

OVERVIEW

How can new generations of cultural activists find inspiration, solidarity and fulfilment to invest in the future development of arts and culture? Throughout this book, ideas, proposals and imaginative recommendations emerge in almost all of the texts that have resonances for the future. In addition to these references, which can be discovered and noted as the reader engages with each author, case study or interview, this section highlights some exciting and important directions that might indicate directions worth investigating or pursuing, as important to their practice. Within the context of the Italian cultural centre Manifatture Knos, Michele Bee interviews the French gardener and philosopher Gilles Clément, developing on the theory and practice of Third Space; Maureen Salmon suggests taking the concept of Jazz and applying it to diversity, as a way of embracing what is a certainty in a world of increasing interculturalism; Ian King looks at what decreases in public funding might mean and how looking beyond European borders could give examples of other approaches and an interview with members of the ufaFabrik cultural centre in Berlin sheds insight into the most important challenge of our time, namely global warming and how they have combined culture, creativity and sustainability into daily life. But at the end of the day, if there is one overriding feature and recommendation arising from 'Models to Manifestos' it is that culture, in the holistic and all-embracing meaning of the word, should take centre stage with regard to the future policies, support and development of our society. In this light, it is not about adopting 'business models' but is about changing the very concept of 'business models' to serve and be part of a different approach to how we create our futures. A conclusion might be that 'business models' are a problem, not just for the arts and culture sector but for the wider world who place profit before culture, appraise art as important when valued as a commodity and denigrate creativity as worthless. This then leaves us with a hugely poorer civilization and a future of ever-diminishing returns.

MANIFATTURE KNOS (Lecce)

"Spaces of indecision"

HOW DOES A CULTURAL PROJECT ON THE FAR TIP OF ITALY, IN A REGION THAT IS BESET BY PROBLEMS, SURVIVE WITH LITTLE OR NO STATE FUNDING, AUDIENCES AND PARTICIPANTS WHO HAVE VERY LITTLE MONEY, A REGIME THAT IS LARGELY DISINTERESTED IN CONTEMPORARY ART AND A POLITICAL AND SOCIAL ENVIRONMENT THAT CAN BE DISMISSIVE OR ACTIVELY AGAINST NEW INITIATIVES? ONE WAY IS TO USE ALL OF THIS AS A LABORATORY FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF A RADICAL NEW CONCEPT THAT THRIVES ON THE VERY NOTION OF INSTABILITY AND THE PERIPHERY - WHAT MANIFATTURE KNOS CALLS 'SPACES OF INDECISION'.

A citizen's initiative, Manifatture Knos is a sociocultural project founded in 2006 with a very strong philosophical concept that informs all of its work. This concept, known as Third Place, is inspired by the concept of Third Landscape, which looks to nature as an organic way of living and organising. It is about not dictating or forcing, but facilitating and allowing things to grow naturally. In this way Manifatture Knos could be seen as opening up a safe and unrestricted space for citizens to enter and to feel free to explore and develop their dreams and ideas. This concept of Third Place also extends to the way the space is managed and developed, resisting conventional models and formal systems. This is not easy in a world that demands formality and bureaucratic responses but Manifatture Knos tries to navigate this reality and, at the same time, protect its core principles and enable uses/partners.

The organisation acquired the use of a former engineering training school in 2006 from the owner, the Provincial Council of Lecce. The space is a very large complex of industrial-type buildings, with an equally large surrounding outdoor vacant lot. Receiving no direct state subsidy, the organisation is supported by project funding and, in particular, by its users, comprising individuals, groups and associations, who benefit from the space for workshops, developing creative work, communal and social activities and as a venue for music, performance, festivals and the like.

Third Place as a concept was developed by Gilles Clément's Third Landscape, a French gardener, garden designer, botanist, entomologist and writer. He has gained attention all over the world for his design of public parks and his writings. Manifatture Knos' development has been inspired by Clément, who, in turn, has worked with Knos in their evolving process. Here he is in conversation with co-founder of Manifatture Knos, Michele Bee.

MB: You said that every intervention generates a neglect. What does this mean?

GC: We consider interventions, alterations, constructions, in relation to a surface of the land but without taking into account the whole landscape. We receive the authorisation to make an object in a space and then we do what we want in that space. But, what happens at the limit of the space, in the periphery – where we can do nothing, since it is not convenient, because geometry or whatever does not allow it. We do not care about this space. We forget about it and it becomes a third landscape, it becomes abandoned land. There are other reasons for abandonment, but that is a systematic, unconscious and mechanical reason and it goes with the growth of a city and its wider fabric. If the fabric was dense, we would not have it. And in the old city this never happens because the houses are stuck together, because the roads run along the houses. But in the construction of the modern city, we put a building here and another there, sometimes we put a road and we put the house a little behind. So, there are spaces that are not exploitable at all. When they are not exploitable and nobody cares, it becomes an abandoned space.

MB: Is it good that there are abandoned spaces?

GC: It is always good that there are abandoned spaces to accommodate a diversity that is driven out of everywhere else. That's always good. But when this landscape - the third landscape - is, say, staged in a way that is not very happy, not very pleasant, then the population will say "but what is that, it's not beautiful, it is just weeds". In short, there is an ignorance about the real content, the wealth, that it represents. This is where you have to do pedagogy. It makes it necessary to change the cultural model and to teach everyone the wealth that exists there, for it to be accepted.

MB: Can we generalise this concept? By saying that, then perhaps every action, even administrative, even power, produces these abandoned spaces, these spaces of freedom?

GC: We cannot totally generalise a principle like this because there are cases where the construction, the fabrications of a development, do not produce neglect. It is quite rare, but it does exist. But actually, this is a concern for the city, which is re-densifying today. Today, there are more and more theories of re-densification of the city, to avoid sprawl. The issue of biological wealth is important and it needs to be integrated into the space. That we make an intervention development that is sufficiently proportioned to the terrain, so that all of the land itself becomes interesting. Here at Knos, for instance, there is a huge esplanade, which is amazing in proportion. It is land that is abandoned, except maybe for parking. But, in reality, it is a space big enough to do something. So, it may not be a neglected, in the mechanical historical sense but it should be a space recovered for something interesting.

MB: Can we imagine a policy that consciously leaves something in its action that escapes it? And would that be a good thing?

GC: To convince the politicians that they organise the city and manage citizens leaving spaces of

indecision is very difficult. Because politicians always have the feeling of power. They want to control, always. And it's unbearable to the politician to do otherwise. But, we can give the policy tool "third landscape", which creates the possibility of deciding that at this or that place we do nothing, then the politician gets the opportunity to decide to do nothing. It's not indecision, it's a decision on the politician's part that there will be a space of indecision, a space where we do not know what will happen. But it's still very important for the politician to live the illusion that something has been decided.

MB: Why would it be important that there be spaces where we do nothing? And what difference is there between doing nothing and a space of indecision?

GC: It's important to do nothing, in most situations, in the city, in the countryside, because when you do nothing, you have a series of animal and plant species that find a home there and could not settle elsewhere. They cannot settle in the places where people work, where mankind turns the ground, where there are industries, there are roads, there are sterilised surfaces: it is not possible. But what we are talking about makes it possible. But these spaces are not very big, there are not many. And we need diversity. We are dependent on this diversity because we are constantly exploiting it. But we do not know what the future will bring. And perhaps we will need to draw from this treasure the possibility of finding something that is our future: a food, an energy, a textile, a material. But, it is surely not a necessity to exploit everything. It is also necessary - and this is another reason - for a territory of indecision to bring to these places, what we call the gardener's auxiliaries. That is to say, the insects, the animals, which help us in the territory that we exploit. For example, a small vegetable garden is more ecologically balanced if there is space around it, so much better if it has this third landscape, that is to say, indecision. Finally, the third reason, very important, is that there is the genetic pool, the genetic wealth, from which something will happen in the future: it is the territory of the invention of life. The more different species there are, the more likely it is that something special happens. It is better to have a basic genetic wealth to move forward in the future than a genetic narrowness.

MB: Is this 'indecision' approach only fundamental for plants and animals or is it for human beings also?

GC: This 'indecision' approach to the third landscape, to space, where we pay attention to doing nothing, is important for everyone. We are beings belonging to this diversity of which I speak. So we too, as human beings, need a mental space of indecision, a mental space of hope, in which something can happen that we have not foreseen. What we do not expect can always happen in an organised territory but it is more likely in a territory that is not organised. So, we need this, we need to welcome plants and animals that have no place elsewhere, but also humans who do not find their structure in an organised space, from which they feel excluded, hunted. That's important too. So, we can use the metaphor of the third landscape, saying that it is also a model for society. But, even outside of that, I think it is a necessity - besides being very difficult for everyone to specify - to have a particular poetic dimension. And this dimension, it is felt by absolutely everyone. There are no poor, no rich, there are no classes, there is nothing of this there. We are really in the "undecided" margin of the mental territory of the human.

MB: We talked about plants, animals, human beings in general. Could this approach also make sense when talking about children, about education? What is pedagogy for Gilles Clément?

GC: There is an extraordinary force in a neglected territory, a pedagogical force through play. It is a fun territory par excellence. The children know it very well. In the past, there was a word in French: "terrain vague". A vacant lot is an abandoned lot, where there have been activities, there are traces, materials, sometimes pieces of wood, pieces of iron. And children, they come here, they come to do something, which is a kind of construction, which is a game, but which is also the expression of their creativity. That's exactly what's happening in Knos, except it is more organised, it is no longer just with very small kids, it is bigger kids doing something that is an expression of their creativity. They can do that with bike wheels, they can do that with pieces of wood or salvage. It is a beautiful wasteland. So, this is the third place, in Knos we are in the third place, more than in the third landscape, the original meaning, because the third landscape in the original sense was rather non-human biodiversity. But here we are in a space of freedom that directly interests the adults and especially the children. I would say, the opposite of that, the opposite that is imposed, the opposite really wanted by the market, is the manufacture of toys. We make toys, plastic, all colors, automatic, which flash and do I know not what, but then it is finished. There, the child is the consumer of something that has been imagined by someone else and forced to consume. It is not at all the same. And in the end it is dead, it is over. It will take a lot of time to wake the child up after this. Whereas, when the child is immersed in a space of freedom, a third place - as you define it - at that moment children are obliged to think about what they will do with what is at hand. It becomes a creative experience. The child becomes autonomous in their thought, obliged to think for themselves, and is not the consumer of someone else's thought, and that is very important.

It seems to me that places like this can provide answers to questions that everyone is asking today. In Knos there is something that I see happening. The space of freedom that Knos transmits, in a certain way, the spirit, giving them an access to freedom to which they themselves did not expect. And we have feedback from this, from people who are quiet, that are not here to make a revolution. And they do it. Despite everything. Because they want to make a hole in the asphalt.

MB: We talked about spaces of indecision for plants, animals, human beings, children. What could it mean to be a gardener of oneself?

GC: We can transpose between taking care of a garden and taking care of ourselves. And besides, one of the ways to take care of oneself is to make a garden. Because by doing a garden we put ourselves in a position of balance, physical and mental, and we put ourselves in a position, rather particular, to wait for something that is happy. When we put a seed in the field, it is for tomorrow. We are drawn to the future, we don't dwell on nostalgia, and so we hope. This is what I call a mental territory of hope: the garden. This is my definition of the garden. Among others. I do not have many, but that one I prefer. To be a gardener is to put yourself in equilibrium. It means to share the shadow and the light, recognising there is both shadow and light. But, it is necessary to know what is the shadow at home,

what is the light at home. Otherwise, we will apply a cultural model of society, which will belong to others and try to apply it to oneself. It does not always work and even, I would say, it never works. It works for a community, it does not work for an individual. We need rules for society, for the individual we need the rules that we discover ourselves. That is to say, we will search in ourselves what suits us. To do that, you have to get rid of everything we've been taught. That's more difficult. Sometimes it's impossible. But, there is something that can help us get rid of our certainties: it's the journey. When we travel we will see other ways of thinking, other cultures, other models. And at that moment, one says oneself "but, then, where I lived, it is good, but the others also are good, the others are also interesting". At that moment we relativize and we finally abandon all the certainties. It is the abandonment of certainties that makes it possible to develop. When we have certainties, we are blocked.

MB: Is there a relationship between inner balance, ecosystem balance, and economic equilibrium?

GC: There is a relationship between an ecosystem balance, an economic equilibrium and an internal equilibrium from the moment the economic equilibrium is a balance that takes into account the other two. The economic equilibrium in our societies is a constructed equilibrium; it is a balance which is the object of reflections, of theories, of particular thoughts. The biological equilibrium of an ecosystem is a spontaneous equilibrium, where there is no consciousness, no obligatory reflection. The internal balance is an equilibrium, one can call, spontaneous: one is not obliged to make a psychological analysis for oneself, one can arrive intuitively to balance oneself. The economic equilibrium is the balance of an organized society. Today, in the current state of things, this economic equilibrium is absolutely not adjusted, neither to the biological equilibrium nor to the human equilibrium, at any time. It works for itself and for the benefit of a few people and at the expense of a very large number of people. So, if this system is to be completely eliminated, it is necessary to invent another one.

MB: We talked about inner balance and gardening ourselves. I'm still taking a metaphor, but to try to look at something. Is there a third landscape in ourselves, in our lives, something that escapes us?

GC: The question of the third landscape within oneself is a question that can be mentioned, I think, at any moment because it is the work of the unconscious. The unconscious is a fund, a biological fund that is almost intangible, immaterial, which is extraordinarily rich and very surprising. As far as I am concerned - I do not know my unconscious very well, since it is the characteristic of the unconscious, finally, not to be enlightened by consciousness - I was able to experience its power through drawing. Drawing is what allows us to show the invisible. Otherwise, for what is visible, we take a picture. But when we draw, we draw something particular that we chose and that is extracted from reality and put in another context. Sometimes we draw without knowing that we draw. Because we're phoning, because we're in a meeting and we're really bored, so we do something. And all of a sudden we see we did something. That's the third landscape we have at home. And we say, "That exists? It's monstrous! It's horrible!". Or we may say "Ah, it's very beautiful!", and so on. But, it does not matter, it is interesting. It was something we had not planned, that we did not know that existed in itself.

MB: I wonder if love has to do with freedom, of oneself, of others, or if it is the desire to have, to control. So, I wonder, I ask you: what is love for Gilles Clément?

GC: I think it's something we share, it's moments we're in absolute agreement with, and it's superior to any interested system. It is something that is above materiality too. There are things that are material and that we can also share, but, finally, in the sharing of the immaterial there is a pledge of love to the extent that we are without calculations and we do something because we think it's the best we can do for each other at that time.

MB: Is the miracle of talking to birds possible?

GC: Yes, I think it's possible to speak to birds, but it's harder to talk to humans.



FUTURE FACING WITH TOMORROW'S JAZZ WARRIORS

MAUREEN SALMON

"WHITE PEOPLE'S CULTURE APPEARS TO DOMINATE THE WORLD'S INTERNATIONAL CULTURE AT PRESENT, EVEN THOUGH WHITE PEOPLE ACCOUNT FOR ONLY 16% OF THE WORLD'S POPULATION... IT SEEMS INEVITABLE THAT SOME SERIOUS CHANGES ARE GOING TO HAPPEN OVER THE NEXT 20 YEARS OR SO" (MOSSLING 2010).

At the start of the new millennium, I, like many cultural activists of my generation, envisioned and invested in a future where cultural diversity would be a twenty first century reality, part of the new world order (Salmon 2003).

We should now be living in a Europe where everyone should be feeling valued, empowered and have access to opportunities to contribute in ways that benefit their communities. Despite the proliferation of research, government policy directives, initiatives and funding incentives, progress within the arts and cultural sector has been slow. There is a significant leadership challenge in the sector, evidenced by the under-representation of black and minority people in key leadership roles expected to be influential in promoting cultural diversity (Arts Council England 2019). The lack of cultural diversity in leadership is stifling the culture change necessary for creativity, innovation and sustainability in the arts and cultural sector.

Using jazz as a metaphor for social change, this essay is a call for action motivated by social, cultural and economic value of cultural diversity in leadership in the arts and cultural sector in UK and wider European context.

Change is a certainty and it is everywhere. Europe is changing, the world is changing. The global trends that are driving change are many: political and economic uncertainty, globalization, urbanisation, digitalisation, environmental sustainability, migration and demographics (Bakhshi and Schneider 2017). While we have little control over our external environments, we can however, tune into our emotional and cultural intelligence to engage and respond to opportunities for greater cultural equality and equity. The outcome of the 2016 referendum signifying Brexit has magnified the complexity of cultural diversity and created uncertainty for the future of the arts and cultural sector. However, a likely and unforeseen positive outcome of Brexit is the UK's ambition to reconnect with its past, the non-Western countries and regions it disconnected from decades ago. These are places of cultural change, cultural diversity, creativity, innovation, rapidly emerging creative industries and economies.