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Editors’ foreword
This book is part of The Fika Project which is supported by the EU Erasmus+ education and training programme and Region Västra Götaland in Sweden. Its aim is to develop a Continuing Professional Development (CPD) concept for international cultural leadership capable of meeting the demands of our complex and changing times. The project was initiated by Nätverkstan Kultur and its partners Trans Europe Halles, ENCATC and Olivearte Cultural Agency. As the starting point for the work, the project group undertook an analysis of the needs of the cultural sector and a survey of existing cultural leadership training. Together with Narratives by Cultural Change Makers, which is being published alongside it, this book forms the analytical and empirical basis of the CPD programme for international cultural leaders that is The Fika Project’s ultimate objective.

Perspectives on Cultural Leadership is not a manual for cultural leaders. The writers involved do not possess identical views on what cultural leadership is or does, and the book by no means covers all the areas of expertise that a cultural leader ought to be familiar with. Rather than aiming to be all-encompassing, the book seeks to open up discussion by offering thought-provoking perspectives on some of the waters that cultural leaders these days are obliged to navigate. The experiences of the project group in education and training and our active role in international cultural life have convinced us that our task in providing training is not to propose custom versions of professional roles but to draw attention to the challenges and opportunities cultural leadership are faced with. We aim also to make people aware of the hidden knowledge held by those working in the field. In contrast to other cultural leadership training, we do not assume that the tasks and abilities required of cultural leaders are the same irrespective of the nature and size of the organisation – an assumption that in practical terms often means that larger, established arts and cultural organisations become the norm. The Fika Project focuses more on smaller cultural organisations that in some cases are relatively new. This does not mean that we are closing the door to participants who have ambitions to lead major theatres or muse-
ums, it is simply that we have a different norm and reference point. We welcome participants and readers from the whole of the broad arts and cultural field, making no attempt to provide precise definitions of these elusive concepts. More important for us is that participants should have a desire to achieve something with their organisation; they must be people who want to make a difference, bring about change. We believe that there is a fundamental distinction between those organisations whose main aim is to generate a financial profit and those whose main desire is to create social, cultural and artistic value. This does not mean that cultural organisations can disregard monetary issues or financial management. On the contrary, they need to be especially efficient in their management of scant resources and creative about generating income. It does mean, though, that cultural organisations and their partner organisations, users and funders must all be clear about what the essentials and non-essentials are in terms of their creation of value.

Accompanying this book is the newly-published *Narratives by Cultural Change Makers*, which consists of interviews with ten prominent cultural leaders from different parts of the world. Active in different countries, in different types of organisations and with different art forms and types of culture, they tell us about life and work, education and training, professional experiences, success and setbacks, dilemmas and solutions.

Together, these two books form the basis of our attempts to design a CPD concept that is able to respond to the demands placed on cultural leadership in an international context today. We hope that, rather than presenting role models to emulate, these essays and stories will serve as inspiring examples and thought-provoking perspectives for the reader to test against their own experience.

The project group would like to extend its thanks to the authors of the articles and wish you an enjoyable read.

*Bohus-Björkö, spring 2016*  
*Karin Dalborg and Mikael Löfgren*
In 1993, a short but comprehensive paper was published in Sweden with the title *Alternativt ledarskap i kultursektorn* (‘Alternative forms of leadership in the arts and cultural sector’).\(^1\) The author, Margareta Lundberg, was the head of arts and culture at the local authority in Kungsbacka, a small town on the west coast of Sweden. The background to her paper was the financial crisis in the country in the early 1990s, which led to mass unemployment and severe cuts in the public sector. Instead of despairing in the face of these gloomy developments, Lundberg sought to use her research – based on interviews with cultural leaders – to share the experience and insight she and her colleagues had gained over the years. Lundberg felt that the research then available was of little help:

> “Current leadership theory is very much coloured by the prevailing approach of the business world. Leadership is often discussed from an organisational and structural perspective in terms of delegation, control measures and finance.

> What is missing in my view is both a more in-depth approach to working with individuals, groups and processes, and a greater awareness of the need to develop the ability of managers and col-

leagues to express themselves creatively. Employees in the cultural sector very rarely have the opportunity to express their creativity and their creative powers.

It is also my contention that the public sector needs to elucidate the core humanistic values that are the basis of its work, not least because the existence of the public sector is often controlled by short-term, self-interested financial premisses.”

There were thus three areas where Lundberg called for new thinking: opportunities for more in-depth development of the individual and groups; scope for the creativity and creative powers of managers and colleagues; and clearer links to artistic work’s core humanistic values.

In terms of literature on cultural leadership, Lundberg’s paper is an early example even from an international perspective. The 1990s, it is true, were witness to a sharp increase in academic literature on the subject of leadership, and there was an explosion in particular in articles on leadership focussing on management and psychology. But it was not in fact until the 2000s that the cultural leader became an area of interest for academia, and also for politics and civil society, as shown in the following anecdote.

..............................................

2. Ibid., p. 1.


4. According to Sue Kay,”cultural leadership” became a concept in British English in “early 2003”. (Scratching the seven year itch: a commentary, p. 9. in: A cultural leadership reader, eds. Sue Kay and Kate Venner with Susanne Burns and Mary Schwarz. http://ntcreativearts.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/a_cultural_leadership_reader_201007051349381.pdf.) In many places in the world, “cultural leader” has more the connotation of “community leader”, a representative and spokesperson for a minority ethnic and/or religious group. See, for example, the American training programme Cultural Leadership: “Understanding through the African-American and Jewish Experience” (culturalleadership.org), or the definition of American lecturer and activist Toby S Jenkins: “Cultural leadership is a leadership proxy that is rooted in community, family, and cultural identity.” (http://tobyjenkins.weebly.com/cultural-leadership.html) The British Council’s definition is completely different: “Cultural leadership is the act of leading the cultural sector. Like culture itself, it comes from many different people and
One of Scandinavia’s most successful and influential cultural leaders is Suzanne Osten. For several decades she led the work of Unga Klara, an independent part of Stockholms stadsteater (Stockholm City Theatre), which has revolutionised theatre for children and young people both in Sweden and internationally. Osten has also been an unrivalled inspiration and role model for generations of female artists and intellectuals. In an interview she talks about meeting a well-known business leader while on a flight, who told her that he regularly used her film *Bröderna Mozart* (‘The Mozart Brothers’) in his leadership courses. Osten comments:

“That was when I first became aware of the concept of leadership. I knew of course that I was managing the work, and I have also been aware of who my bosses were; I had my disputes with them and created an organisation for myself that suited my way of working. So I am well aware of what I have done, but I would not previously have acknowledged that I was so clearly engaged in leadership as part of the artistic process.”

---

**Historical outline**

In general terms, the sudden surge in interest in cultural leadership at the start of the 21st century was due to the dramatic expansion and diversification of the cultural sector in the previous decade. This was against a backdrop of globalisation – which gathered speed after the implosion of the Soviet Empire – European integration and advances in information technology. Increased spending power and more leisure time meant that more people in more and more parts of the world were able to spend increasing amounts of time and money on the cultural sector in its broadest sense. By the early 1990s, the global cultural and entertainment industry was already making its presence felt as can be practised in many different ways.”

---


6. Uwe Bødevadt, *At lede kunstnere m.m. - 12 skandinaviske kulturlederportrætter*. Børsens Forlag, Copenhagen 2009, p. 56.
one of the most profitable and rapidly-growing sectors. At the same time, culture, in the extended sense of creative ability and expressiveness, took on an ever greater role in an increasing number of areas of work life. Robert Reich, President Clinton’s Secretary of Labor from 1993 to 1997, coined the expression “symbolic analysts” and Richard Florida launched the concept of “the creative class” to describe the central players in the new economy.

Globalisation is not a continuous, one-dimensional process. It is contradictory, evolves in step changes and has financial, political and cultural aspects to it. In its neoliberal guise, globalisation had been seeking since the 1980s to remove obstacles presented by the welfare state and tear down national barriers to the logic of capital. The public sector was ordered to copy the management philosophy and evaluation techniques of the private sector. One of the consequences of the policies of deregulation and privatisation was the blurring of the traditional boundaries between the arts and the cultural sector.

In 1997, Tony Blair’s newly-elected Labour government attempted to make a virtue of what seemed to be a new financial and political reality. Under the “Cool Britannia” slogan, the Department of National Heritage, which included the arts brief, was renamed the Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS). In 1998, the creative industries were promoted as the future of the struggling economy. This was an optimistic, forward-looking vision that linked in with the UK’s traditional

9. Neoliberal deregulation and privatisation policies were different in different parts of the world but generally applied to vital areas of society such as utilities, healthcare, education and communications.
strength in popular culture while at the same time contrasting with the Thatcherist ideology that had begun to reverberate with out-dated imperialism (“Rule Britannia”). The world would now be reconquered by means of pop music and fashion, London would again be swinging, and the economy would magically recover. Almost in passing, the British discourse on creative industries – and the consultancy work that the discourse paved the way for – became export products in themselves.¹¹

The glad tidings that the old opposition between culture and capitalism had now been overcome had an appeal far beyond the British Isles. In 2006, a Belgian consultancy produced a report commissioned by the European Commission about how the importance of the cultural sector for the economy was underestimated, attracting a great deal of attention.¹² During the first decade of the 2000s, country after country assembled statistics about and strategies for their creative industries.¹³ Researchers such as David Throsby and Giep Hagoort broadened and qualified the discussion about the relationships between culture and the economy.¹⁴

But globalisation did not just mean a rapprochement be-


¹². The KEA consultancy firm in Brussels produced their report The Economy of Europe in 2006. The work was based on the target adopted at the European Council meeting in Lisbon in March 2000 that required the EU to be “the most competitive and dynamic knowledge-based economy in the world, capable of sustainable economic growth with more and better jobs and greater social cohesion” by 2010. The basis of the consultants’ report was that the importance of culture and creative industries was underestimated in this target, and this was now to be corrected. http://www.keanet.eu/studies-and-contributions/economy-of-culture-in-europe/

¹³. See for example the report on culture and creative industries in Germany: https://www.unesco.de/fileadmin/medien/Dokumente/Bibliothek/culture_and_creative_industries.pdf

tween culture and economics in the conventional sense. During the 1980s, the *developmental* economist Amartya Sen set out an alternative theory of welfare, which included broadening the concept of freedom to include survival, education and social security, known as “functional capabilities”. In 1995, the World Commission on Culture and Development, which was initiated by UNESCO, published its influential report *Our Creative Diversity*. The report, which argued for the incorporation of sustainability and diversity into the concept of culture, can be read as a mild diplomatic protest against the prevailing economic system’s brutal exploitation of human and natural resources. More militant disapproval was expressed in the global justice movement that came together in the World Social Forum. The UNESCO initiative continued with the *Cultures and Globalization Series*, an ambitious research and book project under the editorship of Helmut Anheier and Raj Isar. An important contribution to the analysis of the role of culture in the “informational” networked society has been made by the Spanish-American sociologist Manuel Castells in his three-volume work *The Information Age. Economy, Society and Culture*.

Despite the expectations placed on the creative industries,

---

15. The theory is called “the capabilities approach” and has inspired both developmental economists and philosophers in their approaches to combating poverty, and not least in their perceptions of the progressive role often played by women. Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom*. Oxford New York: Oxford University Press 2001.


17. The World Social Forum (WSF) was launched in 2001 as a grassroots social equivalent to the World Economic Forum of the economic, political and media elite in Davos, Switzerland. Under the slogan “Another World is Possible”, activists from civil society across the world gathered for the first time in Porto Alegre, Brazil. In 2016 the WSF will be taking place in Montreal, Canada. The heterogeneous movement is sometimes called the anti-globalisation movement. For a perspective on activist strands of culture, see Sandy Fitzgerald’s contribution to this book.

18. The first volume in the series, *Conflicts and Tensions*, was published by Sage in 2007. Five volumes have been published to date.

19. The trilogy was originally published by Blackwell in 1996–98.
the cultural sector has been under significant pressure since the start of the new century. This is partly due to the cost crisis that derives inevitably from the fact that cultural activity is limited in the extent to which it can rationalise and become more efficient by cutting down on staff – there are just as many parts in *Hamlet* and *The Ring cycle* today as there were when the works were created.\(^{20}\) The financial crisis of 2008–9 and its far-reaching repercussions have also played a role. But is also due to ideologically-motivated cuts in public support for the cultural sector.

Influxes of refugees and migration prompted by poverty and the post-colonial wars in the Middle East and Africa, together with the financial crisis and increasing unemployment, have stirred up racism and xenophobia, and also provided a fertile environment for both radical nationalism and religiously-motivated extremism. The whole of Europe is witness to the rise of nationalistic and xenophobic movements and parties, which can reasonably come under the heading of *cultural* politics, i.e. the exclusionary political programmes are based on a culturally (historically, linguistically, ethnically/territorially) constructed identity.\(^{21}\)

There is just as much reason today to take an interest in the situation of the cultural sector and cultural leaders as there was when Margareta Lundberg wrote her book in the early 1990s. The need for enlightenment and humanism in the Europe of today is an urgent one.\(^{22}\)

\(^{20}\) The dilemma of the “productivity lag” and the limited rationalisation options available to the performing arts were noted by William J. Baumol and William G. Bowen in *Performing Arts: The Economic Dilemma*. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund 1966 – a work that is considered to be the beginnings of cultural economics. See also James Heilbrun, “Baumol’s cost disease”, in: *A Handbook of Cultural Economics*, ed. Ruth Towse. Edward Elgar 2005.

\(^{21}\) See Lena Andersson’s contribution to this book.

\(^{22}\) The issues bring to the fore the discussion on values that Mikael Löfgren addresses in his contribution to this book.
Analytical framework

Although it has become more and more common in the 2000s to talk about culture as a sector (a tendency that is probably linked to its growing economic potential and the resultant political and bureaucratic interest), the activity brought together under the ‘cultural sector’ umbrella is almost incomprehensibly diverse. The cultural sector consists of organisations and activity that differ widely in terms of size, financial resources, reputation and seniority. Some of them are commercial businesses whose overall objective is to generate profit. Others are public sector organisations and must comply with politically-determined terms of reference and regulations. Still others have their base in the civil society or the voluntary sector, where they chose to be so that they could create art, have some fun or change the world – or do a bit of each. Few cultural organisations are purely one thing or the other. Almost all of them need to earn money and comply with politically-determined laws and rules to some degree, and are imbued with an ambition to create art or to make a difference in some way.23 Every cultural organisation should clarify for itself and other people where it fits and what its overall objective is. For the sake of clarity let us distinguish between three possible purposes for a cultural organisation:

1. To earn money (commercial grounds);
2. To create social cohesion or employment opportunities, make a town/region attractive both for residents and for visitors (political/administrative grounds);
3. To create art and meaningful community, change the world (aesthetic/cultural/social grounds).

Some of the grounds above may seem puzzling. What organisation would want to justify its activities on bureaucratic grounds? Probably none. However, this doesn’t mean that there aren’t or-

23. See Sarah Thelwall’s contribution to this book.
ganisations that in reality act as if they have forgotten all the other reasons for their existence. Neither does there need to be any contradiction between the various purposes. There are organisations that earn money by creating art. Changing the world does not need to be as revolutionary as it sometimes sounds. It may be achieved by using art or some other cultural activity to help to make life a little easier or richer for people round about you. It’s the same thing whether the purpose is to create art or community or change the world, which we define as public value. There is no definitive definition of this concept as it will be the outcome of a negotiation between all the parties involved. The main thing in this context is that the individual cultural organisation raises awareness of the purpose of its existence and its activity both for itself and for the people around it.

It should be noted that every purpose, which is legitimate in itself, entails an inherent risk of the organisation’s own goal or interest obscuring all others or those of other people. This ultimately leads to problems. A cultural organisation that is blinded by the purpose of making money runs the risk of eventually losing the ability to do just that. A cultural organisation that is only responsive to bureaucratic terms of reference runs the risk of eventually forgetting the original meaning of the group. A cultural organisation that focuses only on satisfying its own motivations runs the risk of eventually losing the ability to be relevant to anyone other than the originators themselves.  

As part of the clarification process organisations should question themselves about their actual and desired reach. How local or global is the organisation and how global or local would it like to be? We call this the nature and degree of glocality and it encompasses relationships with users, partners and funders. There is often a tension between the aim to be, on the one hand, locally rooted and, on the other hand, to be relevant in a wider, perhaps global, context. How,  

24. We should add here that there is a difference between creating art and allowing it to be put before an audience. The former is an asocial activity that neither can nor should take account of others’ perceptions. The latter is a social activity that both can and should do so.
for example, can a contemporary art organisation be both locally relevant and at the forefront of the international art scene? Is it possible, or is there a need for compromise? If so, with whom? It is not just a matter of how many people you want to reach and collaborate with; it is also about which people you want to work with and for. And what capability – i.e. knowledge, skills and competences – the organisation has in relation to, say, the digital domain, intercultural collaboration and intersectionality.\textsuperscript{25}

For a cultural organisation to fulfil its purpose, it needs to work up a well thought-out \textit{strategy}. This will naturally vary depending on the direction and objective of the organisation, but some of the main features are suggested below:\textsuperscript{26}

\textbf{Moore’s strategic triangle}

\begin{center}
\begin{tikzpicture}
\centering
\node[shape=circle,fill=blue!20] (A) at (0,0) {Legitimacy \\
& resources};
\node[shape=circle,fill=blue!20] (B) at (-3,-3) {Operational capacities};
\node[shape=circle,fill=blue!20] (C) at (3,-3) {Public value};
\draw[->] (A) to (B);
\draw[->] (A) to (C);
\draw[->] (B) to (C);
\end{tikzpicture}
\end{center}

\textsuperscript{25} See the contributions from Rasmus Fleischer, Chris Torch and Paulina de los Reyes in this book.

\textsuperscript{26} The model, and the discussion about public value, are borrowed from Mark H Moore, \textit{Creating Public Value: Strategic Management in Government}. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press 1995. As can be seen from the discussion above, we have taken the liberty of broadening out Moore’s concept of public value to include not only social value but also cultural and artistic values. The reasoning for this move can be found in Mikael Löfgren, \textit{Inga undantag. Värdeskapandet i små och medelstora samtidskonsthallar.} (‘No exceptions. Creating values in small and medium-sized contemporary art galleries.’) Nätverkstan 2015, p. 75ff.
Every cultural organisation should ask itself the following strategic questions: 1) What is the public value (artistic, cultural or social) that we are striving for in our work? 2) How can we secure legitimacy and the necessary resources to produce that value? and 3) What operational capability (including investment and innovation) do we require or need to create to achieve that value?

However, it is not enough in itself for the cultural organisation’s board or management or even its entire workforce to be in agreement about how to address these strategic issues. The organisation must enter into a dialogue and negotiations with all parties involved, i.e. the users, funders and any other partners. This negotiation is not something that can easily be dealt with in one sitting; it is an integral part of the organisation’s ongoing work. It requires sensitivity, flexibility and an awareness that value can be realised over different periods of time – but the organisation must also have clarified for itself the reasons for its existence and the type of public value it wants to create.

So what qualities does a leader need in order to be able to lead a cultural organisation in line with the above principles? Few social players in a patriarchal, capitalist society are as ideologised as the leader, a fact that has given rise to a veritable industry both within academia and in the form of consultancy and publishing. In the self-help literature of popular science, leadership is presented as the route to social and financial success.

In more formal contexts, it is important at the outset to clarify the distinction between a manager and a leader. The former is a post, the latter is a capability. By no means all managers – unfortunately – are leaders (think of Ricky Gervais’s character in

27. For three perspectives on contemporary leadership in different parts of Europe see the contributions to this book by Joke Schrauwen, Annick Schramme and Jesse Segers; Lars Lindkvist; and Sue Kay.

Neither do all leaders need to be appointed managers; this, though, is a lesser problem, if indeed it is one.

Scarcely any other area of society has such powerful and legendary representatives as our artistic and cultural life. They include the fabled poets and sculptors of classical antiquity, the universal geniuses of the Renaissance and the philosophers of the Enlightenment. The strongest of these myths is the notion of the romantic (male) genius who, inspired by God, sacrifices himself and often those around him to Art with a capital A. This was a notion that endured until at least the end of the last century in the shape of demon conductors like Herbert von Karajan and demon film directors such as Ingmar Bergman. Judging by the TV series *Mozart in the Jungle*, which portrays a demonic maestro who communes with the dead masters, the romantic genius remains a standard in popular culture.

Towards the end of the last century, the artistic genius leadership model gained some competition. The artistic director of major cultural institutions was joined by an administrative director who was given responsibility for staffing and budgets and was also the CEO. This dual command model, still in use in many institutions, has preserved the notion of inherent conflict between artistic and financial responsibility.

As a counterpart to the tendency in the business world to emphasise creativity and entrepreneurialism, the creative industries brought with them a partly new view of the cultural leader as an inventive, collaborative and communicative coordinator of

29. This is of course a reference to Ricky Gervais and Stephen Merchant’s original British show from 2001 and not the pale American imitation. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/The_Office_(UK_TV_series)


31. The television series broadcast from 2014 is based on a documentary memoir by the oboist Blair Tindall dating from 2005: *Mozart in the Jungle. Sex, Drugs, and Classical Music*. Atlantic Monthly Press. The maestro played by Gael García Bernal is said to have been inspired by the Venezuelan conductor Gustavo Dudamel. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mozart_in_the_Jungle
working relationships. But the new impetus did not come solely from the private sector. Since the counterculture of the 1960s, the voluntary sector had seen the emergence of other, more participatory, democratic ideals for artistic and cultural activity and leadership. People questioned the idea of artwork as man’s work, and also queried working methods and concepts of quality. Even though the old ideals very much lived on in the tradition-bound cultural institutions such as national theatres and state art museums, they were challenged in small cultural organisations that were naturally at home in civil society. Rather than the old ideals of authoritarian, charismatic leaders, the latter practised a more democratic form of leadership, which in its most radical form advocated participation in leadership. With this, the exercising of leadership is not restricted to a post or a person; it denotes responsibilities, roles and tasks that are assumed and fulfilled by different workers at different times. Thus while not collective, participatory leadership is neither a formal position nor a set of attributes but a profession or rather a professionalism characterised by (democratic) participation, reflexivity and capability.

Leadership of this sort places considerable demands on the organisation, employees and its ways of working. And internally, the cultural organisation must work long-term on the strategic issues relating to the organisation’s purpose – how to create legitimacy, adequate resources and operational capabilities. The creation of public value requires the application of cultural leadership and ways of working in three interrelated dimensions: operational, relational and contextual. These dimensions can be viewed as spheres of activity each of which require several capabilities: knowledge, skills and competences. The operational dimension relates to the tools needed to enable the cultural leader to

32. See Julia Romanowska’s contribution to this book.

33. The distinction between knowledge, skills and competences relates to the European Qualifications Framework (EQF), a tool to facilitate translation and comparisons between different qualification systems in Europe. See https://ec.europa.eu/ploteus/search/site?f%5B%5D=im_field_entity_type%3A97
work efficiently and professionally. These may include resource planning, financial management and evaluation. This is about skills. But there is also a need for competence in the shape of a readiness for action and knowledge, i.e. an awareness that no tool is neutral in value. The relational dimension is about the team or organisation. How can you ensure that everyone participates and is able to become fully effective and do the best work they can? How do you best manage conflict: by trying to avoid it or by learning from it? How do you counteract harmful stress? Here too there is a need for the whole set of capabilities: knowledge, skills and competences. Finally, the contextual dimension requires an analysis of the context in which the activity takes place and that influences it, a context that it may to some extent be seeking to change. How do the organisational structure, ways of working and the organisation’s environment influence each other? What does a market analysis look like? What skills and competences are required to put its findings into practice?

Format of the book

This view of vocationally-oriented learning determines how this book has been organised. This is not a cultural leadership manual. The contributors have been recruited on the basis of their specialist knowledge, not because we share views on what culture and leadership is or should be. Instead of defining the words per se we scrutinize their context. We think the best way to handle the uncertainty surrounding concepts like ”culture” and ”leadership” in a programme like ours is by making them subject to common reflection and discussion. The aim of which is not to define once and for all the meaning of the words, but to give every participant an opportunity to with the help of others clarify her views on the matter. As its title suggests, rather than aim-

34. See Anna Johansen Fridén’s and Kerstin Jeding’s contributions to this book.
The book seeks to open up discussion by offering thought-provoking perspectives on some – but by no means all – of the key challenges faced by cultural leaders today. In accordance with the theoretical framework outlined above, the editorial principles for the book have been to highlight examples of the operational, relational and contextual fields of activity in which leadership is constructed and enacted.

The book consists of three main sections: Value and Values; Work and Art; Challenges and Opportunities.

The work of Pier Luigi Sacco and Sarah Thelwall has practical, applied importance for both urban areas and regions (Sacco) and small arts and cultural organisations (Thelwall). Sacco provides a background to and a brief outline of the main principles of the new era that he calls Culture 3.0, which is in part characterised by the fact that culture plays an essential role not just for people’s well-being or in terms of economic growth but for all aspects of society. Thelwall uses her experience as a consultant working with small cultural organisations in the UK and other countries to argue for the importance of creating a realistic picture of an organisation’s financial situation, and how it can be affected. Her article focuses on the difficult balance to be achieved between public subsidy and earned income.

The discussion about value that has flared up in recent decades is not just about the role culture plays in the rest of the economy. It is also about other values that art and culture contribute to society and its citizens. Some of the routes taken in this continuing value discussion, which includes Mark Moore’s analysis of public value, are presented here by Mikael Löfgren.35

The sphere of arts and culture is an area in which traditional roles are questioned. Authoritarian leaders and hierarchical organisational structures are unthinkable for generations who have grown up in a culture characterised by digitilisation’s relativisation of the boundaries between originators and audiences.

and between copying and creating. Small cultural organisations in particular seem to prioritise a model based on shared leadership, and on the whole this is not for formally democratic reasons but because it produces better artistic outcomes.

In the section Work & Art we have brought together three articles about cultural leadership from different parts of Europe. Joke Schrauwen, Annick Schramme and Jesse Segers have been researching how shared leadership works in practice in the arts and cultural sector. Using empirical material from continental Europe – Belgium and France – they test the hypothesis that shared leadership is better placed to meet the increasing challenges of a rapidly-changing world. Lars Lindkvist’s article provides advice on how leadership can best be practised in cultural organisations through an analysis of various leadership models and study of a specific county theatre in south-east Sweden. Sue Kay examines a number of common preconceptions about cultural leadership by looking at how leadership is practised in the day-to-day work of three small theatre organisations in southwest England. Her article underlines the significance of size. If our understanding of cultural leadership is based on large organisations as the norm, the circumstances and ways of working of small organisations (with fewer than five employees) – the overwhelming majority of all cultural organisations in the broadest sense – are rendered invisible.

The section concludes with Julia Romanowska, a musician and researcher at Karolinska Institutet in Stockholm, who reports on the leadership training she has conceived that she calls “Shibboleth”. In contrast to the business-related initiatives that like to philosophise about entrepreneurship as art, Romanowska uses art – fragments of music, literature and visual art – to improve the leadership of managers in different sectors. The

36. According to the Bible (Judges 12:5-6) pronunciation of the word shibboleth, which means “ear of corn” or “stream”, was a way of determining whether someone was a Gileadite or an Ephraimite, i.e. friend or foe. In contrast to the Gileadites, the Ephraimites did not have a ‘sh’ sound in their dialect and so pronounced the word as sibbolet.
article provides unexpected perspectives on the issue of the values of arts and culture.

Cultural leadership does not operate in a vacuum. It is always practised at specific times, in specific places, with specific colleagues and in relation to specific users. Education and training that wishes to prepare participants for the reality they will encounter would do well to be based on real conditions as far as possible and should constantly be putting theory into practice. The ‘Challenges and Opportunities’ section brings together articles depicting specific environmental challenges that at the same time present challenges for an organisation’s operational and relational dimensions: the ability to deal with conflict (Anna Johansen Fridén) and stress (Kerstin Jeding), the latest developments in the digital domain (Rasmus Fleischer), the concept of intersectionality that is the focus of the increasingly heated debate on identity politics, feminism and post-colonialism (Paulina de los Reyes), and intercultural cooperation (Chris Torch).

Anna Johansen Fridén is Head of Education at Nätverkstan Kultur, and an experienced trainer in group facilitation, mediation and conflict management. In her article she focuses on how to develop new approaches to conflict in daily life. While conflict is regarded as inevitable in friendship and love relationships, people at work are more likely to want to avoid it and to feel frustrated by it. By contrast, Johansen Fridén argues that conflict is essential for the creation of mutual trust and that there is much to be learned from it.

Kerstin Jeding, an Oxford-educated psychologist now active in Stockholm, passes on lessons from her research and practice about how to establish a healthy workplace and combat harmful stress. She notes amongst other things the importance of getting colleagues involved in the overall vision of the organisation – but also of ensuring that their involvement is established in a way that is sustainable in the long term. This means finding the right level of requirements and expectations, of goals that are not only inspiring but also realistic and sustainable.

With his starting point in the development of the American
company Google to date in this century, Rasmus Fleischer raises questions about the consequences of the internet being transformed from common land into increasingly closed-off, commercialised territory. What is the difference between having a database and being a database? What are the long-term consequences of public service organisations, such as libraries, outsourcing their archives and catalogues to private companies? What digital knowledge, competences and skills should a cultural organisation itself have at its disposal?

In Paulina de los Reyes’s contribution, intersectionality is a concept that cultural organisations can and should use to explore and challenge inequalities and subordination based on gender, class, sexuality or ethnicity. These are not permanently fixed categories that create finished identities; they are social positions that are given meaning through people’s actions in specific social and historical contexts. In this way, intersectionality is both the knowledge of these processes, the competence to identify them, and the skills to do something about them – both within an organisation and as part of its outreach activities.

Intercultural activist Chris Torch shares several formative experiences and encounters from his own lifelong work. No person is just one person; we all have several identities that we activate in different contexts. Torch sees intercultural cooperation as often the missing link in the European project. He has therefore drafted nine demanding tasks for those who wish to accept the challenge.

The book is interleaved with two essays that place the focus on art. Sandy Fitzgerald takes his own life as cultural leader and activist as the basis of a reflection on the relationship between art and political activism in recent decades. Swedish writer and opinion-maker Lena Andersson, whose novel Egenmäktigt förfarande - en roman om kärlek (2013) (‘Wilful Disregard: A Novel About Love’) has been translated into most European languages, concludes the book with a meditation on the limits of art and freedom of speech with reference to the terrorist attack against the satirical magazine Charlie Hebdo in January 2015.
Outlook

The cultural leaders of the late 2010s have a different world to grapple with than the one that was challenging Margareta Lundberg and her colleagues in the early 1990s. Globalisation, digitalisation and migration are exceeding their established limits. The welfare state has been more or less deregulated, privatised and segregated. There is no longer a separation between the local and the global. The world is here, and everywhere. International relations are increasingly becoming intercultural. Rather than a “computer-generated virtual reality” (Wikipedia), the virtual is becoming “real life”. Access to music, images and narratives is immediate and inexhaustible. In the digital remix culture, it is impossible to distinguish an original from a copy, or an originator from a plagiarist.

Meanwhile, new boundaries are being drawn and new walls are being put up. In the physical world, human and social rights are being made conditional on citizenship; others are left to an illegal existence, isolation and subordination. The digital common land is being fenced in and an individual’s activity is being supervised by commercial and state bodies. Unlimited accessibility is reducing education to a search function on the internet. In the face of the maelstrom of modernity, some react by cementing their identity and values to unyielding fundamentalism, assigning the realm of freedom not to the future but to the hereafter.

What is the meaning, in such a context, of ‘public value’, ‘culture’ and ‘art’? What must a cultural leader do?