiliated politically with the accumulation ethos of a society in which "too much is not enough", a society afflicted by what James (2007) and others have termed "affluenza" (see also Grierson & Mansfield, 2003, 2004).

Neoliberalism has diversified and expanded (see Irwin, 2007) to create a greedy and ever-increasing stranglehold upon an increasing number of areas of the life-world in commodity exchange. The creative subject, body and spirit, become cornered as the fetish of surplus and value protracts "beyond the sole notion of labour time" (De Lissovoy & McLaren 2003: 141). Subjectivity and spirit are ravaged "by capital itself as rage and desire". Some serious questions arise. Can the emotional and spiritual registers generate forms of praxis, which in turn can embellish (augment and enrich) interventions in the domain of policy and practice? Will such registers be able to resist compressed and crude representations of artistic and creative processes (De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003: 133) into forms or representations that "conform to the logic of commodity production and exchange"? Can we recognise the ideological component or nature of tenacious beliefs in "personal responsibility" or "prudentialism" as Peters terms it, "in the face of a reality that is in fact overwhelmingly socially determined [and] is what Adorno called 'idealism as rage'" (De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003: 134)?

Impacts of 'Neoliberalese' in discourses of creativity

The neoliberal pragmatic version of creativity now invoked under 'enterprise' in, for example, music of the moment has no time for the lingering aesthetic language of "ecstasy rather than urgency" (Cuming, 2008, pers. com.). Within neoliberal discourse, such a creative activity refers to a subjective experience extending beyond the learning outcomes' domain. Cognitive

theory has thus atomised curriculum 'performance objectives' and measured 'learning outcomes' placing creativity into the differend as it becomes incommensurable (see Lyotard, 1984; Haynes, 2007). Bronwyn Davies points to "the impossibility of intellectual work—to be creative is to be able to live and work in a world characterised by constant change and uncertainty…" (Davies, 2005: 11). The creativity discourse within terms of "neoliberalese' (Davies, 2005: 11-12) is a discourse that values the short term, the flexible, "movement over stasis". Within it, governmentality intensifies and discourses of survival are embedded (see Davies, 2005) and become interlaced with compliance and surveillance mechanisms to add value. Davies refers to "arrogant and pseudo-empirical language crafted to lock creative people into cages of inferiority …" (see Davies, 2005: 7). This "shuts down creativity—it makes emotion, humour poetry, song, a passion for the life of the intellect unthinkable … (what becomes unthinkable is play, humour, poetry, song)".

Dare we ask, in the face of this discourse with its anxiously policed boundaries, unsettling and disturbing questions that fragment the certainties and securities of well-worn metanarratives, questions that leave us teetering on the edge of uncertainty? (see also Davies, 2005: 7). Yet artists, arts educators and philosophers, in all their particularities, *do* dare to ask and *can* see and play with uncertainty and the absurd. Artists and art educators, musicians and music educators, dance and dance educators challenge the disqualification of alternative knowledges. Yet somehow, at policy level in the politics of curriculum space and teacher education, these arts subject areas, in fact, join the ranks of Santos's epistemicides.

Santos describes what he calls the "sociology of absences" (cited in Dale & Robertson, 2004: 158-159) where "what is seen as not existing has been actively produced as non-existent". Extrapolating from this, these absences in the arts have been actively produced by suppression, disqualification and marginalisation. These are contradictory impulses given the apparent revitalisation of the 'creativity' discourse now visible in policy documents and mission statements. Such modes of knowledge have been sedimented as external to "epistemological and social monocultures…" (Santos, cited in Dale & Robertson, 2004: 159). Teachers, it seems, become the subjects of a 'training' and 'education' that revolves around the monoculture of knowledge required for their adjustment to their technological lot, to "technological literacy", "financial capabilities", entrepreneurialism and survival (see Ministry of Education, 2007). Thus the arts in education become esoteric zones preserved for an elite, as the neoliberalising of creativity assists in the proletarianisation of teacher education.

The arts and creativity become swamped in stifling contradictory discourses. The ways these operate on the one hand reduce (at a practical policy level of teacher education and politics of curriculum space) the time and money devoted and allowable to the arts, treating them as incommensurable with 'human capital' development and the logic of commodity production, and on the other hand, they work to appropriate creativity, imagination and energy as 'valuable' commodities in the business world shifting the site of creativity to science, technology, and innovation. The creative subject becomes heralded as creator of value, seen as saviour of competitive creative economic production, while human creativities are herded or mobilised in ways that disallow any instance of the "practice of freedom" (Friere, 1996, cited in De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003: 141). These contradictions deserve to be teased out a little further when thinking about the discursive circumstances of creativity and the arts in education. *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007), legally binding for

teachers, makes certain claims. The curriculum claims emphatically that the students should develop certain "key competencies". Indeed, obedient "competency" cardboard mobiles labelling individual competencies dangle from some classroom ceilings dressed colourfully as creativity, and expressing, by implication, the binary opposites: incompetency, ineffectivenes and disobedience, and if teachers do not do as they are told, they'll be 'down the road'.

The New Zealand Curriculum (Ministry of Education, 2007) states, "The school curriculum should challenge students to use and to develop the competencies across the range of learning areas and in increasingly complex and unfamiliar situations" (Ministry of Education, 2007: 38). This presupposes these "competencies" in teachers and presumably, their preparation for teaching the arts areas. My argument contends that this is mere curriculum rhetoric born of the need for political legitimation. The demand for 'competency' in any of the arts areas is a complete nonsense in the seven and a half compulsory hours offered in some current versions of New Zealand teacher education. "Managing the self" (Ministry of Education, 2007: 38) is laid down as the first of the key competencies. This is followed by others, "relating to others", "participating and contributing", "thinking", "using symbols and texts". One must question the possibility of any of these "competencies" occurring in the arts subjects given this time allotment in either teacher education or its equivalent in school practice.

Similar arguments apply when thinking about what is termed "effective pedagogy" and the arts. "Effective Pedagogy" is a major subheading within *The New Zealand Curriculum* (Ministry of Education, 2007: 34) dedicated towards curriculum accountabilities for the 'production' of flexible competencies. The curriculum statements under this heading claim that "The evidence tells us that students learning is best when teachers … provide sufficient opportunities to learn … Students learn most effectively when they have time and opportunity to engage with, practice, and transfer new learning. This means they need to encounter new learning a number of times in a variety of tasks or contexts" (Ministry of Education, 2007: 34). Further, it is claimed, that "effective teachers [should] attend to the cultural and linguistic diversity of all their students". All of this is posited as individual teacher responsibility in an impossible situation that is clearly politically, globally, socially and economically produced. Complexity theory tells us that the purposes and process of education, including the arts, must be necessarily complicated to account for difference. Ho-Chia Chueh (2004) and others have written of identity processes under globalisation as being "anxious", hybridised, complex and distributed. Given this scenario, with the tightening of the modernist hold on the curriculum in postmodernity, how can heterogeneity breath? This signals the need for vigilance in educators in resisting the violence done to heterogeneity, and an acceptance of what Felicity Haynes names as "sublime heterogeneities" (Haynes, 2006), and an acceptance of "incommensurability" (see Lyotard, 1984).

In neoliberal discourses of creativity, neutrality and objectivity become aligned with the creativity of the subject. De Lissovoy and McLaren (2003: 132) seek to show how "dominant trends in education accountability facilitate a violent reification of human consciousness and creativity". They warn of the exploitation that presides directly within the field of subjectivity. The creative individual becomes the 'entrepreneurial' creative individual. Creativity's goals become subverted in 'creative innovation', which is portrayed as neutral and objective. Capitalism and its paraphernalia organise processes in the subjective as well as economic registers (De Lissovoy & McLean, 2003). Quantification questions are asked concerning the degree of effectiveness,

the amount of improvement in creative output, and just how emotionally intelligent or entrepreneurial each 'performance' is (see Hartley, 2003). The arts, their students and teachers, become trapped in a "hegemonic state apparatus" (De Lissovoy & McLaren 2003: 141), which enacts "hypermeasurement of 'success' and 'failure' as systems of subjugation and punishment of student bodies and subjectivities" (141). It is the entreprenuerial creative individual that is rewarded and held up as exemplary under neoliberal regimes of creativity (see Dean, 1996).

David Hartley in the United Kingdom writes of the school's promotion of "emotional intelligence". "The affective school is the effective school" (Hartley, 2003: 6). An instrumentally rational relationship operates between effective and affective schools where emotions and creativity operate to create a kind of economically-based 'creative capital'. There is even talk of 'emotional literacy' where emotional and 'creative literacy' are part of the discourse of economic productivity. This represents the political production of particular forms of subjectivity whereby emotion and reason are placed into a productive relationship. "Emotion and capital" argues Hartley, "are now linked in a new configuration of emotional capital" (2003: 11). In this scenario education for creativity appears to have as its aim the production of the prolific, purposeful, creative, entrepreneurial subject. The cultural economy and serviced-based economy demand, it seems, that more and more of the creative and emotional self are sucked into the instrumentally rational vortex of the knowledge economy, and this, at the same time as a tightening of a modernist ethos, may be witnessed in curriculum politics. Hartley describes these processes as "a remodernisation and instrumentalisation of the expressive" (2003: 17). Heraud and Gibbons worry justifiably that "the consequences of asking the contemporary student to make herself into the enterprising/consuming subject is that she will develop the habit of living before she acquires that habit of thinking" (2007: 1).

Artistic creative complex processes resist compressed and simplistic representations of knowledge in terms of output as "contributions to the commodity form" (De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003: 133). In the process of demanding commensurability between different forms of creativity, or "consensual validation" of knowledge, in Elizabeth Grierson's terms (2007), what damage is done to human individuality and "particularity? (see De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003: 133). In the arts areas of *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework* (Ministry of Education, 2006, 2007), this commensurability is represented via the conceptual notion of a generic arts 'literacies' (music literacy, dance literacy etc). 'Arts literacy' as a policy strategy is enabling to neoliberal discourses of measurement and accountability, and it can be seen that lumping 'The Arts" together in one category, nominated to suit the system, involves the "violence of erasure" (De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003: 133). The 'literacy' notion (at least with regard to the politics of space in curriculum) pays homage to a homogenising totality through its erasure of particularity and difference. Curriculum, as a blueprint for action, plays a significant part in this totalising process via the 'rationality' of its metanarratives. By these means, the creative subject is moulded into the logic of commodity production and exchange as creativity becomes instrumentalised. This is where creativity discourses 'dwell', to answer Elizabeth Grierson's questioning stance.

Ruth Irwin comments that the "globalisation of capitalist production has removed the accountability for labour relations, production safety … from any given nation state" (Irwin, 2007: 5). Extrapolating from this we can claim the effects of this globalising aspect of education—now a form of capitalist production for the knowledge economy with its

productive and 'effective' pedagogies—and its lack of responsibility for the actively produced "epistemocides" in the arts and its distancing of concern for teachers' emotional safety under working conditions that Ball terms "the terrors of performativity" (Ball, 2003: 215). While teachers and students may be constructed popularly and politically as debtors and delinquents (De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003) if they do not produce some return on investment, the state itself takes no responsibility for the political production of musical and artistic "epistemocides" (see Santos, cited in Dale & Robertson, 2004) as a result of its deliberate policy strategies in teacher training, in curriculum productivities and in research funding. Notions of 'literacies' are deeply implicated here.

Attempts are made to force arts researchers, through the playing out of unequal power relations, into what De Lissovoy & McLaren would term "postures of subjection" (2003: 138). The increased profit that capital seeks to extract in the educational arena has policy implications for the creative subject. There is a rescripting of 'creativity' and the creative subject in a way that provides for reduced spending in the arts and that places the burden of capital accumulation upon the creative subject (see also Hartley, 2003). The creative subject has then to read or judge herself/himself as a "mere index of things external to it" (De Lissovoy & McLaren, 2003: 138).

Rallying a collective conscience

Arts educators, teachers and researchers may identify with Felicity Haynes' "sensus communis" (2007: 336), and De Lissovoy and McLaren's claim to "a ground of imagination and possibility in a human solidarity that refuses to be recuperated into the logic of exchange" (2003: 142). In thinking about this resistance, we need to think about what the actual discursive circumstances are of 'creativity' within the 'literacies' discourse. What, in fact, are they? The analysis shows that, confined within literacies, creativity is shackled, compressed and almost extinguished. Under this regime opportunities to "call subject groups into being" within creative pedagogy are likely to be limited. Evans, Cook and Griffiths envision the key to creative pedagogy as lying "in the power to call subject groups into being, to establish group identity that is not based around a common spatio-temporal subjection to institutional power" (Evans, et al, 2008: 336). This is all very well in theory, however, given the reality of severely reduced circumstances of the arts in the public space (primary schools and primary teacher education in particular), this "common spatio-temporal subjugation to institutional power" pervades practice and in fact, does dominate. Opportunities for "the subject group" to disrupt or "deterritorialise dominant educational practice and discourse" (Evans, et al, 2008: 336) through the mobilisation of "the diffuse and situated knowledge of students" (Evans, et al 2008: 336) are likely to be extremely diminished for the teachers and researchers in the arts, as the power relations within the politics of knowledge are deeply embedded in curriculum structures. They are likely to dominate, prohibit and sabotage collective, critical conscience and radical creative pedagogy under stifling conditions of censure (see Mansfield, 2000; 2005b; see also Grierson & Mansfield, 2004). This domination is represented partly via the micro-practices articulated by particular forms of academic leadership.

Notwithstanding the obvious impediments, however, as critical, creative educators, we do need to operate with a collective consciousness and be aware of the importance of being articulate and versed in our purposes, and in understanding the violence done to creative subjectivity under what James (2007) calls the "selfish capitalist" regime. That is, we need to know how discourses operate on desire (see Davies, 2005: 13) and to comprehend methods of subjection to it. We

need to generate "stable enough narratives of identity" (Davies, 2005: 13) to be able to work with "discursive uncertainty" (stable narratives of identity need not mean essence and purity or closure), and "to understand the ways in which neoliberal discourses and practices will work against that stability" (Davies, 2005: 13), as flexibility is designed for flexible accumulation. With this in mind, we need to view with "critical interpretivist" rigour (Kincheloe, 2006) and skepticism such performative, essentialist descriptions of our work as "effective pedagogy" dedicated towards curriculum accountabilities for the production of "flexible competencies".

Artistic, critical and creative pedagogy and the teaching subject

I conclude with some questions and thoughts about our practice as critical, creative and philosophical educators in the arts. A number of philosophers have claimed the extreme importance of the arts: Foucault, Heidegger, Nietzsche and Wittgenstein, to name but a few. As Devine and Irwin indicate, "Foucault, Heidegger and Nietzsche focus on thinking, poetry and art as the means to exceed the worst of the totalising calculation and control" (2005: 326; see also Mansfield, 2003, 2005a; Grierson, 2003). Wittgenstein too, saw as the answer to cultural bankruptcy "the imagination of the arts and philosophy that could provide a renewed and authentic self through symbolic expression: music, poetry, art, architecture and philosophy that focused on the relations between language, ethics, and representation" (Peters, 2008: 602).

In thinking about knowledge beyond its purpose in the world of work, and as a deepening of educational opportunities, do we provide a critical education that allows students to respond artistically, ethically, and emotionally to the disquieting and the serendipitous? Is there a critical educational space in which they may respond to passion and fantasy? How may students deal with dissensus and unpredictability? If 'turbulence', has been a graphic metaphor for our time—an age of terrorism, of refugees and of ethnic cleansing, of globalisation and of "media saturation" (see Lynn, 2007: 19-20) —how then, in education, do we deal artistically with the "micropolitical dimensions of culture as a contextual, experiential and circumstantial site where subjects are situated and produced?" (Semetsky, 2003: 213). How do we deal artistically with feelings of anguish, loss, fear, grief and anger, along with ideas "of hope, sustenance, the capacity to dream and find refuge?" (Lynn, 2007: 20). Do we provide the time and criticality in education to enable, through art, dance, music, text, image, sound, etc., new and innovative passages into the past and future, which sidestep customary paths of colonisation and globalisation? Artists, academic writers, thinkers and teachers cannot ignore and deny this turbulence for we are within it. The arts have sensory dimensions and may "catch us off guard, …to provide a difference, a sense of the absurd, the magical, the humorous, the deeply personal and, of course, pain" (Lynn, 2007: 20). Teachers of the arts may draw strength from Semetsky's distilling of Deleuzian philosophy when she discusses subjectivity as a "process of becoming" (Semetsky, 2003: 213). "The notion of being as fold points toward subjectivity understood as a process irreducible to the universal notions of totality, unity, or any prefixed self-identity". Such insights into questions of subjectivity recognise as vital elements of knowledge production the contingencies of social interaction (see Lave & Wenger, 1991, cited in Fendler & Tuckey, 2006: 596).

The creative subject through the different arts areas of the curriculum, in all their particularities, may respond to global turbulence. In protest, students may image the contradictions and ambiguities around them humorously, critically, and satirically, and most importantly, "in a gesture of aesthetic defiance" (Lynn, 2007: 19-20). In resistance, resilience

and survival may be explored through multiple artistic responses. Do we provide the latitude for the artistic expression of endurance, mutation, triumph and absence—conditions that may be responded to artistically? (see Lynn, 2007).

Moving between cultures and from one space to another involves a questioning of issues around transit, and transition. The enabling and suppression of mobility are key questions of our time, and of histories and inheritances born of diversity. Further, in an age of "selfish capitalism" (James, 2007) where designing "flexible accumulation" has become a focus, whose flexibility and whose accumulation are pertinent questions. In an age of "uncertainty, displacement and fragmented identity" (Peters, 2008: 594), educators in the arts are well placed to deal artistically and expressively with issues of uprootedness and homelessness, and the "effects of space-time compression" arising from forced exile, which is, according to Peters, "emblematic in the age of globalisation" (see Peters, 2008: 594). The constantly contested, imagined and re-imagined, transformed and negotiated nature of culture may provide fodder for students of music, art, drama, dance, etc. to improvise, to use wit and wisdom while making artistic comments as they play with uncertainty. While the philosophy of the subject sought "certainty and truth as the foundation of the self, the hermeneutics of the self …" (Foucault, 2004, cited in Peters, 2008: 601) "sees self-understanding as a cultural act that can only take place within the dynamic of or dialectic of self and other—an active cultural reading and re-reading of self-interpretation" (Peters, 2008: 601).

Students of the arts may transcend cultural difference and, giving rise to alternative modes of coexistence either through imagination or through ancestral stories, may register and celebrate the "radical incommensurability of cultures" (Manray Hsu, 2005, cited in Lynn, 2007: 30). Much can be learned from artists' work and intentions in the process of rethinking the meaning and enactment of critical, artistic and creative pedagogy**.** De Lissovoy and McLaren (2003), in calling for an awareness by critical educators, speak of the "violence done to heterogeneity" in the realms of subjectivity via what they term, the "violence of capital". The French philosopher, Jacques Ranciere writes in *Aesthetics and Politics: Rethinking the Link*, of artists having a "new capacity for framing scenes of dissensus", which he describes in relation to artists' propensity for critique: it is art's very distance that makes it a political act (Ranciere, 2002, cited in Lynn, 2007: 31). Peters (2008: 592), in his thinking about what is now the normality of globalisation, multiculturalism, and internationalisation, draws attention to the importance of location for educational thinking and its implications for postmodern subjectivity. This suggests the need for an attention to an 'ethics of care' within global economic governance (see Robinson, 2009) that goes beyond the predatory imperatives of neoliberalism, and something artists and art educators may be likely to respond to.

The artistic teaching subject, in philosophising positionality, identity and difference may also reflect upon and contemplate Deleuzian desires. Deleuze seeks our acknowledgement of the "multiplicity of the plural and pragmatic subject" (see Semetsky, 2003: 220). The Deleuzian subject eludes containment in a "vicious circle", for unfettered it may "break things open; it lives by its philosophy, both putting theory into practice and forming new concepts, contingent on the dynamics of experience". As Inna Semetski argues (2003: 223), "the transformational pragmatics of Deleuze and Guatarri begin in the middle and muddle of life per se, yet the quality of folded experience includes multiplicities of both material and immaterial signs, or pure events, giving rise to meaning, producing not the global but the local truth (without

a capital T), contingent on the contexts of different situations". An artistic, critical and philosophical pedagogy, which understands and validates difference, does not sever knowledge in the arts from the contingencies of its modes of production and will always challenge the power-invested processes of canonic knowledge. Thus it will place reified knowledge of timeless concepts into political, historical, social and cultural contexts.

References

Ball, S. J. (2003). The Teacher's Soul and the Terrors of Performativity. *Journal of Education Policy, 18*(2), 215-228.

Bolwell, J. (2009). Senior Lecturer Music, Victoria University of Wellington, personal communication, July 22.

Bowell, I. (2009). Senior Lecturer Art, School of Education and Policy Implementation, College of Education, Victoria University of Wellington, personal communication, July 21.

Chueh. H-C. (2004). *Anxious Identity: Education, difference and politics.* Westport, CT: Praeger Press.

Craig, D. (2007). Antipodean Anti-Turbulence in Art and Political Economy. In *Turbulence, Third Auckland Triennial* (pp. 32-39). Auckland Art Gallery, Toi o Tamaki.

Cuming, C. (2008). Concert pianist and piano teacher, personal communication, July 19.

Dale, R. & Robertson, S. (2004). Interview with Boaventura de Sousa Santos. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 2*(2). 147-160.

Davies, B. (2005). The (Im)possibility of Intellectual Work in Neoliberal Regimes. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education, 26*(1), 1-14.

Dean, M. (1996). Foucault, Governmentality and the Enfolding of Authority. In Andre Barry, Thomas Osborne & Nicholas Rose (Eds.), *Foucault and Political Reason: Liberalism, neoliberalism and rationalities of government* (pp. 209-229). London: UCL Press.

De Lissovoy, N. & McLaren, P. (2003). Education 'Accountability' and the Violence of Capital: A Marxian reading. *Journal of Educational Policy*, *18*(2), 131-143.

Devine, N., & Irwin, R. (2005). Autonomy, Agency and Education: He Tangata, he tangata, he tangata. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 37*(3), 317-331.

Evans, J., Cook, I., & Griffiths, H. (2008). Creativity, Group Pedagogy and Social Action: A departure from Gough. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 40*(2), 330-345.

Fendler, L. & Tuckey, S. F. (2006). Whose Literacy? Discursive constructions of life and objectivity. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38*(5), 589-606.

Grierson, E. (2000). *The Politics of Knowledge: A poststructuralist approach to visual arts education in tertiary sites.* Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy thesis, The University of Auckland, Auckland.

Grierson, E. (2003). Heeding Heidegger's Way: Questions of the work of art. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Cultural and Policy Studies, 22*(1 & 2), 23-34.

Grierson, E. (2006). Creativity, Culture and Identity: Questions of art and art education in a global knowledge economy. Paper presented at *Politics, Business, and Education in the Twenty-first Century*, the thirty-fifth annual conference of the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia, 23-26 November.

Grierson, E. (2007). Creativity and the Return of the Political Will: Art, language and the creative subject. Paper presented at *Creativity, Enterprise, Policy: New Directions in Education*, the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia Conference, Te Papa, Wellington, December 6-9. Retrieved January 11, 2008, from http://www.pesa.org.au./html/documents/2007-papers/grierson,%Elizabeth.pdf

Grierson, E. & Mansfield J. (Eds.). (2003). *The Arts in Education: Critical perspectives from Aotearoa New Zealand.* Palmerston North: Dunmore Press.

Grierson, E. & Mansfield, J. (2004). The Politics of Censure and 'Will to Certainty' in Teacher Education. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication and Cultural Policy Studies, 23*(1), 1-9.

Habermas. J. (1976). *Legitimation Crisis.* London: Heinemann.

Hartley, D. (2003). The Instrumentalisation of the Expressive in Education. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 51*(1), 6-19.

Haynes, F. (2006). Sublime Heterogeneities in Curriculum Frameworks. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 38*(6), 769-786.

Haynes, F. (2007). Creativity, the arts and toxic institutions. Paper presented at *Creativity, Enterprise, Policy: New Directions in Education,* the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia Conference, Te Papa, Wellington. Retrieved, February 15, 2008, from http://www.pesa.org.au./html/documents/2007-papers/Haynes,%Felicity.pdf

Heidegger, M. (1977). The Question Concerning Technology. In *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays* (William Lovett, Trans. & Intro.) (pp. 3-35). New York: Harper and Row. (Original work published in German 1954).

Heraud, R. & Gibbons, A. (2007). Creativity, enterprise and the absurd: Education and the Myth of Sisyphus: a challenge to an educator. Paper presented at *Creativity, Enterprise, Policy: New Directions in Education*, the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia Conference, Te Papa, Wellington. Retrieved February 15, 2008, from http://www.pesa.org.au./html/documents/2007,%20R%20+%Gibbons,%20A.pdf

Irwin, R. (2007). Environmental education to education for sustainability after neoliberalism. Paper presented at *Creativity, Enterprise, Policy: New Directions in Education*, the Philosophy of Education Society of Australasia Conference, Te Papa, Wellington, December 6-9. Retrieved February 17, 2008, from http://www.pesa.org.au/html/documents/2007-papers/Irwin/%20R..pdf

James, O. (2007). *The Selfish Capitalist: Origins of affluenza*, London: Vermilion.

Kincheloe, J. L. (2006). A Critical Politics of Knowledge: Analysing the role of educational psychology in educational policy. *Policy Futures in Education 4*(3), 220-235.

Lines, D. (2003).*The Melody of the Event: Nietzsche, Heidegger and music education as cultural work*. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy, The University of Auckland, Auckland.

Lingard, B., Hayes, D., & Mills, M. (2003). Teachers and Productive Pedagogies: Contextualising, conceptualising, utilising. *Pedagogy, Culture and Society, 11*(3), 399-424.

Lynn, V. (2007). We Live in Turbulent Times. In *Turbulence, Third Auckland Triennial* (pp. 19-31). Auckland Art Gallery Toi o Tamaki.

Lyotard, J-F. (1984). *The Postmodern Condition: A report on knowledge* (G. Bennington & B. Massumi, Trans.). Manchester: Manchester University Press. (Original work published in French 1979).

Mansfield, J. (2000). *The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum From Policy to Practice*. Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy thesis, The University of Auckland, Auckland.

Mansfield, J. (2003). Framing the Musical Subject: Technoculture and curriculum, A Heideggerian critique. *ACCESS: Critical Perspectives on Communication, Culture and Policy Studies, 22*(1 & 2), 55-65.

Mansfield, J. E. (2005a). The Global Musical Subject, Curriculum and Heidegger's Questioning Concerning Technology. In David Lines (Ed.), *Music Education for the New Millennium: Theory and practice futures for music teaching and learning* (pp. 131-145). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Mansfield, J. E. (2005b). Certainties and Censure: Teacher education in a changing terrain. *Policy Futures in Education, 3*(2), 221-231.

Marshall, J. (2000). Technology, Education and Indigenous People: The case of Maori. *Educational Philosophy and Theory, 32*(1), 121-131.

Ministry of Education (1993). *The New Zealand Curriculum Framework*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (2000). *The Arts in the New Zealand Curriculum.* Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (2006). *The New Zealand Curriculum Draft for Consultation.* Wellington: Learning Media.

Ministry of Education (2007). *The New Zealand Curriculum for English Medium Teaching and Learning in Years 1-13*. Wellington: Learning Media.

Naughton, C. (2007). *The Thrill of Making a Racket: Nietzsche, Heidegger and Samba in community schools.* Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy, The University of Auckland, Auckland.

Peters, M. (2008). Wittgenstein as Exile: A philosophical topography. *Educational Philosophy and Theory 40*(5), 591-605.

Peters, M., & Besley, T. (2006). *Building Knowledge Cultures*. Lanham & Oxford: Rowman and Littlefield.

Robinson, F. (2009). Feminist Ethics and Global Security Governance. In A. Francheschet (Ed.), *The Ethics of Global Governance* (pp. 103-118). Boulder London: Lynne Rienner.

Semetsky, I. (2003). The Problematics of Human Subjectivity: Gilles Deleuze and Deweyan legacy. *Studies in Philosophy, 22*, 3-4, May, 211-225.

Smiers, J. (2003). *The Arts Under Pressure: Promoting cultural diversity in an age of economic globalisation*. London New York: Zed Books.

Willinsky, J. (2005). Just Say Know? Schooling the knowledge society. *Educational Theory, 55*(1), 97-111.