

## **PEDAGOGY OF ART**

Scientific Magazine of Russian Academy of Education

“Institute of Art Education”

<http://www.art-education.ru/AE-magazine/>



№ 4, 2010

### **“Current trends about education and art “**

Selivanov Nikolay,  
Professor,  
Artistic Director and Ano Director "Art Design Studio"  
(art-edu-studio.com),  
[ns@art-edu-studio.com](mailto:ns@art-edu-studio.com)

#### **“About Liberal Arts and School at a Dead End.**

#### **Archaeology of Concepts, Manifesto and Italian Experience.”**

*The article is formed by an introduction, a translation of Manifesto of ARTINSIEME by the Italian teacher Fabrizio Fiordiponti, and a quick overview of the Italian Reform of Education.*

#### **Introduction**

At the Hermitage Museum there is a huge tapestry that represents the seven liberal arts. The figurative art is not among them. In the context of an art museum, the lack of the “pictorial art”, that we consider one of the most important art, produces some questions by the contemporary man. Where is art? What art is? Obviously, these questions can arise only in a fixed condition, that is, when a contemporary man is able to raise questions by himself.

I think this state is not fortuitous. It expresses my attitude towards the current Russian pedagogy, which is not directed to the development of such features of personality and possibilities of thinking, so that it doesn't allow any question at the sight of such museum objects. Therefore, questions don't come out. But this is only my consideration. Therefore, let's go back to visual arts.

The explanation of their lack among liberal arts is quite simple.

In the seventeenth century, when this tapestry was woven for the Hermitage Museum, the idea of “Fine Arts” still didn’t exist. Handicraft, pictorial technique, sculpture, engraving, etc, were known.

This types of activities are included in the main current of the Greek concept, which describes practical knowledge and abilities - Techne (τέχνη). In Russian, the word “Art” comes from the ancient Slavonic language "Iskous", that means “Experience”.

Afterwards, the Latin term «Ars», that has become the modern word «Art», assumed a rather different meaning. All the variations of meaning (I think it’s not necessary to list them. If you are interested in them, you can check on your dictionary) can be gathered in an understanding of the intellectual material, or in a special knowledge, that defines individual’s abilities and the possibility of some kind of activity. According to this sense, liberal arts, that are named «Artes Liberales» (we will discuss about them later) represent knowledge as a whole, that has been achieved by a free and intellectually independent man. But the most important thing in this particular Latin word «Ars» is another Indo-European reference, «Ar-ti», that is, the compatibility of some parts in a completely new context.

For example, you can find this understanding of the artistic action in the poem *Science* by Horace:

*If a painter, while he was sketching a head, tried to join it to the neck of a horse,  
And to every kind of limb by means of variegated fins  
For horror making the wonderful features  
Of the woman end with the black tail of a fish,  
and then he showed you the whole, my dear friends, would you be able to hold back the  
laughter?  
And yet, believe me, Pisoni, identical to a picture  
A book is , in which meaningless images  
Seem to come out of a feverish man’s dreams, where neither head nor feet  
Accord with a finished figure. '*

<...>

*And also by means of sharpness and prudence in binding words together,  
your language will be unique, if an unusual matching  
makes a known word a new word.*

That is, «Ars» is the ability to match, to put together.

In the priority of intellectual control of action, the deep difference between Art and Techne is based on the cultural knowledge of «Ars» and on the logic of rendering the material of «Techne».

After having generalized a lot and used metaphors, in order to define the differences between Techne and Art, in simple terms, the difference lies in the technical ability. For example, the ability of a potter to make a pot, the ability of a poet to tell his/her own feelings. Obviously, if according to the creator the process of doing things is more important, the poet can consider his/her activity in line with Techne. But the willingness to represent a complex idea transfers interest from the process of manufacturing to the background, that is brought forward by the foreground, that is, the ability to manage a symbolic system. This is art, that is bound by a common cultural identity. Techne and Art are integrated in the contemporary commonplace concept of "Art", which requires constant explicative remarks on every specific position, and that the artist expresses by the creation of a work of art. This is how I understand that distinction.

Now, you have the key question: how and why does this strange definition “Figurative Arts” come out of? It has clearly appeared in the trend of thought of Techne for the evaluation and the description of a particular kind of objects and categories, such as paintings, sculpture, illustrations, and especially for the realization of those objects, that need a special ability, such as portraying.

Moreover, you need standards to value these abilities. But when photography appeared, the concept of “Art” began to have serious problems.

Previously, the art of portraying had been directly dependent on manual techniques.

Then, during the development of the cinema, and especially nowadays, in the context of computers, by ways of presenting ideas and spasmodic attempts to run away from the conceptual impasse, there is a new phenomenon, that is, the term “Visual Arts”.

But the most of these “Visual Arts” (films, animations, modelling, 3D ...), by means of a full immersion into the sound and descriptive conceptual texts, have become multi-component, synthetic-hybrid, poli-artistic, and not only visual!

From all this, it follows that the concept, which should circumscribe their field of activity, doesn't correspond to reality. And this means that you don't have the full understanding of the meaning and cultural aims of the creative activity. The remote

meaning was lost and a new one has to be found, that will be specially bound to the way of living and development of today.

I would like to ask a question, that is also a thought: what are the means you have to use in order to prepare yourselves to teach your students?

If this question is asked in a context of a School of Crafts (where there is the teaching of weaving, lace, enamel painting, watercolour painting, painting, etc.), answers are obvious.

But if this question is asked in a context of general training or a further training to be developed, you have to look for an answer.

Is only the production of artistic objects the ultimate goal of an artistic education? Or is there another target, the creation of a particular way of thinking? *Techné* or *Art*?

The answer to this question will depend on the conceptual position of the modern artistic education, on its methodology, its contents and its prospects.

I want to remind once again the quite “incomprehensible” tapestry at the Hermitage Museum.

It represents the seven liberal arts. What does it represent? And why are they in such a number?

If you make a reference to its history, you can see that it comes from afar. The range of liberal arts, together with the necessary intellectual and cultural skills of man, formed over a long period of time, that is, a few centuries. It started from the golden age of the Greek philosophy, then during the Roman rhetoric, and finally in the medieval period of scholastic.

I think it's not necessary to investigate the hints of this involved issue. It's enough to say that liberal arts remained seven. Liberal arts are: grammar, rhetoric, dialectics, arithmetician, geometry, astronomy and music. All arts were divided into two training cycles.

The first cycle is called Trivium, and it is formed by the three sciences of education: grammar, rhetoric and dialectics.

The second cycle is called Quadrivium, and it is formed by the remaining four sciences: arithmetician, geometry, astronomy and music.

Obviously, rhetoric, grammar and dialectics are representations, that can be defined as aesthetic and intellectual methodologies for the qualitative evaluation of phenomena.

Building a conceptual design, with distinction and perception of senses, together with their evaluations, the desire for clarity with expressiveness of speech: all this creates a

special ability of thinking, as it gives a chance to talk and listen to, to understand the others' thoughts, and to express at the same time the mastery of quality criteria in order to assess what to say and how to talk.

And after Trivium, the four disciplines of Quadrivium – mathematics, geometry, astronomy and music, that is otherwise known as harmonica – began to create an environment of independent thought and to develop intelligence through the complexity of methodology of thought by operations of acquisition and abstraction, that are necessary for the contemplative perception of the world.

In the end, music lessons (problems of expression, comparison, coordination, rhythm) are needed to develop abilities of a more elevated intellectual synthesis.

Needless to say, in the scholastic training Trivium and Quadrivium were merged in what we now call additional training.

First, there are theatrical performances, that require not only the memorization of past poetry, but also contemporary poetry.

Since students at the same time studied history, dates, happenings, people, and the “glorious past” of their country (that are naturally mythologized and idealized, but also planned to develop moral qualities of the individual), they made a multiform activity of creative practices.

What can I say, did my familiarity with this long experience maybe make me forget the full development of the individual? Especially if you consider the standard of culture, that is generated by the present didactic system!

It is important to underline that my experience gives the reason for pondering over the current situation. This is an afterthought, that is only apparently clear, but it keeps me still in the wrong, because it doesn't give me the possibility of seeing the reality I'm living in.

But if you examine a changing reality, it always appears with new meanings, that need a new steady understanding in your professional activities, too.

Here I want to state the words of an Italian colleague, that are very clear and logical. They express an opinion on artistic education, that I widely share.

Fabrizio Fiordiponti is a young teacher-operator, who is a Secondary School teacher, an artist, a musician, and a so called “Internet Activist”. He publishes an e-magazine, in which he explains his comments on the situation of education in Italy.

To be precise, I will finish my issue with a comment on Education Reform Bill in Italy, and then with the translated text of the Manifesto of Fabrizio Fiordiponti's "ARTINSIEME"

## **THE MANIFESTO OF ARTINSIEME**

### The Art of Educating

Artinsieme is a pedagogic project, which crosses different forms of the traditional Art and Knowledge (here they are all considered as Arts). It is intended as a model to make school by means of the Art of Teaching.

Artinsieme makes no difference between the Art and the Knowledge, but it considers them all on the same level; just as how the ancients did when they classified the fields of Knowledge in Arts of trivium and Arts of quadrivium. For Artinsieme, the Arts and the scientific/disciplinary Knowledge are all Arts, because the Knowledge is One.

It draws its pedagogic inspiration from the theories expressed in "The well-done head" by the French philosopher and sociologist Edgar Morin.

As it is aware of the Art being first of all a labour of creative freedom with due respect to the logic, Artinsieme must not be bound to (consolidated and dinosauric) fixed patterns. These fixed patterns belong to the past, and they make up an hindrance to the experimentation, the research and the development, and they are often inclined to close the mind instead of open it.

In Artinsieme's point of view every Art is linked to the others through the logic, and all of them refer to each other.

As we are aware that the maturity of any human individual is directly proportional to his/her capability of linking things, in Artinsieme the knowledge doesn't run dry in a single Art, but it develops by changing from one Art to another (for example, from music to painting, poetry, cinema, theatre, from history to biology, sociology, psychology, philosophy, economics, from mathematics to sciences, languages, and so on). At other times, one Art strengthens the idea already expressed by another Art, by means of developing and enriching it.

Everything happens in a continuous flow of the Knowledge, that, through multidisciplinary, and from the point of view of the *Theory of Multiple Brains* by Howard Gardner, makes learning and knowledge easier. It also supports the forming of a flexible and complex thought, either a diverging or a converging thought (as it was

theorized by J.P.Guilford), namely an Artinsieme thought, which is at the same time predisposed to the mathematical / scientific logic, to the creativity / expressiveness / interpretation, to the planning and the improvisation, to the inductive, deductive, and abstractive method, to the perception, to the pre-existing schemes, to the freedom from the same schemes in order to create new and more effective ones. The thought is One, so the problems are easier to solve and the solutions are more reliable, if we can look at them from different points of view, with a wider range of knowledge and with several systems.

Even though each Art maintains its own nature (none of Them is raped ...), nevertheless in Artinsieme any Art can't do without the other.

Artinsieme must be free to be free, it must not stoop to compromises, that could change its essence, namely that they could make it lose its freedom of being what it is.

The idea comes from the structure and working of brain. It is composed of two cerebral hemispheres, that are connected between them and not divided. There is a nearly incalculable multiplicity of neurons, that are connected between them by means of filaments, which allow the mutual exchange of information. When neurons are stimulated, links between them are formed. When they are not stimulated, links break. The more the links between neurons and activated neurons are, the more the intelligence is.

From a practical pedagogical point of view, in order to help the development of this way of thinking of (which is necessary in this world of globalization) a work, a performance, or any work, Artinsieme has to:

- CONCEIVE THE ART first of all as an instrument of knowledge (there's nothing more exciting than knowing and understanding things ...);
- LINK the ARTS and the traditional Knowledge, with and by means of the logic, in an organic overall structure, which turns out beautiful (as Art should always be), and that makes its own strength the strength of many Arts going in a synergetic way in the same direction .
- AROUSE as much interest of people as possible to the Art and the Culture, so that each person, according to his/her own sensitivity, could be charmed with a particular aspect, perhaps he/she couldn't understand other aspects, but meanwhile and however he/she could get nearer to them.
- EDUCATE and have mainly charitable, not economic purposes, because the Art, when it is used to do GOOD, is even more beautiful ...

- TRAIN men to the conscious respect for all the rules commonly agreed from their belonging community; to the freedom of speech and expression; to the freedom of the necessary Science and Art for a civil discussion of the rules themselves in order to find better ones; to a feeling of belonging which could become more and more important, supporting the inclusion and the integration instead of intolerance and racism.

## **WHAT ARTINSIEME IS?**

Artinsieme is not only –art-, as it would seem by its name, and as the word -art- commonly means in the current etymological meaning, that the language provides for. On the contrary, Artinsieme is a ‘new’ way of being of the –art- itself.

In ancient times every –field of knowledge- was called –art-, so there were the arts of trivium and the arts of quadrivium. We don’t understand why this beautiful outlook of the -knowledge-, that is sublimed by the use of the word –art-, added to the specific descriptive adjective of the -field- (astronomical art, mathematical art, naval art, musical art, pictorial art, etc.), got lost, and why today we use a ‘cold’ terminology such as –discipline- or , even ‘colder’, -subject- .

Astronomy, Literature, Music, Painting, Mathematics, Engineering, Architecture, Economics, Cinema, Theatre, Psychology, Sociology, etc., require studies, that cannot leave aside the creativity, and/or the interpretation, and/or the expressiveness. Besides, studying is always creative, and/or interpretative, and/or expressive.

By means of the creativity, the expressiveness, and the interpretation, a training subject (or an already trained subject, even if the training should be conceived as permanent) evinces his/her own intelligence, and his/her own sensibility, as well as his/her own behaviour. Every –field- (none excluded) needs creative, expressive and interpretative abilities, in order to be studied, investigated and improved.

The researcher and the scientist are as –artists- as a musician or a painter. In their research they pursue a common aim, that is the research, and/or the investigation, by means of the study. A scientist, or, in any case, a researcher, or a practitioner of any –field-, goes in search of the truth, or in search of the improvement of what is being, exactly as an –artist- does. All of them are looking for an explanation of certain phenomena of nature, of extra-nature, of morality, of psyche, of society, of physics, and so on.



That's why, according to Artinsieme, every –field of knowledge— is –art-. As a consequence, the –knowledge- is –art-. It couldn't be otherwise. Even in ancient times, a break in two stumps (the arts of Trivium and the arts of Quadrivium) was a mistake. However, at least the word –art- was kept.

Today we are ridiculous.

The –knowledge- is one!!!

The denominations of the –fields of knowledge- are very vague.

All the denominations, but the right ones, are used.

Discipline, subject, education: a complete mess.

We don't understand why, in the Primary and in the Secondary School of first grade, there is a division of the –knowledge- in –Disciplines- (Mathematics, Italian, etc) and –Educations- (Motor or Physical Education, Artistic Education or Education to the Images, Education to the Music, etc), as if Education to the Mathematics or Education to the Italian do not exist, or as if we cannot pursue an education by means of them.

What's the sense of it?

Moreover, what does 'Education to the Images' mean? By chance, are children educated to take care of their own look? No, they aren't! They draw, they paint, they cut, etc.

There is a real Babel in the use of terminology.

Artinsieme proposes at school the adoption of these terminologies, that are correct from an etymological point of view: the Linguistic Art (is art required, or not, if we want to read and write good?), the Mathematical Art (is art required, or not, if we want to solve a problem?), the Musical Art, the Technical Art, the Economic Art, the Manipulative Expressive Art (for example, instead of Education to the Images), etc.

Strongly and with firm believe, Artinsieme aims at the unity of the – knowledge-, and so, at the unity of the –arts-, starting from scientific positions. We think that this step is necessary for an evolution of the human species towards the good. As a matter of fact, we believe that the problems should be faced and examined from several disciplinary prospects (that is, according to Artinsieme, artistic prospects). We also believe that the solution of a problem is more correct (and easier), if the several –fields of knowledge- would have the possibility to interact, so that they could supply a shared solution of the problem. An economic problem cannot be faced only on an economic level. The suggested solution won't ever be effective, and it won't ever be the right solution. An economic problem must be examined from different prospects, that had to include, for example, also sociological, psychological, legal valuations, etc. For this reason, it would

be opportune that, in order to face an economic problem on a legal level, a team of practitioners, coming from several –fields-, not only from the economic –field-, would work at it.

We can tell the same for an environmental problem, or for any other –field- problems.

It goes without saying!

We suggest an Artinsieme team, because we firmly believe that we could find creative, functional and effective solutions.

The division into sectors of the –culture-, and the consequent professional specializations, are all modern elements of “proposing the knowledge”, that behaved as if they inserted the thought in conceptual categories. Thus, the thought is made little adaptable to multi-disciplinary connections, that, as we know it for some time, better favour the “problem solving”, namely, the ability of a free thinking individual to face and solve the problems, that life constantly sets before him/her.

By means of the specialization, the mind of a single person extended, developing, even if by means of his/her intelligence, only microscopic sectors of the so much wider –knowledge-, so that it generated an important preparation in an infinitesimal –field- of the –culture-, and it generated a complete real ignorance in anything else.

It follows that anything else is judged and valued by means of prejudices and preconceptions, and not by using an actual knowledge of how things really are from a scientific point of view.

To speak scientifically, we often activate only neurons that belong to the same area, while the others stay a little in abeyance.

An hyper-specialized man/woman has general ideas concerning the other –fields of knowledge- that he/she thinks a little or not at all connected to his/her competent cultural –field- (yet, we all know that everything is connected!). But such ideas are wrong most of the times, because they are not supported by a scientific knowledge, that is outside his/her own sector of professional competence. Unfortunately, we don't have the time to investigate such ideas, because this would mean to achieve specializations in other –fields-!

The issue is that the title “Doctor in ...”, that is achieved at the University, is meant by the society as a title of warrant of the intelligence or the training of the owner. But we don't think that, considering the scientific theories of the *Multiple Brains* by Gardner and the *Emotional Brain* by Goleman, the degree in a – field of knowledge - proposes an investigated understanding of that very – field -, but, at the same time, it proposes an

ignorance (from the Latin *ignorare*, that means “not to know”, without an offensive meaning) of anything else.

It's up to the good will of a practitioner to investigate his/her knowledge, by filling the gap of his/her ignorance in all the other –fields-, in addition to his/her own -field-. The practitioner, who acts like this, is able to be certainly more productive and effective in his/her work, for himself/herself and for the others.

We need to remember that the science claims that the human being has developed only a very little part (nearly an infinitesimal part) of his/her potential intelligence.

The consequence is that a person has not the solution of the general problems of life, which afflicts the human species, from the origin of the times since now, namely the happiness and the search for it.

A single individual is not able to do it, but maybe many individuals all together, coming from different –fields of knowledge- are able to do it. If only it would be possible to get together many forms of intelligence, that could join between them, and that, each of them, could humbly go and overcome the owned prejudices and the preconceptions towards the –fields of knowledge- not belonging to his/her single competence!

Artinsieme is trying exactly to do this, by means of the contribution of different thoughts, that work together with synergy on the formulation of a complex thought, as it is meant by the French philosopher and sociologist Edgar Morin, who has been recently asked to personally intervene by the Italian Ministry of Instruction, University and Research.

The teaching of the Master Socrates (“I know not to know”) has getting lost in the course of history, and today, in spite of us, everybody believes to know everything.

But, unfortunately, human presumption is an evil, that the man could never get rid of, as history teaches us. By means of the arbitrary personal elevation of the very intelligence of the individual over the intelligence of the others, this presumption has also produced and still continuously produces injustices, as, who presumes and has the power, acts influencing the freedom of the others. And who presumes is not always right.

History is filled with many examples of men, who caused, by means of their presuming, not only serious injustices, but even disasters. Those were first of all emotional disasters of the general awareness of people, who have not the power, in spite of them, even if nowadays people are beguiled to get the power by means of the concept of democracy, which is still, with our never-ending sadness, only a concept.

The presumption is the highest form of foolishness, as it prevents from opening to the “problem solving” at the starting of a constructive dialogue, that would aim at the solution of a problem.

We can notice a deep historical modern contradiction between what the school, as an institution legally deputed to the training of the citizens of tomorrow, on the basis of constitutional rules, and, among them, the Article 33 of the Constitution is the foundation of it, suggests as fundamental and necessary, in order to training a ”well-bred and good thinking” subject, and the society that, in spite of us, pursues other aims.

The school wants the unity of the knowledge, the society divides the knowledge.

The school wants inter-culture, the society is not able to put it into practice.

The school wants justice, the society is not able to warrant it.

The school should reward the merits, the society sometimes rewards the merits.

The school wants equal rights, the society suggests differences.

The school thinks of the future, the society tries to find a remedy for the damages made in the past.

And what about the present?

The present is a shapeless synthesis between “what should be and it is not” and “what had been and it is no more”

This is a big problem, and we need to solve it soon, if we don’ t want the situation to slip out of our hands.

By means of Artinsieme, we want to suggest a new way of making –culture-, of making -art-, that could complete (you need to be careful: ‘complete’ and not ‘modify’) the concept itself of –art-, by completing it as the class of thought, of which we are accustomed to thinking.

Artinsieme wants to complete this concept by moving to a scientific direction, that could seem deceptive and probably ideal, but however it makes the mathematical/philosophical logic an adhesive aspect. But who can coherently think that it couldn’t be at least formative? Is it not right just because it draws inspiration from well-known and acknowledged pedagogical theories?

The –art- is considered as a more complete class of thinking than we are usually accustomed to imaging today.

The –art- that wants to unite, not to divide.

The–art- that wants to be freely what it is.

The –art- that wants to propose humbly a present solution to the present man.

The –art- that wants to explain.

Artinsieme was founded by an artist, who is also a state regular teacher of the primary school indefinitely. It proposes itself as an apolitical and non-party school, that is purified from some of its ancestral expressive excesses, and that is enriched by new elements fallen into the reality of the same –art-, with the primary purpose to turn out as a beautiful, formative and intelligent example/model to follow for the future time.

We hope that Artinsieme will be carefully considered as it really deserves, and that it will be helped to grow in the direction, that would respect the purity of the thought it represents.

We hope that Artinsieme will be able to represent soon a model, of which Italy must be proud in the eyes of the world, and that can be exported all over the world as an academic model.

The main etymologic knotty problem to solve, the real struggle of Artinsieme, is that the –art- is educational in its own essence, and that anything not educational is not –real art- but –artism-.

But, if we think so, how much actual “art” do we have to throw into the toilet?

Educating is from the Latin “*educere*”, that means “to lead out”. In the Italian dictionary the meaning of educating is expressed like this, among many others: “To help, by means of suitable discipline, to put into effect, to develop the good inclinations of the heart and the powers of the mind, and to fight against the not good inclinations; to lead the man out of the original defects of the rough nature, by means of instilling frames of morality and good manners”.

Is this or not the task of the –art-?

## COMMENT

This is such an emotional manifesto!

Now we need to talk about what's happening to education in Italy.

The Bill was developed by the Italian Minister of Public Education Reform, Maria Stella Gelmini. When I'm writing about this Reform, that caused student and teacher unrests, the resentment has arrived at the peak, as it would reduce the numbers of teachers and the single teacher would return in the Primary School.

To tell you the truth, in favour of the protest against these administrative measures there are sound reasons, that are connected with the process of stagnation of the development of education in Italy in the last ten years.

But the essence of the Reform and the opposition against it is caused not only by these elements. The Bill of Gelmini provides for modifications of those polytechnic institutes, that have technical guidance, towards humanistic, artistic and creative sciences.

Maybe did the reader hear about such areas of modern economy as "creative industries", called "cluster"?

This is the disaggregation of great industrial enterprises and the organization of a flexible system of production of little multi-service structures, that are focused on the research of products and services. Energies that are needed for these new social production areas draw their strengths from a creative initiative, that requires an artistic style thought, imagination, knowledge and understanding of cultural and symbolic contexts of design and activity organization methods.

The reasons of these ideas are beyond the purport of this article. But making a reference to a quote from an open letter by the Japanese architect Kisho Kurokawa, the Governor of St. Petersburg, Valentina Matvienko, wrote: "The XXI century is a new era. The economic development can't go on without a creative economy, in which the main fields are architecture, computer science technology, cinematographic and animation technology, television and music industry, design industry, education, health and food industry, entertainment, sport and tourism industry.

Japan, USA and UK are already on the path of economy reconstruction towards a creative economy".

In this direction, Maria Stella Gelmini unfurls the sails of her "ship", that clearly takes its place as the flagship of the leading European countries.

For this reason, scientific and technological universities are in the wane, because of their inflation. At the same time, all the subjects, that are based on creative education in every level of training, and all the subjects of art and artistic education are growing, as they are becoming the main priorities in the Primary and Secondary School all over the world, so that the compulsory study of a second language of Latin origin has been introduced.

All this is a “steady hand” in the administrative reorganization. Obviously, there cannot be many unemployed teachers of engineering sciences, who are specialist in electric resistor of materials, and so on. But many students, who have planned to take a technical degree can now count on a diploma of special Secondary School. That is, there is a well-known process of “who was important before, but now has become nobody”.

And not everybody would agree in sharing the not very nice prospects of being marginalized.

But because of all these processes, you can clearly draw the conclusions, that concern everybody’s responsibilities for the future of one’s own country and the consequent outlook in perspective.

I support the manifesto of my Italian colleague. His experience of how to link contemporary art and artistic pedagogy are summarized in many parts of his manifesto of ideas. And I’m grateful to have caught a glimpse of changes to come.

The future, which Kisho Kurokawa speaks of, the future, that Maria Stella Gelmini is building in Italy, is on its way.

It seems that there are no other ways.

*“As leaves on the branch change together over the years,  
Everybody’s past falls as words on tongue. Some grow old,  
Die and again other people flower and grow stronger. “*

(Quintus Horace Flaccus, *Science Poem*)

## BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. ARTINSIEME // Электронный журнал URL <http://www.artinsieme.eu/eng/> (дата обращения: 12.12.2010)
2. Адо И. Свободные искусства и философия в античной мысли. – М.: «Геко-латинский кабинет» Ю.А.Шичалина, 2002.
3. Бергсон А. Творческая эволюция / пер с фр. В.А. Флеровой. - М.: КАНОН-пресс, Кучково поле, 1998.
4. Гарднер Г. Великолепная пятерка: Мыслительные стратегии, ведущие к успеху. – М.: Альпина Бизнес Букс, 2008.
5. Квинт Гораций Флакк. Собрание сочинений. – СПб, Биографический институт, Студия биографика, 1993.
6. Морен Э. Метод. Природа Природы. – М.: Прогресс-Традиция, 2005.
7. Савенкова Л.Г. Научная школа Б.П. Юсова.// Научные школы в педагогике искусства (часть 1). Коллективная монография под редакцией Л.Г. Савенковой 2008. – М.: Издательский дом Российской академии образования. 2008.
8. Селиванов Н. Предыстории. – М.: Мастерская художественного проектирования, 2008. Интернет версия книги URL <http://art-edu-studio.com/ru/publications/book2008/book2008.htm> (дата обращения: 12.12.2010)
9. Селиванов Н. Проектирование как творческое познание. Поиск методологических основ для интеграции компьютерных технологий в художественное образование. // Педагогика искусства: электронный научный журнал. - №3 2008, URL [http://www.art-education.ru/AE-magazine/archive/nomer-3-2008/selivanov\\_24\\_08\\_2008.htm](http://www.art-education.ru/AE-magazine/archive/nomer-3-2008/selivanov_24_08_2008.htm) (дата обращения: 12.12.2010)
10. Фейерабенд, П. Против метода. Очерк анархистской теории познания / Пер. с англ. А. Л. Никифорова. — М.: АСТ; Хранитель, 2007.
11. Юсов Б.П. Когда все искусства вместе // Под общей ред. Б.П. Юсова. – Мурманск, 1995.
12. Энгельмейер П.К. Теория творчества/ с предисл. Д.Н. Овсяннико-Куликовского, Э. Маха. Изд.2-е. – М.: Издательство ЛКИ, 2007.



Traduzione dal russo all'italiano: Gennaro Leopoldo

Traduzione dall'italiano all'inglese: Laura Bondi