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**Outline/ Format of the Roundtable**

The IIAS Roundtable at Jaipur was a strategic meeting to develop clear, policy-relevant, recommendations for the rehabilitation of crafts knowledge in humanistic education, particularly drawing upon Asian experiences. Since there will be no monologues or seminar like presentations, the role of moderators to steer and develop the discussion on the prescribed themes is crucial. The Roundtable is a *collective*endeavour aimed at concrete deliverables at the end of the two day session.

The first day was devoted to framing the discussions with the questions of *why*and *for whom* (Session 1) and to taking stock of what already exists programmatically in the world and especially in Asia (Sessions 2, 3). The second day sessions focused on concrete new ideas that will enhance Crafts Knowledge and Practice in institutional (and non-institutional) education. The last session will help frame a policy model aimed at shaping alternative humanistic knowledge towards an outline of a new proposal with potentially interested partners.

**Objectives/ Concept note of the Roundtable:**

The IIAS [Roundtable on Cloth, Culture and Development](http://rethinking.asia/event/cloth-culture-and-development) held at Chiang Mai, Thailand, in August 2014 was the stage for the declaration of shared intention in the [Preamble](http://rethinking.asia/report/preamble-roundtable-cloth-culture-and-development) to an emerging manifesto on craft in Asia. It brought to centre stage the contemporary upsurge in demand (and patronage) for the handmade and the paradoxical devaluation of manual work and craft education. The various case studies presented illuminated the supplanting, sequestering and labourising of craft practitioners amidst a globalizing fascination and fashion for the handmade. The Roundtable acknowledged the re-articulation of craft within nationalist agendas of cultural preservation and economic development in different parts of Asia. But it also shed light, ironically, on the contemporary renunciation of craft-work as a viable livelihood option among the rising generations.

There has been a silencing of craft as anachronistic (and ‘aristocratic’) knowledge and practice under the dominant factory-based capitalist mode of production (Hobsbawm, 1984). Indeed, its erasure as a legitimate form of embodied learning has been pervasive. It is evident in the systematic inculcation and universalization of ‘disciplined time’ and its inscription on the labouring body, since the industrial revolution (Thompson, 1964). The disavowal of craft in the new millennium has been exacerbated by the ascendancy of what Ursula Franklin (1990) has termed ‘prescriptive technologies’ that promote a ‘production model’ of work-practice and knowledge transmission. Control-oriented education is the norm, itself viewed as an ‘act of depositing’ for the shaping of adaptable minds (Freire, 1970) and training of disciplined bodies (Foucault, 1977), in this all-embracing production mind-set.

Eurocentric scholarship has also marginalized artisanship as an ‘Asiatic’ mode whose recovery in modernity via aesthetics, economics and epistemology, has been mainly via a nostalgia that reproduces, rather than rejects, the mind-body distinction. Craft has been a model for arts/design/technical (vocational training) education but not in the theoretical sciences engaged in the pursuit of rarefied knowledge. Craft mediates the separation between the humanities and the sciences and yet it is exoticised and infantalised in the image of the crafting (ethnological) ‘body at work’ (cf. Mathur, 2007).

In a world that values the written word as a reliable medium of knowledge transmission then, how does one imagine and represent craft pedagogy? We know that learning is co-constructed within what Lave and Wenger (1991) have called ‘communities of practice’ and is a social process rather than an abstract transmission of knowledge which, in some cases, is reluctantly passed on (Herzfeld 2004). Is there a way to recover the salience of the tacit and the tactical in pedagogy for “catching the implicit knowing of the [craft] profession” (Gamble, 2001) as it were? Can we think of new, and also highlight existing, ‘subaltern’ forms of mind-body concatenations that surpass and confound the naturalness of bodily ‘skill’ and inform what we are calling ‘pedagogy from below’?

The continuing process of decolonization of knowledge and transnational exchange provides both opportunities and challenges to explore and expand the sites of craft and its modalities of inculcation. There are many formal and non-formal arrangements that can be identified as discursive spaces of craft pedagogy at various levels in Asia. They include workshops, industrial and vocational training institutes, peripatetic masters/designers/teachers, artisan households and communities, alternative spaces for communitarian living, state and non-state centres for local-cultural preservation; ashrams/monasteries/temples; and visionary schools and universities. The binaries of a modern education - teacher vs. student; mind vs. body; public vs. private; work vs. leisure; conformity vs. creativity; credentialism and consumerism vs. human (soul) fulfilment; must be resisted and overcome if one is to consider a pedagogy that is through the body and with other bodies.

Bringing together people who have been engaged in practices of ‘pedagogy from below’, ‘pedagogy through bodily practice and experience’, or ‘vernacular pedagogy’, the Roundtable Reconsidering Craft as Pedagogy from Below seeks to renew the conversation on:

* Craft work as the site of ‘embodied learning’ (Marchand, 2008). Resisting conventional distinctions between mind and body, here ‘imitation’ and ‘repetition' take on meanings far removed from those attributed under Taylorism.
* Sites of innovation and change, not as spurts of individual genius but as a shared practice and collective ideal.
* Gender, class and caste hierarchies in the reproduction of craft work.
* Artisanship as a challenge to the capitalist logic of obsolescence, consumerism and private ownership.
* The on-going dialogue between craft work and newer forms of technologies and changing local ecologies.
* Envisioning an e-University facilitating craft work as a legitimate and viable option in the contemporary world.

**Summary of Discussion:**

**Opening session**

The IIAS Roundtable held at Jaipur, India, on 16th and 17th March, 2015, sought to re-examine craft and handwork in the context of the labourisation of work and de-legitimation of artisanship among the rising generations. The opening session of the Roundtable commenced with introductory words from the local host, Director General of the American Institute of Indian Studies (AIIS), Ms. Purnima Mehta apprising the group about AIIS and its activities in promoting scholarship on India. This was followed by a brief on the objectives of the roundtable in relation to the Mellon-supported project “Rethinking Asian Studies in the Global Context” by IIAS Director, Dr. Philippe Peycam. The roundtable convenor, Dr. Aarti Kawlra provided the context of this third and final event under the forum “Uses of Culture and Cultural Heritage” (<http://rethinking.asia/forum-2>) and outlined the day-wise schedule of sessions and modus operandi of the roundtable. The meeting commenced with participant introductions followed by session moderators opening each session for discussion with key questions.

**DAY ONE: THE NECESSITY OF CRAFT AS PEDAGOGY**

Recognizing craft as humanistic knowledge and mode of production following the recommendations of the Chiang Mai Roundtable in 2014, the Jaipur Roundtable aimed to validate artisanship as an alternative form of knowledge transmission and livelihood. On the first day, the discussion focused on diverse efforts (and failures) involved in the rehabilitation of crafts knowledge in formal and informal settings drawing from Asian and African contexts.

**Session 1: Craft as Pedagogy – For Whom and Why**

The first session moderated by Philippe Peycam and Aarti Kawlra spotlighted the question of craft “For Whom and Why” in the context of the sub-alternisation of craft practices and forms of knowledge reproduction in the modern world. Jacob Eyferth illuminated the fact that in China young anthropologists are being trained as administrators in the representation of craft by the state. Local knowledge and practices such as dance, folklore and rituals are significantly owned and patented by the state. However, an older anthropologist registered these practices in the name of the practitioners for the first time. Even so, the certification of craft practice is still given by the state in China.

Even though craft is valorized as heritage in Asian and African countries it is not necessarily a desirable livelihood option for youth as it is otherwise marginalized in the larger globalizing political economy. Moreover, agricultural and artisanal production, says Susan Visvanathan, are dissociated from one another and seen as discrete sectors in policy formulations. Aarti Kawlra observed that many artisans in India have given up their practice as it is economically not viable and socially often disregarded and even disrespected. Aringla Vashum, a weaver from Manipur, India said that this was demoralizing for many communities where prestige is derived through the pursuit of excellence in one’s work.

Francoise Verges remarked that one needs to be aware of the discourse of craft that masks processes of violence, exploitation and colonization of knowledge. Michael Herzfeld warned against the tendency of states to bureaucratize craft practices as artisans do not transmit their knowledge in standardized ways. Moreover, he pointed out that culture is reified by nation-states and nationalism and craft becomes part of its vocabulary and is served to us as authorized knowledge. It is important therefore according to Verges that we clarify received concepts pertaining to craft and employ a common grammar and become aware of how we use these concepts. The important point made was of open access to knowledge and its free circulation and not its ownership. State intervention it was agreed is not always detrimental or suspicious, as in the case of Japan where Yuko Kikuchi noted that ‘wasa’ or ‘skill’ has been maintained through 60 years of formal state regulations. Trevor Marchand noted that in some countries in Africa the awareness of craft as heritage has come not from the government but from scholars and elite players. However, when matters of intellectual property and proprietary rights emerge and transmission enters the domain of the written word - it becomes exclusionary.

How do we then sustain the production and reproduction of craft knowledge in a learning paradigm that goes beyond the perpetuation of authorized knowledge? Min-chin Chiang suggested that the gap between craft practice and its transmission could be bridged by abandoning the discourse of heritage and preservation. Wan Lee Chen referred to the example of Yuma Taaru a weaver hailing from the Atayal tribe, trained at a Design School in Taiwan and who is now championing the cause of her own inherited traditions. The session concluded with the observation by Herzfeld that education is always political and that learning craft can be very incompatible ( as in the case of “stealing with one’s eyes”) with stable forms of education and citizenship.

**Session 2: Ideas, Institutions and Practices from Asia - Historical and Contemporary**

The second session centred on historical and contemporary instantiations of craft reproduction. The moderators for the session, Pamela Smith and Min-Chin Chiang, opened the discussion by asking how various local institutions work to support or hinder craft practice, and how are ideas and structures being mobilized towards the sustenance of craft. Angela Srisomwongwathana from Chiang Mai revealed that as a photographer, her work has served to awaken a consciousness of the value of their work in the eyes of her artisan subjects. Seng Sary observed that a paucity of opportunities for the deployment of craft as a livelihood also impedes the transmission of skill. Sandria Freitag highlighted on non-governmental organizations as effective avenues of negotiation between local communities, the state and the corporate, in the valorization of craft as a sustainable livelihood. Annapoorna Mamidipudi drew attention to the opposition between craft practitioners and the researchers of craft, and the need to bridge this gap. Francoise Verges raised the point that politics of vulnerability and the fabrication of craft as precarious due to ideological and political interest should be critiqued. Wan-Lee Chen stated that mediating spaces that bring together communities of practice and artists, designers and academicians in co-learning and collaborative opportunities is more important than preserving craft as relics in museums.

Susan Visvanathan and Roshan Sahi pointed to how grass-root education through craft could be deployed to represent ideas regarding citizenship rights to livelihood. There is the need to understand craft within the changing social organization of work, Michael Herzfeld asserted, which has come about due to the changing nature of kinship relations and the family, and expansion of urbanization and industrialization. It is also necessary, he added, to move away from the hierarchies of knowledge predicated upon the Cartesian division between mind and body, handwork and mental work. The session wrapped up with examples from the past, relating to alternative models of learning. Aarti Kawlra reflected upon 20th century crafts-based educational experiments at Kalakshetra in Madras by Rukmani Arundale and Tagore’s Sriniketan in Bengal, Gandhi’s ashram at Wardha and Kamaladevi Chattopadhayay’s recovery of craft as national heritage and Philippe Peycam talked of Vietnam’s eagerness to participate in the idea of Asia as a civilizational alternative to western modernity.

**Session 3: Gaps to be filled – For an Alternative Humanistic Educational Model in/for/from Asia?**

The session moderated by Francoise Verges and Yoko Inoue opened with the recognition of a hierarchy of language. English had contributed to the dominant definition of craft and did not adequately describe terms such as *techne* or *shilpa* for instance. Moreover, there is a gendered idea of craft according to Jacob Eyferth where weaving is likened to the act of cooking and paper-making for instance is seen as legitimate craft. Pamela Smith called for recovering the experience of embodied work in the diversity of knowledge. Roshan Sahi acknowledged the importance of tactile knowledge that comes to surface in the course of interaction with the environment. Trevor Marchand pointed to the “discovery” aspect of craft practice through the method of “problem of solving” and the need to bring back workshops in schools so “people can think in a full-bodied way”. Yoko Inoue suggested however that it was more about “problem searching”. The transmission of embodied techniques is not possible in the present framework of the classroom, and therefore it is essential for the student to learn in situ with the community, stated Yoko Inoue.

Pamela Smith recalled the very long human history of collective innovation and experimentation through craft work, stretching all the way back to, for example, the invention of bronze (ca. 3500 BCE) and glass (ca. 1500 BCE)--both entirely human-made materials--and continuing through the following millenia in craft workshops everywhere, and carried out today in scientific laboratories.  This handwork is, however, now erased in scientfic publications that emerge from science laboratories.Annapoorna Mamidipudi provided the example of the skilled practice of the musician in which innovation coincided with an absence of the self in the act of creation. The session concluded with remarks on disciplined learning and Francoise Verges’ concern to avoid craft from being associated with ‘creative boredom’, in which the economy merely pushes towards a certain kind of production and consumption.

**DAY TWO: AN ALTERNATIVE PEDAGOGIC MODEL?**

The second day of the roundtable focused upon the formulation of “craft as alternate pedagogy” and called for its insertion, and ultimately legitimation, in diverse institutional and non-institutional educational arrangements.

**Session 1**: **Craft Pedagogy as Early Education?**

Discussions in the first session underscored craft in early education with Jacob Eyferth and Roshan Sahi as moderators. In China, according to Jacob Eyferth, a girl from a family where weaving is a community practice, starts to weave at the age of twelve to prepare for her wedding trousseau and is generative of social relations. Roshan Sahi raised the concern, “How to introduce craft in elementary education to children who do not have a history of craft practice?” In Crete, Herzfeld argued that being cunning is valued over being good. “Are we training children for the world in which they live, or the world that we would like to see?” he asked. Woralun Boonyasurat, a craft practitioner in Chiang Mai, Thailand, stated that schools at the primary and secondary level encourage craft learning from an early age, and by the age of thirteen, many of them become famous artisans in the city. Workshops in Chiang Mai, she added have been very effective in bringing together different learning contexts by collaborating with municipalities, monasteries, educational institutions and masters. In the context of early education, Francoise Verges remarked it is also essential to recognize the role of the tactile environment in the psychological development of the child prior to schooling, and the teaching of language and coordination by parents, by use of narratives and stories that has pedagogic implications influencing the personality of the child.

Trevor Marchand illustrated the case of Mali, where children work at building sites to pay for their educational expenses, and learn through their hands-on training and apprenticeship. This also imparts knowledge pertaining to budgeting, and also gives them the option of continuing the profession later. The alternative form of learning, as Roshan Sahi asserted, will then require a reconstruction of the idea of the classroom in order to involve processes of community learning as well as a possible two-way learning between teachers and children. In Taiwan, Min-chin Chiang stated, some universities invite artisans to impart skills to students, after which the students visit the field, and return to the classroom to further develop their experiences. This is followed by taking back all the ideas to the craft community again.

In Taiwan, as Yuma Taaru demonstrated, the significance of weaving is transmitted to children through songs and stories. Bridging the gap between formal and informal education, with the sponsorship of the government, all weavers, mothers and grandmothers are invited, for the purpose of teaching the younger generation, a form of knowledge that had disappeared with colonialism. The session concluded with Francoise Verges’ call for challenging and overcoming the idea of illiteracy being connected to the vernacular language, and with Pamela Smith’s emphasis on “corporal memory” and “making as knowing”.

**Session 2: Craft Pedagogy as Advanced Education?**

Introducing the context of advanced education and training in UK and Japan, the moderators of the second session Yuko Kikuchi and Trevor Marchand initiated the discussion. Yuko Kikuchi remarked that in Japan, craft has never been an alternative, and universities have had successful craft-teaching histories. The Tokyo School of Arts set up as a school of Fine Arts in the late 19th century, has now become Tokyo University of Crafts. In the United Kingdom however, craft courses that had a long history of training artists in the Universities of Glasgow, Edinburgh have closed down recently, leaving little scope of higher education. Reflecting on the dilution in the traditional idea of apprenticeships, Trevor Marchand spoke on how the workplace has shifted to the factories in which teaching is delegated to employers, but examinations are government controlled. With the growing popularity of social networking websites like YouTube, artisans are now learning and sharing skills online.

In the context of changing craft traditions and practices, the moderators then posed the question -what qualifies expertise? Both Michael Herzfeld and Pamela Smith asserted on the understanding of expertise being reliant on the ability to stand apart with distinction and recognized as such by a community. By putting forward the case of Germany, Jacob Eyferth remarked that training by the guild master, and certification according to the qualification standards of the guild, exists for almost all traditional crafts. New crafts also have evolved the apprenticeship method of training and are still valued in Germany. A master could be someone who possesses the qualities of innate capability and talent which might not necessarily arise from training, reflected Annapoorna Mamidipudi. But the notion of the ‘master’ derives from the term’s usage in colonial discourse and in fact misrepresented the context of craft production and reproduction in India, Aarti Kawlra added.

Francoise Verges raised the need for a deconstruction of conventional understandings of notions of ‘master’ and ‘expert’. Roshan Sahi added that the potential of agency in the making and doing of craft, even if executed badly, must be recognized in handwork. Wan-lee Chen emphasized the inability of the Anglo-American tradition to adequately translate the different traditions of local knowledge, while Susan Visvanathan spoke of opening schooling and universities as “osmotic” spaces that rethink age in the learning process.

The ensuing group-discussions raised issues of the difference between the meaning of craft as imposed by UNESCO, the role of academicians as mediators between craft practitioners and students, the contextual nature of craft knowledge, multilingualism, embodied learning, the cultural construction of colour and other craft-based terminologies, the problem of translation and transmission.

**Session 3**: **Concluding Reflections and Prolegomena for Craft-based Learning: Outlining Strategic Elements of a (Pilot) Model of Alternative Pedagogy through Crafts?**

The last session of the roundtable reflected on the discussions that were carried out in the previous sessions with the objective of forwarding pilot structures of alternative pedagogy aimed at humanistic education. With Michael Herzfeld, Wan-Lee Chen and Annapoorna Mamidipudi as the moderators, the session sought the formulation of potential projects for the future. Michael Herzfeld initiated the session by asking as to what kind of model of humanistic learning can be developed which can integrate the twin streams of academic and craft learning that will recognize the aspect of embodiment and decolonize the hierarchies of knowledge. Philippe Peycam stated that the need was to identify areas of intervention and possible projects, keeping in mind the feasibility, time-frame and budget. The moderators outlined the following potential project categories: 1) Political agenda (to break down hierarchies), 2) Epistemic agenda (critical study of knowledge), 3) Institutional agenda, and 4) Alternative imaginations (alternative social attitudes, misfits and mavericks).

Susan Visvanathan reflected on the need to refrain from perceiving the craft community as subaltern, and instead to evolve new vocabularies of equality and citizenship. Herzfeld suggested the use of networks like the IIAS, while Francoise Verges proposed the creation of an e-University platform for the validation and certification of craft practices and techniques for youth and practitioners in Asia and Africa . Pamela Smith emphasized the need to work with comparative history and alternative historical narratives in projects that start from the craftspeople, while Herzfeld added the possibility of documentation of the tradition by the craftspeople themselves. When Sandria Freitag asked how it would be possible to bring craftspeople together, Philippe Peycam, Aarti Kawlra and Jacob Eyferth suggested the idea of workshops and other forms of shared platforms of interaction between artisans, scholars, designers, non-governmental organizations and governmental organizations. Min-chin Chiang suggested the need to connect the household and the classroom in the transmission of craft knowledge while Ektaa Jain proposed a mapping of different craft traditions.

Yuko Kikuchi stressed on the need for alternative history writing by illuminating diverse case studies, which could influence research funding and network building. Francoise Verges asserted the need to build an ecological methodology that would not only focus on networking between craftspeople and scholars, but would also provide access to materials and resources. Roshan Sahi remarked that the present process of formal learning should be deconstructed and craft should be understood in terms of the right to livelihood. Aarti Kawlra added that this pedagogy should also focus on bringing about political awareness particularly of the complicity of many craftspeople in their own subjugation and encourage historical consciousness. With these comments, the participants divided themselves into groups with potential project plans for the dissemination of craft as alternative pedagogy.

**Main points of the Roundtable:**

* Moving beyond the discourse of heritage and understanding craft as production of knowledge, social relations and body-centric ecological practice
* Crisis of sustenance of and through traditional craft practices but also critiquing the politics of vulnerability and precariousness of craft
* Going past hierarchies of caste, class and gender towards citizenship rights to livelihood through craft work
* Questioning the hegemony of dominating languages and viewing craft as both making and knowing
* The need for deconstructing and de-centering the classroom towards embodied learning
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* **Philippe Peycam** is a historian and currently Director of the International Institute of Asian Studies, Leiden, Netherlands. He was formerly the founder director of the Center for Khmer Studies in Cambodia, an international – yet locally rooted – institution aimed at promoting scholarship on the region while building local capacities. He shares a research fellowship at the US Institute of Peace, Washington DC and the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore. Email: p.m.f.peycam@iias.nl
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* **Susan Visvanathan** is Professor of Sociology at Centre for the Study of Social Systems, Jawaharlal Nehru University, New Delhi, and the author of many books, including *The Christians of Kerala* (OUP 1993) *Friendship, Interiority and Mysticism* (Orient Blackswan 2007) and *The Children of Nature: The Life and Legacy of Ramana Maharshi* (Roli 2010) She is the editor of *Structure and Transformation* (OUP 2001) and her most recent books are *Reading Marx, Weber and Durkheim* (Palm Leaf Publications 2012) and *The Wisdom of Community* (Palm Leaf Publications 2015 forthcoming)  She has been Fellow of the Nehru Memorial Museum and Library and Hon Fellow of the Indian Institute of Advanced Societies. She was trained at Delhi University and Jawaharlal Nehru University. She has been Visiting Professor at MSH, Paris and Universite Paris 13, also at Queen's University Belfast as Charles Wallace Fellow, and guest faculty at Freie University, Berlin and at University of California at San Diego and at Santa Cruz. She is a well known writer of literary fiction. She joined JNU in 1997, having taught 13 years previously at Hindu College. Email: susanvisvanathan@gmail.com
* **Trevor Marchand** is Professor of Social Anthropology at SOAS and recipient of the RAI River’s Medal (2014). He is trained in architecture (McGill), anthropology (SOAS), and fine woodwork (Building Crafts College). Marchand has conducted fieldwork with masons and craftspeople in Yemen, Mali and East London. He is the author of Minaret Building and Apprenticeship in Yemen (2001), The Masons of Djenné (2009), and The Pursuit of Pleasurable Work (forthcoming); and editor of, among others, Making Knowledge (2010) and Craftwork as Problem Solving (forthcoming). He has produced and directed documentary films and curated exhibitions at the Royal Institute of British Architects in London and the Smithsonian Institution in Washington DC. Email: tm6@soas.ac.uk
* **Wan- Lee Chen:** Ph.D. in Design and Applied Arts, the University of Edinburgh, UK.
Director of Center for the Traditional Arts and professor at the Department of Theatrical Design and Technology at Taipei National University of the Arts.  Research and design interests include theater arts, traditional textiles and crafts. Recent teaching and research projects involve bridging traditional and contemporary arts with innovative artistic approaches. Email: wanlee.c@gmail.com
* **Woralun Boonyasurat**: Head, Thai Art Department, Faculty of Fine Arts, Chiang Mai University, Thailand. Email: woralun@gmail.com
* **Yoko Inoue**: Originally from Kyoto, Japan, Yoko Inoue is a multidisciplinary artist based in Brooklyn, New York. She has worked as an assistant to archivists at the National Museum of Ethnology in Osaka, Japan and Japan Society in New York in the Performing Arts Department prior to MFA degree at Hunter College of the City University of New York. Inoue explores the commoditization of culture, assimilation and identity issues in the form of installation and public intervention performance art. Often using traditional ceramic methods, the underlying theme of her object making is derived from her examinations of economic factors, cultural values, socio-political implications behind products in the context of globalization. Inoue’s work has been shown at Brooklyn Museum, Sculpture Center, Momenta Art, The Bronx Museum and Art in General in New York, UCLA, Yerba Buena Arts and other national and international venues. She has received Guggenheim Fellowship, The Joan Mitchell Grant, NYFA Fellowship, Lambent Fellowship, Jerome Foundation Travel and Study Grant, Franklin Furnace Performance Fund, LMCC GAPS 9-11 Fund, State Department Cultural Specialist Grants, Anonymous Was A Woman Award and other grants. Residencies include Skowhegan, .ekwc (European Ceramic Work Center) in The Netherlands, Civitella Ranieri in Italy and Sacatar Foundation in Bahia, Brazil. Most recently she was awarded Paris Residency by Direction des Affaires Culturelles (Mairie de Paris) and Lower Manhattan Cultural Council of New York. Currently Inoue is a faculty member of Visual Arts at Bennington College, Vermont USA. Email: inoueyokonyc@gmail.com
* **Yuko Kikuchi** is a Reader at TrAIN (Research Centre for Transnational Art Identity and Nation) and CCW graduate school at University of the Arts London. Her key works include Mingei Theory and Japanese Modernisation: Cultural Nationalism and ‘Oriental Orientalism’ (RoutlegeCurzon, 2004), Refracted Modernity: Visual Culture and Identity in Colonial Taiwan (University of Hawai‘i Press, 2007), and special issues: ’Transnational Modern Design Histories in East Asia’, The Journal of Design History, 27-4 (2014) and ‘Negotiating Histories: Traditions in Modern and Contemporary Asia-Pacific Art’, World Art, 5-1 (2015).  She is currently working on a book about Russel Wright and the US intervention in Asian design during the Cold War, and on a Critical Reader of East Asian Design. Email: y.kikuchi@chelsea.art.ac.uk
1. **Program Schedule:**

***Day 01, March 16, 2015***

***Opening Session: 10.00 – 11.00am***

* Introductory words by the organizing institution representatives
* Participant introductions (1 minute each)
* Objectives of the RT in relation to the Mellon-supported project "Rethinking Asian Studies in the Global Context"
* Briefing on the modus operandi for an interactive Roundtable

*Coffee: 11.00 – 11.30 am*

***Session 1: 11.30 – 1.00pm***

**PART 1: THE NECESSITY OF CRAFT AS PEDAGOGY

Craft as Pedagogy, for Whom and Why?**

With reference to the recommendations of the Chiang Mai RT on textile and to other materials produced by participants in preparation to the present RT, discussions will centre on the notion of craft as pedagogy from below in all its multiple layers and complexities. The questions *for whom*and *why* will be pointedly addressed.

*Lunch: 1.00 – 2.00pm*

***Session 2: 2.00 – 3.30pm***

**Ideas, Institutions and Practices from Asia - Historical and Contemporary**

Discussions will focus on various past and present conceptions, ideas, institutional / programmatic arrangements and subaltern practices that can provide us with models and references from different parts of Asia.

*Coffee: 3.30 – 4.00pm*

***Session 3: 4.00 to 5.30pm***

**Gaps to be filled: For an Alternative Humanistic Educational Model in/for/from Asia?**

Discussion on various ideas, institutional arrangements and subaltern practices continues, with a special focus on *the existing gaps and limitations needed to be tackled.*

***Day 2, March 17, 2015***

**PART 2 - AN ALTERNATIVE PEDAGOGICAL MODEL?**

The following sessions are about *inventing* alternative pedagogical models or systems, taking craft as a fundamental form of humanistic knowledge transmission.

***Session 1: 9.30 – 11.00am***

**Craft Pedagogy as Early Education?**

Discussions will examine Craft as an integrative mode of early knowledge transmission *beyond*traditional dualist models (mind vs body, theory vs praxis).

*Coffee: 11.00 – 11.30am*

***Session 2: 11.30 – 1.00pm***

**Craft Pedagogy as Advanced Education?**

Discussion on whether Craft Knowledge and Practice can be framed as a valid, recognized and ultimately sanctioned advanced pedagogy, *beyond*Western cannons of ‘formal education’?

*Lunch: 1.00 -2.00pm*

***Session 3: 2.00 – 3.30pm***

**Concluding Reflections and Prolegomena for Craft-based Learning: Outlining Strategic Elements of a (Pilot) Model of Alternative Pedagogy through Crafts?**

Drawing together the various strands of the Roundtable discussion into a concrete proposal for an alternative pedagogy through crafts.

*Tea: 3.30 – 4.00pm*

***Session 3 (continued): 4.00 – 5.00pm***