



THE ELEVENTH  
ANGLO-ISRAEL  
COLLOQUIUM

MEASURING  
THE VALUE  
OF THE ARTS

MISHKENOTSHA'ANANIM,  
JERUSALEM,  
30 OCT-1 NOV, 2015

# MEASURING THE VALUE OF THE ARTS

THE ELEVENTH ANGLO-ISRAEL COLLOQUIUM

**THE ANGLO-ISRAEL COLLOQUIUM** was launched in 1997 at the initiative of the Anglo-Israel Association in London, with the aim of bringing together every one or two years, a select number of people from Great Britain and Israel, to discuss a particular topic which varies from year to year. The hope is that the participants, drawn from many walks of life, some of them experts in the field under discussion, others having a wide general interest and breadth of experience, will be able to share ideas, thoughts and practical knowledge, in the hope that the results can be to the mutual benefit of both countries. Our discussions at past Colloquia have frequently led to continued contacts, joint activities and sharing of information.

The Colloquia are organized by two steering committees, one in London and one in Israel, under the auspices of the Anglo-Israel Association, in keeping with its objective of helping to develop wider understanding between the British and Israeli people. I would like to take this opportunity of expressing my thanks to David Elliott, who has been my opposite number in London as coordinator of the Colloquia for the past 16 years and has decided that enough is enough! His help has been invaluable and the Colloquia would not have succeeded without his contribution. My thanks also to Ms. Ruth Saunders of the Anglo-Israel Association for her cooperation throughout the planning period, and finally but by no means least, to Dr. Pamela Peled who was a very efficient and painstaking rapporteur for this Colloquium, and to Ms. Caron Sethill for her editing of the Report for publication.

The following is a list of the ten Colloquia that preceded the present one:

1. 1997 Wiston House, Sussex: "The Politics of Heritage"
2. 1998 Beit Gabriel, Sea of Galilee: "The Arts and Culture: whose Responsibility?"
3. 2000 Kibbutz Ma'aleh Hahamisha, Judean Hills: "Power and Responsibility – the Role of the Media in the Information Age"
4. 2001 Balliol College, Oxford: "The Universities: What are They for and can we Afford Them?"
5. 2004 Mitzpe Ramon, Negev Desert: "Ensuring a Healthy Environment for Future Generations: is Development Sustainable?"
6. 2005 Kibbutz Ginosar, Sea of Galilee: "Multiculturalism – A Comparative Perspective"
7. 2007 Kibbutz Kfar Blum, Northern Galilee: "Wealth and Happiness: Quality of Life in Israel and the United Kingdom"
8. 2009 Kfar Maccabiah, Ramat Gan: "In Loco Parentis: Who Should Raise our Children?"

9. 2011 Neveh Ilan, Judean Hills: "Genetics and Society"
10. 2013 Mishkenot Sha'ananim, Jerusalem: "Ethics and Responsibility in an Interconnected World"

This year's Colloquium revisited a topic that we had first tackled back in 1998. In the 15 years that have passed there have been major changes in the way the arts and culture in general are perceived by the public, entrepreneurs and administrators of cultural events, public and private corporations and foundations, donors and philanthropists, and above all, the government and local authorities. The topic is one of great interest and relevance to both countries especially with regard to what can be considered "low" as opposed to "high" art and to what extent either or both should be funded – and by whom – if indeed they should be at all.

It is my pleasant duty to acknowledge the financial support provided by the Sainsbury Family Charitable Trusts, the Clore Foundation, Jerusalem; Paul Brett, Sheila and Denis Cohen Charitable Trust, Jerusalem Foundation, Sidney and Elizabeth Corob Charitable Trust, Bank Leumi UK and other anonymous donors without whom this Colloquium could not have taken place.

**Asher Weill**

Convenor

Jerusalem

FROM SIR ANDREW BURNS, CHAIR, UK  
STEERING COMMITTEE, THE ANGLO-  
ISRAEL COLLOQUIUM

It is a great pleasure, as the new chair of the Steering Committee in the UK, to introduce this report on the 2015 Anglo-Israel Colloquium. It was yet another very successful discussion of a policy issue of topical importance, in this case Measuring the Value of the Arts. We were deeply grateful to the hospitality and organising skills of our Israeli hosts.

But I am particularly delighted also to be able to use this opportunity to pay tribute to my predecessor, Lilian Hochhauser, for her outstanding leadership of the Anglo-Israel Colloquia over the last 20 years. Lilian's devotion and commitment to building greater understanding and friendship between Israel and the people of the United Kingdom has been remarkable and influential. She has played a key role in the activities of the Anglo-Israel Association. For the Colloquia and their participants she has truly been our guiding spirit and dearest muse.

At the same time we in the UK are delighted to welcome Professor Michael Turner as the new chair of the Steering Committee in Israel. I would also like to welcome Joel Cohen who has taken upon himself the UK co-ordination of the Colloquia, replacing the indefatigable David Elliott to whom we give our very deepest thanks for his years of enthusiastic help and support.

**Andrew Burns**

FROM PROFESSOR MICHAEL TURNER,  
CHAIR, ISRAEL STEERING COMMITTEE,  
THE ANGLO-ISRAEL COLLOQUIUM

This was the first Colloquium after the passing of our friend Viscount David Herbert Samuel, in October 2014. Professor Samuel was the first Israeli Chair of the Anglo-Israel Colloquia and took his role seriously incementing ties between our two countries. He took pride in the academic, social and economic achievements of Israel and was happy that they be shared with a wider British audience. He was anxious to develop new ideas and was excited to hear about promising fields and innovation. Accompanying the Colloquium over all these sessions, David was a warm personality with a joke for all situations. We will miss his bonhomie and erudite guidance.

Our debates have often included the arts and in Measuring the Value of the Arts, we revisited many of the issues debated in previous Colloquia. The coordination by our chairpersons, and Professor Michael Levine with our indefatigable convener Asher Weill made for excellent deliberations and heated exchange. They have set the bar high for our next event to take place in 2017.

The skillful guidance of the two co-chairpersons, Claire Fox and Professor Michael Levine, kept our deliberations energized and in focus and made for excellent deliberations and heated exchanges. They have set the bar high for our next event to take place in 2017.

I would like to thank our indefatigable convener, Asher Weill for keeping us on track as usual. Allow me also to thank Lilian Hochhauser for her wonderful leadership and support since the beginning of the Colloquia and especially for the one that has concluded, although she was unfortunately unable to attend. Finally, I welcome my counterpart Sir Andrew Burns, who together with Sarah are no newcomers to Israel.

**Michael Turner**



# REPORT

THE ELEVENTH ANGL0-ISRAEL COLLOQUIUM  
MEASURING THE VALUE  
OF THE ARTS





**CO-CHAIRS:** Claire Fox (UK), Michael Levin (Israel)

The Colloquium opened with Setting the Scene: The State of the Arts in the UK and Israel – where the co-Chairs presented a brief ‘snapshot’ of public support and funding of the Arts in their respective countries and challenged the group to a ‘no-holds barred’ discussion on the topic.

The Co-Chairs proposed some questions for the Colloquium to consider, ranging from the pragmatic to the philosophical.

- What is the role of government in supporting art and culture in a democracy?
- Does culture add to quality of life?
- Should art exist for art’s sake alone, or taking an instrumental approach, must it serve a social purpose?
- Facing funding pressures, how does one demonstrate value for money, reach wider audiences without compromising quality?

The ensuing discussion reflected on these questions highlighted the respective differences between Israel and the UK, in particular with regard to levels of funding, and within Israel the funding gaps between Jewish and Arab culture, the increased political pressures on Arts institutions in Israel.

Ticket prices and accessibility was also raised, and an unapologetic but controversial claim was made for Western Art ‘ which is the best that humanity has to offer’

The themes raised in the Opening Session were revisited and explored in the ensuing sessions, providing a multi-layered and powerful debate throughout the two days.



## **SESSION 1: Arts and Education**

What is the role of the arts in education and outreach?

Chair: Richard Howells

Speakers: Adi Stern, Ken Arnold

Respondents: David Behar, Carina Westling

Speakers presented examples showing the power of visual design on the educational experience, creating 'magic in education' and attractive and effective tools for learning. The view that art enables us to shake off routine and find ourselves through experiencing the world around us is a platform for the role of art in education. Art should touch more than just artists; it should help us to investigate our own experiences, and in the ensuing discussion, participants asked whether the process of making art was more important than the art itself.

It was noted that new technology means that art and new ideas are created differently, and can be publically shared. Breaking away from the bonds of 'traditional' education, art can inject creative and investigative thinking into an experiential process of learning. Experiential production includes effort, aesthetic, meaning and discipline, and can work with classical texts. However, it was challenged that these experiential approaches should not take the place of learning traditional texts and some advocated for a mix of experiential and real study and research.

A general observation was made that there was reluctance to engage in what should be taught, while educators at the same time obsessed over how to teach it. It was noted that today art education is diminishing in many schools where it is seen as secondary and not preparing pupils for life; where the language of science is needed for the global village.

It was asked how awarding academic degrees in art impacts on the concept of artistic excellence.

'Today we have given up on effort and quality, beauty and truth, and value 'quirkiness' and what's 'out there;' noted one participant 'yet we still have to teach 'the real thing.'"

## **SESSION 2: The Arts and Society**

*Public spaces: museums and galleries. Are the high arts necessarily elitist? What can science and the arts offer each other in the digital age? Can the arts be significant agents of regional development and invisible exports or is this just wishful thinking and special pleading?*

Chair: Aya Luria

Speakers: Michal Rovner, Harry Witchel

Respondents: Said Abu Shakra, Ken Arnold

The Chair opened by presenting a contemporary art museum founded to commemorate sons and soldiers killed in the war - a combination of a cultural art center and a place of commemoration.

Michal Rovner discussed the spaces where Art is placed : museums, which honour art; galleries which praise and price it; and private collectors who don't show their collections – each with subsequent impacts on the artist's custodianship.

The intersections between arts and science were discussed. The SciArt project of 1996-2006 facilitated the connections between science and art, fostered interdisciplinary and collaborative creative practice in the arts and science - aiming ultimately to create new understanding that can be applied to health and medicine, behavior and society. Unintended outcomes included the re-engagement of people with art, more critical conversations about Science and reigniting a sense of art as a way to engage with powerful ideas. Artists and scientists perceived mutual benefits from collaboration - Art can provide a refuge for difficult questions and provide inspiration for scientists.

Arts as a platform for change was exemplified in the personal narrative of Said Abu Shakra, as a refugee and minority after his family was displaced in 1948, he believes that art can create a revolution and bring equality with the Jews. He established an art museum in Umm el-Fahem, creating a narrative that Jews can touch, to come and see good work, and Arabs would not feel like victims. Despite, political turmoil and vandalism at his museum, he chose to deal with life through art and not violence.

The discussion touched on challenges for museums today and their sustainability. Should there be museums devoted to design, or should design be integrated into general museums? Museums are 'unruly' spaces and only very rarely do things happen there as expected. It was suggested that this contradiction is the great recourse of museums, and they don't need to resolve issues. Presenting them is enough.



**SESSION 3:** Measuring the Value of the Arts

*Music, dance, theatre, happenings, is it sophistry to ask 'What can the arts do for our economy?' rather than 'What can the economy do for our arts?'*

Chair: YinamLeef

Speakers: Omer Krieger, Tiffany Jenkins

Respondents: Shimon Levy, Ben Walmsley.

YinamLeef suggested replacing 'economy' in the title with 'community' and considered the question through the perspective of music, suggesting that modern societies are losing singing, brass bands etc. that are at the core of community, in favour of more individual music.

The centrality of audiences ie 'the public' was raised - artwork is made of people and meaningless without them. Every person can be an artist and, moreover, should use art to take a stand on issues of conflict. An example was given of the flawed methodology by the Edinburgh Festival, to make a case for public funding of the arts – reduced to attendance numbers and financial impact on the city. Although Festivals do make a financial impact, that is not the reason to fund them. In the 1940s, in times of dire economic straits, the Arts Council was founded to foster art. It is in the public good to fund the arts and the appetite for valuing art only in economic terms devalues it.

It was argued further that the value of art as qualitative cannot be measured in terms of quantity. Israeli theatre began at its peak, Levy claimed and since then almost all theatre caters to the lowest common denominator. He deplored the increased involvement of politicians in using government funding to determine which drama school-kids should watch. He proclaimed that every morning artists should 'bite the hand that feeds them.'

In the ensuing discussions, someone countered that politicians are elected to make judgements with public money, and there is a place for economic factors in calculating what art to fund, but by choosing projects based on criteria rather than pure artistic merit, public funding turns artists into bureaucrats.

Ben Walmsley suggested that to monetize is to focus on the least important facet of art, and actually to reduce its value. He proposed the triple bottom line for measuring arts - by economic impact, social or instrumental worth and their intrinsic value. Audiences, he said, never see art in economic terms, art is measured by its meaning, the memories it arouses, and in human terms. Can the arts can really lift downtrodden people's spirits. The claim that "All you need is opera," is a lie, all people really need is bread.

Funding new art ' that flourishes in the cracks' can lead to exciting big ideas. New art needs to be exposed to give it the chance to flourish. It was noted how Biennials have sprouted up in so many cities since the 90s. Perhaps these events help the economy, but what do they do for art? Conversely, perhaps we should aim to inspire people to love the arts without major state intervention?

It was also noted that the cultural life of a country affects how it's viewed internationally. There was disagreement over whether art should be seen as bridge building and promoting peace and universal values; and ,according to one participant, in Israel art can even reinforce differences.

**SESSION 4:** Excellence and Accessibility for Different Publics

*How can the arts, architecture and design be made more accessible? Is there a conflict between high quality and popularity, between excellence and accessibility?*

Chair: David Elliott

Speakers: Ezri Tarazi, Angus Kennedy

Respondents: Joseph Cory, Igor Toronyi-Lalic

The Chair opened by examining the vocabulary of 'excellence' and "high quality"? Art that has passed the test of time, or bears repeated exposure? Awarded some honour by experts? Does it reveal its greatness slowly; is it crafted well?

Ezri Tarazi focused on design and accessibility- industrial designers commenting on political events; exemplified by his tables created from maps – some ending up as collector items, becoming inaccessible to the public. Other designers blend utilities with art, so design is becoming a more acceptable, legitimate, powerful type of art. By using industrial manufacturing, high design can become more accessible to the buying public.

Joseph Cory argued that whereas architects used to be on the top of a pyramid, he believes in a flat pyramid where everyone in the building chain is equally important. He defined BIM – Building Information Modelling – where all information is accessible from the beginning. Through modern technology and apps people can learn remotely about buildings; all is accessible to all.

Angus Kennedy declared that the arts, architecture and design should NOT be made more accessible. He claimed that high art has been knocked off its pedestal and it's time to put it back. In his view there is no conflict between excellent and popular; the conflict arises between excellent and accessible. Great works of art, he claimed, can raise us up while including the new; these great works express humanity and outlast us, providing a vision of heaven on earth and thus deserving of special treatment.

Igor Toronyi-Lalic claimed there are historical myths that 'the arts were once popular,' claiming that orchestras are more accessible today than they ever were, and that opera has always been accused of being boring. In his opinion arts should not all be free; everyone, he claimed, (to dissent from the forum) has 15 pounds for a ticket. Class propels people to visit 'high art' but he would rather people said something meaningful about 'low art.'

There was discussion about whether it is good for the public to be told what is beautiful, new, and complex, noting that sometimes guidance is necessary. The term 'excellence' has subverted its own authority - if everything is the best, nothing can be the best. Ethical and moral values should be considered alongside excellence.

There was disagreement on whether the public can make a purely rational decision about art –when art is irrational and makes us laugh and cry. It was suggested that a work of art does not need to be understood; but to create a dialogue between the artist and the person who views it. Permanent work can be seen by millions of people and public art is accessible to all types of people, not only those who patronize museums. There was a discussion on whether there is a moral imperative for art to be available to the tax payer, leading to a discussion on whether museums should be free – or is beauty relatively rare, and therefore needs special treatment?





**SESSION 5:** Promoting the Arts – Press and Media

*Is there a danger that if we don't promote widespread appreciation of the arts they will remain a luxury for those who have the time, education and money to enjoy them? Or should we accept the primacy of the arts as a freely chosen private pleasure, however difficult it is to make this case in a cash strapped democracy?*

Chair: Asher Weill

Speakers: David Witzthum, Igor Tononyi-Lalic

Respondents: Ruth Direktor, Ben Walmsley

Respondents: Joseph Cory, Igor Tononyi-Lalic

Asher Weill opened the discussion with two examples: The Jerusalem Book Fair – the first of its kind to be open to the public and without charge. "Ariel" Magazine for the arts and culture was published by the Foreign Ministry, in six languages, English, French, German, Spanish, Russian and Arabic. The magazine was closed down in 2003 by government decision, ostensibly on budgetary grounds. Since then the country has no serious cultural outreach in languages other than Hebrew.

David Witzthum, a veteran broadcaster with the Israel Broadcasting Authority, explained that the government has decided to shut it down and create something else, which he suspects will be pro-government and not independent. The IBA was modelled on the BBC, decisions about audiences and what should be broadcast was based on "the great and the good." rejecting party politics and had a vision of itself as contributing to nation building. Mass culture TV, 'invented' after the Six Day War TV, translated national themes to culture – music, talk shows, comedy series. "It held the torch of nationalism and culture while Israel was starting to fall apart". Witzthum noted that until the 80s and Russian immigration, TV did not represent its diverse audience "Today mainstream local culture is being scorned," he claims, "and Channel One is becoming an enemy." There is not one culture programme on Channel One, despite arts and culture flourishing in the country as never before.

Igor Tononyi-Lalic professed that in his opinion arts don't need promotion. Journalists should simply report on art in a dispassionate and disinterested way. Art existed before critics and will exist after them, he said, adding that culture is healthier without marketing. He argued that people enjoy art and if they don't like things we should accept that they are not very good. "Our souls will not be diminished by the absence of 'great art' and orchestras can evolve into something else," he declared.

Ruth Direktor argued that as a journalist, lecturer and writer about art she saw it as her mission to mediate between the contemporary world of art, the artist and the public – to make art accessible. Modernist art talk was initially characterized as authoritative and non-democratic and then it became too open-ended and vague – this became an obstacle to public accessibility. Today the public know what they like and say so with self-confidence, yet she lamented the fact that many of the public are becoming passive and intellectually lazy.

Ben Walmsley there is a false dichotomy in accepting the premise that arts are good for the soul but being hesitant to promote them. He sees a challenge in finding ways to engage an audience with new things while at the same time leaving arts to be a freely chosen private pleasure. On the subject of accessibility Walmsley disagreed that people would value arts more if they had to pay expensive ticket prices, calling for lowering financial barriers as well as lowering the "threshold anxieties" of audiences who are unfamiliar with for example, how they are expected to dress for opera. This idea was met with some derision from some, who said it presents the public as being feeble-minded.

The participants examined the role of critics in promoting accessibility of art. There was dissension about Tononyi-Lalic's Darwinist approach to the arts. Another viewpoint posited that while it's preferable that the critic be an expert, he must not make audiences suspend their own judgement.

Questions were raised about 'Public Art', does the public pay for and choose it? Are the borders blurred between high and popular art? Is personal taste influenced by directors of festivals, for example, deciding what art to promote?

Most participants agreed that the role of critics is to say "this is worth listening to, or worth reading." "Billions of people have lived happy and fulfilled lives without being in the 'club of the initiated' we don't have to worry if all art is not accessible". However, it was agreed that art speaks a universal language and that anyone can see beauty on some level, the barriers that exist can be overcome.

**SESSION 6: Whither Policy and Management in the Arts**

*Does public support and financial investment mean that the arts are dependent less on their intrinsic worth and more on their contribution to improving well-being and quality of life?*

Chair: Angus Kennedy

Speakers: Caron Sethill, Richard Howells

Respondents: Michael Levin, Tiffany Jenkins

Angus Kennedy introduced the subject by wondering whether we are overburdening the arts – can they really bring world peace or build bridges? He suggested that art is not that all-powerful and that expecting such results from art will lead to its being found lacking.

Caron Sethill also wondered whether more money for the arts improves well-being. In Israel government funding represents only 21% of the cultural budget; and far below the UNESCO recommended one percent of the national budget for the art. The problem in Israel now is the politicization of conditions for government funding, in previous years professional merit was the overriding criterion. However, we need to ask whether arts funding should reflect the ethnic and religious composition of society. How much funding is needed for people to make their own choices? Is well-being about experiencing art or participating in art? Perhaps the public interest should be to create conditions for people to be creative. British Academy research that claims in order to harness Science and Technology to really improve well-being we need to understand what makes us human, Arts are fundamental to this.

Richard Howells asked if 'whither' should be 'wither' – is it a question or a fervent wish? He then discussed government policy vis-à-vis funding the arts; the Thatcher government was not interested but the New Labour government declared funding the arts was an investment for the economy and for society. This has resulted in a cumbersome bureaucratic process and the issue of control – monetization turns artists into public servants. He proposed a 'dangerous' remedy: that artists and art organizations decide to stop accepting government funding – not to free the tax payer, but to free the arts. However he admitted that finding alternative funding would be difficult; philanthropy is hard to obtain, corporate funding also comes with strings attached. In conclusion, he argued, arts must not be measured by their contribution to society and the economy but for art's sake alone.

Michael Levin maintained that money does not always generate wished for results – citing the Netherlands and France. In the UK artists are wary of being told what to do with government funding, while in Israel government funding is so low that artists just beg for it, and worry about the consequences later.

Tiffany Jenkins argued that there are two problems with not taking money: the market can't determine what we value as art as it won't support what is expensive or alternative. In addition, Western society has stopped thinking about arts as a good thing in and of itself, and the constraints of the economy and social good will guide appreciation of arts.

The difference between government spending on the arts in Britain and in Israel was discussed: and the distrust of setting funding targets. Although there is a desperate need for funding for culture in Israel, this does not mean that more money leads to excellence. One participant claimed that in the UK state funding has been a disaster, stating that the state isn't interested in art, rather in art

as solving problems – and that is too much to expect from art. There was disagreement on the issue of whether a government which is voted in by the electorate and then funds art that fits the political leanings of that electorate is democratic. There was some discussion about the political nature of arts; some participants thought that it should not be political, while others thought that political ideas are intrinsic to art.

It was noted that the problem with taking public funding combines the worst of capitalism – you're on your own – with the worst of socialism – do as you're told. The bottom line, one participant claimed, was that art tells us who we are, and who we would like to be. Artists should be free to make these choices.

# UK PARTICIPANTS

CLAIRE FOX	Director, Institute of Ideas, London (UK Chair)
DR. KEN ARNOLD	Head of Public Programmes, Wellcome Trust
DAVID ELLIOTT	Past Director, British Council in Israel, UK Colloquium Coordinator
ALAN GEMMELL	Director, British Council in Israel
DR. RICHARD HOWELLS	Dept. of Culture, Media and Creative Industries, Kings College, London
TIFFANY JENKINS	Cultural commentator, journalist
ANGUS KENNEDY	Institute of Ideas. Author; Being Cultured:in Defence of Discrimination
IGOR TORONYI-LALIC	Arts Editor,Spectator
DR. BEN WALMSLEY	Lecturer in Audience Engagement, School of Performance and Cultural Industries, University of Leeds
DR. CARINA WESTLING	Lecturer, University of Arts London. Media and Cultural Studies
DR. HARRY WITCHEL	Lecturer in Physiology, Brighton and Sussex Medical School

## GUEST SPEAKER

HON. DAVID QUARREY      British Ambassador to Israel



# ISRAELI PARTICIPANTS

PROF. MICHAEL LEVIN	Shenkar College of Engineering and Design (Israeli Chair)
SA'ID ABU SHAKRA	Director, Umm el-Fahem Art Gallery
DAVID BEHAR	Director, MediaLab, Technion, Haifa
DR. JOSEPH CORY	"Green" Architect, Geotectura, Haifa
ELLA GERA	Lawyer, active in political and cultural issues
RUTH DIREKTOR	Curator, Contemporary Art, Tel Aviv Museum
AMINA HARRIS	Lawyer, active in social and cultural affairs
OMER KRIEGER	Artist producing actions, social and media events in public space
PROF. YINAMLEEF	Composer, President, Jerusalem Academy of Music
PROF. SHIMON LEVY	Professor of Theatre Studies, Tel Aviv University
DR. AYA LURIE	Director and Chief Curator, Herzlia Museum of Contemporary ART
MICHAL ROVNER	Video Artist

CARON SETHILL	National and University Library, Jerusalem
PROF. ADI STERN	Graphic designer; President-Elect, Bezalel Academy of Arts and Design
PROF. EZRI TARAZI	Industrial Designer; Bezalel, Council of Higher Education
PROF. MICHAEL TURNER	Architect, Chair, Anglo-Israel Colloquium
ASHER WEILL	Publisher and Editor, Convenor, Anglo-Israel Colloquium
DAVID WITZTHUM	Radio and television journalist, specializing in culture and music

RAPPORTEUR: DR. PAMELA PELED  
COLLOQUIUM SECRETARY: JOY BROMLEY



## **ANGLO-ISRAEL ASSOCIATION**

PO BOX 47819, LONDON NW11 7WD

**T:** 020 8458 1284

**F:** 020 8458 3484

**E:** [INFO@ANGLOISRAELASSOCIATION.COM](mailto:INFO@ANGLOISRAELASSOCIATION.COM)

[WWW.ANGLOISRAELASSOCIATION.COM](http://WWW.ANGLOISRAELASSOCIATION.COM)

REGISTERED CHARITY NO. 313523

## **THE ANGLO-ISRAEL COLLOQUIUM**

PO BOX 7705, ISRAEL

**T:** +972 2 644 9707

**F:** +972 2 643 7502

**E:** [DEBASHER@NETVISION.NET.IL](mailto:DEBASHER@NETVISION.NET.IL)



**THE ANGLO-ISRAEL ASSOCIATION**