

EUROPE: THE INTERCULTURAL AREA

Yes, No, Maybe*

The greatest achievement of a civilisation is not to have a collective identity to be stressed, simultaneously, by all individuals. It is precisely, the contrary: to have reached a level of economic development, of culture and freedom that allow citizens to emancipate themselves from collective identities – throwing off the yoke – and to choose their own identity, in harmony or disharmony with the rest of the tribe. In that way, the individual can exercise his or her sovereignty, becoming authentically free.ⁱ Mario Vargas Llosa

In using this quote Anthony Everitt in his book *Europe: United or Divided by Culture*ⁱⁱ points out that that with the rise of individualisation we should not hold out any great hope for a European consciousness as it essentially is not desirable. He is of course right; however what we can hope for is an increased understanding of the cultures that are contained within the countries that make up the Union. The emphasis on cultures not countries is important.

However it is clear that at times the centralised administration of European cultural funding has failed to grasp the point made by Mario Vargas Llosa.

This paper will address the theme of the conference by considering the appropriate competences that will need to be developed in cultural management education to achieve ‘intercultural dialogue’. It will be argued that a capacity to evaluate risk and trust in communication and partnerships are becoming the most valuable competencies. However these are unlikely to be developed within a system driven by a dysfunctional funding mechanism. This is not because it does not ‘fund’ but that in doing so it creates a sense of uncreative cynicism. The paper will alternateⁱⁱⁱ between a consideration of appropriate competencies or capacities and a critique of the mechanism of EU funding. These two areas are connected as they try to function side by side the appropriate competencies belong to a contemporary understanding of management practice and the current EU funding system belongs to an earlier period of hierarchical management practice

I will argue that the key competency needed to create intercultural dialogue is communication, this may seem obvious. However If you wish to achieve this through actions as suggested above then this does not mean just ‘speaking’ across cultures but understanding within each culture the other key concepts such as risk and trust, and what each partner understands by them, this is crucial to an effective co-operation. This understanding needs to be developed ‘up’ from doing, rather than ‘down’ from theory.^{iv}

The introduction to this conference expresses a dream for *Europe: the intercultural area*, this is a good place to start and a dream is essential as the reality in cultural terms is sometimes depressing.

“Different cultures, communities and individuals have to develop the essential principles, such as knowledge, empathy and tolerance which also serve as the defining framework of intercultural communication.”^v

I would suggest that knowledge, empathy and tolerance are most likely to develop through active engagement with the cultural 'other' not just in relation to the content of a cultural product that is exchanged, or even newly created between organizations from different cultures, but in relation to the processes needed to produce it that is not directly part of the 'artistic' product but is essential to its creation.

Most artists and creative administrators/managers are likely to be people who certainly have empathy and tolerance to other cultures otherwise they would be engaged in a different profession.

This process of production is, or should be relatively organic, driven by the needs of artists and cultural creators, unfortunately this is now often not the case – partly due to how European^{vi} funding is administered.

In many instances a 'proposed' project is created to chase the money available within a given category – the project is essentially financially driven. Categories or themes are created at high EU administrative level no doubt with the intention of encouraging artists to develop work to address a particular theme – a worthy aim. This may in part, work however many cultural organizations have become adept at filling in the forms – 'creating partnerships' from a list of potential collaborators and on receipt of the funding then really consider how they might deliver a cultural product 'outputs' – within the terms and criteria they applied for the funding – and finding themselves tied into a very rigid structure that limits any real creative development.

The engagement with the cultural 'other' does not in the EU usually start with a journey of creative discovery with another group of artists but on a journey of frustration and reinforced negative stereotypes as the EU funding system is encountered.

The current system *has* developed one competency that is shared across Europe, that of going around the system, of manipulating it to try to achieve something, however inadequate. The question is should we be educating the cultural sector to succeed in perpetuating this system or changing it?

The above may be seen as a rather cynical response to a more idealized approach. This is not the case, a clear distinction has to be made between the level of policy in this particular year, of a year of 'intercultural dialogue' where the aims are exemplary and on the other hand the system of EU administration – particularly that of cultural funding that actively represses dialogue and creativity. There is a distinct gap between strategy and implementation.

So should we be developing competencies with cultural managers (those who create the space, funding and administration for artists to create) enabling them to operate within the 'system' – fill in the forms, manipulate budgets and create reports of fiction. Or should we be developing a more sophisticated approach. Of course fundraising, project management, audience development project evaluation and a number of others are essential skills, but they may not be the most important in developing co productions across cultures.

Knowledge, empathy and tolerance may serve as valuable outcomes from intercultural communication, but they will not be achieved without a sophisticated level or mechanism of communication.

I will also speak from a very particular perspective of designing an MA in Arts Administration and Cultural policy that has on average 40 students a year with at least 50% from outside the EU. Competencies are taught in cultural policy analysis, fundraising, audience development, strategic planning, arts education, project management, applied culture in non traditional environments as well as intercultural work and evaluation of cultural projects/policy. Most students subsequently work internationally and interculturaly at some point in their careers.

However these competencies although essential are to some extent secondary. What we hope students learn is how to *think* in a creative way. It is this *thinking* which develops knowledge and creates projects and cultural work - which provides the context for intercultural dialogue. It is hard to achieve the more abstract outcomes this conference recommends without having a context in which to learn through doing.

However it is essential to acknowledge that this *thinking* is also culturally created.

The overall educational ethos is that the above abstracts (particularly, empathy and tolerance) will only be achieved from cultural actions that enable them to be part of the process of creating cultural product^{vii}. At the same time in education as well as society these are only going to be achieved by questioning and in some cases tough dialogue and reflection with creative partners rather than a bland acceptance of difference.

To some extent learning about the history, culture and language of another culture automatically become part of the process of exchange when jointly creating new artistic work. Although just because we work across cultures does not automatically mean that that empathy and tolerance will be achieved – in some cases the opposite might happen, stereotypes maybe reinforced (and often are) – but that is a risk we have to take. There is negative outcome is less likely to occur if there is good communication between partners. This cannot really be taught theoretically, but principals can be seen to emerge from undertaking projects across cultures where subsequently there is time to reflect on the actions taken and their outcomes.

A very good example of this would be the student festivals of theatre across Europe^{viii} where students actually play a major part in the organisation. However just doing it is not enough, with subsequent reflection and analysis of how they worked and understanding their own 'culture of management' the experience becomes properly learning/educational. This can be enriched by relating to management texts that expressly deal with this form of analysis for cultural operators or social entrepreneurs such as those written by Weber, Handy, Bennis, Stewart, Lawler, Page or Belbin - where the emphasis is broadly on understanding leadership skills.

Being competent to evaluate risk and trust would seem to be crucial components of effective communication. Hence the title, *Yes-No- Maybe*. By understanding what these words mean in different cultures we can begin to create the cultural events, processes, projects that begin to develop the desired cross cultural dialogue as they encapsulate understandings of risk and trust. I think it is essential here to use the word culture, although the EU is made up of different countries in this context it is the cultures that matter as the relative understanding of Yes-No-Maybe is likely to change in relation to culture not country.

It is also noticeable that there is a different understanding of what competencies are required for intercultural projects from those who have experienced working on them than those who have not. In the absence of extensive research in the area I have relied on informal discussion with a number of practitioners engaged in creating and touring cultural work internationally.^{ix} All experienced success and failure dependent on aspects of communication more than other areas.

Having also recently worked on an intercultural project with partners in Norway and Turkey each of these words (*Yes-No- Maybe*) was seen to have a completely different value. However as both organisations were very professional they are able to give a value to the terms each time they are used by partners. The more they work together the more the dialogue becomes deeper, by reflecting and analysing the ongoing relationship they are also able to understand that they have 'learnt' skills that can be applied to future relationships/projects. The professionalism comes from acknowledging the differences and acting to understand them and base actions on that understanding.

However to not fall into the trap indicated by the Losa quote, those who are responsible for undertaking the 'communication' within projects are also individuals working within their cultural norms and may or may not represent that culture. Therefore a further skill in understanding the value of *yes-no-maybe* in relation to a particular person is needed in addition to understanding that relating to a particular culture. This concentrates on the issue of trust of both individuals and organisations. This need not be considered a skill [understanding trust] not based on instinct but a capability or competence based on process and knowledge.

In *Trust Me On This*^x Thomas A Stewart cites *The Organisation Man* by William H. Whyte where he showed that in traditional hierarchical organisations the 'notion of individual responsibility for one's actions mutated into an organisational ethos'^{xi}. In this context 'interpersonal trust is unnecessary' as the hierarchy exists to protect relationships. The boss commands and the employee does. 'Everyone has his place and everyone else knows what that place is. Position substitutes for persuasion.'^{xii} However in most small and medium scale arts organisations the hierarchy of management is much flatter and the 'chain of command' does not exist in the same way, therefore persuasion as a skill or competency is required. When engaged in intercultural work the competency requires additional skills as the language of trust may need translation.^{xiii}

When working intercultural, maybe more than in any other context an organisation needs to be flexible, able to reshape, reform and think fast as circumstances change. Although this needs people with particular competencies, qualities and skills it also needs an organisation that is secure in itself, knows its own values, and what it is prepared to compromise and to develop – confident but not arrogant.

In teaching specific competencies for arts/cultural management there is a further issue, as within most contemporary organisations there is now a division of roles and therefore competencies. Audience development, fundraising, event or production management are roles in themselves and in many cases separate departments. These are further subdivided for example in fundraising to –

corporate giving, individual giving, foundations and charities, campaigns. In educational terms for a student to have a chance in a job market they will need to have a general understanding and operational competency in a number of areas but will also need to specialise in an area of their interest. It may sound vague to an employer if a student states that they are experienced in communication however in relation to intercultural working this may be of greater value than those described above.

The overarching skills of communication can be taught - to provide a concrete example related to the MA mentioned before. If students are working in a group researching a particular cultural area or creating a marketing strategy they can additionally have specific training seminars in the psychology of group dynamics, on the culture of management (for example Handy models) and on personality types (Belbin). These students may have a cultural background from France, Greece, Lithuania, UK or Japan and in this context are asked to reflect on their own behaviour within a group, understanding which of their actions may be culturally conditioned or which are individual. These skills in self evaluation, evaluating the strengths and weaknesses of the group, group dynamics and collectively creating a strategy to work together effectively are of equal value to those more traditional ones listed above. This competency learning is not dependant on the project but is taught in parallel with the subject studied. A key part of this is reflection on individual and group actions and their consequences.

This further reinforces the need for those involved in creating an intercultural dialogue to be able to work through processes and ways of thinking rather than learning only proscribed formulas. It might be useful at this point to consider the difference between education and training and the depth of learning implied.

The word 'training' is a contentious one - as it goes to the heart of understanding what competencies may be valuable for those undertaking intercultural work. It also questions the role of universities as centres of 'training' rather than education. In this context 'training' is usually used to describe a process when someone learns to do a specific task (production management, fundraising - filling in applications to foundations) however 'education' teaches people to learn, to have the tools to approach a new situation, analyse it, create a strategy, action plan, undertake the project and then crucially reflect upon it and use that experience in the next situation/project. As mentioned above this reflection and analysis additional to the training develops the ability to learn (from any and all actions) rather than just for a specific task.

However the difference is crucial the 'training' assumes there is a task to be accomplished and that with the application of skills and knowledge it can be done. 'Education' makes the same initial assumption (there is a task to be accomplished) but then questions what is the best way that an appropriate outcome can be achieved. For example there is an assumption by many arts companies that they can only operate with a grant/subsidy and without it they can only be inactive - in fact the grant is seen as a validation of their existence and that the 'skill' or 'competency' is in getting the grant - rather than thinking that there may be another way to operate.

Working across cultures can in itself develop new thinking skills. In his book, *The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies* Scott E. Page^{xiv} tries to move the arguments about diversity in groups away from rather dated notions of difference based around race, culture and class and on to understanding how different individuals think. Their background will play some part in this but what he emphasises is the ability of groups of divergent thinkers to be able to create more sophisticated and relevant solutions to problems than 'clever' 'individuals'. He demonstrates through a great range of examples how 'groups that display a range of perspectives outperform groups of like-minded experts. Diversity yields superior outcomes'. There is no reason why this should not work across the cultures of the EU; however we would have to agree to teach communication and problem solving rather than just country specific versions of traditional competencies.

This is only going to work if there is agreement to form the diverse thinking groups in the first place. Within some EU cultures/countries this would be a considerable step forward as many have an inbuilt mechanism within their education systems to assume that their approach to the 'dialogue' is the only appropriate one. Conversely particularly among the new accession countries the assumption is often the opposite – that they have something to learn rather than to offer as they feel less confident in this educational environment^{xv} - of course this open attitude means that they are in fact more advanced in international cultural thinking than the original members.

What we have a tendency to do on a European level is draw up lists of functions that we wish students to achieve in a homogeneous way rather than go one stage higher and use our diversity of thinking in a positive way.

Although competencies tend to be culturally based – the more specific they are the more they adhere to the culture of the country or even region that created them. If this is acknowledged then it is possible to move on to considering them in an objective way rather than becoming concerned with a 'right' way of doing something.

Therefore the potential value in competencies would be in ones where students are learning how to 'cook' rather than follow 'recipes' - to develop our human capital rather than only concentrate on technical capital.

Edward E. Lawler suggests that we are now in an era of human capital, or how we operate and communicate internally within organisations and externally is as important as what we produce if we are to achieve our aims. In the case of jointly producing artistic work through a collaborative process this would mean that the means of managing the project is likely to contribute as much as the content of the work to being able to satisfy both parties. He distinguishes between core competencies and organisational capabilities. He is refereeing to manufacturing but could equally be talking about theatre, dance or any creative work. The core competencies in his examples are about being able to produce products such as engines, chemical processes or offer a focused customer service such as a low cost airline. Essentially a creative arts company operating internationally will have a core competency in producing the kind of work it is known for. In some arts companies this core competency will be more advanced and will be demonstrated in co-producing with new partners. However in this more advanced type they will have an organisational capability beyond their ability to deliver the core competency.

An arts organisation that is likely to have this capability will have two key components. The first is a structure that is not a 'hierarchical, job based and bureaucratic model' but will be one that 'relies on teams, information technology, networks, shared leadership' and engages the whole organisation in the creation of its output. The second is that this type of organisation is likely to attract administrators/managers who will thrive within an organisation with this ethos. Their value will be understood to be equal but different from those creating the 'artwork'. In strategic terms for an organisation to attract and retain people with these capabilities they will have understood that they need equal status and operating flexibility to the artists and the freedom to take key decisions on a daily basis.

Organisations with this ability will have also understood, as Lawler points out that it will have moved away from a 'job based' approach to managing its staff [and its external relationships] to 'knowledge and skill based approaches'. He makes further points about the status of all employees owning the method of production even though they are not directly manufacturing it. In relation to an arts company this would mean recognising that the person/s enabling the co production are of equal value to those performing/designing/directing.

With many business companies the value of the company is no longer in physical assets [machinery] but in human capital. Therefore the employees are no longer facilitating production but are themselves the machinery [hopefully conscious, thinking and developing]. In terms of arts or culture based companies the value of 'human capital' within the organisation has always been valued, but primarily in relation to the 'artist producers'. This may now be changing, because if the 'mission' is to co produce or engage cross culturally through the production of art then those facilitating this mission will be the owners of the process [or the means of production].

A by-product of this process is that those individuals who can broker this process – achieve the co-production, not only have higher status within the producing organisation but are also in a position to transfer that process or capability to another context. Their loyalty maybe to the intercultural process as much as to the specific art created, and therefore can be attracted to other producing organisations. They are therefore not dependent on producing, theatre, music or dance but on the act of producing itself^{xvi}.

With this increase in competencies and value the administrator/manager has the potential to become more mobile. Artists have always [depending on the art form] had the ability to work in other cultural contexts, now managers with particular competencies have the same opportunity. Barriers of language have and will be the same for both artist and manager but now with essentially transferable skills and knowledge in co production the potential for mobility for the manager has increased. This means that they will become less culturally bound to the communication processes of any one culture. This could be both positive and negative, the positive is that they could operate without a background of a particular cultural approach but adopt the culture of flexibility. The negative would be that they are 'culture less' and therefore are not rooted into a cultural system and therefore adopt the culture of a generalised bureaucracy. This is clearly what has happened to the cultural operators of the EU.

Lawler also advocates leadership as an organisational skill or more rightly described as a capability as he is suggesting that organisations do not only need dynamic leaders [certainly not in the traditional sense in cultural organisations of the artistic director leading from the front] but that those skills

should be 'diffused' throughout the organisation thereby creating an organisation with leadership capability not just a few [or one] leader.

He also indicates that a 'failure to develop leadership talent throughout an organisation is a sure prescription for creating an organisation that is heavy on technical talent but weak on direction and talent'^{xvii}. This is clearly right in relation to most cultural organisations. However on a larger scale in relation to the EU cultural system this thinking is subverted or turned on its head [only in the EU would this be possible] where there is far sighted leadership undermined by a system that in operation is dysfunctional , where the 'technical talent ' runs systems , particularly in funding that has no understanding of the organisations who are its clients. The funded organisations have to compromise and distort their ethos to receive funding. They are the service deliverers for an administration that cannot achieve its mission without them but instead of being supportive and developmental is actively dysfunctional. For evidence of this statement a reading of any application for cultural funding will prove the point.

So why does a dysfunctional system persist? The key reason is that the flea^{xviii} (small arts) organisations can manoeuvre around the elephant [EU cultural funding]. They are in the most part driven by individuals with a passion for their art who have learnt to 'play the game'. As Handy points out successful flea organisations will endure the 'long hours, failures and mistakes' to be successful - in this case in obtaining funding.

He also points out that most successful flea organisations are created by charismatic^{xix} directors. This is true particularly in cultural organisations. The leader that becomes synonymous with the organisation. However if looked at in greater detail this often only applies to the founding of the organisation, to develop they have gone in the direction indicated by Lawler of devolving the leadership down through the organisation^{xx}.

An inevitable consequence of these two cultures [elephant and flea, EU funding and arts organisations] being interdependent on each other is that a new type of manager has emerged . Hopefully this role will be one that becomes less necessary in the future but is predominant now – that of the manager of knowledge workers - the person who can interface between the bureaucracy and the creative individuals in an organisation^{xxi}. Ultimately this is not a valuable function as it likely to be a role that does not create knowledge for the development of the organisation^{xxii}. An example of this role would be that of a fundraiser for a cultural organisation operating within the EU. In the future it is hoped that if the funding system becomes supportive rather than adversarial this role will become redundant. Not the role of fundraiser but the role of interface with an unproductive bureaucracy

To return to the theme of why the EU development of culture across countries is not reaching its potential. The following reference in *Abusing Culture*, a chapter in *Making it Home: Europe and the politics of culture* by Simon Munday are apposite here, although written in 1997 little has changed.

Officials are human too. At least some give the appearance of being so. The suggestions they make are often governed by their own experience. In Brussels this may mean that they adhere too closely to the cultural practices of their own home country. It may also mean, though, that if they are part of the new breed of Eurocrat, bred and educated

outside the parameters of any one culture, they may try to build a Europe that pays little regard to the niceties of regional diversity, preferring to fashion a set of rules which impose more homogeneous standards. Both are ultimately destructive approaches.^{xxiii}

It should be understood that the way funding forms are constructed and administered are conditioned by very specific cultural norms whose agencies have the arrogance to assume (because they have clearly not considered it) that there might be alternative ways that would achieve their objectives more efficiently. In EU cultural funding they have created systems in the image of a few of the countries rather than the overall membership.

Brussels has adopted systems in accounting of such labyrinthine excess in the name of efficiency that it is unlikely that they would ever be approved by independent auditors and yet they expect cultural organisations to adopt and respect their mechanisms.

The fault in the system maybe that those administering funds have very rarely ever been implementers, they are career bureaucrats that the system in which they work does not consider appropriate to educate (through experience) in carrying out projects .

Some intercultural projects start after the initial idea or enthusiasm between creative artists which leads to: funding and the filling in of forms. This grant is available – shall we construct a project? – to get the money. Unfortunately a great number of projects are ‘funding led’ for the wrong or questionable reasons - we want to do this project but we need to include additional international partners because it is the year of, diversity, inter-culturalism, disability.

Applications for European funding essentially make most cultural organisations dishonest. To complete the form with any chance of success you have to deliver, outputs normally and outcomes occasionally that are unrealistic. Outputs are valued because they can be accounted for and are often tangible e.g. reports, databases, records of productions/concerts /installations /exhibitions rather than art of any quality.

There may be high satisfaction with a performance or exhibition from creators and audience directly after the event but proving long term effect is quite difficult – however it is likely to have been promised in the application for funding. As anyone who has created productions or exhibitions will know is that - the plan that most creative and successful people tend to follow is to start the project and make corrections as they go along. However funding applications do not work like that – you need to be able to articulate the end result before you have started. In cultural strategy terms this is seen to be acceptable but would be entirely unacceptable and seen to be counter creative with in any research or science discipline.

Current European funding strategy and implementation has clearly adopted the worst aspects of those of its member states rather than the best. Therefore at present a good fundraiser within the EU and EC context is seen to be one that can ‘operate the system’ fill in forms and crucially distort most projects that organisations want to achieve for artistic/cultural reasons to fit the ‘*year of*’ agenda of the funders.

At an operational level current methods of project accounting are byzantine and totally counterproductive to achieving valuable project outcomes but more importantly create a culture of deviousness among cultural organisations to 'go round the system'. This is clearly an unacceptable inefficiency that regularly demonstrates the distance between strategists and implementers. It is not a question of making financial accounting 'looser' it is in fact a question of making it more efficient and fit for purpose -essentially toughening it in the service of a mission that is admirable.

Pragmatically should we be 'training' our students to 'operate' the system and at the same time to change it ?

Clearly transnational funding has issues of trust and risk which this paper does not have the specific brief to pursue however if the form you fill in has a structure that assumes an approach to accounting, both financial and operational that suggests you need to be very tightly controlled it creates a defensive/antagonistic relationship with the funder which is counter creative and will also persuade many of the most exciting and dynamic young organisations not to apply.

The Daiwa Foundation in Japan (but with offices in many countries) provides substantial grants that cover both education and culture with Japanese partners. The form is essentially three pages with a strict word limit of 150 words in each of five sections. It encourages applicants to be precise, to prioritise what you can achieve and removes long lists of possible outputs/outcomes. It is tough to fill in but infinitely more effective and sophisticated as a management tool for grant giving than most. The level of trust implied in the application engenders a relationship of partnership and coproduction rather than that with a banker.

Developing funding outside of the EU is a different process as administrators maybe dealing with systems or partners in continents with very different processes and criteria for example Korea, Japan, USA or South Africa. This is where the competency described below is relevant as it requires a clear understanding of partner's context and objectives. However it is sometimes more straight forward as the funding agency, although often from a national government, or in a national 'system' has had to actively think how work with international partners and has made the process user friendly, they acknowledge difference. They also tend to be more realistic on what can be achieved in terms of outcomes and change rather than just outputs and crucially with programmes seeking sustainability constantly review, evaluate adapt and change using management tools (found in most other sectors) to deliver more relevant outcomes – the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations come to mind as being good at this.

Therefore the competency in fundraising that could/should be taught is not a training to fill in specific forms but an education to understand a process of approaching applications that can be applied in any context. Cultural funding has diversified and the skills now needed cover, state, corporate, individual and foundation sectors – with a particular emphasis on different state sources from health, education, criminal justice and city regeneration^{xxiv}. However this can only be achieved as part of a more holistic education in strategic planning of which fundraising is only a part.

While these competencies can be taught the main problem in achieving cultural impact lies outside the range of competencies a cultural organisation may have – they lie with the European cultural

funding system itself. The system reflects a past era of administration that does not develop or support the potential of cultural organisations that operate in a more contemporary way.

However there is light at the end of the tunnel. There is thinking that moves beyond the dependence on institutional thinking. As explained at the start of this paper the new competencies and capacities needed by cultural and intercultural operators can only be fully developed with a serious change in the key cultural support mechanism, that of funding. The approach proposed by: Invitation to an Alternative Future by Mission Models Money : Designing for transition is more radical than that suggested above.

Institutions established to nurture the risk-taking practice of the creative artist have become embroiled in procedures designed to manage risk out of existence. There is no place for failure in this system – yet without it we can make nothing. Do not fall into the traps laid by this institutional landscape. Embrace uncertainty – let your accountants ‘manage risk’. Remember to look for the future with tomorrow’s eyes, not the spectacles handed us from the past. Create your own space – of failure and success, change and continuity, chaos and control, risk and comfort, integrity and mischief.^{xxv}

Essentially with new capacities, individuals and organisations will develop themselves, particularly with the use of new technologies^{xxvi} outside of the existing systems. If EU systems do not meet cultural organisational needs then the most adventurous will just go round the system.

We get trapped in immovable mindsets, fixed assumptions. Education and technology are specialist departments, not universal contexts.....

Some of these traps we fell into so long ago they have become our world. There is no other. We accept as read that we live in a time of scarce resources, increasing anxiety, and inevitable zero-sum competition. We must fight, even each other, to gain our share of the pot. Creative collaboration suffers. Money, accountability, institutional structure – they have all come to distort the picture rather than frame it.^{xxvii}

Therefore by teaching new capabilities we will inevitably change the system – however it will take some courage as there is considerable pressure from students and practicing administrators [understandably so] to be trained to work and gain employment in the existing systems. However I would argue that the role of universities is to educate for the future not just for the status quo.

The creative leaders on the horizons of the new culture are not only inventing new experiences, they are seeking out more flexible models and forms. Naturally fluid, collaborative, loosely structured organisations and adhocracies, unlabelled, operating in the interstices, creating entrepreneurial connections, alchemists of the impossible. If encouraged, they can refresh and invigorate the traditions and mature institutions that we need to anchor us and guide us through times of change, while at the same time being changed themselves. Great art is unconstrained. It emerges at the edge. It thrives on the impossible. Your journey to an alternative future will take you there. Was that not always your mission?^{xxviii}

We can educate and give students the tools to operate in this new environment and become the creative leaders of the future, however this could no doubt be achieved more swiftly if those who create the means to produce across the EU and enable 'intercultural dialogue' would embrace a mission to embed change within themselves.

This paper was originally prepared for:

***Comenius University, Department of Culturology, Faculty of Philosophy in Bratislava**

ⁱ Mario Vargas Llosa. Spoken at the final conference of the series, Europe: A Beautiful Idea? Organised by Nexus Institute, Rotterdam 2004. Cited from Anthony Everitt. Europe: United or Divided by Culture. European cultural foundation 2008.

ⁱⁱ *ibid*

ⁱⁱⁱ Hopefully not too irritatingly

^{iv} In fact this is exactly where new thinking and theoretical frameworks can be developed from practice.

^v Quoted from the conference introduction

^{vi} And some international funding

^{vii} Product here means theatre, music, dance etc production

^{viii} Istropolitana Project VSMU Bratislava, Slovakia , Diskurs Festival Giessen Germany , National Student Drama Festival, Scarborough UK etc

^{ix} This is obviously an area for potential research

^x *Trust Me On this, Organisational Support for Trust in a world of Hierarchies*. Thomas A Stewart. In *The Future of Leadership*. Ed Bennis, W. Spreitzer, G Cummings, G. Jossey-Bass 2001.

^{xi} *Ibid* p68

^{xii} *Ibid* p69

^{xiii} This is not referring to 'language' as such but to understanding of cultural communication.

^{xiv} *The Difference: How the Power of Diversity Creates Better Groups, Firms, Schools, and Societies* Scott E. Page. Princeton University Press 2007 New Jersey USA.

^{xv} But of course have just as much to offer as any culture/country

^{xvi} In this case intercultural producing.

^{xvii} *The Era of Human Capital Has Finally Arrived*. Edward E. Lawler III. *The Future of Leadership*. Ed Bennis, W. Spreitzer, G Cummings, G. Jossey-Bass 2001.

^{xviii} The idea of the elephant and flea organizations comes directly from the work of Charles and Elizabeth Handy. *The New Alchemists*. London Hutchinson 1999. The term alchemist is used to describe those who have created 'something from nothing, or from the metaphorical equivalent of base metal'

^{xix} I am referring to leadership styles defined by Weber

^{xx} The alternative was that of those organisations studied by Handy showed that as they grew large, towards the elephant, they devolved into many separate small companies all interconnected. By doing this they maintained their flexible and responsive structure.

^{xxi} This idea is developed by Thomas H Davenport. *Knowledge Work and the Future of Management*. P56. *The Future of Leadership*. Ed Bennis, W. Spreitzer, G Cummings, G. Jossey-Bass 2001.

^{xxii} Except in interfacing with the funding system.

^{xxiii} Simon Munday. *Making it Home: Europe and the politics of culture*. European Cultural Foundation 1997

^{xxiv} As cultural production deals with the agendas of these different sectors there is now a freedom to apply for funds from a range of funders – ministries, foundations NGOs.

^{xxv} *Invitation to an Alternative Future* by Mission Models Money : Designing for transition Clare Cooper and Roanne Dods Co-Directors, Mission Models Money

<http://www.missionmodelsmoney.org.uk/mmm3/renderb327.html>

^{xxvi} Particularly those of networking and new platforms of delivery.

^{xxvii} *Invitation to an Alternative Future* by Mission Models Money : Designing for transition Clare Cooper and Roanne Dods Co-Directors, Mission Models Money

^{xxviii} *ibid*