


cultural
leadership
programme



equality, leadership,
possibilities:
addressing social change



Culture operates in a global marketplace. International perspectives and exchanges are vital for cultural development here in the UK. The Cultural Leadership Programme's Dialogues on Leadership created a platform for debate and exchange on the broader issues and challenges that affect our creative and cultural leaders and society generally.

The opportunity to curate and chair the Dialogues was not to be missed. It was structured so as to give plenty of scope for discussion and facilitated the bringing together of those working within the sector with key contributors from other professional contexts: politics, international finance, sustainability and social justice, amongst others. The Dialogues took us around the country as we discussed the prospects for the creative and cultural industries sector and its leaders in the next decade; questioned whether we had really understood what it meant to be European; asked how the cultural sector could best engage with climate change; explored issues such as ethics and economics; and debated the challenges facing cultural leaders in a globalised world.

With an eye on key present-day issues such as equalities, diversity, and the stresses and strains as well as the pleasures of leadership, Dialogues on Leadership was also concerned to look to the future and to the world beyond the UK. These debates raised for us all the challenge of how we bring more reflection – indeed more sophistication – to how we debate and deliver on leadership and encourage new players, styles and pathways to success to flourish.

There are imaginative ways to address these issues. I'm convinced, for example, that we could make better use of the expertise of the diverse communities we have here in the UK. The 2012 Cultural Olympiad could provide a unique moment for really deep thinking about diversity and an opportunity to be more focused on the reality of contemporary, global life, although such thinking is as yet by no means secured.

The Dialogues on Leadership have made an important contribution to the debate. We now need to work together to turn our debates into action.

Baroness Lola Young of Hornsey OBE

Discourse and debate has been a key component of the Cultural Leadership Programme. We are committed to exploring how leaders from the cultural sector work across boundaries and share their experiences with others within and outside the sector. The aim of the Dialogues on Leadership, staged between 2006 and 2008, was to deliver a groundbreaking series of debates on the broader issues and subjects that affect our society and its future.

The Dialogues were structured around four broad themes: our world, our society, our aspirations and challenges, and the public arena. These themes allowed us to debate together intercultural exchange and dialogue in a global context. We reflected on the ways in which the experiences and insights of cultural and creative organisations and their leaders added real value to society. We looked at the personal challenges and issues facing cultural and creative leaders today. And we drew out the voices and contributions of cultural and creative leaders on some of the most pressing issues and developments of our time – climate change, for example. We also staged a series of linked debates under the heading Beyond Diversity. These drew articulate and passionate contributions from participants across generations as they debated afresh the subject of equal opportunities, of gender, race and disability.

We were delighted that Baroness Lola Young agreed to chair the Dialogues of Leadership and to have the opportunity to work in partnership with organisations such as Manchester International Festival, City University, Tipping Point and DALI.

We wanted to capture and extend the debate that went on in the Dialogues on Leadership. So we asked the commentator and policy developer Naseem Khan OBE to write an essay inspired by them. She has done this by engaging a number of international thinkers and inviting them to bring their own perspective to the themes of the Dialogues. The result, Equality, Leadership, Possibilities: addressing social change, is both a legacy from the Dialogues and a call to continue the debate on leadership. This is something the Cultural Leadership Programme is committed to doing.

Dr Hilary S Carty
Director, Cultural Leadership Programme

equality, leadership, possibilities: addressing social change



What do we need from leadership today? Could the cultural sector have developed the competencies that are particularly valuable now? Can it contribute? Can we afford for it not to? Today's conditions demand a reassessment. This essay suggests a role for cultural leaders that is richer, more significant and generally more relevant than has been traditionally perceived.

The theme of leadership might seem simple enough to begin with. We are conditioned by history and by countless novels and heroic works of art. The leadership style that they present draws heavily on genes and breeding, and on an individual's innate ability to inspire what has been termed, 'followership'.

Leadership, the legacy

Popular practice, with its emphasis on figures such as captains of industry, has compounded the idea of men of power and leaders of men. But reality rarely matches stereotypes and organisations have been quietly moving away from this Napoleonic version of leadership for some time. But the question is, in what direction have they been moving and how can new theories of leadership learn from and benefit the cultural sector?

The Cultural Leadership Programme, in collaboration with Cultural Brokers, devised and curated Dialogues on Leadership¹, a series of debates to address precisely these issues. This essay seeks to follow up some of the questions raised in the Dialogues' highly exploratory sessions. It has also called on a number of experts with views on how leadership operates within their particular sectors.

They come from a variety of standpoints. Educationalist Abha Adams from India, cultural activists Rose Juby and Basil Manning from South Africa, and media expert Kyril Razlogov from Russia have addressed varying aspects of the

¹ See Appendix 1: Dialogues on Leadership 2006-2008

nature of leadership in transitional economies. Baroness Lola Young, the curator of the Dialogues on Leadership, has reflected on the way in which racial integration is an aspect of structural change and wider equalities. UK consultant Julia Rowntree and Russell M Davies, founder of the Open Intelligence Agency and a blogging and branding expert, found themselves agreeing that a new language of communication had to be the key to leadership. Finally, Robert Palmer, the Council of Europe's Director of Culture, and Dragan Klaic, of the Feliks Meritis

Foundation, reflected on the nature and potential of a new Europe. Their views have fed into this piece and can be found in their entirety in Appendix 3.

The Dialogues on Leadership assumed as their starting point that cultural leaders need to engage on a wider plain than their arts and institutions alone. A changing world order has thrown up new and urgent issues – not least the economic turmoil in which we are all now engulfed. The way in which they are addressed cannot be a matter for politics and government alone. And culture has a very specific contribution to make.

The shifting landscape

The landscape for leadership has changed. Leaders now have to consider flatter and more lateral models of organisation. Organisational theory talks about the need to understand the importance of overall job satisfaction and participation. Existing now within a more flexible and democratic system

of global connections, leadership can no longer subscribe unquestioningly to the idea of the single isolated leader operating in a centralised command system. A globalised world has come to place a greater emphasis on interdependence. Migration, climate change, world recession – none of these can be solved by separate countries alone. And interdependence, in its turn, has come to place an emphasis on the skills needed to work across and with cultures.

These major shifts are not noises off, but the fabric of our present-day lives. The task of both the Dialogues on Leadership and the wider cultural debate has been to see how they can influence the sector and how they can be incorporated into thinking and planning.

What would assist the process? What impediments operate? How can they be overcome? Given that we now exist in a connected world it stands to reason that there are lessons to be learned from the experiences of others. The growth of global cultural connections implies the adoption of similar techniques and strategies. However, these could – as some of the contributors to this essay feel – undermine the local way of going about things. When does globalism shift from being a stimulant to a threat? Such issues cannot be avoided nor can the presence of different systems of thought and organisation.

The connection between the arts and public policy is a troubled and contentious area. Many artists and arts managers are troubled by a scenario that could line them up exclusively behind social

I would recognise a cultural leader as someone who can connect culture with the society and surrounding communities rather than identify with business or be a fellow traveller of politics; as someone who sees culture as a function of citizenship rather than of political power or any sort of group identity.

Dr Dragan Klaic

benefit. Dr Dragan Klaić, drawing on extensive experience in his native Yugoslavia and then with pan-European cultural bodies, warns of the perils of ignoring the creative imperative of the arts. Justifying culture in terms of economic impact exposes a deep and critical malaise: 'The current fashionable discourse on cultural or artistic leadership reveals the deep crisis of the established cultural organisations, the loss of their self-evident authority under the onslaught of globalisation, migration and explosive growth of the commercial cultural industry. The more that not-for-profit cultural organisations, public or private, are expected to behave as a business, the more notions of leadership get imposed on them. Leadership tends to imply a cultural superman, endowed with an artistic vision, suave with the media, inspiring the staff, excellent at fundraising, connected to an impressive network and a sponsors' darling.'

The notion of creativity has become a new driver for productivity as innovation is recognised as an engine of development. Market forces are continuously re-defining cultural life, where limitless consumer appetites are being proliferated. The advertising world and the visual and aural environment, combined with pervasive aestheticism and business dynamics, are requiring a continuous re-definition of cultural processes.

Robert Palmer

But neither Klaić, nor many people, would believe wholeheartedly in art for art's sake with no reference or connection to the world in which it arises. Indeed, Robert Palmer argues persuasively that 'cultural leadership now occupies a terrain that helps to bring about the marriage of cultural and political change'. But that terrain, he goes on to argue, requires very specific skills. 'The cultures of our communities are processes that extend or inhibit meaning, relationships and consciousness. Leadership no longer demands a mentality of command and

control but one of exploration, discovery, flexibility, reflexivity, empathy and personal responsibility.'

His view, from the Council of Europe, struck answering chords with the participants at the various Dialogues on Leadership. But they were far from certain that the current situation enables exploration, discovery, flexibility and so on. 'The job of leading a cultural organisation is even more difficult and challenging than leading a mainstream plc or a large, ordinary, public sector

organisation,' said Chris Smith, drawing on his earlier perspective as Secretary of State for Culture. In addition to all the usual skills, 'you have also to have a passion for the content of what your organisation is about. It's an absolutely essential ingredient for a cultural organisation.'

Market and mission

Other countries and cultures reported a similar battle to balance market and mission; organisation and creativity. India, says Abha Adams, has traditionally veered towards the latter. 'Leadership in India has always been problematic. For hundreds of years India has been ruled by invaders who have restricted access to leadership positions through caste, religion, class and dynasty, and though Independence brought a change of faces, it left the whole apparatus of colonial, dynastic, class and caste-based leadership largely intact. The 1950s saw a period of nation building which

concentrated on showcasing traditional and folk arts as India's cultural heritage, promoted in the main by government funding and the establishment of large, unwieldy bureaucracy-ridden arts institutions run by the state.'

Economic liberalisation has fuelled a rash of energetic new art forms in India: media, graphics, design technology, animation, a greater global arm to its mighty film industry. But it has also, Abha

Adams argues, revealed a lacuna. While 'these new cultural innovators are bringing a flexible, alert, more professional and entrepreneurial approach to cultural development and are now reaching positions of influence in a cultural hierarchy that had been dominated by state-sponsored cultural czars', they are doing so on the basis of a fragile professional base. Arts administration and management are not highly regarded careers and frequently it is

Western-returned graduates who bring back the skills they have learned overseas. This inevitably raises questions. How far are systems transferable? Does globalisation mean uniform strategies or can interchange be useful and healthy?

Ubuntu, the human face

Basil Manning would agree with Razlogov (see highlighted box). Long involved with cultural

developments in South Africa and Lesotho, Manning argues passionately about the need to remain faithful to tradition, culture and customs. It has not happened, he says, in Africa. 'The leadership model of a Western or European culture has systemically entrenched itself in the world and we appear powerless to break this cycle of designed deprivation and degradation. If Africa's gift is giving the world a more human face, how

we have failed!' And what is leadership, he argues, if it is insensitive to the traditions and conditions in which it operates?

It is worth looking a bit further into the human face that Manning recommends. He defines it in terms of the traditional quality of 'ubuntu'. 'Translating the Setswana expression captures it best: A person is a person through other people. What makes me human is my interconnectedness with you. I cannot meet

you; have eye-contact with you, without greeting you. The Zulu greeting 'Sa-wu-bo-na' means: I have seen you. I acknowledge your presence. You are part of me. When leadership or others act in an oppressive way the Tswana will immediately react: 'Ga ba batho', meaning 'They are not people. They have lost their humanity. There is no ubuntu.'

It is an attractive vision of sensitivity but perhaps not as limited to Africa as Manning would claim. Debates at the Dialogues on Leadership returned

Because Russian culture has been so essentially logo-centric or text-based, intellectual leadership in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries came mainly from writers such as Pushkin, Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, and then later from famous Soviet dissidents such as Solzhenitsyn....[but] with the arrival of a post-Soviet market economy, the older pattern has reasserted itself, with cultural leadership once again being vested in officialdom. The old traditional intelligentsia has collapsed economically and survivors have adopted a transatlantic style and values. Leading intellectuals and artists have come to be measured by their income or their frequency on TV screens.

Kirril Razlogov

time and again to the question of empathy. Defined by the Oxford English Dictionary as ‘the power of identifying oneself mentally with, and so comprehending, a person or object of contemplation’, it is surely ubuntu in a different dress.

Part of it involves the acknowledgement of mutual responsibility. Robert Palmer challenged a tendency to isolation or Little Englandism, and so did his European colleague, Ilona Kish, from the European Foundation for Arts and Heritage: ‘It’s quite humbling when one sees the work of cultural organisations and artists in many countries where they are literally facing the prospect of imprisonment on the basis of expressing their own view... Do we care about that and should we care about that? Do we care only about Britain or do we care about the world at large?’

But it goes deeper and further than simply a sense of responsibility. Palmer eloquently spoke for a new Europe where ‘art occupies a borderless world of relationships and flow; where everyone is increasingly connected on the web, in their networks; dependent on one another; and on one another’s individual and collective imaginations.’ And using the imagination, said Yvette Vaughan Jones, Director of Visiting Arts, in one of the Dialogues on Leadership, is what the cultural sector is all about. The cultural and creative industries are, she said, past masters of empathy. It necessitates an act of the imagination, the ability to step lightly from one version of a living reality to another. The knowledge of ‘several co-existing

narratives rather than a single one’ is second nature to artists. The gift that the arts have to give to audiences and participants is to nudge them away from the conditioning and values they had assumed were absolute in order to – for maybe a moment or maybe longer – share and understand another point of view.

Recognising cultural filters

Yvette Vaughan Jones talked about the need to become aware of the ‘cultural filters’ that are constantly affecting the judgments we make.

Others at the Dialogues on Leadership expanded on this from their own experience. It is, said one, ‘like travelling with baggage that you don’t notice. It only starts to weigh on you when you are on someone else’s pitch.’ Another talked about how Australian aborigines hold the

custom of ‘listening back’ in high regard. And ‘humility and openness’ everyone agreed, were the key attributes.

The value of such an awareness in our present-day fractured world cannot be anything but obvious. This is not, of course, a new discovery. Organisational theory has been moving away from the clichés of leadership for a long time. In fact, almost since the discipline’s inception, it has been testing out and transcending different models: from Trait Theory in the 1930s to Style Behavioural Theory; Contingency Theory to Charismatic Theory; and nowadays Transformational and Transactional Leadership Theory. Each involves different ideas of

Africa has strong cultural leadership models and values that entrench the human - ‘ubuntu’ - aspect of relationships and ideals. Where are they? Why are they hidden from the public discourse? Why are they not used as a filter for modern leadership models to find connections and congruency so that we develop ‘wholeness’?

Dr Basil Manning

what leaders need to do, how they came to be (born or made?), and most crucially, what sort of contract they establish with their followers. The talk nowadays of emotional intelligence surely belongs in the same box as empathy and even ubuntu.

It is striking how well that fits with the definition Graham Leicester used in his provocation paper *Rising to the Occasion: cultural leadership in powerful times*. 'The arts,' he wrote, 'are essentially in the meaning business. The ecology of the arts is an ecology of meaning. The arts are all about perception and re-perception, about narrative and sense-making, about human relationships and emotion, and about questioning and playing with rules rather than blithely following them. These are precisely the qualities we need to enrich if we are to navigate the transition to a more sustainable, effective and fulfilling global culture.'

The Dialogues on Leadership made a determined move to talk not about 'cultural diplomacy' but 'globalism'. Although it was not spelt out, it was clear that this meant a more profound relationship than the more separated and polarised model of 'diplomacy'. In the globalism model, an element of change or transformation, is assumed – not simply a matter of 'nation speaking truth unto nation'.

Its global reach makes it clear that Britain has a distinct asset in its own ethnic diversity. The health

of British society depends very much on developing the kind of skills described by Basil Manning and on the ability to 'listen back'. Rose Juby gives what can be read virtually as a prescription of the elements needed, whether here or in South Africa. 'The nub of the issue is that to lead effectively in a multicultural society, individuals require broad-based insights and contextual understanding, coupled with a good dose of self-understanding, humility and an ability and willingness to work effectively across diverse social systems.

South African organisations were exposed to global competition at the same time that they were dealing with internal transformation imperatives. This forced people far out of their comfort zones. To survive, South Africans who were former enemies suddenly found themselves challenged to become allies and work together. They had to put aside history - including their own stereotypes and prejudices - to depart from the known, engage in bold thinking, take risks and learn to rely on people who had had very different life experiences.

Rose Juby

'Leading successfully in a multicultural society begins and ends with an individual's ability to understand his or her own assumptions and paradigms, as well as how groups of people (potential followers) understand and interpret the world. Managers who aspire to be leaders in organisations in South Africa and who are oblivious to the

fundamentals have quickly come unstuck with their workforce, for reasons they do not begin to comprehend. Ignorance and arrogance are fatal leadership flaws.'

However, any sort of real listening is predicated on equality, and here lies a problem. At the Dialogues on Leadership it was agreed by the contributors that the key to a vibrant body of leadership lies in its being representative, but – they also agreed – the old ladders of class, gender, physical ability and race continue to dominate. It is not unquestioned.

The system is under attack on a number of fronts: in India from young entrepreneurs, in South Africa from new energies, from the disability movement in the UK. 'I want to get off my soapbox,' declared Jenny Sealey, Director of the Graeae Theatre Company, at one of the Dialogues. 'I'm tired of talking about deafness and disability!' And the wish of ICA Director, Ekow Eshun, for the arts centre that he directs concerned a kind of social accuracy: 'that cultural life of this country can be truly pluralist; that the cultural life of the institution can be truly the life we see around us, on the streets outside. Leadership is about vision and is about focus and about getting up every morning and being ready to try at least to change the world every single day.'

Equality is central

The urge for equality is a force that can and does crack old conventions in the arts. Diversity in Britain has stretched and invigorated local art forms. The choreography of Akram Khan – existing in a space between cultures, but where each stream contributes - is not alone in having shown new ways of expressing contemporary reality. But how far has management embraced equality? Black and Asian artists and administrators at the Dialogues on Leadership spoke tellingly of racial stereotypes that stood persistently in the way advancement. Even a successful one, such as Marc Boothe, who co-produced the film *Bullet Boy* and whose organisation, B3 Media, consistently

nurtures and advances new media talent, can say soberly, 'What I face as a producer is no different to a producer who isn't black but although they're the same challenges, I presume for me the stakes are higher.'

Despite a high proportion of women working in arts management, all too few have reached the upper echelons, suggesting to speakers at the Women at the Top debate that intervention is needed. 'There will always be stars that come through,' said Sue Robertson, Dean of Arts at

London's City University, 'so we need to look at things that are more securely rooted than that.' Institutional structures lag behind sensibilities. Only 11% of FTSE 100 directors are women. It will take 73 years for parity to be achieved based on the current rate of progress according to the Sex and Power report in 2008. It will take 200

years to achieve equal numbers of women members of Parliament. And it will take 55 years to achieve an equal number of senior women in the judiciary.

It is incredible but true that arguments for equality still need to be made. David Lammy was Minister for Culture when he opened the Man Talk Dialogue on Leadership. He could not have put it more clearly: 'A cultural leadership that comes solely from one community or gender will simply not be enough to sustain this country and keep us moving forward. The public at large needs wide narratives in the stories that are being conveyed;

What are some of the cultural changes demanding new navigation tools? One is arguably the recognition of the impact of a plurality of cultures and a pluralism of values that questions the very meaning of cultural expression and conventional approaches to cultural governance and participation. Old models are no longer working and are unable to deal with a cultural transformation that requires new flexible and adaptive organisational forms.

Robert Palmer

the public at large needs role models that they can identify with.'

But more is at stake than social justice alone. Equality implies more than simply a ceremonial opening of doors. At heart it concerns the reinvention of society. Each shift succeeds in changing assumptions and mindsets. Consider the comments made when women were first allowed into the House of Lords or enrolled as newsreaders. How ridiculous they now sound in their alarm and their concern. A moribund society cannot accommodate change; a vital one can only grow by it. Leading cultural critic, Kenneth Kwame Appiah put it more strongly in 2006: 'Cultures are made of continuities and changes, and the identity of a society can survive through these changes. Societies without change aren't authentic. They're just dead.'

A number of contributors saw opportunities for change. Lola Young, for example, described the potential inherent in London 2012: 'The creation of the 2012 Cultural Olympiad presents a unique opportunity for really deep thinking about diversity. Is that likely to happen? I certainly hope so because it could mark a decisive break with the old, unimaginative and unproductive models of working through this subject. A fresh way of thinking that can re-conceptualise notions of excellence and world-class in a way that doesn't simply replicate the status quo is urgently needed. We should be much more focused on the reality of contemporary, global life, and its possible futures.'

A new common language

Julia Rowntree recounts an experience that gives a clear account of the potential for change. In charge of development at the London International Festival of Theatre (LIFT), she had

become increasingly uncomfortable; aware of an intrinsic conflict. 'Business sponsorship was most usually secured for LIFT's shows through brand promotion and marketing benefits. Commercial values at times ran counter to LIFT's work with artists and young people. The Festival wished to find a more vivid form of engagement with people in business but did not know how to do this without a common language and from a position of inferior economic power.'

That essential imbalance turned out to have a solution that came from close at home – from creativity. 'To help LIFT think, a group of business advisers was convened around a simple, open, question: "Has business something to learn from the arts?" Responses provided the foundation for the LIFT Business Arts Forum. In the process, the Forum inspired new vocabularies and inventive approaches to seemingly intractable challenges in business, the public sector and the arts. Starting by not knowing proved to be an asset rather than an obstacle. LIFT found that it did not have to know all the answers at the outset. It did, however, have to take the risk of speaking differently. It needed to re-learn how to surface questions arising from the art, its wider context, and the assumptions and beliefs of all involved. It was art and our human response to it that inspired new vocabularies for inventive engagement with today's world.'

The way in which LIFT used its own strengths to find a way forward is heartening, and indicative. It reinforces Lola Young's call for a new language to debate change, leaving behind categories that have outgrown their purpose. 'We would simply welcome more reflection, more sophistication, about how we debate and deliver on diversity. Take terms like Black and minority ethnic or disabled people or working class. None of these categories are watertight. Yet they are used as

though they are fixed and unalterable. Most damagingly, the people ascribed to these groupings are viewed as having characteristics and behaviours that are also immutable.

'We could try concentrating much more on structural barriers to a diverse workforce and the professional cultures which keep them in place, instead of focusing on the perceived deficiencies of the individuals or communities that are the subject of current discourse on diversity. Much more active thought, leadership and commitment from national, regional and local organisations, both public and private sector, would be welcome.'

The example of the LIFT initiative suggests that Dragan Klaić's well-argued suspicions of business-speak might be able to be tempered. When LIFT set about creating a base of equal communication, then the nature of the connection became healthy. And this points towards a possible strand of leadership training. But less cheerily, it brings up a theme that found its way into the Dialogues on Leadership and that is far less positive. Klaić was right in identifying a crisis of confidence. The Realities and Revelations Dialogue on Leadership devoted a large proportion of its session to trying to devise arguments and evidence that would convince the wider world of the value of the arts. It became clear that this was a concern for many at the top of our arts organisations today. Consultant Graham Devlin reported on a series of private meetings he had had with Chief Executives on the issues of most concern to them. These included the isolation that comes with high office and the absence of a sustaining structure; and also a real concern that the arts - to which they devoted their working lives and not a little of their private lives - were, they felt, generally held in low esteem. It was undermining, demotivating and disempowering.

The needs of the times

The cultural sector is notable for getting its own house in order, and is responding instinctively to the needs of the times in the process. Connections, cross-disciplinary working, new partnerships and networks all came up as strategies and devices during the Dialogues on Leadership. The picture that emerged was a composite one of a more flexible organisation: less fixed, more open and malleable and more able to respond to change.

Film producer Marc Boothe named networking as one of his essential tools - not one network, but five of them: cultural, technological, social, business and personal. Together they form a shifting structure that gives him a considerable lateral reach but that also creates its own unexpected opportunities. Because they are not uniform, when elements from his diverse networks occasionally collide, innovation can result. It is a phenomenon that occurred, for instance, when LIFT's arts network met its business network.

Today's cultural leader is a networker - and has to be if he or she is to survive and thrive. 'The kinds of order we need now are different from those of the conquerors,' wrote Geoff Mulgan, in his 1998 book *Connexity: responsibility, freedom, business and power in the new century*. 'They are less permanent, less fixed, less brittle, more open to change. They are reciprocal, not hierarchical: open, not secretive. Their use, in other words, is that they make things predictable but in ways that can evolve and adapt.'

Mulgan's description anticipates the fierce and principled ethos of today's bloggers and digital marketing experts who reject hierarchy and closure out of hand and out of principle, looking for fluidity and dynamism in their working networks. Russell M Davies, influential founder of the Open

Intelligence Agency and blogger and brander, speaks for the movement (however much they might reject the term) when he argues that 'Leadership is a Myth':

'The cliché is true: the web only works because no-one's in charge. There are no leaders; it works splendidly without them. Wikipedia. Google. EBay. Amazon etc. Their power to transform culture is vested in the millions of people who contribute to them, not the "leaders" who made them. This is nudging anthropologists and psychologists into realising that leadership is a myth everywhere.

We fool ourselves into seeing it in lots of places – politics, companies, NGOs – but it's mostly coercion or persuasion via money or power. The Western stress on the idea of the individual has created these murky, distracting categories of leader and follower and they don't capture the

collective, societal way people actually work. You don't get those distractions online. It's a place of societies, communities, people, actions. A place where great things can happen without plans, schemes, leaders or chiefs.'

It is also a place where the heroic gesture is rejected. 'No-one wants any more big ideas. Leaders spouting big ideas haven't got us anything but trouble. The internet wants people who'll do things. Small, incremental, helpful things. A reputation for doing things is powerful digital juju. It'll get you a long way. As will a sense of humour and a tendency to write in lists. And small ideas are best expressed quickly and with the minimum

of fuss, which is why digital people don't worry about posters and printing and that kind of thing. They use any tool they can get their hands on - stuff that's easy, free and broad and has a built-in channel for talking back. And having played with these tools they've learned the value of living in a world that's broader than their own supposed expertise. They're not limited by the worlds of culture and art. They've played in other places. They can help an idea take flight because they can lift it beyond the boundaries of the world they're supposed to be in.'

Your networks all interchange throughout your daily life or business life and over time they create connections...And if there's one thing I've used more than anything else it is the fact that the more connections you have, the more leverage. The idea of extending that leverage through networks over time is really key. I don't think we do that enough. I've put people together that I've never met before and have realised that what glues everything together in terms of networks is trust.

Marc Boothe

There is a subversive bounce and playfulness about this that masks the real seriousness of the endeavour. But it has been adopted more as a marketing tool than an ethos in the arts. Theatre Royal Stratford East's hip-hop production, Da Boyz, in 2003 sent out text messages to hundreds of mobile

phones. Social networking and blogging and viral advertising have joined the ammunition of the marketeer. The National Theatre will email you to invite you to join an online chat room and talk about the show you've just seen. Radiohead know that they can sell their new album to you, and get a sell-out audience without advertisements, posters and flyers, by simply using the internet.

But although its digital clothes have been enthusiastically acquired, there is something far more noteworthy about this mode of being and marketing. It is quintessentially of its time, concentrating as it does on the ability to respond to the constant flow of new information and

players that the digital age provides. Its resistance to hard and fast solutions echoes its suspicion of hard and fast hierarchies. The porousness of the world it commends is a smaller version of the Europe Robert Palmer describes: 'What's interesting about the new Europe is that it is seeking to expand human empathy and not territory. Everyone is increasingly connected on the web, in their network, dependent on one another, one another's individual and collective imaginations. The old idea of a fixed self-contained autonomous consciousness seems to be giving way to a new notion of self in connection with others. And the same will happen with nations and states. It is simply a matter of time.'

The picture of freestanding, freewheeling, leaderless arts is engaging but can't be accepted without provisos and caveats. It fits small concerns well. 85% of creative and cultural industries employ fewer than five people, and they will thrive on networks and lateral connections. But it would need reshaping or mutating for larger concerns. The Royal Shakespeare Company, for instance, is rethinking itself along lines that strongly privilege involvement and participation across the board, but certainly under the guidance of a visionary top management.

Different leadership

It is possible to get carried away by the sheer volume of information that cascades down through

the internet. It needs leaders who are able to sift, sort and ascribe value in a way that they had not to do in earlier times. Malcolm Higgs, researcher and lecturer in organisational change, notes that big businesses now contract out whole areas of their work. A Chief Executive can no longer have total control or inside knowledge of all areas. This implies a new cast of thought that takes the Russell M Davies' formula into a rather different arena. Cultural commentator Jude Bloomfield, has surmised, '[this] might point to a role for different

kinds of leadership – critical thinkers and specialists, but ones who recognise they are only specialised in one sphere; people who cross over spheres/cultural worlds and networks and can translate between them; iconoclasts who can throw a spanner in the works and make people look afresh; rebels who are prepared to go against consensus... And

maybe a new emphasis on leadership that brings differences together; recognises strengths and virtues of each; plays off differences to clarify debates and policies; and can synthesise.'

Such shifts call for a far more holistic view of leadership and its development. Davies' insights are relevant, as are the speakers at the Dialogues on Leadership who focused so strongly on equality, connections and empathy. How can they all be accommodated within one paradigm? The values of openness and constant change surely must threaten the continuity and stability that society always needs for its under-pinning.

A cultural leader could be recognised by his or her ability to make their own organisation sustainable and distinctive through... a sharp sense of time and space: looking five years ahead, understanding their own immediate environment and connecting it with the wider world. For a UK cultural leader especially, a pro-European outlook and a familiarity with the variety of cultural conditions on the Continent would be more desirable than the habitual infatuation with everything American.

Dragan Klaić

Cross-fertilisation

A clear and useful direction came in a telling metaphor in the Young Foundation's 2007 report, Social Innovation. 'The story of change emphasises the interaction between the innovators and the environment in which they are working...between what could be called the "bees" and the "trees". The bees are the small organisations, individuals and groups who have the new ideas, and are mobile, quick and able to cross-pollinate. The trees are the big

organisations – governments, companies or big NGOs – which are poor at creativity but generally good at implementation, and which have the resilience, roots and scale to make things happen.'

Imagination needs to be cross-referenced and to cross-fertilise. Lola Young was speaking of diversity but her argument holds good in general: 'There are opportunities to address the issue imaginatively. For example, looking at the changing world economic order, I can't help thinking that this country is missing something in relation to the Diaspora and migrant communities based in the UK. Whether it's skills of translation – literally and metaphorically – or art form skills and creative energy, we should be able to make better use of their expertise in moving across cultures, in developing an ease with trans-national identities, in exploring fresh aesthetic sensibilities.'

Uncertainty, complexity and climate change shape the context of leadership today. All require imagination and inventiveness on an unprecedented scale. In our institutions – not only cultural – the vocabulary of economics, policy delivery and consumerism dominates. This narrow language creates a corresponding paucity of concepts. Cultural leaders have a vital role in enriching vocabularies and thus conceptual and inventive capacity across the board.

Julia Rowntree

The issue of leadership in the cultural sector is at heart the way in to wider change. It challenges old set structures. It offers a tool for relating creatively and appropriately across frontiers and cultures. It promises to add to social capital. And it supports Robert Palmer's optimistic view that 'cultural leadership now occupies a terrain that helps to bring about the marriage of cultural and political change'.

Divergent and complementary forms of leadership can do more than simply co-exist. They

can and should cross-fertilise (as in the metaphor of bees and trees) if we are to reap the full benefit of our current times. The creative and cultural industries are powerful triggers. They open the door to elements that are vital for survival – inclusiveness, equality, participation, innovation and creative change. They

develop qualities of empathy that are essential not only domestically but also internationally.

An integrated system, supported by government and expressed in a flexible framework, would encourage connections and interchange between elements that currently either know little of each other or contradict each other. It would facilitate dialogues and conversations in which the insights of one could be exposed to another. The bees and the trees, the social networkers and the chief executives, belong in the same world. They need each other, and we need the freshness,

innovation and creative social change that their combined presence and co-working could help deliver.

A far-sighted (and indeed self-interested) public policy would go further and investigate greater cross-referencing around ways of defining and developing leadership, using the competencies that culture and the arts specifically offer. The benefits – as so many in the Dialogues on Leadership attested – are not confined to the cultural sector. They carry relevance across a wide spectrum – education, trade, foreign relations, third sector and so on. Connections and partnerships have been seen to work. The Atana Programme in the Netherlands that began with developing inclusive management in the cultural sector, proved its case and has replicated its methodology in the education sector. LIFT's business/arts partnership, described by Julia Rowntree, brought advantages and new ways of thinking to both sides of the equation. Two examples certainly do not make a summer, but they are enough to merit far closer examination. Positive thinkers in general have touted the opportunity for creative thinking existing in an economic downturn. Both the need and the tools, this paper argues, lie to hand.

Naseem Khan OBE

Naseem Khan has been at the forefront of Britain's cultural change as commentator, policy developer and initiator for over thirty years. Her ground-breaking report, *The Arts Britain Ignores*, was the first to highlight the cultural work in ethnic minorities communities and to focus on its place within British culture.

She followed it up with a substantial body of work in cultural policy for organisations that include the Council of Europe, European Union, UNESCO, Gulbenkian Foundation, Asia-Europe Foundation and Arts Councils of England, Scotland and Wales. She has written regularly for the *Guardian*, *Independent*, *New Statesman* and others. After seven years as Head of Diversity for Arts Council England, she returned to freelance life in 2003 to run her own consultancy, KC. It focuses on research, evaluation and policy advice. She was one of five Women of the Decade in the Arts in 1993 and was awarded the OBE for her work in 1999.

appendices

1 dialogues on leadership 2006 - 2008

The Cultural Leadership Programme developed and staged a series of Dialogues hosted by Baroness Lola Young of Hornsey and featuring a wide range of leaders from across the cultural and creative industries as well as contributors from other sectors.

The aims of the Dialogues were to:

- Create platforms for debate and exchange on the broader issues and subjects that affect our society today and for the future.
- Exemplify the ways in which the experiences and insights of creative and cultural organisations and their leaders add real value to society.
- Identify the key challenges facing cultural and creative sector leaders.
- Make connections from across a range of sectors in order to identify ways of developing effective leaders in challenging circumstances.
- Open up the debate about leadership to wider participation and discussion.

Key challenges for leadership in the twenty-first century

Rich Mix, London, 15 November 2006

Host: Baroness Lola Young

Keynote: David Kershaw, Chair, Cultural Leadership Programme and Chief Executive M&C Saatchi

Speakers: Lord Smith of Finsbury, Director, Clore Leadership Programme; Gemma Emmanuel-Waterton, Producer, Eclipse Theatre; Graham Fisher, Chief Executive, MLA London; Michael Lynch, Chief Executive, South Bank Centre.

Are we european yet?

**Arsenal Emirates Stadium,
London, 4 May 2007**

Host: Baroness Lola Young

Speakers: Ilona Kish, Secretary General, The European Forum for the Arts and Heritage; Robert Palmer, Director of Culture and Cultural and Natural Heritage, Council of Europe; Jagtar Singh, Founding Director, The Change Institute.

Realities and revelations

RSA, London, 10 November 2007

Host: Baroness Lola Young
Speakers: Lord Victor Abedowale, Chief Executive, Turning Point; Janine Irons MBE, The Dune Music Company; Graham Devlin, Independent Consultant; Jenny Sealey, Artistic Director, Graeae Theatre Company.

Cultural leaders in a globalised world

Tate Liverpool, 23 January 2008

Host: Baroness Lola Young
Speakers: Professor Jack Lohman, Director, Museum of London Group; Yvonne Ike, Head of J P Morgan West Africa; Yvette Vaughan Jones, Director, Visiting Arts; Ummaya Abu-Hanna, Cultural Diversity Coordinator, Finnish National Gallery.

A cultural sector agenda on climate change

**in collaboration with Tipping Point
National Theatre, London, 4 March 2008**

Host: Baroness Lola Young
Speakers: Naresh Ramchandani co-founder of Do The Green Thing; Ruth Nutter collaborator on The Whirl in the Woods; Theresa von Wuthenau, Conseillère Artistique, Le Quai, Angers, France; Paul Handley, Production Manager, The Royal Court Theatre; Marcus Romer, Director, Pilot Theatre.

Vision 2020

Royal Opera House, London, 26 June 2008

Host: Baroness Lola Young
Keynote: Rt Hon Andy Burnham MP, Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport
Speakers: David Kershaw, Chair, Cultural Leadership Programme; Alan Davey, Chief Executive, Arts Council England; Sue Wilkinson, Director of Policy and Advocacy, Museums, Libraries and Archives; Tom Bewick, Chief Executive, Creative & Cultural Skills; Michael Day, Chief Executive, Historic Royal Palaces; Vikki Heywood, Executive Director, Royal Shakespeare Company; John Holden, Head of Culture, Demos; Yvonne Ike, Head of JP Morgan West Africa; Keith Khan, Artistic Executive, LOCOG; Jagtar Singh, Founding Director, The Change Institute.

2 beyond diversity - linked debates

Man talk

ICA, London, 13 March 2007

Chair: Baroness Lola Young

Keynote: Rt Hon David Lammy MP, then Minister for Culture, DCMS

Speakers: Marc Boothe, Director, B3 Media; Ekow Eshun, Artistic Director, ICA; Keith Khan, Artistic Executive LOCOG; Charles Small, Chief Executive, The Drum, Birmingham; David Tse, Artistic Director, Yellow Earth Theatre Company and Chinatown Arts Space.

Equal opportunities: why bother?

in collaboration with Manchester

International Festival

Manchester Art Gallery, 30 March 2007

Chair: Ruth Mackenzie, General Director, Manchester International Festival

Welcome: Virginia Tandy, Director, Manchester City Galleries

Speakers: Rt Hon James Purnell, then Minister of State for Pensions Reform; Martin Beaumont, Group Chief Executive, Co-operative Group & NWBLT member; Karen McCormick, CEO, Cheshire Building Society & NWBLT member; Hilary Carty, Director, Cultural Leadership Programme.

Women at the top

in collaboration with City University, London Barbican Centre, London, 4 June 2007

Chair: Sue Robertson, Dean, School of Arts, City University

Keynote: Rt Hon Tessa Jowell, MP, then Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport

Speakers: Sandy Nairne, Director, National Portrait Gallery; Jenny Sealey, Artistic Director, Graeae Theatre Company; Althea Efunshile, Executive Director, Arts Planning & Investment, Arts Council England; David Farr, Artistic Director, Lyric Theatre, Hammersmith; Heather Rabbatts, Executive Deputy Chair, Millwall Football Club and Executive Chair, Millwall Holdings plc.

High time: leadership from a disability perspective

in collaboration with Disability Action

Learning Initiative (DALI)

Royal Opera House, London,

31 January 2008

Keynote: Marie Pye, Disability Rights Commission

Speakers: Alison Walsh, Editorial Manager, Channel 4 – Disability; Nick Goss, Managing Director, Goss Consultancy Ltd; Maria Oshodi, Director of Extant.

3 essays and authors

1 Abha Adams

Abha Sood Adams has spent over 30 years in education, media and the arts. She lectured in English at Delhi University, did a second MA in Theatre Arts at the University of Leeds and went on to work as an Education Producer and Features Editor at BBC Radio Leeds. As the Founding Director of ADiTi, Abha worked closely with Arts Council England before returning to India in 1992 and becoming Director of the Shri Ram Schools. Presently, she heads her independent education consultancy, is on the Boards of several educational institutions, writes for leading newspapers and is coordinating the International Theatre Festival for India's National School of Drama. www.abhaadams.com

Leadership in India has always been problematic. For hundreds of years India has been ruled by invaders who have restricted access to leadership positions through caste, religion, class and dynasty, and though Independence brought a change of faces it left the whole apparatus of colonial, dynastic, class and caste based leadership largely intact. The 1950s was a period of 'nation building' and concentrated on showcasing traditional and folk arts as India's 'cultural heritage' promoted in the main by government funding and the establishment of large, unwieldy bureaucracy ridden arts institutions run by the state.

Over the last 60 years there has been a slow, uneven and fragmented development of a new

society. Political democracy has flourished and the barriers of caste, class, community and religion have weakened. The change is fuelled by rapid economic growth, and the development of a large, informed, media aware, globalised, more liberal, urban middle class. This move towards a full market economy is demanding professionalism in its leaders and new avenues in the arts are beckoning. As urban India becomes a more westernised liberal and secular society, cultural barriers are coming down and with an increasingly younger population (65% are under twenty five) the arts are becoming more youth orientated.

Young people are branching out from the traditionally accepted medical, engineering and finance related careers and are gaining degrees in marketing, film production, event management, graphic design, design technology as well as drama, art, dance and music. Interestingly, arts and sports management do not find a place in colleges in India and increasingly students are travelling overseas to gain these skills and returning to India to meet the needs and opportunities of the new economy. These new cultural innovators are bringing a flexible, alert, more professional and entrepreneurial approach to cultural development and are now reaching positions of influence in a cultural hierarchy that had been dominated by state sponsored cultural czars.

There are winds of change in the commissioning process with risks being taken in almost every sphere. Recently Madhavi Mudgal took a breathtaking piece to New York for the India

Festival which brought together all the classic dance forms including Manipuri; there are more opportunities to see iconoclastic dance pieces from young artists using both yoga and the martial arts and of course modern dance troupes performing dance sets combining both hip-hop and Bollywood are becoming commonplace.

In music, musicians trained in, and influenced by western forms are dramatically changing traditional folk, classical, and popular music. The most influential is A.R. Rahman. With a degree in western classical music from Trinity College of Music London, by 2004 he had sold more than one hundred million recordings of his film soundtracks. He changed the way music by classical and folk artists is perceived, played, and created, and in the process he has brought new audiences to traditional based music.

Innovations in the arts are now the norm and not the exception. This is because young artists are being encouraged by a cultural leadership that is prepared to push the traditional frontiers of the art forms, develop new venues, explore community participation and seek private investment. In the long term these new forms will increasingly marginalise the traditional arts that are/were India's glories. However the cultural leaders in India are not simply aping the west or pandering to an international market. What they are producing are new forms of Indian art for a new Indian audience.

All these changes are taking place against a background of governmental traditionalism, ineptness, and amateurism. The numbers of trained arts administrators is minimal and arts education has ossified. However, the youth, media and lifestyle revolution that is occurring is heady, and there is a great need for fresh young blood to

gain professional skills rather than drift into this arena and learn on the job. For the time being, old guard and the young risk takers are co existing peacefully.

The challenge for our young turks is to ensure that they begin to develop career paths and create training opportunities that will professionalise arts management. These will address marketing strategies and professionalise venues. Most importantly, it is critical that we protect the traditional classical and folk arts with greater public/private partnerships. It would be a dangerous future for arts in India if they depended entirely on the commercially driven private sector.

Having said that – the future has never looked more promising!

2 Russell M Davies

Russell Davies is a writer and consultant who has moved from reasonable success in the world of big organisations to experimenting in the world of no organisation. He spent long years in advertising, contributing to award-winning work for brands such as Honda, Nike and Microsoft and has been at the forefront of getting brands and businesses to understand the digital world. Having bought the Charles Handy 'portfolio life' idea years ago he's now finally got one; doing consulting for people and businesses, writing for Wired UK, blogging at www.russelldavies.com and doing organisational experiments at ReallyInterestingGroup.com

Hello. I'm your representative from cyberspace. The place without leaders. The place which is slowly proving that good-natured leaderless muddle can produce better results than leaderful,

hierarchies. Where software and encyclopaedias are written by crowds of un-coordinated amateurs. As you can imagine this gives me a slightly twisted perspective on leadership.

- **Leadership is a myth:** The cliché is true; the web only works because no-one's in charge. There are no leaders, it works splendidly without them. Wikipedia. Google. EBay. Amazon. Etc. Their power to transform culture is vested in the millions of people who contribute to them, not the 'leaders' who made them. Which is nudging anthropologists and psychologists into realising that leadership is a myth everywhere. We fool ourselves into seeing it in lots of places – politics, companies, NGOs – but it's mostly coercion or persuasion via money or power. The Western stress on the idea of the individual has created these murky, distracting categories of leader and follower that don't capture the collective, societal way people actually work. You don't get those distractions online. It's a place of societies, communities, people, actions. A place where great things can happen without plans, schemes, leaders or chiefs.
- **To contribute is all:** Online life is a life of small contributions. People do what they want to do, and often what they want to do is support other people, to contribute. A message, a picture, a link, a suggestion. If you want to 'give back' (and I presume anyone reading this is after giving back, you're not interested in leadership just for the power are you?) the best plan is to abandon leadership fantasies and look for something you'd like to help with. Out there, on the wild, woolly web will be someone who's already had the idea you're so mad keen on. Surrender your ownership of that idea and go and help them build it. Aspire to followship not leadership.
- **Cherish the small idea:** No-one wants any more big ideas. Leaders spouting big ideas haven't brought us anything but trouble. The internet wants people who'll do things. Small, incremental, helpful things. A reputation for doing things is powerful digital juju. It'll get you a long way. As will a sense of humour and a tendency to write in lists. And small ideas are best expressed quickly and with the minimum of fuss, which is why digital people don't worry about posters and printing and that kind of thing. They use any tool they can get their hands on – stuff that's easy, free and broad and has a built-in channel for talking back. And having played with these tools they've learned the value of living in a world that's broader than their own supposed expertise. They're not limited by the worlds of culture and art. They've played in other places. They can help an idea take flight because they can lift it beyond the boundaries of the world they're supposed to be in.
- **Don't take my word for it:** The web likes people who'll say unsupported, crazy things like all of the above because it knows the collective will knock the edges of it, examine the assumptions, link to the errors and extract any worthwhile juice. Any merit will bubble to the top. And, in the best web tradition, I should acknowledge that if there's anything decent in the last 500 or so words it was inspired by the blogs at johnniemoore.com and herd.typepad.com. Bye.

3 Rose Juby

Rose Juby graduated from the University of KwaZulu-Natal in 1979. With a background in industry and banking, she joined Deloitte & Touche as a management consultant in 1993. Rose was appointed its acting CEO and was responsible for implementing strategic changes, including a complete financial and organisation restructuring. The process also involved rebuilding relationships with staff, unions, corporate funders and the new South African government. Rose is currently a partner in the Turnaround Group, which focuses on strategy facilitation, organisational transformation, leadership development and diversity for a wide range of clients.

South Africa is a developing country with a multicultural and extremely diverse society (rainbow nation), with the result that issues of national identity, culture and leadership are quite vexing, even at the best of times. Isolated from global forces and trends for over 30 years during the apartheid and sanctions era, South Africa opened up in the early nineties – as the world was experiencing rapid globalisation.

South African organisations were exposed to global competition at the same time that they were dealing with internal transformation imperatives. This forced people far out of their comfort zones. To survive South Africans who were former enemies suddenly found themselves challenged to become allies and work together. They had to put aside history – including their own stereotypes and prejudices - to depart from the known, engage in bold thinking, take risks and learn to rely on people who had had very different life experiences.

As anyone engaged in leadership development will tell you, people don't develop the capacity for leadership in a classroom – they need to experience the challenge of leadership. Participating in leadership roles and processes is often the catalyst needed for leadership development to take place. Leadership is full of novelty, difficulty, conflict, triumph and disappointment – something South Africans have had in spades! As a result, South African managers are now a sought after commodity world-wide. The belief is that if you can survive as a leader and manager in South Africa, you can do it anywhere!

Today's leaders carry enormous responsibility, not only for organisational performance, but beyond into areas that traditionally did not concern them (environment, social etc). The nub of the issue is that to lead effectively in a multicultural society individuals require broad-based insights and contextual understanding, coupled with a good dose of self-understanding, humility – and an ability and willingness to work effectively across diverse social systems.

But what does this really mean? In South African organisations the dominant business culture is Western. However, the majority of people are from African cultures. At a social level firstly, leaders (from all backgrounds) need to understand the potential conflicts that arise through the adoption of Western style structures and systems, and the impact of this on traditional African people. For example:

Western style management approach

- Is about the Individual: I think therefore I am
- Holds things private and confidential. Business works on a need-to-know basis.
- Manages deviation (from procedures) through Industrial Relations in order to achieve fairness and consistency.
- Relationships and respect accorded are driven by structures, systems, roles and responsibilities.
- Is future orientated: let bygones be bygones; don't cry over spilt milk; it's water under the bridge.

African culture

- Is about Group: I am a person through my relationships with others
- Is communal. In Zulu there is no word for privacy. Information – about payslips, for example, is openly shared.
- Makes its assessment on moral and emotional grounds – each case should be treated on its special merits.
- Relationships are driven through principles of ubuntu. Role and function are secondary. How you treat me as a person commands respect.
- There is no future unless the past has been resolved: past workplace issues come back to haunt you unless satisfactorily dealt with.

Leading successfully in a multicultural society begins and ends with an individual's ability to understand his or her own assumptions and paradigms, as well as how groups of people (potential followers) understand and interpret the world. Managers who aspire to be leaders in organisations in South Africa and who are oblivious to the fundamentals – as shown in the above examples – have quickly become unstuck with their workforce, for reasons they do not begin to comprehend. Ignorance and arrogance are seen as fatal leadership flaws.

So how have South African organisations risen to the challenge? More than ever it is understood that organisational effectiveness depends on the quality of leadership – at all levels – and that leadership development is a process. In a developing society – which implies chronic skills shortages – organisations are not able to recruit

middle and senior leaders into the organisation except at prohibitively large premiums. They have to grow and develop them. Hence the issues of assessment, selection, mentorship and succession planning are key. Leadership development programmes must cater for the changes required at the different levels of leadership, from entry level to Chief Executive.

Organisations in all sectors of the economy – business, government and NGOs, face basically the same issues. In the simplest of terms they need to define a purpose, strategise to deliver to their market, manage stakeholders, recruit, develop and retain good people and balance their books etc. Most of all, they need to develop good leaders who can make well informed, wise judgments because their decisions impact exponentially on the lives and livelihoods of others.

4 Dragan Klaic

Dr Dragan Klaic, a Permanent Fellow of Feliks Meritis in Amsterdam, teaches arts and cultural policies at Leiden University and Central European University, Budapest as well as Bologna University and elsewhere. Dr Klaic is Initiator and Chair of the European Festivals Research Project and a writer, lecturer, researcher, advisor and frequent conference speaker, particularly on contemporary performing arts, cultural policy and international cultural cooperation. Author of several books, including *Exercises in Exile* (2004), *Europe as a Cultural Project* (2005) and *Mobility of Imagination: a companion guide to international cultural cooperation* (2007) as well as a contributor to many journals. See www.draganklaic.eu

The current fashionable discourse on cultural or artistic leadership reveals the deep crisis of the established cultural organisations, the loss of their self-evident authority under the onslaught of globalisation, migration and explosive growth of the commercial cultural industry. The more non-profit cultural organisations, public or private, are expected to behave as a business, the more leadership notions get imposed on them. Leadership tends to imply a cultural superman, endowed with an artistic vision, suave with the media, inspiring for the personnel, excellent in fundraising, connected to an impressive network, a grant getter and a sponsors' darling. A talk show nabob and a rainmaker behind a set of technocratic and managerial expectations.

Even an exceptionally competent mortal can hardly fit this excessive profile. A cultural leader could be recognised by their ability to make their

own organisation sustainable and distinctive through a mid-term developmental strategy, looking ahead and anticipating challenges and opportunities, and through articulation of their own dialectics of local and global issues. In a nutshell, a sharp sense of time and space: looking five years ahead, understanding their own immediate environment and connecting it with the wider world. For a UK cultural leader especially, a pro-European outlook and a familiarity with the variety of cultural conditions on the Continent would be more desirable than the habitual infatuation with everything American.

I would recognise a cultural leader as someone who can connect culture with the society and surrounding communities rather than identify with business or be a fellow traveller of politics; more as someone who sees culture as a function of citizenship than as representation of political power or any sort of group identity. Someone who can enhance the intercultural competence of their own board, staff, associated authors and public rather than someone who is handy with spreadsheets and unabashed to chop budgets, programmes and personnel. Allowing institutional panic demonstrates a clear lack of leadership but displaying institutional arrogance disqualifies many nominal cultural leaders.

Leadership can be taught and built through coaching and interaction with peers. It's more an attitude, mentality and a complex world view than a set of skills. Potential cultural leaders fail if they reduce cultural production to the institutional mode and ignore non-institutional realms of creativity, fragile and unstable, and the rapidly growing cultural output on the internet,

especially on its social networking platforms. Another strategic fault is to mimic cultural industry, its marketing drive and equalisation of success with profit – not an appropriate benchmark for non-profit cultural organisations. Asserting their own personal and institutional autonomy implies a capacity to recognise and respect the autonomy of collaborators and associates and fellow cultural organisations, also much smaller and more fragile ones.

Can an artist, not entrenched in a cultural organisation, be considered a cultural leader? Yes, in two distinct modes: as an opinion maker, a spokesperson for less empowered constituencies, a voice of consciousness and a critical intellectual, in the vein of Harold Pinter or Wole Soyinka; and as a leader of a creative project, a team leader, only temporarily associated with a cultural organisation and its resources (a venue, a festival...), grouping other artists and inspiring them with the strength of their own imagination and enabling them to find and input the utmost of their own creativity, as Peter Sellars and Robert Lepage frequently do.

My favourite leadership development conspiracy would be to create a European consortium that selects 12 younger artists and gives them in 15 months a European outlook and network, coaches them individually and in a group, allows them to test their emerging leadership in a residence at some university abroad and afterwards implant their own artistic project in a cultural organisation. Price tag: £350,000. Any takers?

5 Basil Manning

Basil Manning is a clergyman who has been involved in community development/organisation, leadership development and work for racial and gender justice, over a period of 40 years. Initiatives in these areas of work were conducted in the UK and Europe, North America and the African continent which included the development of ALIA (African Leadership in Action). He currently resides in South Africa, to which he returned in 1990 after 25 years of exile.

Steve Bantu Biko left a leadership legacy for Africa which is yet to be fulfilled. It reflects our greatest challenge. He said, 'We believe that in the long run the special contribution to the world by Africa will be in the field of human relationships. The great powers of the world may have done wonders in giving the world an industrial and military look, but the great gift still has to come from Africa giving the world a more human face.'

We have not fulfilled this leadership legacy and instead we have capitulated to the Western/European model of 'Capital Leadership'. We defer to industrial and military models, devoid of the human thread with its only focus on profit at all costs. The world is littered with the human debris of these leadership models and yet we persist with it even today. This model has not worked for Africa or for the world. The abject poverty of the world both materially and emotionally is a direct reflection of the impact of past and current world leaders. The culture of the value that is espoused is intrinsically selfish and inhuman. When will we unlearn this inhumanity?

The leadership models of a Western/European culture have systemically entrenched themselves in the world and we appear powerless to break this cycle of designed deprivation and degradation. If Africa's gift is giving the world a more human face then how we have failed!

If Africa is no longer physically in the 'master/slave' role then why do we persist psychologically in the style of the 'slave master'? Why emulate ethnic hierarchies based on an ideology of white superiority? Why continue the divisiveness and perpetuate oppression? Africa has strong cultural leadership models and values that entrench the human/ubuntu aspect of relationships and ideals. Where are they? Why are they hidden from the public discourse? Why are they not used as a filter for modern leadership models to find connections and congruency so that we develop 'wholeness'? African cultural leadership models must be the first integral tapestry of African societies complemented by other models that serve all humanity for humanities sake, not for power or capital gain.

Biko knew instinctively that Africa has a gift of humanity through which the world can learn. It is a gift that has been suppressed over time and circumstance. It is the shackles of this, our oppressive past, from which we must free ourselves. This is the challenge that African leaders face. How else are we able to connect with our true selves as Africans and with the souls of our ancestry? The Courageous African Leader is one who dares reflect on the soul of their ancestry and find the humanity of their wisdom and teaching that will change their world and the world. The Courageous African Leader is one that does not hunger after power in the framework of

the capitalist but is focused on ensuring that all they touch, influence and impact upon experiences their gift of humanity. Africa, give the gift.

6 Robert Palmer

Robert Palmer is the Director of Culture and Cultural and National Heritage at the Council of Europe. He has worked in the cultural sector for more than 20 years and, prior to joining the Council of Europe in 2006, was an adviser to several cities and regions on cultural development and regeneration, cultural tourism, festivals and arts policies. He has been very involved in European Capitals of Culture and was the Director of two of them: Glasgow (1990) and Brussels (2000). Robert Palmer is a board member of various arts institutions and international festivals and the Chair of European arts juries.

Great cultural leaders are a varied lot. Among them are poets, dancers, jazz singers and talk show hosts. You can find strong cultural leaders who are rabbis, chefs, museum directors and social activists. Some come from urban ghettos and others are graduates of public schools; they might be younger than thirty-five or older than eighty. A few may be openly recognised for their success; most work below the radar of fame and prestige.

Such leaders are not the trend-mongers, marketeers, statisticians and followers of the latest government-inspired versions of culture-speak. They are people who have catalytic visions of human possibility and achievement, and who inspire us to change our lives and the world. The

best of these cultural leaders are not just dreamers but practical people who are full of energy and accomplishment.

Let us not confuse the roles of strong leaders and good managers. Leadership skills are not confined to analysis, organisation and team working. There are many cultural leaders who possess the talents of both, but the essence of leadership is an ability to push beyond the boundaries of individual professional specialisms and personal interests.

Today we struggle with political, economic and cultural systems that stifle change by pitting agenda against agenda in rolling gridlock; important change can only happen if it is connected to what is going on in different places. Cultural leaders have the capacities to connect the daily pre-occupations they may have with their own organisations, groups or places to external processes. The new cultural maps of our communities are networks of criss-crossing beams that demand leaders to achieve a strong connectedness that is integrative rather than anthropocentric.

What are some of the cultural changes that demand new navigation tools? One is arguably the recognition of the impact of a plurality of cultures and a pluralism of values that questions the very meaning of cultural expression and conventional approaches to cultural governance and participation. Old models are no longer working and are unable to deal with a cultural transformation that requires new flexible and adaptive organisational forms.

The notion of creativity has become a new driver for productivity as innovation is recognised as an engine of development. Market forces are continuously re-defining cultural life, where

limitless consumer appetites are being proliferated. The advertising world and the visual/aural environment combined with pervasive aestheticism and business dynamics are requiring a continuous re-definition of cultural processes.

The social cement holding many of our communities together is being weakened by the rise of an increasing individualism, which is paralleled by a growth of new forms of association and new networks of affinity fostered by technological innovation and the information revolution. The internet is now the most influential single medium of global cultural and educational development. Boundaries between artistic disciplines are being blurred and giving way to new cultural mutations and forms. At the same time in world terms, digital, economic and social divides are widening. Assumptions about political order are being challenged, and the preservation of cultural diversity in many parts of the world is under threat.

This calls for new responses and the need to rethink the nature of social and cultural contracts that underpin our communities. Cultural leadership now occupies a terrain that helps to bring about the marriage of cultural and political change. The cultures of our communities are processes that extend or inhibit meaning, relationships and consciousness. Leadership no longer demands a mentality of command and control, but one of exploration, discovery, flexibility, reflexivity, empathy and personal responsibility. It requires approaches that favour holistic, systemic and integrative thinking; perception, re-perception and the development of new narratives. This style of cultural leadership incorporates both ordinary and extraordinary tasks.

All this is a tall order for cultural leaders. Those who take up the challenge require internal drive, adaptive behaviours and obsessional survival strategies. For some, such challenges create stress and lead to burn out, and so inner balance becomes an essential asset. There is no prescription and no tailor-made courses to follow, and so a commitment to learn from one another through open conversations, to share experience, to embark on enlightened but often risk-taking practice become necessary approaches. Leaders require strong support mechanisms and incentives to meet challenges, which should include patience and tolerance by results-obsessed boards, stakeholders and funders, who also need to engage in the complexity of leading in turbulent times, where there are few certain rules and no simple answers.

7 Kyril Razlogov

Kyril Razlogov was born in 1946. He has a PhD in cultural studies and is the Director of the Russian Institute for Cultural Research. He is the author of 15 books and several hundred articles on film and the media, cultural history, art history, cultural policy and development. He has organised and programmed a number of film festivals and is a columnist at Moskovskaya Pravda and the business weekly Kompania. He is author and presenter of a weekly television programme Movie Cult on the Kultura channel and a Professor of cultural studies, film history and media studies at the State Film Institute (VGIK). He leads advanced courses for film directors and script writers at the Institute for European culture in Moscow and is the Academic Secretary of the National Academy of Motion Pictures Arts and Sciences of Russia.

Leadership in Russia has gone through a number of historical paradigm shifts. In virtually all traditional societies, of whatever religion, the priest was the cultural leader. It was the priest who translated God's will for the masses, interpreting every possible situation or conflict. The Church provided the framework and guaranteed priestly social and political power.

In Tsarist Russia, the Russian Orthodox Church provided the cultural leadership. The Tsar himself became its official head in the seventeenth century, exercising absolute sovereign power. His political ministers, who were technically responsible for education and culture, had to be Orthodox.

In the 1830s, a formula that became the guiding principle of government policy towards the end of imperial rule was formulated by Count Sergey Uvarov. As Deputy Minister of Public Education, he expounded the theory, 'Orthodoxy, Autocracy, Narodnost'. 'Narodnost' is essentially untranslatable. It has been defined variously as 'Nationality' or even 'Populism', but that misses its sense of an intrinsic national character, a Russianness. It implies that all actions and policies are in harmony with that spirit or essence. It gave supreme authority to the monarchy and the state and justified the absence of a democracy. Narodnost is rarely mentioned nowadays but it is still valid, I think, as a psychological archetype, making democracy a negative value, imported from the West and contrary to the Russian tradition.

Soviet Communism came to follow a similar model, though the individual cast members were different. The Church was replaced by the Communist Party and the monarchy by Party rule,

with the General Secretary of the Central Committee (CC) becoming absolute de facto head of everything. Every minister had to be a member of the Party and leadership was divided between the ideological wing of the CC, who were the real decision-makers, and the government ministers who were formally accounted the decision makers. Between the 1930s and 1960s, the Communist Party supervised a system of so-called 'creative unions' (writers, painters and sculptors, composers, filmmakers, actors and so on) that were formed to control creative activity and who sponsored certain carefully chosen major artists who were proven staunch and faithful communists.

Because Russian culture has been so essentially logocentric or text-based, intellectual leadership in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries came mainly from writers such as Pushkin, Leo Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky, and then later from famous Soviet dissidents such as Solzhenitsyn. Their number has been joined by filmmakers: officially-approved ones like Bondarchuk and Mikhalkov, and unofficial ones like Tarkovsky and Konchalovsky who were both subject to censorship and decided (or were pushed) to emigrate. Tarkovsky died in exile, but Konchalovsky came back to Russia and is pursuing an international career.

With the arrival of a post-Soviet market economy the old pattern has reasserted itself, with cultural leadership once again being vested in officialdom. The old traditional intelligentsia has collapsed economically and survivors have adopted a transatlantic style and values. Leading intellectuals and artists have come to be measured by their income or their frequency on

TV screens. Television presenters, as everywhere else, are the new cultural leaders even if they are mostly reading words that have been written for them by other invisible and unnamed people.

TV advertising has become the major art form. Everything else is so diversified that there are no shared values except archaic ones that border on xenophobia. They are supported by the official search for the 'National Idea' located somewhere at the crossroads of Russian Orthodoxy and New Gas and Petrol Superpower Capitalism. Its cultural values are highly conservative with a low premium on creativity and innovation.

However, we must remember that this group is statistically small. Russia is vast and still contains diversity - local and regional, religious and linguistic, social and demographic - each with its own values and leadership systems. This is where I believe hope must primarily lie, where cultural life will continue despite the aridity of the national picture. And finally, we must celebrate the achievements of some Russian artists and intellectuals who have managed to break into the global market. Timur Bekmambetov is a case in point. A Jew born in Kazakhstan, he spent most of the Soviet period in Tashkent, Uzbekistan, then moving to Moscow where he has divided his time between advertising shorts, feature films and experimental installations. He has subsequently directed three major box-office hits in Russia as well as a Hollywood blockbuster, *Wanted*, without emigrating, just 'going global'.

8 Julia Rowntree

Julia Rowntree is a freelance adviser on fundraising strategy and cross-sector engagement. From 1986-2005 she held a series of development roles at LIFT (London International Festival of Theatre) where she pioneered initiatives in the field of arts, business and civic engagement and curated a lecture series, Imagining a Cultural Commons. Her book Changing the Performance (Routledge 2006) details these ventures and her approach to fundraising. Currently co-director of an international ceramic project, Julia lectures and advises on arts development issues internationally and has won a number of national awards. www.jrowntree.co.uk; www.claygroundcollective.org

Uncertainty, complexity and climate change shape the context of leadership today. All require imagination and inventiveness on an unprecedented scale. In our institutions – not only cultural – the vocabulary of economics, policy delivery and consumerism dominate. This narrow language creates a corresponding paucity of concepts. Cultural leaders have a vital role in enriching vocabularies and thus conceptual and inventive capacity across the board.

Vocabularies of the richest potential emerge from creative engagement on equal terms between people from different walks of life, levels of power, culture and generation. Transcending these conventional boundaries and building these qualities of dialogue can mean taking a lead without formal authority with an uncertain picture of the task ahead. Art provides the key, but where to begin?

One example comes from an experimental dialogue forged at LIFT (London International Festival of Theatre). Business sponsorship was most usually secured for LIFT shows through brand promotion and marketing benefits. Commercial values at times ran counter to LIFT's work with artists and young people. The Festival wished to find a more vivid form of engagement with people in business but did not know how to do this without a common language and from a position of inferior economic power.

To help LIFT think, a group of business advisers was convened around a simple, open, question: 'Has business something to learn from the arts?' Responses provided the foundation for the LIFT Business Arts Forum, a programme through which people from business and the public sector were invited to attend LIFT's theatre performances and to reflect together on what they had seen and felt. This experience, shared with artists and young participants, provided a prism through which to perceive the world and individual roles anew.

With LIFT's productions as the focus, an international perspective was a given, while visits to events in different parts of London provided local insight. LIFT shows and workshops gave expression to unfamiliar views and feelings. Participants' experience was altered and enriched through shared dialogue with people of different culture, generation and expertise.

The Forum inspired new vocabularies and inventive approaches to seemingly intractable challenges in business, the public sector and the arts. It sparked deeper understanding of cultural diversity and of sustainability issues at personal, organisational and environmental levels. It laid

foundations for enduring working and social relationships.

LIFT learned through this experiment too. The Forum expanded views about the role of the Festival and of the arts, contributing to confident advocacy, artistic and organisational evolution. It continues to inform LIFT's vision today.

Starting by not knowing proved to be an asset rather than an obstacle. LIFT found that it did not have to know all the answers at the outset. It did however have to take the risk of speaking differently. It needed to re-learn how to surface questions arising from the art, its wider context, and assumptions and beliefs of all involved. It was art and our human response to it that inspired new vocabularies for inventive engagement with today's world.

9 Lola Young

Baroness Lola Young of Hornsey is a freelance Arts and Heritage Consultant. Her clients include Arts Council England and the Museum of London and the BBC. She writes for academic journals and the national press. Her book, *Fear of the Dark: Race, Gender and Sexuality in Cinema* was published in 1995. She was Head of Culture at the Greater London Authority from 2001-2004 and is a former Chair of the Arts Council's Cultural Diversity Committee. She has been a board member of Resource: The Council of Museums, Archives and Libraries, and a Commissioner on the Royal Commission on Historical Manuscripts. Lola Young was awarded an OBE in 2001 and appointed a life peer in the House of Lords in 2004.

Like its older cousin 'multicultural', 'diversity' has been much used by cultural sector and other policy-makers; has been open to a variety of interpretations; and has provoked support and antipathy in more or less equal measures.

If I suggest that some of us are tired of talking about diversity that should not be read as signalling either defeat or surrender. We would simply welcome more reflection – more sophistication – about how we debate and deliver on diversity. Take terms like 'black and minority ethnic', or 'disabled people' or 'working class'. None of these categories are watertight; yet they are used as though they were fixed and unalterable. Most damagingly, the people ascribed to these groupings are viewed as having characteristics and behaviours that are also immutable.

We could try concentrating much more on structural barriers to a diverse workforce and the professional cultures which keep them in place, instead of focusing on the perceived deficiencies of the individuals or communities that are the subject of current discourse on diversity. Much more active thought-leadership and commitment from national, regional and local organisations, both public and private sector would be welcome.

There are opportunities to address the issue imaginatively. For example, looking at the changing world economic order, I can't help thinking that this country is missing something in relation to the diaspora and migrant communities based in the UK. Whether it's skills of translation – literally and metaphorically – or artform skills and creative energy, we should be able to make

better use of their expertise in moving across cultures, in developing an ease with trans-national identities, in exploring fresh aesthetic sensibilities.

The creation of the 2012 Cultural Olympiad presents a unique opportunity for really deep thinking about diversity: is that likely to happen? I certainly hope so because it could mark a decisive break with the old, unimaginative and unproductive models of working through this subject. A fresh way of thinking that can re-conceptualise notions of excellence, and world-class in a way that doesn't simply replicate the status quo is urgently needed. We should be much more focussed on the reality of contemporary, global life, and its possible futures.

London 2012 is just around the corner, so what is on the horizon in the 2030s? When might students from my local comprehensive school aspire to being the Director of the British Museum or the Chief Executive of a major publishing company? In 25 years time, which of them will be the first port of call when the arts and heritage correspondents from the quality press want a comment on the government's latest Comprehensive Spending Review settlement for the arts?

One organisation has calculated that at the present rate, it will take another two or three centuries before we achieve a membership more representative of Britain as a whole in the Houses of Parliament: how long will it take for the cultural and creative sector?

4 bibliography

Appiah, Kenneth Kwame, *The Case for Contamination*, New York Times extended feature, 1 January 2006

Equal Opportunities Commission, *Sex and Power*, 2008

Leicester, Graham, *Rising to the Occasion: Cultural Leadership in Powerful Times*, provocation paper for Missions, Models, Money programme (MMM) 2007. See www.missionmodeslmoney.org.uk

Mulgan, Geoff, *Connexity: responsibility, freedom, business and power in the new twentieth century*, (Chatto & Windus 1997)

The Young Foundation, Social Innovation report 2007

You can get this publication in Braille, large print and on audio CD.
Please contact us if you need any of these formats.

If you require further information about the Dialogues on Leadership or
other aspects of the Cultural Leadership Programme please contact
www.culturalleadership.org.uk

© Cultural Leadership Programme 2009

Designed by tangerine, London

www@culturalleadership.org.uk

