



A DESIGN FOR LIFE

A personal rumination on the value of rules



Author(s): Ross Millard

Type: Provocation Paper for the Clore Leadership Programme Fellowship 2017/18

Note: The paper presents the views of the author, and these do not necessarily reflect the views of the Clore Leadership Programme or its constituent partners. As a 'provocation paper', this piece is a deliberately personal, opinionated article, aimed at stirring up debate and/or discussion.

Published Under: Creative Commons





The Clore Leadership Programme

Ross Millard

(Open Fellowship Supported by Arts Council England)

Ross lives in Newcastle upon Tyne. Ross works with a range of organisations as Artistic and Music Director including Wildworks theatre company.

After a successful career as a professional musician, Ross co-founded Split Festival, Sunderland's first ever music festival which gave a platform for international and emerging performers. Ross is a Trustee of Sunderland Music, Arts and Culture Trust, supporting a vision for Sunderland's creative future. He is also co-chair of What Next? Sunderland. He was also a Founding Director of the FAC, which aims to provide a collective voice for the artist community within the music industry and to government.

This paper was written as a part of the author's Fellowship with the Clore Leadership Programme in 2016-17.

The Clore Leadership Programme is a not-for-profit initiative, aimed at developing and strengthening leadership potential across the cultural and creative sectors in the UK. The Programme awards its flagship Clore Fellowships on an annual basis to exceptional individuals drawn from across the UK and beyond, and runs a choice of programmes tailored to leadership needs of arts professionals at different stages of their career. This provocation paper has been produced under the aegis of Clore Leadership Programme. For more information, visit www.cloreleadership.org.



The Clore Leadership Programme

In Sunderland, in the autumn of 2000, I formed a band with three of my closest friends.

We were in our late teens, and in the very midst of that formative transition from thinking we knew everything to realising that we actually knew nothing. Now, in a band, understanding who you are becomes the very bedrock from which your best material can be excavated. After all, “the unexamined life is not worth living” (or at least so said Socrates). At the same time, when you’re 18 or 19, it’s far more common to be exploring the back catalogue of Nick Drake and discovering the existential effects of one-too-many pints of Diesel than it is to be gaining an understanding of the Johari Window. And even now I’m of an age where it’d be difficult to not snigger at what it might mean to “know thyself”.

So what, then, are the options for a young band whose members who are all ostensibly similar – in the sense that we were all white, Mackem lads with a love of guitars (reductive but certainly true)? We thought ourselves individual enough that left to our own devices we’d probably all choose to make music in very different ways, but we felt duty bound to have a go at doing something together, seeing as we were such good mates. What would we do when we got into the rehearsal room? The first notes of the first idea in a brand-new band could be extremely decisive. Who would introduce that initial idea? Who would dare set the template? Heavy lies the head that wears the crown...

Except it didn’t happen like that. We were teenagers, and we were probably a bit cocky, and certainly pretentious. We had all been in bands before, so the idea of ‘doing that again’ seemed passé and dreary. This time there’d be a concept, a purpose, a design, a – dare I say it – *manifesto*. Parameters would need to be set, we decided, so that this band wouldn’t wade into murky waters, where semi-tanned blokes with muscle t-shirts and four-minute songs about love and America would jam all night. We set some procedural rules that, surprisingly, would stick and come to define us. It was possibly the best decision we ever made as a band. Somehow, we did it before even playing a note.

● The Clore Leadership Programme



So, our six-point plan for The Futureheads was drafted, and it went something like this:

1. SING IN OUR OWN ACCENTS
2. NO TALKING IN BETWEEN SONGS
3. SAY SOMETHING ONCE, WHY SAY IT AGAIN? DON'T REPEAT ANY SECTIONS
4. IF LOVE MUST COME INTO IT, THEN IT MUST BE UNCONVENTIONAL -
OTHERWISE BORING
5. WE MUST ALL SING, ALL OF THE TIME (NO UNISON ALLOWED)
6. THE MUSIC MUST BE PLAYED FAST AND HARD

This brief play-book of things that we were and were not allowed to do was revelatory. Quite suddenly, there was identity. There were ideas. There were solutions to tricky problems with things like song structures, dynamics, tempo, purpose, intention. *The constraints were actually helpful.* We could be as ludicrous as we liked, but as long as we adhered to the tenets of the band, then it was permissible. I must say, it felt gloriously creative.

"I personally love restrictions because that forces you to create within boundaries, and maybe you think of neat ideas because of these restrictions."

David Lynch, film-maker and artist.

Something I feel that I should say, is that these self-defined principles can be as value-driven, aesthetically-oriented or fundamentally philosophical as one chooses them to be. The purpose is that they simply exist in the first place, and that they are applied without exception. A steadfast extension of a personal philosophy, I suppose, that seeps into all aspects of a professional or creative life as an extra layer of internal governance.

I hadn't particularly thought about these self-imposed constraints for quite a long time prior to starting my Clore Fellowship. However, given that the band is now only one of many plates that I find myself spinning (I also run a festival in Sunderland and have

● The Clore Leadership Programme



worked as an MD on various theatre productions in recent years), it occurred to me at some point earlier this year that I have employed no such procedural rules to the rest of my professional life. I have difficulty with saying no to projects, and over the past five years or so, I think it'd be fair to say that I haven't been particularly strategic about the work that I've chosen to take on. There have been some happy accidents along the way, but certainly no "starting with the end in mind" as businessman and scholar Dr Stephen R Covey would have it. After some consideration, a great deal of reflection and possibly some pontification, I decided that it might be a good idea to devise some new rules for myself.

Throughout this year, whilst I've been adventuring and experiencing what it means to be a Clore Fellow, I've met some incredibly inspirational people who are running arts organisations large and small around the UK. Obviously, there are a lot of things to try and pay attention to when you're speaking with someone for a short time. But for the first time, I've been struck on several occasions by cultural leaders who have mentioned their own personal or procedural rules during our conversations. Sometimes unprompted, too. Now, rather obviously, there has been a lot of focus this year for me on *visions* and *mission statements* and suchlike, which I appreciate are absolutely vital a lot of the time, but that's not what I'm talking about here. They don't quite cut the mustard because they can run away with themselves. They can be interpreted or passed down, and part of their function is the very notion that they aren't personal at all, but rather presiding, and, in theory, eternal. No, in this instance, I'm more interested in the things that an individual will impose on themselves, in order to create parameters, restrictions or situations for better focus, purpose or direction.

Whilst keeping such thoughts respectfully anonymous, I've been inspired this year by the Director who won't have more than two meetings with a manager or agent before meeting the artist, and who won't programme a piece of work if it's also going to go to another venue somewhere else in the UK. I learned from an extraordinary organisation who spoke of "loyalty in return for freedom" through the implementation of task-based,

● The Clore Leadership Programme



rather than time-based, contracts. I attended a conference where a keynote speaker spoke of “reading for an hour a day, every day” and another who told of the importance of losing “the fear of being disliked” by actively choosing to speak up at all things they disagreed with, regardless of context.

There was a great piece of advice from one Director of a museum, a sector renowned for its paternalistic relationship with the public, who spoke of looking to “kill the father” when they joined an organisation as a leader. By that, I think, they implied that visible remnants of the previous Director must be removed in order to bring about a new order of things – to signal a fresh start. There was an artist-leader who as a rule refused to ever use a studio, as it would feel “too much like work” to impose those confines. I heard from a retired politician and cultural advocate that they would never answer “no” but always “yes, if...”, and that person spoke very passionately about the change in positivity and focus within their organisation on account of this shift. On our second residential course, we heard from an Executive Director whose rule was to “always interview the unlikely candidate”, and, when discussing crisis management in particular, spoke of “setting the course, and delivering on it. Don’t deviate.” As cultural leaders, as with artists, there is process in everything we do, and there is meaning in everything we do. Sure, these rules as I’ve chosen to define them might walk a fine line between being defining factors of any given individual’s leadership style or *modus operandi*, and merely “pretty playthings” as American jurist and scholar Karl Llewellyn might have once flippantly described them. But there’s nothing to say that – at least occasionally – they can’t be both.

Of course, the rules for the band didn’t stay in place for our entire lifespan – things came and went, and we adapted the rules as we adapted our ideas on what the band was trying to achieve over the years. Over time, our relationship with music changed, and new rules and ideas came into play. For each album, new rules. Each time, they’d become so implicit after a point that they would exist solely in our heads, unspoken. I

● The Clore Leadership Programme



often wonder if that was a mistake in itself. Even being scrawled on a whiteboard in the practice room might have served as a useful reminder at times.

Successes, failures, pressures and expectations all had their say, overtly or surreptitiously, over subsequent sets of rules. There were also times, later, that the rules periodically went out of the window altogether, and for me that's where - artistically at least - we would sometimes fall a little short with some of the work.

I can't overstate the value I place on the rules we imposed, especially at the start of doing The Futureheads, and I'm slightly annoyed with myself that I haven't appropriated the idea for my working life before now. Here goes with a new six-point set of procedural rules for implementation, starting now:

1. ONLY SAY YES TO PROJECTS WHERE THERE IS SCOPE FOR CREATIVITY
2. DON'T ALLOW ONE PROJECT TO TAKE UP ALL OF YOUR TIME, AT ANY GIVEN TIME
3. MAKE NEW WORK – OR PERFORM – EVERY WEEK
4. SAY YES TO CREATIVE OPPORTUNITIES THAT INVOLVE TRAVEL TO ANY NEW LOCATIONS
5. COLLABORATE TO CREATE AT LEAST ONE NEW LARGE-SCALE PROJECT EVERY YEAR
6. ADVOCATE FOR SUNDERLAND AND THE NORTH-EAST ANY CHANCE YOU GET

We live in an age where a multitude of online social channels provide endless possibilities for us to edit, sensor and re-format who we are and what we stand for. Might it not be a good idea to have something codifying to keep us on the right track, whatever track that might be? There are literally millions of quotes, memes and gifs flooding the online void with holistically-driven airy-fairy rubbish like “feelings are just visitors - let them come and go”, and these things do very little to advocate for the concept of personal rules. In fact, I can see why things like this would be enough to put

● The Clore Leadership Programme



someone off even trying to articulate theirs, but it was valuable to me once, and I have a feeling it'll be valuable to me again.

During my year spent on the Clore Fellowship, there were two questions that came up that I haven't been able to forget about. Both of these questions had me harking back to the rules of the band. They were: "What do you need in place in order for you to do your best work?" and "How, when you need to, do you do the most with the least?" The answer to both of these questions, for me, is provided through the focus and structure of a personal manifesto, of sorts – a design for life. I appreciate that for some, having a set of values, or a systematic way of doing things is more than enough to be cracking on with. I also know that for many, there are enough constraints, biases and disadvantages already at play in the world that it might seem entitled and indulgent to look to impose more. But that would miss the point of this process. I think there is a discipline, integrity and compass in having such endemic rules. Sometimes it can be a bit of fun, no more no less. But sometimes – crucially – they could be the rails that keep the train on the track.