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ABSTRACT

Creativity as an Adaptive Process in the Making of a Civic Parade Event in Manchester: An Ethnography

This thesis uses insight drawn from fieldwork among people developing a civic parade in Manchester over 2011-12 to analyse what happens in the translation of ideas into entities for display. It argues for creativity as an adaptive process, a responsive, dynamic activity manifested by parade makers, as they sought to realise the imagined event. It traces the roles that underpinned parade production and how people made sense and use of allocated responsibilities, while working within and through organisational boundaries.

It situates the parade as an ‘art object’ (Gell 1998), constituted of assemblages at different scales (De Landa 2006), each embedded in a web of relationships to show how: a civic attempt to bring a public into being provides insight on the constituting organisational structures; the operational style of the arts organisation commissioned to produce the parade, led to imagining it into existence; and how two community groups responded to the parade parameters according to their own social dynamics.

The thesis builds on ethnographic analyses of collaborative activities to consider how organisational shapes combine and how their constitutions substantially affect evolving entities. Situating creativity as an adaptive process separates creative activities from art practices by emphasising how supporting people to respond productively to changing circumstances encourages them to be creative.

This thesis makes an original contribution to anthropology by showing through ethnography how creativity is a process, enacted through purposeful adaptation to circumstances in order to realise something tangible. It also encourages the development of a comparative framework for contemplating the extent to which different cultural contexts enable adaptive endeavours.

Jessica Symons, PhD Social Anthropology, The University of Manchester

19th October 2014
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Prelude: The Story of My Fieldwork

“You’re one of those housewife students, aren’t you?” a senior lecturer said as we stood chatting in the corridor. My eyes widened with shock. ‘Does she have any idea what it takes for me to do this?’ I asked myself.

When I started this PhD in 2009, I was a self-funding, working parent studying alongside mainly young single students with lifestyles that focused primarily on their studies. Over five years, I have studied and worked with three consecutive jobs including setting up a social enterprise, working on an EU project to design a web solution for cities to track their green and digital activity and now an anthropologist doing more fieldwork on an AHRC research project in Salford. I also have two young children, their active lives to organise and a home to maintain (together with my husband). I did not do this PhD as a hobby to keep myself entertained, I did it because I was driven to do it.

There are many beginnings to the story of my fieldwork. My point of orientation developed over time, through conversations with thoughtful people, from my work experiences, in my preoccupations with social change, in a quest to combine flights of fancy, an interest in arts, music and performance with pragmatic focused structural solutions to bring about a more equitable world. In chronological order, here are a few...

...I became an activist while working in the IT industry during the dot com boom. I was appalled by the wanton spending of money, raised on the stock exchange by dodgy men in back rooms with no ethics, while people starved and died of thirst in other parts of the world...

...I became a storyteller when I realised that campaigning for sustainability and equality needed to be entertaining to catch people’s attention. I started doing community radio, writing poetry and developing ideas for fictional stories...

...I realised I needed a PhD while working at Demos, a think tank in London, where the most persuasive people in the room had a structure and form to their arguments that came from doctorate training. The most impressive researchers were anthropologists who rooted insights in cultural contexts...
...I realised that I was not a social entrepreneur when I started several social enterprises and once established, lost interest in them. It was the development of ideas that interested me, rather than starting a business and keeping it going.

In 2007, I completed an MA in Social Anthropology at the University of Manchester. Keen to continue researching social issues and drawing on my experience from Demos, I started a think tank in Manchester. I was already running a women’s network and there was enthusiasm among people I encountered for a policy focused organisation. My engagement with city decision makers and contemplating its dynamics was promising but could only get funding for community action projects rather than action and research. I decided that the only way I could have the space to think deeply about alternatives to capitalist totalitarianism and environmental degradation was to do a PhD. But in what?

After 20 years working in IT, I am naturally oriented towards systems and processes. As a business analyst and project manager, I identify needs and requirements and then design IT solutions to accommodate them. In contemplating possible PhD areas of enquiry, I focused on decision making. I reasoned that if I could identify and understand the critical moments where one idea was pursued and not another, then activists could direct their energy more efficiently.

I write poetry and fiction for fun but also for activism. I am particularly interested in imagining future scenarios to help contemplate, and prepare, for alternative ways of living. Social Anthropology provides rich ethnographic insight into multiple cultural contexts, but few people outside anthropology can interpret ethnographic texts. Inspired by the public accessibility of art output and its methodological approach, I approached the University of Salford Contemporary Fine Art MA programme looking for a way of combining art and anthropological practice. In 2008, I started their MA but continued to develop ideas for a PhD while also working.

At an event on sustainability issues, I watched a presentation from a man called Joe and spoke to him afterwards. He also lived in Chorlton, South Manchester. He invited me to dinner. There I met his wife, Amanda, an anthropologist and artist. We became friends. Amanda asked me to an Anthropologists, Artists, Architects
and Archaeologists event in Glasgow to talk about a community cafe project I was
involved in. I was inspired by the academic environment there. I felt comfortable
and excited by the ideas shared. A few weeks later, I emailed a man from the Royal
Society of Arts who was doing a research project on how the brain works. We met
for lunch and a chat. That evening, I wrote my PhD Social Anthropology proposal to
do ethnographic research into the decision making process around sustainability
issues and using art methods as a form of engagement.

During the first year of the PhD, I spent some time deliberating on where to situate
fieldwork. My fixed interests were: understanding decision making; understanding
and participating in art practice; staying within the Manchester area; doing
something fun and playful. I approached the main art communities in the city –
Castlefield Gallery, Islington Mill, the Manchester International Festival. I
discussed becoming an ‘anthropologist in residence’ with Islington Mill artist
studios and the Contemporary Fine Art course at Salford. However they were not
keen. Artists tend to be quite introspective, shy even. Many ideas emerge
unexpectedly, on the move, in the kitchen, waking up. The chances of being there
when they happened seemed unlikely. It became clear that I needed a situation
where decisions on ideas were publicly negotiated and made.

While the Manchester International Festival involved collaborations and therefore
conversations to hear and participate in, the organisers considered development of
their art projects as highly sensitive. They were concerned that artists would be
uncomfortable with ‘being watched’ by a researcher. I gradually realised that I
could be seen as a nosey problem for artists, who might avoid me rather than be
interested in sharing their decision making processes.

To help with my own decision making, I produced a spreadsheet of wants and not-
wants. One key criterion was to develop new skills while doing fieldwork. At the
time, I was working on community food projects and I contemplated whether I
could do research helping people as they cooked, learning about how they chose
ingredients. But in cooking, decision making is also an internal process. I needed a
field where people were negotiating verbally and making many decisions on a
daily basis.
At work, I was setting up a social enterprise offering cooking sessions. As I discussed and developed the launch event with a colleague, I realised that public events would be a perfect site for analysis. I went to speak to the organisers of the Manchester Food and Drink festival at the Midland Hotel and while there, listened to a presentation about the role of public events in developing a city's cultural and economic potential.

The presenter, Howard, was a key player on the Manchester events scene and I met up with him several days later. He participated in several public event boards and was willing to introduce me to others involved in high-level conversations so that I could observe how decisions were made. He was also working on an event of his own. He had commissioned a cinematographer and sound engineer to film and record footage of the North and South poles. He had a classical music background and was in the process of commissioning a score to accompany the film footage. The films were to be screened with the score played live by Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra.

Howard really engaged with my research interests and we discussed how I might explore the creative process involved in the writing of a film score and also in the development of a filmed and live music event. I came away from our meeting excited. As I developed my research proposal for fieldwork in Manchester to follow 'public art events', I waited to hear from him but I never did. In the end I got an email from his colleague informing me that, sadly, he had died. I am grateful for Howard's insight and sorry that we did not have the opportunity to work together.

My focus was set – public art events in Manchester city centre. I started to think about all aspects of event development and emailed Manchester City Council to find out about 'Health and Safety' in public events. When I turned up for a meeting, my contact was not available and instead I met a man called Rodney. Rodney led me through the open plan council office and into a small meeting room. We sat down facing each other. I told him about my research and how I was interested in the organising of public art events and how decisions got made. Our subsequent conversation shaped my research further. Leaning back in his chair, he said to me, “It's all about the crowd. Without a crowd, there is no event”.
This thesis is about the often hidden and unrecognised aspects of a public art event. Rodney’s role in event management was functional. His responsibilities were traffic management, toilets, signage, safety and equipment. Yet he saw himself as a co-producer of something bigger than all these prosaic pieces. He was an enabler, a facilitator that made it possible for the crowd to enjoy themselves, to support and engage with the performers. Rodney described a gig in a North Manchester park. The pop band Oasis came on and the crowd surged forward, cheering and filling the space with an amazing energy. Then the PA system died and the band had to come off. He said, “The event wasn’t the same after that. It’s the power of the crowd that makes an event”.

Rodney suggested that I contact the Head of Events at the Council to find out if I could follow an art event and when I did email her, she told me that the Council only had control over one art event in the city centre - the Manchester Day Parade. I was welcome to follow that. She introduced me to the parade organisers who welcomed me into the parade making process, opening up opportunities to meet and follow artists, community groups and council officials.

During my fieldwork, the parade organisers gradually involved me in their activities. Initially, particularly in meetings, they would ignore me and I would take notes. Key insights came through conversations with people as we walked between meetings or over a cup of tea during a break. As time passed and I became more confident, I volunteered for increased responsibilities and became a part of the team – as a project manager, an artist and a member of the two community groups. I formed friendships, involved my family, promoted the parade to people I knew and generally committed to a successful event.

As I reflect back on the development of this thesis, I realise that my journey to parade as a fieldwork site mirrors the thesis structure, echoes my experiences in the field and supports my central premise of creativity as an adaptive process. This thesis analyses the ‘bones’ of the parade, its underlying structures and processes, just as I would analyse needs and requirements of a client when working in IT. Its moments of rich description aim to evoke the experience of the field. My movement from one individual to another as I gained focus is reminiscent of my
movement from one theoretical concept to another. Attention to applying this learning to a policy context draws from my activist sensibilities.

Finally, attentiveness to the anthropological tradition, working alongside people, learning from them and sharing my skills, led directly to my insight into creativity as an adaptive process. It was truly revelatory; it came to me half-way through writing up when I was deep in the text, reading fieldnotes, working with other anthropological insights and writing about my experiences. I shaped the final text to focus on this aspect because opening up creativity to people from all backgrounds, rather than locating it around certain individuals such as artists or musicians, seems an important step towards achieving a more prosperous, safe, sustainable and happy society. Recognising oneself as creative and therefore adaptive, approaching problems with alacrity and determination instead of defeatism, has the potential to empower people to engage with social solutions and imagine possible alternative futures.

My next step is to develop these insights through fiction and performance whilst advocating and practising anthropology.
CHAPTER 1: SETTING THE SCENE

“I think it is our job as artists or an arts organisation to provoke something that goes away from literal and naturalist and towards the poetic, metaphorical, imaginative.” (Parade Director, 2011)

This thesis uses insight drawn from fieldwork among people developing a civic parade in Manchester to analyse what happens in the translation of ideas into entities for display. It argues for creativity as an adaptive process, a responsive, dynamic activity by parade makers as they sought to realise ideas and give them tangible form. The analysis focuses on how organisational and other networks, skills, knowledge and resources were mobilised to develop a set of foundational ideas into an entity as big and unwieldy as a parade. Using the term ‘entity’ seeks to encapsulate these dynamic forms and inherent relationships.

The civic parade celebrated ‘Manchester Day’ and combined efforts from Council officials, arts organisations, private sponsors, freelance artists and community groups to produce large-scale parade sections, comprising structures and costumed people, dancing and performing to music and song on one single day. The Parade was an ‘opportunity for imaginative journeying’ (Parade Director) and just as it wended its way through the streets of Manchester, so the people who brought it into existence, participants and audience alike, followed particular paths and not others, responding productively to barriers and structures.

The analysis traces the roles that underpinned parade production and how people occupied, made sense of and used allocated responsibilities, working within and through organisational boundaries. It situates the parade as an ‘art object’ (Gell 1998), constituted of assemblages at different scales (De Landa 2006), each embedded in a web of relations to show how a civic attempt to bring a public into being provides insight on the constituting organisational structures. It builds on ethnographic analyses of collaborative activities to consider how organisational structures combine and how their constitutions substantially affect the evolving entity. Situating creativity as an adaptive process separates creative activities from art practices by emphasising that supporting people to respond productively to changing circumstances encourages them to be creative.
Using the metaphor of flow as an analytic frame, just as a river finds its shape from rocks and soft soil banks, so the parade shape emerged with obstacles and opportunities as parameters influencing people’s activities. Artists, brought into the parade to translate community groups’ ideas into ‘tangible lumps’ (Parade Design Co-ordinator) or physical entities, were relied on for this very ability to work comfortably in open-ended contexts. Born proposes in her ethnography of the BBC (Born 2004), that when organisational boundaries become too restrictive, people’s abilities to ‘be creative’ become stifled. In contrast, the people in the parade whose role was to ‘be creative’ worked with and around the restrictions in place; they solved problems when they came up against issues or ‘log jams’ (Parade Director). The process for ‘making ideas real’ underpins understandings of creativity in this context.

The parade works as a ‘moral moment’ (Corsín Jiménez 2007) providing insight into shared understandings that run through social activity. In particular it reveals that while artists were sought out for their creative potential, manifested in their ability to be adaptive, many non-artists work in similar ways which are not recognised as similarly creative. While fieldwork initially sought insight into the ‘creative process’ among ‘artists’, the analysis explores inter-relationships that go beyond creativity in art practice to consider how organisational structures shape understandings of creativity.

In order to develop an anthropological analysis of the parade, it is necessary firstly to establish it as a viable entity to be examined. The following sections show how the parade was constituted and how shared understandings and activities were enacted through different cultural contexts such as the Manchester City Council, outdoor event production, art practice, religion and ethnicity in the case of the community groups. As people collaborated over a period of years and the parade became established as an annual event in Manchester, the parade developed a coherent presence in itself to which people responded. People primarily, however, acted from within the context of their own organisation, community or interests. The first section below describes the constituent parts of the parade itself, the second discusses how to make the parade an object for analysis and the third considers how insight into creativity can be gained through analysing the parade. These sections set the scene for ethnographic analysis. Subsequent chapters take
on different perspectives on the parade sequentially and are brought together again in Chapter 6 to consider creativity in the parade as an adaptive process focused on the realisation of ideas. The conclusion contributes to growing discourse on the role of creativity as a mechanism for social engagement.

THE CONSTITUENT PARTS OF MANCHESTER DAY PARADE

In 2010, the Manchester Day Parade made its inaugural march down Deansgate, a floating world of aliens, robots and planes with an audience of 40,000 people. Themed ‘Out of this World’, the parade was a spectacle of dancing, stilt walking, bright colours, live music, huge trolley and bike mounted structures with a leading figurehead of ‘Spirit’ (based on the Rolls-Royce car bonnet ornament). The parade involved over 1,800 participants from 90 community and social groups across Manchester, supported by freelance artists and co-ordinated by the arts charity, Walk the Plank. It attracted sponsorship from a multinational engineering services company, a major food retailer, a national building company and many other private sector companies. Council operations ranged from political leadership and the ‘Major Events Team’ to food distribution, road planning, safety, refuse management and crowd control.

In 2011, 2012 and 2013 the parade once again marched down Deansgate, following a similar route, with many of the community groups from 2010, again co-ordinated by Walk the Plank and supported by Council staff and Councillors. Each year was themed differently – in 2011 ‘A Voyage of Discovery’, 2012 ‘The Sky’s the Limit...a celebration of heroic achievements’ and 2013 ‘Wish you were here’. Each parade promised and delivered a visual and aural display of noise, colour and movement. My fieldwork focused on Years Two (2011) and Three (2012), firstly as a parade organiser and then as a parade participant. The field site was the parade itself situated in parts of Manchester city centre as spaces animated by the parade participants and the processes through which this animation was made possible.

I began fieldwork in January 2011 with the parade organisers in the lead up to the parade in June 2011. Afterwards, I explored the parade’s genesis, interviewing people involved in its formation and developing connections with several community groups who had participated. I followed the parade into 2012, working with two community groups, their associated parade artists and in the workshop
alongside other artists. The first year of fieldwork focused on the managing and organising processes, largely following and working with the parade organisers. In the second year, seeking insight into the parade participants themselves, I was welcomed into two distinctly different groups - an art café and an Italian society and spent time in the basement of the art café and in the artist workshop, working alongside artists and members of these groups on these sections and others.

**Parade makers**

In this thesis, the term ‘parade makers’ encompasses the key Council officials involved in the parade, the parade producers and the parade artists. They formed a core ‘community of practice’ (Lave and Wenger 1991) across organisations who played a crucial role in ‘making’ the parade. ‘Parade organisers’ were the parade production team and council officials. People from ‘community groups’ were obviously also involved in developing the parade. However the shared understandings that gave community groups anthropological coherence came from their organisational contexts, rather than through their parade participation. The term ‘community group’ itself was adopted by the local authority, Manchester City Council to describe collections of people who gathered together for shared activities across the city, from schools, community centres and public sector workplaces to charities, interest and ethnic groups.

Massey finds urban spaces full of conflicting and competing trajectories “set within, and internally constituted through, complex geometries of differential power” (Massey 2007:89). Manchester Day Parade provided a fieldwork site crisscrossed with these multiple trajectories. People participated in the parade for all sorts of reasons, both voluntarily and as part of their job. How they interpreted their engagement and what happened when they crossed paths at meetings, in making workshops and through collaborations, provides perspectives on both collective imaginings of parade making, as well as personal motivations and influences, with “one’s own world always implicating the world of others” (Jackson 1998:2). In the following chapters, the Manchester Day Parade provides insight as an instantiation, a collection of frozen moments where the combined effects and impacts of interacting people, objects, concepts and circumstances can be detected.

---

1 The process of putting together the parade sections was referred to by Walk the Plank organisers and artists as ‘making’. This term is commonly used in art practice and provides a useful term to represent the development of the parade (cf Ingold 2013)
and interrogated. The first area for discussion is the parade within the context of Manchester itself.

The population of Manchester during the research period was 483,000, Greater Manchester had 2.5 million residents and the city also acted as an urban hub for a further 10 million people (Hebbert 2009). In this analysis, there is no claim of insight into a 'Mancunian' mentality, or a primary set of shared understandings. Instead, it focuses on how groups of individuals made sense of their activities. Since assemblages work at different scales, so ‘Manchester’ can be a cohesive entity in how it is made and represented by those who are thinking at that level. Similarly the parade, parade sections and their component parts were all entities which folded into each other, but can also be separately constituted. When discussing those involved in the Manchester Day Parade, their representations can be ‘held’ at different levels of scale and thought through that way. These coalescences formed transient but robust sets of shared understandings but also understandings that appeared shared but were actually drawn from very different assumptions and perspectives. From these bases, it is possible to follow roles and relationships between different entities and consider how they connected together.

The parade was commissioned by the Manchester City Council, the government organisation responsible for governing the urban area and overseen by elected officials. The Council representatives involved in the parade production consisted primarily of officials in the ‘Major Events team’ and two senior politicians who advocated for and initiated the parade idea itself. The officials commissioned arts charity, Walk the Plank to ‘produce’ the event. This charity had considerable experience in outdoor event production, ranging from complex firework displays to opening ceremonies at sporting events and civic celebrations.

The parade was developed over nine months from October to early June the following year. In the autumn Walk the Plank would pitch a topical theme to the Council-dominated ‘Steering Committee’ established so that the parade organisers could report to the parade founding politicians whose remit covered city based

---

2 ‘Steering Committees’ are commonly formed to oversee collaborations between multiple organisations in Manchester, UK and European contexts. These committees set the overall direction of activities and usually combine representatives who do the work with politicians and others with relevant connections and influence in other areas.
cultural activities. Steering Committee discussions usually focused on how to frame the event as a celebration of ‘all things Manchester’ aiming to spark ideas among Manchester communities without overly controlling the end result. This delicate balance is explored further in subsequent chapters.

Just before Christmas, invitations to participate in the parade were announced with the expectation that ‘community groups’ would apply to participate with ideas for parade sections relating to the proposed theme. These groups ranged from a Jewish Council, a Home Education group, a Samba band, a gay line-dancing troupe, a police contingent, cancer hospital, schools and charities. Each group participated as a ‘section’, their involvement elicited through the Council-led request for participation along the chosen theme. About 100 groups submitted an application form with their idea for parade participation and submissions reviewed by Walk the Plank and the Steering Committee with participants’ applications accepted in February. If successful, each community group was paired with an artist appropriate to their proposals. This coupling of artist and community group was overseen by the Design Co-ordinator of the Parade and project managers who focused on production, budgets and bringing people together. On call was a wide range of freelancers with specialisms in choreography, street theatre, pyrotechnics and ‘engineery types’ (a term used by a Walk the Plank Producer discussing repairs to undercarriages).

The parade ‘making’ workshop opened to artists and groups in March with two additional ‘making’ days open to the wider public in May. The parade happened on a Sunday in early June, the specific date changing from year to year responding to other events in the annual public calendar such as Father’s Day. The parade pieces were dismantled over seven days immediately after the event – recycled, thrown away or stored as deemed appropriate by parade organisers. The same again happened the following year.

Engagement with the parade developed through meetings, scheduled with periodic regularity - the key organisers met with the Steering Committee every month and monthly with project managers. The project managers met with the community groups and artists regularly, scheduled based on mutual availability, with the next meeting organised at the end of the current one. These more formal meetings were
interspersed with email and text exchanges, telephone calls and face-to-face encounters in the workshop. Each encounter aimed to check progress, clarify uncertainties, discuss how to resolve conflicts, and most of all, to make decisions collaboratively. They provided orientation points in the fixed time based structure that was the annual parade cycle.

The Council were already involved in community engagement activities throughout the district, with an engagement strategy, officers and dedicated funding. However this parade was the Council’s only internally directed event for the city centre (Head of Events, personal correspondence, 2010). All other public events in the city centre were initiated by other organisations, with Council support on infrastructure, event management and, at times, funding. For this event, the Council commissioned Walk the Plank, a specialist in ‘street theatre’ to work as a Council mediator, providing the artistic vision and operational capacity to devise an overall theme and play an active role in development and delivery. For the Council, the parade emphasis was a celebration of ‘Manchester Day’.

“Manchester Day is incredibly exciting and a great way for Manchester residents and communities to enjoy celebrating the achievements of their city” (Chair of Manchester Day).

This kind of control over ‘cultural’ output in the city was a new turn for the Council as described further in Chapter 2.

PARADE AS AN EVENT

The parade was brought together through planning meetings, making workshops, community group gatherings, health and safety walkthroughs and many more incremental steps that led to the day itself. Ladurie (1979) reflects back on Carnival as an event that provides “symbolic revelation, in miniature” of a society’s political, social and religious mores and Handelman (1998) describes events as “important phenomena because they constitute dense concentrations of symbols and their associations, that are of relevance to a particular people.” It is important to emphasise the nature of parade as an event in time and place and how this


4 It should be noted that gradually the ‘Manchester Day Parade’ morphed into ‘Manchester Day with an accompanying parade’ on the posters, website and press releases. There were hints at this ambition during fieldwork as I discuss in Chapter 6. By 2014, the parade was one of many Manchester Day events going on in the city centre.
impacted on people’s activities. This event was notable in its relevant present, dense with symbols and associations from past and projected futures, but always located in time as well as space. Its meanings must be interpreted through and with those who participated and contextualised it within their own frameworks.

Events can be planned, unplanned, inconsequential or pivotal moments in history. They may be identified in retrospect, expressed and interpreted through idioms of ritual, experience, practice and culture, and become metaphors and inspiration for wider social forces. Much like gift exchange, events can be characterised as ‘total social facts’, or to paraphrase Mauss, events are never completely separated from the people who make them (Mauss 1990 [1925]). For the Manchester Day Parade, the time based parameters provided its momentum. Alfred Gell suggests that the anthropology of time provides “means of representing, dispassionately and critically, the manifold ways in which time becomes salient in human affairs” (Gell 1992:315). In relation to the parade, the creation of a goal and deadline, a time based objective, acted as a mobilising force to combine a set of disparate activities in Manchester into something tangible and public for display in the streets of Manchester.

Time and the event as a ‘spot-in-time’ were useful mechanisms to enable action. Walk the Plank had the capacity to deliver these events consistently well, drawing on the expertise of its capable crew and absorbing the potential stress from the parade commissioners at the Council. A critical aspect of their role in the parade making process was to ensure that it actually happened, on time and to budget. The recognition of the parade as an event in a particular time and place, shot through with shared understandings from particular collaborations and shaped by the specific activities and interactions that took place as the parade development progressed, creates an object for analysis, albeit only partially discernable and unstable.

According to Gupta and Ferguson (1997), “we must turn away from the common sense idea that such things as locality and community are simply given and natural and turn toward a focus on social and political processes of place making, conceived less as a matter of ‘ideas’ than of embodied practices that shape identities and enable resistances” (Gupta and Ferguson 1997:6). In this case
however, the development of an event to produce a tangible representation of Manchester was indeed predicated on the production of ideas, for the parade itself (led by the Council politicians), for the parade theme (led by Walk the Plank) and for the parade sections (ostensibly led by community groups, supported by artists). It was the realisation of these ideas specifically for the parade event which led to both the shaping of identities and enabling resistances as well as being influenced by them.

The ethnographic approach was to follow the development of these ideas for the event, a trajectory in itself with a very fixed goal and end point. The time-based structure of the parade as a specific event with a particular configuration of participants and activities provided a layer of anthropological context for analysis. In Chapter 2, this event is put into the context of Manchester's existing activities. Chapter 3 considers parades as entities in themselves. In Chapter 4 and 5, the event is examined through the structures of organisations involved in it and in Chapter 6 the constitution of the parade as an idea-led event provides insight into creativity.

ORGANISING PARADE
Parade making activities were largely carried out by individuals working within related organisational and group contexts. This analysis draws from the practice of institutional ethnography which “takes as its entry point the experiences of specific individuals whose everyday activities are in some way hooked into, shaped by, and constituent of the institutional relations under exploration” (DeVault and McCoy 2006). IT workers in Engineering Culture (Kunda 1995), physicists working on particle acceleration in USA and Japan (Traweek 1992), family firms in Italy (Yanagisako 2002), workers in a Japanese cake factory (Kondo 1990), employees at the London Science Museum (Macdonald 2002) all show how the workplace brings influences from outside into organisationally specific cultural contexts and back out again. In many cases, key individuals emerge as experts in these hybrid cultures and shape the direction of the organisation. Jackall’s ethnography of managers in a large manufacturing corporation in the US shows how decisions were guided by the “prevailing morality of their organisational milieu”, where “even the CEO’s wishes and whims are taken as commands by close subordinates on the corporate staff, who turn them into policies and directives” (Jackall
1988:599, 602). Similarly, Born explores the changing dynamics of the BBC as it went through transition over the 1990s, from a secure, institutionalised workplace, protected by unions and tradition, to a market dominated, dynamic entity with little job security. Her key revelation is that senior management’s rhetoric about the BBC changed, but the practices of patronage and tribal aligning did not. Staff were promoted or protected, based on their relationships with other senior management. “Those who are winning are repeatedly reshuffled and renamed by those in power. Those who are not stay nominally still. The BBC is truly run by a nomenklatura. Ordinary staff are asked mutely to witness and concur with these obsessive renamings” (Born 2004:66).

Institutional ethnography shows how hybrid cultures can emerge where individual decision-making and inclinations are shaped by elements of past practice, patronage networks, habits and insights. While organisations attempt to make clear lines of command and structures, they are constituted of individuals who overlay new ways of doing things on old ways learned from other places, much like a palimpsest, so each approach becomes uniquely characteristic to the individual themselves and also shape the organisation in more or less obvious ways. Manchester Day Parade consisted of multiple groups, collaborating to varying degrees to put on the parade, and each group contained individuals with varying perspectives on how to fulfil their responsibilities. So while the analytical approach draws inspiration from institutional ethnographies, its boundaries lie not around a corporate entity but around concentrated coalescences of people gathered at a sufficient level of intensity to create a discernable social trace, accessible through fieldwork. De Landa provides a sense of scale to these coalescences or ‘constellations’ (De Landa 2006:49). He argues that everything is made up of a combination of assemblages, or interconnected parts. These assemblages can vary from a cell, whose constituent parts include DNA and proteins, to a city, to a nation state. The parts can range from material components such as body limbs, trees, cars to expressive components such as language, sensual or passionate ‘impressions’. Each assemblage is made up of other assemblages, and each assemblage itself has a function that is more than just a ‘sum of the parts’. He uses this approach to analyse the different forces that are enacted on and through
assemblages, and to consider their impacts in stabilising or destabilising social contexts. This approach is analysed further in Chapter 3.

Parade participants include the makers and community groups along with the audiences, parade sections, objects, materials, ideas, concepts, processes, systems and anything else involved in the collective assemblage that made up the parade. Actor-Network-Theory and material semiotics have drawn out the importance of analysing people in relation to the material aspects within which they are situated (Haraway 1997, Latour 2005, Moser and Law 2006, Law 2009, Suchman 2011). In this thesis, the parade itself and its components are contemplated more as a distributed ‘art object’ situated in a web of relations. While assemblages and material semiotics help identify the epistemological landscape, Gell’s Art Nexus helps interpret meaning (Gell 1998).

INTERPRETING PARADE
The Art Nexus identifies art objects as ‘indexes’, which mobilise certain connections and relationships within social groups. The art artefact is an index, nested in relations between initiators, producers, recipients, where the art object indexes, or points to, the forces and relations of others brought to bear upon it. So a painting of *Rokeby Venus* by Velázquez, slashed by suffragette Mary Richardson, photographed, restored by the National Gallery staff and described by Freedberg and by Gell, is integrated into a system of relations and acts as multiple indices for different aspects of these relations (Gell 1998). Not only does it index Velázquez’s motivation but also acts as an index for Mary Richardson’s anger and violence, for the museum’s consternation and the ‘public sensation’ that it caused when slashed, not to mention indexing the academic intention of both Freedberg and Gell who develop arguments based on its existence. (ibid:62) The index represents the “congealed residue of performance and agency in object form, through which access to other persons can be attained, and via which their agency can be communicated” (ibid:68).

Gell represents objects with social force as “vehicles of complicated ideas” in *Vogel’s Net* (Gell 1996:36), a paper that provides preliminary groundwork for the later *Art and Agency* (1998). In this paper, Gell responds to art critic, Danto’s attempt to contextualise a Zande hunting net. Danto is responding to criticism of
the inclusion of a Zande hunting net in the ART/ARTIFACT exhibition at the Centre for African Art, New York, curated by anthropologist Susan Vogel. Gell tackles Dante’s argument by demonstrating that the hunting net was meaningful for Zande people and that traps more generally can “communicate the idea of a nexus of intentionalities between hunters and prey animals via material forms and mechanisms” (Gell 1996:29). For Gell, the hunting net is perfectly situated in an art gallery because, alongside Western artworks, they are objects that can be “scrutinised as vehicles of complicated ideas, intended to achieve or mean something interesting, difficult, allusive, hard to bring off etc” (ibid:36). A candidate artwork is “any object or performance that potentially rewards such scrutinising because it embodies intentionalities that are complex, demanding of attention and perhaps difficult to reconstruct fully” (ibid:36). Gell takes Dante’s argument, that communities have some objects that are meaningful to them, but where Dante concluded that the hunter’s net should only fit into the category of art if it were produced as part of ritual activity, Gell argues that the net constitutes art because it captures social meaning in its relationship with other people and objects.

The social meaning ‘captured’ in this context can be contemplated by considering idea development for the parade. Plato presented ideas as unchanging universals embodying knowledge (Fine 1993). Descartes (1968) situated ideas as thought-images, Locke ((1690) 1970) described them as “the object of understanding when a man thinks” and Hume ((1739) 2012) identified them as perceptual ‘impressions’. Steiner (1988) finds ideas as ‘objects of experience’, apprehended by the mind just as the eye apprehends light. These perspectives share a representation of ideas as abstract entities to be mobilised and developed. The approach taken by the parade makers similarly made a call to ‘ideas’ as a critical part of the parade process. According to an artist working on the parade, ideas were ‘kernels of stories’. His role was to develop stories from the ‘seed idea’ that came from community groups (Interview 2012). For art philosopher Currie, art objects are “paradigmatic narrative entities...We turn to narrative when we want to focus on particularity of things, their relations to the intentions and other mental states of the agents and in situations where recourse to causal laws beyond our reach or unlikely to be helpful” (Currie 2007:33). Drawing on these insights,
the parade trajectory went as follows: the Parade Director designed the parade theme each year specifically to inspire people in Manchester, to generate a response in the form of impressions, thought images and objects of experience that would act as seeds or kernels from which a parade section could be developed, supported and guided by artists. This was how the political figures in Manchester could be persuaded to engage with artists working on the Manchester Day Parade. Artists were experienced story makers who could bring these ideas out and make them real, they enabled people to ‘go on an imaginative journey’ by using their experience and skills to change vague ideas into practical and realisable objects – props, costumes, structures according to parade criteria. This process focused on idea development and helps provide insight into how social meaning can develop around the parade as an art object.

The anthropologically interesting objects, ideas, concepts and events enmeshed in and constituent of the Manchester Day Parade captured social meaning and became ascribed with social purpose. A critical aspect of the field for analysis resides in the ideas and objects which the parade makers held fast to, those that seemed imbued with significant social meaning which people used and regarded as critical to the parade making process. Contemplating how people made sense of the parade provides a cultural entity for analysis, a ‘vehicle of complicated ideas’ retaining traces of organisations and other contexts that produced it. The parade was therefore a hybrid entity born from the union of multiple constituent parts, an ‘emergent’ state rather than a constructed edifice of nodes and connections. In order to analyse the parade therefore it was necessary to trace back and forth the relations between the event and its constituting processes and things; to contemplate how it came into being but also once made, how it then impacted back on others. This insight is examined further in Chapter 4.

For the parade works like Corsin Jiménez’s ‘moral moment’ where political values, social idioms and questions of justice fold onto one another (Corsín Jiménez 2007). His analysis of ‘re-institutionalisation’ aims to capture the work of “re-distributive flow in an organisational context”, providing “ethnographic moments, informed by the re-distributive flows (of affect, morality, power, knowledge) within any one
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5 In future journal papers, I hope to address aspects such as the importance of spreadsheets in organising the parade; the artist meditative relationships with the parade structures; the practice of sourcing materials and the types of materials used in parade construction and the emotional turmoil brought about by the parade destruction after the event.
particular organisational context” (ibid:6, his emphasis). Corsin Jiménez’s purpose here is to foreground the ways that particular concepts of social relationships manifest themselves in organisations, shaped by and shaping how people and objects interact. This helps us think through “how people organise their social life in virtue of the image they have of themselves and of their human capacities” (ibid:7). Contemplating the parade as an ethnographic moment provides insight into how many organisations and groups collaborating on a shared endeavour were also run through with redistributive flows.

PARADE ROLES
The parades that came into existence during fieldwork in 2011 and 2012 were distinct events with their own shape and identity. However, they were not constituted by a cohesive group of people but fluid, ‘pop-up’ collaborations between people, things and places. People drew from their own social contexts in making these connections. Primary contact with the parade came through the Head of Events at Manchester City Council leading to introduction at the highest level, by the commissioning body. The Head of Events connected me to the Director of Walk the Plank and Producer of the Manchester Day Parade. She also welcomed me into the Steering Committee meetings, privileged access which diminished on her retirement six months later.

Experiences throughout fieldwork indicated a symbiotic relationship between roles and responsibilities assigned to individuals within their organisational context and individual inclinations and interests which influenced how people responded to emerging events. With the parade as an anchoring point, this analysis focuses on the organisational contexts and people’s different ‘roles’ in the making of the event. The definition of roles and partial subversion of them was the process through which people from different backgrounds could work together in a coherent way without relying too much on existing understandings of each other’s practices, although therein also lay much confusion. A critical challenge during analysis was considering how and when people took decisions or actions within the context of their role and when they were subverting or challenging it. When the Head of Events invited me to attend the Steering Committee meetings, she used her high status to authorise my presence. She made the introductions to people at Walk the Plank and since the Council was their client, their impression of me was
mediated through that relationship. When she left, I was no longer invited to the Steering Committee meetings but Walk the Plank continued to involve me in their activities. It was important throughout the analysis to be attentive to inherent tensions in people's ability to act independently in organisational contexts and how inaction was just as powerful as action (cf Scott 1985).

This role-based approach speaks to analyses of structure and agency, drawing in particular on Bourdieu's situation of *habitus* as the context within which people act and make sense of the world around them (Bourdieu 1977 (2000 trans.)). By distinguishing between *habitus* as an internalised process that guides activity both consciously and otherwise, and *field* as the structural forces which impact on people’s abilities to act, Bourdieu provides a methodological guide for thinking through social inter-relationships. He makes sense of this proposition by analysing it in a literary context. He situates a literary genre as a *field* which structures and influences how people contribute to that particular genre but the field is also constantly changing as new work is contributed (Bourdieu 1983). People's ability to adapt is restricted by the expectations inherent in the field itself.

My analytic approach situates the individual and the roles they claim (or inhabit) in different contexts either voluntarily or otherwise. Drawing on Bourdieu, these roles had particular organisational or social expectations but these were in continuous flux. Roles evolved as new players and situations entered the field. Both the roles and their contexts were therefore considered in how they emerged (or appeared to emerge) in praxis, the “intersubjective social context” (King 2000:431).

Bourdieu's description of people in *habitus* and *fields* helps bring Turner's emphasis on the performative nature of social engagement (Turner and Schechner 1988). People often make sense of what they are doing while they are doing it. It is the analytic potential of role definition that is useful rather than insisting on the existence of roles in and of themselves. Defining roles for people in the field provides a way of making sense of how people interacted and what characteristics they appeared to emphasise at particular times and to what extent these characteristics seemed to influence how they acted in different contexts.
This approach also suggests a way of thinking through how ideas of freedom can be developed through an individual’s responsiveness to role definition, the extent to which they adopt, embrace or reject roles either self-consciously or otherwise. This analysis is attentive to the self-conscious way people moved between representing themselves based on their position within the parade organising context and their own interests and activities where these did not align. It also recognises my own inability to properly ever know where these boundaries began and ended.

The role call for the parade included: ‘Community groups’ whose participation was predicated on their existing relations and agreement to participate as part the civic politicians’ vision for a ‘Manchester Day’; Walk the Plank who organised entertaining public events and were commissioned by the City Council to produce this event; freelance artists and project managers contracted by Walk the Plank to support community groups in developing their parade ideas; Council officials who commissioned the event, oversaw its public profile and connected Walk the Plank to the community groups, street and other Council services; the Steering Committee where Walk the Plank and Council officials reported to two political figures whose remit covered city based cultural activities; private sector sponsors, largely as a group of staff members rather than key decision makers. These organisations were ‘action spaces’, places from which activities emerged and the cultural contexts that informed participants’ engagement.

It is important to also emphasise the role of project managers developing the parade. Each parade section was supported by ‘Project Managers’ from Walk the Plank who provided a critical liaison role, planning and co-ordinating meetings, budgets, resources, providing moral support, pragmatic advice and labour to the artists and the community groups. Most Project Managers focused mainly on the logistics, but others were very much engaged in the idea development itself, particularly in how to ‘animate’ the parade section on the day. One Project Manager was a performer in other contexts and situated herself as between the organising and artist roles (Interview 2011). While parade contributions came from many people, it was the project manager who often sat, like a spider, at the centre of these relationship webs, liaising between participants, supporting the
'idea' and its successful development. Few people involved saw the full extent of their responsibilities.

Just as individuals and organisations played specific roles in relation to the parade, so too did meetings, such as Steering Committee sessions or Walk the Plank production meetings where lists of tasks were worked through and allocated. By identifying roles played by different individuals, events and activities in the parade and contextualising them as situated within constellations of relations, enacting and being acted upon in different ways, the field for analysis gains further nuance. Role theory is helpful for teasing out different characteristics among groups of individuals and making them comparable (Biddle 1979, Eagly, Wood et al. 2000). However, rather that categorise people during analysis, this approach focuses on how people used role assignation in the field. It considers how artists could say they were ‘not artists’ but still construct the parade and community groups could seem very un-community-like but still be represented in the parade. These dynamics are discussed further in Chapter 3 and 5.

The very tangible deadline of a fixed date and a public event produces a certain kind of responsiveness that contrasts well with the inevitability of a river flowing out to the sea. This metaphor of flow (Hannerz 2002, Rockefeller 2011) runs through the analysis as it provides a perspective on momentum, coherence, obstacles and collaboration, all critical components of parade making as collaborative production, noting in particular how people responded to barriers and obstacles in their determination to ‘get the job done’. It helps work through the ongoing tensions between spontaneity and organisation which the parade organisers tangled with daily. Flow also brings us to the anthropology of organising, how people and structures combined to enable and obstruct social movement. It reveals the methods through which people accessed idioms and rituals as part of their organising. It helps situate the parade as an art object imbued with social meaning but also a transitory entity. Creativity can be found in how people used and subverted roles to adapt to emerging contexts, working with these flows as material entities to be manipulated to achieve certain goals.
INSTRUMENTALISED CREATIVITY

“It is time to take the creative risk of valuing imagination, the poetic, the symbolic, the aesthetic or the spiritual (features of culture-based creativity) as factors of innovation, social progress and European integration.” (KEA June 2009)

Creativity and innovation rhetoric has seeped into public and civil society domains to represent a panacea providing cultural and economic regeneration of cities. A recent UNESCO report exhorts ‘let’s put culture on the agenda’ to stimulate creative economies in developing counties and argues that “creativity and culture are processes or attributes that are intimately bound up in the imagining and generation of new ideas, products or ways of interpreting the world that have monetary and non-monetary benefits that can be recognised as instrumental to human development” (Bringsjord and Ferrucci 1999). Similarly CREATIVE EUROPE is an EU programme distributing €1.46 billion in funding over the next seven years for the ‘cultural and creative sectors’ defined as “European culture, cinema, television, music, literature, performing arts, heritage and related areas”.

In a study prepared for the EU Commission, consultants KEA claimed creativity could act as a lever for innovation, social progress and European integration (KEA June 2009). “The UK”, says Amanda Nevill, CEO of the British Film Institute, “is a leader in creativity, and our creative industries are recognised as key engines for economic growth”. Fieldwork in Manchester revealed a similar attitude towards culture, creativity and economic productivity. All these depictions of creativity as associated with idea production are emic, or local, uses of the term with an apparent shared understanding of its meaning. These contexts imply that the stimulation of novel outcomes for economic growth will come from creativity working as an ‘engine’ to generate desired outcomes. Political and academic circles reify ‘creativity’ drawing it into ‘economic growth’ rhetoric.

In their analysis of Manchester’s implementation of ICT projects funded by the EU, Green et al find very similar rhetoric for Internet and Communication Technologies (ICT) (Green, Harvey et al. 2005). ICT was also mobilised as a tool for similar
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6 The terms of culture and creativity were used loosely and interchangeably by many people throughout fieldwork. This thesis seeks to unpick understandings of creativity. Understandings of ‘culture’ as a concept and practice will be analysed in future research.


instrumental goals of fostering economic development, social progress and European integration. It seems that creativity is now in ascendance among policy makers and civic authorities as a mechanism through which other agendas such EU integration might be achieved. The structural processes involved in shaping how notions of creativity were made to work in different contexts lie at the heart of this analysis.

Anthropologist Robert Borofsky argues that trying to encapsulate creativity is like ‘trying to grasp the wind’ (Borofsky 2001:69). Analyses of creativity stretch across arts, literature and music, computing, science, psychology and management disciplines. Each discipline has its own interpretation which, as E. Paul Torrance, a psychologist specialising in creativity says, “all seem to have something in common, and yet each is slightly different” (Torrance 1979:43). The term creativity is often used without definition and in contexts that are not necessarily called ‘creative’ by the people under discussion.

Several key anthropological texts have explicitly drawn together analyses of creativity over the past two decades. In 2001, Locating Cultural Creativity, found that “while many of the old certainties about high culture and artistic canons may now be disintegrating, culture and creativity themselves are still very much a reflection of social processes involving power and the control of resources” (Liep 2001: back cover). Each author in this edited collection interprets creativity largely as novelty and shows how different social contexts produce interesting outcomes with creativity as an ‘engine’ for generating new possibilities. In particular, Hastrup argues for creativity in the way ”'newness' enters the world” as a feature of human agency; the novelty proposition is not focused on a new thing, per se, but on the creation of new possibilities (Hastrup 2001:29). This perspective combines well with Friedman, who argues that "creativity in the structural sense can be
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9 For example, Charles Limb, musician and hearing specialist and neurologist Allen Braun put jazz musicians into a functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) machine to take pictures of their brains while improvising to learn about ‘deep creativity’ which happens while improvising (Limb 2011). Cognitive scientist, Margaret Boden identifies a creative idea as "new, surprising, and valuable" in concept, method and style (Boden 2007). Her analyses of creativity as a systematic process, essential for the development of Artificial Intelligence (AI) models have proved critical in AI development. In psychology and management theory, leading creativity theorist, Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi, defines it as a form of 'flow' gained through studies of artists and musicians at work and extended this into a model for working in a focused and motivated way. Over 20 years Keith Sawyer has repeatedly emphasised the improvised, emergent and collaborative process of creativity (Sawyer 1992; Woodman, Sawyer et al. 1993; Sawyer 1995; Sawyer 1999; Sawyer 2000; Sawyer 2000; Sawyer 2001; Sawyer 2003; Sawyer 2004; Sawyer 2007; Sawyer and DeZutter 2009). He creates a distinction between product creativity "activities that result in objective, ostensible products—paintings, sculptures, musical scores—which remain after the creative act is complete" and improvisation where "the creative process is the product; the audience is watching the creative process as it occurs".
understood as the improvisation of structural variation" (Friedman 2001:59). In most of the volume however, creativity is used either as an etic term to describe activities which look like creativity to the author, particularly in relation to art, music and performance. A key exception is Löfgren (2001) who calls for attention to ‘everyday creativity’ and urges readers to consider what a non-creative culture or actor might look like.

Leach’s analyses develop ongoing insight gained from the Nekgini-speaking people on the Rai Coast of Papua New Guinea, where he finds “(C)creations, whether they be new persons, or new knowledge, are the outcome of relations between persons, land and spirits” (Leach 1998:19). He uses local people’s understanding of creation as inherent in all things to show incongruity of Euro-American notions of private property. “There is no single authorship of new forms or things in Nekgini. This is because all power to grow things, and all knowledge comes from the land” (ibid). While individuals are recognised as bringing about creations, they do not and cannot deny others who are resident and working the land, connected to these creations. Even creative ownership of the birth of a child is shared. In Modes of Creativity Leach claims notions of creativity reside in ‘Euro-American conceptualisations of the intellect’ where creativity is contingent and can be ‘encouraged or discouraged, stifled or suppressed’ (Leach 2004:170) i.e. it is optional. He compares this with the embodied ‘creative force’ among Nekgini speakers who directly situate themselves in productive processes i.e. creativity is inevitable.

Leach argues that by locating credit for creativity in the individual, there is difficulty “registering exactly the kind of dispersed creativity that collaborative endeavour and interdisciplinary work exhibit” (Leach 2004:27). He critiques as inappropriate, intellectual property law that lays claim to the ongoing and emergent process of making and shows in reference to a later project, how collaboration between artists and scientists causes disagreement due to lack of accreditation (Leach 2007). In one case, an artist failed to acknowledge the facilitator’s role in bringing the artist together with a scientist, instead claiming that they met through a “wonderful coincidence” and in another, a scientist became disgruntled because an artist did not credit his contribution to the works on display. For ‘dispersed creativity’ where “creativity itself lies in the
relationships between differentiated elements...The particularity of the outcome (its novelty, value, unique appearance or whatever) is a function of a kind of initial dispersal of agency and knowledge” (Leach 2007:22).

This perspective helps challenge representations of artists as innately creative individuals by demonstrating how artists provide a particular role in a productive process which can get amalgamated into artist identity as creative. Leach brings this argument to the free software movement (Leach, Nafus et al. 2009) sharing a concern with lawyer Lawrence Lessig, who argues that creativity as free expression has been located round individuals and organisations due to a corporate attention to the value of intellectual copyright (Lessig 2004). An artist or software developer as individual provider of discrete works is easier to acknowledge as auteur facilitating claims for copyright.

At a UK workshop which brought together academics, artists and policy makers to discuss ‘creativity, value, innovation, their contribution to society, and its measurement, in arts and humanities research’, Leach and Wilson argue for arts and humanities research as providing space for ‘responsiveness’ as people test the assumptions they have of the world. They say,

“Freedom, flow, mixtures, confidence, fearlessness, listening to others, and willingness to fail were continually shown to be essential to creativity and innovation. The point is that such endeavours are unpredictable by necessity” (Leach and Wilson 2010:5).

These characteristics of unpredictability and fluidity emerge as critical aspects of creativity in another key anthropological text, Creativity and Cultural Improvisation (Hallam and Ingold 2007). Ingold and Hallam find improvisation ‘keeps life going’, following along the ‘paths of future projections’ with creativity acting as a ‘motor of perpetual astonishment and wonder’ (Ingold and Hallam 2007:15). This collection also combines explicit discussions around creativity, with interpretations of specific activities as creative, including those which appear improvised. The analyses include Leach’s ongoing challenge of creativity as based on novelty (Leach 2007) and emphasise the everyday and incremental in the production and reproduction of cultural processes, including considering how people are deemed to lose creativity as they age (Degnen 2007). In one paper, Hirsch and Macdonald
explicitly situate the development of notions of ‘creativity’ as part of a Western trajectory associated with people taking individual responsibility and realising their potential. This became coupled with imagination so that acts of creation were “testifying to individual distinctiveness and personal identity” (Hirsch and Macdonald 2007). For them, the Romantics encouraged the view that the creative imagination produced something new and unprecedented, related to revealing the divine. Extending this analysis, it seems that associating artists so directly with creativity extrapolates the artist from working in a particular role into an artist as a particular kind of being.

Improvisation is a theme expanded in *Redrawing Anthropology*, a collection again edited by Ingold (2011) which explores the process of ‘following the materials’. Anthropologists, artists and archaeologists argue for corporeal and conceptual intermeshing in learning through doing. Artist-anthropologist Stephanie Bunn describes how people could grasp a patterning technique when they “stopped looking at the diagram” and argues that we should “understand through movement and our bodies” (Bunn 2011:30).

There is productive insight in creativity as improvised. However this perspective implies a lack of planning in advance and discourages analyses of creativity which involve pre-planning and structure. In the 2011 collection, Knappett (2011) counters the ‘conventional view’ that creativity, improvisation and invention are internal mental processes. His insight helps clarify how creativity might not always be about improvisation. Knappett uses a *chaine operatoire* to analyse ‘things’ as opaque artefacts resistant to categorisation. In his analysis he shows how building progressed from emergent design and development during the construction process to relying on architectural drawings and blueprints. Planning the development of buildings might not be an improvised process but can still be creative; an activity can be both planned in terms of desired outcomes and undetermined in terms of what exactly will emerge – it can be both organised and open-ended.

In most of these anthropological analyses, the authors find creativity even though the word itself is not used locally. The anthropologist or artists claim certain situations as relating to creativity based on their own interpretation. Furthermore
art, literature and music practice are often used as sites for analysis of ‘creative activity’, again drawing from the assumption that ‘the arts’ is an appropriate place to look when seeking insight into the creative process. I did the same thing when looking for a field site for this research. I assumed creativity would be found among artists and went looking for an art event where people were collaborating to produce something undetermined. This tendency in both academic and policy contexts to equate creativity with art practice is echoed in Manchester where political strategies identify ‘creative sectors’ as art, music, theatre and digital (Manchester Cultural Strategy Team 2002). It is within this context that many events in Manchester became regarded as creative cultural products through which political ambitions for economic development were mediated, as discussed in Chapter 2.

The Manchester Day Parade was initiated by two politicians within the City Council and overseen directly by them through the Steering Committee. They were focused on creating an event to ‘celebrate all things Manchester’ and the parade was a negotiated effort in realising this ambition, mobilising support and input from other parts of the Council, from the Executive which approved funding to the Events and Community engagement teams to the Health and Safety and Road Management teams. It also required engagement from external parties such as the parade producers, artists and of course ‘the community’. This attempt to ‘make’ culture in the city used specific contextual understandings of community, art and creativity which speak back to academic analyses of creativity. During fieldwork, the rhetorics of economic development, community cohesion, culture and creativity working alongside structured, improvised and emergent processes in actually bringing the parade together. The approach to parade production informs and confirms Leach’s argument for dispersed, distributed creativity and also extends it. While the mobilisation of creativity as a mechanism for economic and social leverage was ongoing, the parade in an ‘Euro-American’ context also produced collaborative improvised processes similar to those on the Rai Coast of Papua New Guinea. Fieldwork provided a perspective on the interplay between these shared and conflicted understandings of creativity.

The Manchester International Festival (MIF), a biennial arts event launched in the city in 2007, provides a useful contrast to the parade. Each festival commissioned
around ten pieces of new work from internationally renowned artists and took place in venues across the city of Manchester. This Festival was perhaps the largest ‘cultural product’ developed as part of a ‘Cultural Ambition’ aimed at stimulating the economy through city centre events\textsuperscript{10}. It was initiated by the City Council politically elected Leader and Chief Executive (neither were involved in the Manchester Day Parade). When planning fieldwork, I failed to get permission for participant observation for MIF but did secure interviews with senior decision-makers involved whose insights are used for comparative purposes in this thesis. Chapter 6 compares the Festival’s explicit focus on supporting artists’ creativity with the distributed ownership of ideas in the parade production.

Organisational ethnographies that pay attention to understandings of creativity reveal characteristics which this thesis argues underpins creativity; namely a willingness to see obstacles and enabling moments as opportunities and an ability to change approach quickly, reminiscent but not quite synonymous with improvisation. In the parade, the ‘creative process’ was negotiated, enabling contribution and sharing through collaboration, and providing insight into the practices that emerge in relation to creativity and cultural rhetoric. For the parade, people produced ideas as a starting point and artists were recruited to realise these ideas in a ‘creative’ role. This analysis considers why artists were assigned the ‘creative’ role in these collaborative activities and how organisational structures impacted artists’ and others’ capacity to develop the work. It argues that creative people work around organisational barriers and structures turning them into parameters. The specific role of the parade artist was to develop an idea into a tangible entity working to a fixed budget and deadline and required parade standard.

By comparing the role of parade artists with MIF artists, this analysis shows how the situation of ideas development at the centre of productive cultural activity is critical to understanding how organisational structures impact on people’s ability to be creative. From the parade itself, to the theme, to the parade sections, every aspect was presented as an idea. Unlike Leach’s Euro-American focus on intellectual property however, the explicit intention behind the parade was to start

\textsuperscript{10} It should be noted that while the economic revenue potential was emphasised when MIF first started, community engagement and accessibility of events to local people has become an increasing matter of importance in reports to the Council (Neighbourhood Scrutiny Committee 2013)
with ideas emerging from Manchester residents and encourage collaborative working between community groups and artists to help realise these ideas as parade sections.

CHAPTER 1 CONCLUSION

The analytical frame for exploring this parade is to conceptualise it as a hybrid of multiple constituent parts, an assemblage (DeLanda 2006) with its own identity but also containing traces of all those that helped create it – both organisations and individuals. As a re-institutionalisation (Corsin Jiménez 2007), it absorbs and (re)presents a combination of social values around participation and community which may or may not be consistent across the entities involved. With a specific group of individuals involved, playing particular roles in the production of the parade and focused on developing explicit ideas into tangible reality, attention must also be paid to agency of the actors themselves. The agency of objects involved in the parade must also be contemplated in how they help define the set of social relations around them.

Hastrup argues that an “illusion of a social whole is an efficient framework for social action...and the frame moves along with the act.” (Hastrup 2001:199). This combination of assemblages, groups of entities connected together and the ways in which these entities are implicated in a web of social relations, can be contextualised ethnographically and provide a field for analysis similar to the world of work and organisations. At the same time it recognises the constitutive flows that shape organisations as people, ideas and objects run through them. It situates the parade as an art object, allowing for analysis of it while recognising its distributed nature. It recognises that art objects emerge from cultural contexts whilst not being singly representative of any context. The parade as carefully defined field provides an ethnographic moment to allow insights into how notions of creativity ran through its constituent parts. Despite a diverse set of participants, contemplating creativity as one of these ‘redistributive flows' helps reveal shared assumptions and understandings; people mentioned ‘creative’ and ‘creativity’ throughout the parade making contexts.
Chapter 2 discusses how the parade emerged from the city council and puts it into the context of other activities in the city. There is an interrelationship between Manchester as a city imagined by its political and civil officers and Manchester as a distributed object, a constellation of multiple parts, a small proportion of which were encountered during fieldwork. Council officials and politicians sat at the heart of the city and the decisions they took impacted widely on other citizens, a role with more power than perhaps they recognised. These civic representatives negotiated a tension in supporting community self-expression: too much Council involvement was overwhelming; too little failed to enable activity. Often the means through which ideas were expressed and resources accessed was enabled by Council funding and/or political support whether they intended this or not.

Chapter 3 puts the parade into the context of parades in other places and explores Walk the Plank and colleagues at the City Council’s approach to making parade. A new approach focusing on an ‘anthropology of organising’ helps reveal the dynamics of the fluid nature of organisations and identifies organisations as simultaneously obstacles and as facilitating the intended direction of people working with and within them. This chapter explores how barriers and obstacles were worked by the parade organisers as parameters to give the parade entity its shape, including the nature of time and events which provide a structure for delivery.

Chapter 4 describes the ‘creative process’ in the making of the parade and how the parade organisers used an ‘art-like’ approach to developing the parade with its shape as an emergent process over which they had limited control. This chapter further develops the insight gained in the previous chapter on the delicate interplay in managing structure and serendipity, an approach used by parade artists and organisers alike. It also identifies the characteristics needed to have both confidence in setting materials in motion and standing back to let the momentum generated have some autonomy. Gell’s analysis of the art object helps here (Gell 1998), which when imbued with its own agency, has power dynamics distinctive from those who helped create it. This chapter shows how interpretations of creativity as either improvisory (i.e. spontaneous) or producing novelty do not encompass this directed and responsive activity.
Chapter 5 draws on fieldwork in Synergy, a faith based art cafe in Manchester, to consider how an attempt to use art as a means for engagement affected their parade participation. The differences in understanding art processes were revealed distinctly in the ways in which people involved themselves in the parade section development. These differences were already causing tensions within the art café itself and demonstrate very clearly alternative perspectives between those who see art as an output in itself and those who want to use it to achieve other agendas. A contrast with the Italian Society community group reveals the distinctly different contexts from which community groups engaged with the parade making process.

Chapter 6 brings together insights from previous chapters to argue that artists’ ability to develop ideas into tangible entities visible to others, is represented as the ‘creative’ component of the parade. An emphasis on ideas in both the Manchester Day Parade and the Manchester International Festival demonstrates the value of idea generation and artists’ role in generating and ensuring ideas into fruition. Artists’ creative leadership produced the cultural entities so desired by the civic body in Manchester but relied on organisational support to deliver them effectively. The anthropology of organising reveals how creativity resides in people’s ability to respond productively to barriers and circumstances to realise certain goals. Focusing on the production of ideas into entities and how this process happens, helps clarify understandings of creativity.

In the Conclusion, these anthropological insights contribute to wider discourse on creativity and cultural production both for academic and policy fields. In particular, it suggests that studying cultural productions in their socio-economic and political contexts helps reveal the dynamics of power surrounding actors in their daily practice. Analyses of creativity focused on how people develop collaborative activities can be used to establish a comparative framework across organisational structures. These structures can be examined to consider specifically how they influence people’s abilities to be adaptable, as they go on imaginative journeys.
CHAPTER 2: PRODUCING CULTURE

During fieldwork over 2011-2012, the Manchester Day Parade was the only major event in Manchester commissioned directly by the City Council. Held annually on the closest Sunday to midsummer, the mile-long parade proceeded through the city centre surrounded by thousands of Manchester residents and visitors. With a focus on ‘celebrating all things Manchester’ as part of ‘Manchester Day’, it brought together Council officials, arts organisations, private sponsors, freelance artists and community groups to collaborate on the production of large-scale floats and band performances. Since the parade took its shape from communities across Manchester, it provided a perfect site for analysing how different and potentially competing interests inscribed patterns on idea negotiation and development.

The Manchester Day Parade sits in explicit contrast with Procession, an artist-led parade in 2009 which caused consternation among civic officials for its provocative and mischievous character. Both instances of cultural expression in the city were part of a wider ‘Cultural Ambition’ intended to stimulate economic activity, to generate revenue for local businesses whilst also supporting social cohesion. These ‘cultural productions’ (Bourdieu 1983) were instantiations born from existing social networks or ‘sites of struggle’ with ‘states’ (ibid:13-14) that became products for exploitation. Rather than approach culture as “webs of significance” (Geertz 1994:214), this analysis focuses on emic understandings of ‘culture’ and cultural activity as constructed entities for particular purposes.

This chapter explores the development of the Manchester Day Parade as a Council-led project, and discuss its relation to a strategic “programme of cultural events”, intended to create Manchester as a “cultural destination” for economic development purposes. A group of public and private sector individuals affected the dynamics of event-making in the city revealing the interrelationship between Manchester as a city in the imaginary of these political and civil officers and Manchester as a distributed object, a constellation of multiple parts and a small proportion of the city encountered during fieldwork. It contrasts civic decision makers, for whom city making was an ongoing and discursive process, with local organisers, many of whom viewed the Council’s active engagement and development of the city as over-controlling. This contrast shows how Council
attempts to create cultural entities relied on the production of a ‘public’ both to participate in cultural events and be an audience. This approach privileged Council versions of Mancunian cultural identity rather than spontaneously emerging ones. Attentive to Navaro-Yashin’s emphasis on the “production of the political in public life” (Navaro-Yashin 2002:1), the account that follows is a ‘fantasy’ led enactment by Council officials and citizens alike on what should constitute ‘cultural life’ in the city centre and subsequent tension over who has the right to construct it. In this way, people attempted to make Manchester, to make culture and make the public as if they themselves were parade structures to be fashioned from bamboo and coloured fabrics.

MAKING MANCHESTER THROUGH CULTURE

The Manchester Day Parade marches down Deansgate, round along Cross Street, past the Royal Exchange Theatre (and site of the IRA bomb in Manchester in 1996), and through Albert Square, in front of the gothic Manchester Town Hall, built at the height of the Industrial Revolution, thereby tracing the Victorian heart of the city. Manchester’s history lies in the ascendance of a fairly prosperous market town, founded initially by the Romans in 79AD, which expanded rapidly during the Industrial Revolution in the 18th century11. The textile and related industries attracted workers from elsewhere in the UK and abroad, leading to one of the most diverse civic centres in the world today with 153 languages spoken12 and inter-relationships that run across the city region, nationally and internationally. The industrial and manufacturing base declined over the latter half of the 20th century along with many other Northern cities but in these ‘post-industrial’ spaces, new dominant sectors emerged such as property development, service provision and retail. When fieldwork commenced, Manchester remained the most significant city in the region. The city centre was the urban hub of ‘Greater Manchester’, brought together bureaucratically through a coalition of ‘Local Authorities’, formed initially to collaborate on joint services across the area. This Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) connects Bolton, Bury, Manchester, Oldham, Rochdale, Salford, Stockport, Tameside, Trafford and Wigan, jointly known as the ‘Manchester city region’ and home to over 2.6 million people (Office of National

11 For different perspectives on Manchester history, see Lloyd-Jones and Roux 1980, Floud, McCloskey et al. 1994, Barker 2004
12 http://mlm.humanities.manchester.ac.uk/, Accessed on 18th June 2014.
Statistics, 2010). In response to changing requirements from central government, these ten authorities have recently become the first in the country to develop a statutory “Combined Authority” to co-ordinate “key economic development, regeneration and transport functions”. Over several decades, the city centre of Manchester became the epicentre of regional activity, a position formalised by the establishment of Local Economic Partnership in 2011.

By 2014, Manchester was generating 50% of North West England’s economic output and 5% of the total national economic output. Its city centre acted as the economic powerhouse for the city region and Manchester City Council generated a substantial income from commercial business rates, with city centre companies paying over £200 million a year in business rates to the Inland Revenue. Yet, the geographical area of Manchester city centre was relatively small, and outside the city centre, the population ranked consistently high on deprivation measures. The majority of wealth generated in the city centre was pocketed by staff and shareholders who lived outside the city either in other local authorities such as Trafford, Stockport or further afield. The economic success of Manchester as an urban island of affluence surrounded by deprivation was associated with a savvy Chief Executive team at the local Council, led over three decades, initially by the charismatic leadership of Graham Stringer followed by his deputy Howard Bernstein (when Stringer left to become an MP in 1997).

Hebbert (2009) describes the renaissance of Manchester’s post-industrial declining cityscape, starting with a bid for the Olympic Games in 1996 which was unsuccessful but still attracted over £100 million in building investment. This was followed by a successful bid for the Commonwealth Games in 2002. The Chief Executive’s insight was that the 1980s Conservative government would not support a local Labour Council, so the team went to the private sector instead, contrary to traditional Labour practices of the time. Galvanised by their success in attracting financial investment and following the motto of ‘Making it happen’, a coalition of public and private sector key individuals focused on a policy of
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17 Manchester was the 3rd most deprived local authority area in England in 2010 (Manchester City Council, 2010)
physical regeneration to stimulate economic development in the city centre over subsequent decades (Tickell and Peck 1996, Quilley 1999).

Tickell and Peck (1995, 1996) argue that the dynamics of this group, a “so-called Manchester Mafia” were dominated by a male chauvinism that harks back to the Industrial era when ‘Manchester Men’ were renowned for “ruthless economic individualism” (Tickell and Peck 1996:605). Quilley (1999, 2000) also describes local political and economic activity in Manchester from the mid-1980s, referring to an entrepreneurial elite (cf also Ward 2003, Fielding and Tanner 2006, Massey 2007). For these political economists and geographers, Manchester provides a case study for how local Councils shifted away from local government to local governance, from hierarchical and bureaucratic forms of decision making to new forms based on local self-organisation, networking and negotiation (Cochrane 1993, Peck and Tickell 1995). A network of interrelated individuals, organisations and QUANGO (Quasi Autonomous Non-Governmental Organisation) bodies\(^{18}\), such as the Local Enterprise Partnerships (LEPs)\(^ {19}\) collaborated to stimulate jobs and capital accumulation in the city region.

In his analysis of “American families of old wealth”, Marcus (1991) shows how legal ‘instruments’ come to shape the way the family itself is constructed.

“A legally devised plan to transfer and conserve patrimonial capital in one generation becomes in the next generation an organisational framework for extended family relations - actually a formal model or surrogate of the family, with law rather than the founding entrepreneurial patriarch as its source of authority” (Marcus 1991:859).

Family relations and ways of interacting came to be defined and shaped through the legal structures put in place to conserve family wealth. In the same way in Manchester, a particular method of working became an established process for governing the city. A strong leadership within the City Council, combined with a network of semi-formal organising groups made up of individuals representing public and private organisations, and a commitment to generating economic

\(^{18}\) Quangos is a term used unofficially in media and common vernacular to describe organisations established by government bodies to realise their agendas outside a civil service context. See http://www.parliament.uk/business/publications/research/key-issues-for-the-new-parliament/decentralisation-of-power/quangos/. Accessed on 27/06/2014.

income for the city produced a method of practising local governance. Where Marcus’s family relationships came to be defined by the legal structures put in place to support them, in Manchester governing the city was shaped by strong relationships between specific individuals working across private and public sector towards the mutual satisfactory goal of economic success.

The overall vision was that improved financial resources would stimulate Manchester into becoming an attractive city to work and live, connecting into existing Western rhetoric on the importance of economic growth in national and urban contexts (Rodrik 2008). In particular, financially successful organisations would provide Council revenue through city corporation tax. The strategy documents that communicate political and administrative processes focused on the Council’s ability to deliver on this objective.

“Manchester City Council aims to continue to develop Manchester as a City of national and international significance where people choose to live and which companies want to invest in [sic]; a city where all citizens benefit from regeneration and have equal access to the wealth, employment and other opportunities which this brings. We will promote Manchester as an attractive and exciting multicultural city to encourage people to live and settle here, to invest here and to visit.” (Corporate Aims, Manchester City Council, 2013)

Throughout the 2000s, UK government strategy documents such as this one aimed to translate broader urban visions into specific policies, action plans and resource allocation. Every Council in the country was expected to develop strategy documents describing their ambitions for their municipality. Activities carried out to deliver on these documents were audited and ranked in the Comprehensive Performance Assessment by the Audit Commission, on behalf of central government. Manchester’s ‘2002 Cultural Strategy’ focused on how to develop the city as a “cultural destination”, to be delivered through “a programme of cultural events” where a primary goal was for the city “to be recognised for its national cultural contribution in the same way as Munich, Lyons, Milan or
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Barcelona” (Manchester City Council, 2002). To this end, a ‘Cultural Strategy Team’ was established in 2003, with a remit for “increasing participation in culture by the people of Manchester and using culture as a means to improve the profile of the city with the aim of attracting people to live, work and play in Manchester”. The “Cultural Ambition” strategy document sought to “ensure a year-round world-class cultural offering attracting more international visitors and a higher profile, as well as providing more opportunities for local people to enjoy and experience cultural events”. While it does not specifically define culture, the Cultural Strategy document refers to sport, arts and entertainment. This abstraction of ‘culture’ into an entity to be mobilized for economic and social gain was a conceptual move undertaken in Manchester as part of an ongoing economic stimulus program that began with physical regeneration through infrastructure investment. However, as Perry (2012) shows in her analysis of regional science funding allocation in the 1990s in the North West, this rhetoric of economic benefit was playing out through many layers of position holding, individual ambitions, misunderstandings and unexpected occurrences. The mobilisation of ‘culture’ as a bureaucratic instrument enabled other organisational and individual agendas.

By 2009, the production of the Greater Manchester 2020: Prosperity for All strategy by Association of Greater Manchester Authorities (AGMA) ‘culture’ was not only part of the “new economy of knowledge-led, often collaborative, enterprises” but also something to be “shifted”. In this document, the “Total Place Initiative” would provide “sharper tools for partnership delivery, which bring innovation and challenging ideas that seek to further integrate our delivery for the most disadvantaged and positively shift culture and behaviours in the most deprived areas” (AGMA (Association of Greater Manchester Authorities) 2009 my emphasis). Following Bourdieu, these documents produced by strategy teams within the City Council, produced a field of symbolic power where ‘symbolic power is the power to make things with words’ (Bourdieu 1989:23). The ‘culture’ identified by the documents was represented as an tangible entity to be mobilised and manipulated for economic and social benefit.
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In her analysis of the generative capacity of documents as objects enacting and acting on social contexts, anthropologist Gillian Evans categorises documents as “propositional statements; technologies of persuasion; organisational building matter; surfacing material and scaling devices” (Evans 2013:404). In the documents produced by the Olympic Park Legacy Company to imagine and prepare for the development of the Olympic Park created by 2012 Games in London, she finds pragmatic and hopeful (idealist) projects of transformation, similar to those produced for the Manchester Commonwealth Games. She argues that sometimes “ideas can mobilise enough reputational capital and a sufficiently dense network of allies that something exceptional happens” (ibid: 406). The two decades of local government focus on physical development in Manchester in 1980s and 1990s was characterised as building the city through public-private relationships and based on a visionary idea of regeneration. In the 2000s onwards, it seems that the civic leaders focused more explicitly on the social and cultural realm to realize similar ambitions. Both the Manchester International Festival (MIF) and the Manchester Day Parade, partly funded by the City Council during a ‘time of austerity’ were presented to citizens as methods for generating income for the city through increased footfall and expenditure in the city centre. MIF in particular, which attracted visitors from all over the world, was often represented as a success because it “brought a £40 million economic boost to the city” in 2013.24

However through their attempts to realize goals around prosperity for the city in a socio-cultural context, the civic leaders engaged in a very different kind of relationship with the citizens. Working with large and diverse groups of people was much harder to control than working with a chosen few building companies with similar objectives of economic productivity. In his analysis of development work, Mosse (2004) discusses a disconnection between policy models and the practices they are supposed to generate. He finds “surprisingly little attention” paid to the gap between these models and the practices and events they are expected to generate or legitimise in particular contexts. Over time, approaches to development changed from projects to broader sector-wide state-level partnerships, a new perspective that narrowed the ends of development (to
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international development targets on reduction of poverty, ill-health and illiteracy) but widened the means – the reorganisation of the state to ensure a good government, the delivery of which required vibrant civil society and democracy (Mosse 2004:640). Mosse draws on Foucault’s ‘governmentality’ to illustrate how power acts both on and through the agency and subjectivity of individuals as ethically free and rational subjects giving policy a ‘productive power which engenders subjectivities and aspirations’ (Foucault 1977:194, Mosse 2004:644). Realisations of ambitions developed in visionary statements are inevitably shaped by and through their encounter with messy reality. Just as Mosse shows how paths do not lead clearly from models to practice, so in Manchester the process of delivering strategic aims through the development of ‘cultural’ objectives ran into difficulties. A key difficulty was the interpretation of culture and creativity, two terms that were used synonymously in strategic documents but rarely defined.

**Making Culture Through Creativity**

Wrapped into the 2002 ‘Cultural Strategy’ in Manchester was a set of assumptions around creativity. Its first strategic objective was to “Challenge, encourage and stimulate creativity in its people by building on the City’s tradition of innovation and excellence in culture” (Manchester Cultural Strategy Team 2002:2) It proposed Manchester as a “creative city” aligning with the MIER Review, an influential study of Manchester’s potential for economic development, which encouraged innovation. In the Greater Manchester Strategy, which lays out a vision for the year 2020, it stated as its first principle “we will secure our place as one of Europe’s premier city regions, synonymous with creativity, culture, sport and the commercial exploitation of a world class knowledge base” (Association of Greater Manchester Authorities, 2009). Notions of culture, innovation and creativity were mobilised as tools through which the city would produce ‘Prosperity for all’. In these contexts, the terms culture and creativity were used unproblematically and interchangeably. They were represented as engines for driving economic development. This approach was challenged in 2009 by Charlie Leadbeater, a London based “leading authority on innovation and creativity” who was commissioned by NESTA, an independent foundation that “promotes innovation in
the UK”. Leadbeater produced a ‘Provocation’ pamphlet on Manchester, envisioning ‘an innovative future for Manchester’. While Leadbeater also used the terms creativity and innovation interchangeably, his overall theme argued for creativity in social and political innovations as well as cultural initiatives.

Leadbeater’s pamphlet referred to Manchester as the ‘Original Modern’ city, highlighting its ambition to be a “distinctive, socially inclusive, entrepreneurial city of innovation” and finding current successes in “physical renewal, property development and the burgeoning retail sector”. Leadbeater then argued that Manchester “must widen its horizons beyond parochial competition”, that “pockets of excellence and entrepreneurship are too often isolated and disconnected” and “scenes of social, physical and economic dereliction and disinvestment are still too common”. He also insisted that “the emphasis needs to shift from physical infrastructure and buildings to people and culture, from inputs to outcomes”. However he argued for a different notion of culture, “by culture we do not mean Manchester’s offer of art and music, but the wider sense of people’s values, especially their aspiration and ambitions, how they get things done, and especially, how they collaborate” (Leadbeater 2009;8;13;15;16). He argued that “culture and outlook are part of the explanation for why Manchester fails to punch above or at its weight” and that the “high ambitions of a relatively small elite will not be enough to carry the city through” (ibid:23-4). Leadbeater finished his pamphlet with a series of recommendations focused on connecting and engaging the people of the city, fostering creativity by providing opportunities for collaboration, building confidence and raising ambitions.

Leadbeater’s intervention came within the context of a wider trend among scholars and ‘thinkers’ calling for ‘creative cities’. While not defining creativity distinctly, the creative city was lauded as a ‘solution’ for urban regeneration, and different strategies provided on how to foster it (Hall 1998, Florida 2005, Landry 2008, Edensor, Leslie et al. 2009). Most of these analyses identify creativity as an engine for ‘cultural production’. Since cities were focused on cultural production for economic purposes, this connection facilitated an appropriation of creativity as a way of stimulating economic growth, or as Peck would have it, incorporating it into the ‘neoliberal agenda’ (Peck 2005). Leadbeater’s document was an attempt to

redefine creativity as a stimulus for generating wellbeing rather than revenue; to access creativity inherent in everyone rather than relating it to particular sectors such as art or music. I attended the pamphlet launch and public discussion in September 2009. There Sir Howard Bernstein, Manchester City Council’s Chief Executive appeared defensive and aggressive about Leadbeater’s findings. Indeed a subsequent discussion with Leadbeater revealed that the report was badly received by certain parts of the City Council (personal communication, 2011).

During question time, I asked Bernstein for his view on the relationship between wealth and happiness. His answer indicated that for Bernstein, wellbeing/confidence came from economic wealth. The idea of nurturing creativity in everyone to foster a climate of wellbeing, which may encourage social and economic wealth at some point in the future did not seem to resonate. I gained the impression that city decision makers such as Bernstein needed a more direct translation between city-supported activity and economic good fortune.

Bernstein’s reaction to the report should be seen in the context of an ongoing tension with existing art and music practitioners in the city. Critical players in Manchester’s regeneration, Howard Bernstein as Chief Executive together with Richard Leese, Council Leader had considerable power over discourses and strategic development of the city. Their figures loomed large over Manchester’s development for 20 years, part of the group of ‘Manchester Men’ (Tickell and Peck 1996). However during the 1980s and 1990s, while they focused on physical infrastructure, a thriving music scene grew and flourished in Manchester which had little to do with the City Council. As Hatherley (2011) accounts in his Guide to the New Ruins of Great Britain, a punk, post punk, then rave and post-rave movement grew up in the run-down areas such as Hulme, just as other parts of the city were regenerating into urban chic dwellings. Manchester Council already had a difficult relationship with some existing artists and musicians in the city, many of whom lived in areas ‘subjected’ to building development in the name of ‘regeneration’. Council attempts to engage in ‘cultural production’ as an economic strategy must be situated in these existing contentious relationships.

One source of this tension can be traced to a distinctive area in Hulme. In the 1990s an experimental 1960s building complex called the ‘Crescents’ was a hotbed of musical and artistic innovation during these so-called ‘Madchester’ years (Haslam 1999). While an innovative building project in the 1960s, by the 1990s, the Crescents had been condemned for destruction. As the buildings deteriorated, the anarchic music and graffiti art scene developed and the area grew famous for its parties in squats. Since the development was close to the university, many former students lived and partied in these buildings. When the development occurred, they were rehoused as Council tenants to nearby developments such as the ‘Redbricks’. One group of people managed to raise finance to commission their own social housing building, knows as the ‘Yellowbricks’ with live/work spaces. New collectives and cooperatives emerged focused on social issues such as ethical consumption and preventing domestic violence. Many residents and groups protested about further regeneration, particularly when this involved chopping down a large tree in the area. A protest built up momentum culminating in the ‘Birley Tree’ occupation and then destruction which made newspaper headlines.

The Council Executive seemed unsympathetic to these protests and condemned the parties in the Crescents widening the rift between the Council and the thriving art and music scene in the city (Hatherley 2011:115-156). The communities involved in both the protests and art/music production were opposed to a City Council who seemed focused only on stimulating a property boom and capital accumulation. Council rhetoric on creating jobs and improving financial wealth did not resonate with the experiences of musicians, poets and environmental activists in the city. In 2007, the UHC Collective, a coalition of artists who took an “outsider/activist approach to regeneration” created The Thin Veneer of Democracy, a 16ft oak table hand-painted in Indian ink. The table makers critiqued what they described as the cosy relations between public and private sector by mapping the relationships between individuals and organisations across public, private and third sector in Manchester (UHC Collective 2007). By inscribing a problematic network of relations onto an object and presenting it to the people participating in the network, the artists not only questioned the political dynamics
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in the city, they also imply a sense of being left out. The UHC Collective was not to be found on the influential network of relations on the table.

The move by the Council Executive into cultural activities focused on bringing in key figures from the now internationally famous art and music scenes. Just as they adapted to the political regime in the 1980s by working with private companies when the Conservative central government cut off access to finance and resources, so the Council adapted to a new emphasis on the cultural assets of the city. The Original Modern concept mentioned by Leadbeater was a reference to a branding exercise undertaken by Peter Saville. Co-founder of Factory Records, an iconic record label in the city that emerged from the anarchic parties in the Hulme Crescents during the 1980s, Saville was commissioned as ‘creative consultant’ by the Council during the early 2000s. By 2006 he had developed an organising metaphor for the city that focused on its status as the first city in the world to ‘industrialise’ as part of the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century. A participant in the thriving dance and music dominated subculture of 1980s and 1990s (Redhead 1997), the commissioning of Saville was a neat appropriation of Mancunian subculture.

In his analysis of political involvement in the urban property boom of 1990s, Hatherley is evidently angry about the way the Council manipulated urban spaces. He bemoans the selection of Manchester as a creative city by Richard Florida, a cultural geographer who produced a highly influential list of creative cities worldwide using criteria that identified groups of people as a ‘creative class’ including people working in digital media, artists, musicians, lesbians and gay men (Florida 2005). Florida argues that this creative class increases the economic productivity of cities. Hatherley condemns this embrace of creativity as economically productive by the Council and local building entrepreneurs such as Urban Splash founders Bloxham and Johnson, themselves part of the ‘post-rave coalition’ of musicians and artists who had become property millionaires through the physical regeneration of the city. Hatherley critiques the Council engagement and appropriation of a ‘creative’ identity and cites Justin O’Connor, co-founder of Manchester urban art gallery, Urbis. He quotes O’Connor’s condemnation of the
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Council’s adoption of Tony Wilson, another Manchester legend from the music scene, as follows

“Despite the fact that Bloxham – a man of little culture and education – was given chair of the arts Council and [is] now VC [sic] of Manchester university³⁰, thus confirming the toadying of arts and education to the ‘creative entrepreneur’, it is Wilson who represents its saddest failures. He made little money from it all and really believed in it. Now subject to a nauseating hagiography by the city Council that kept him outside for years, until the last four or five, bringing him in when his critical faculties had been worn down by years of punditry. He used to say, of the post-rave coalition, ‘the lunatics have taken over the asylum’; pigs and farm was more apposite” (O’Connor quoted in Hatherley 2011:121).

Tony Wilson represented the epitome of the Manchester music scene for many music fans as a manager of bands, co-founder of Factory Records and founder of the Hacienda, a popular nightclub in the 1980s and 1990s. He was hailed as ‘Mr Manchester’ for his efforts in promoting Manchester’s cultural value (Nolan 2010). Hatherley describes how the key figures in the music scene were ‘kept outside’ by the Council for years and then when the economic value of these cultural legends, which he calls the ‘post-rave coalition’ became more apparent, they were ‘brought in’ and involved in Council machinations (Hatherley 2011:115-156). Hatherley also quotes Wilson describing the Chief Executive, Howard Bernstein as an ‘enlightened despot’ (Wilson quoted in Hatherley 2011:121).

When the Council began to initiate cultural activities as part of the Cultural Ambition, they developed new aspects alongside the existing arts and music scenes, as well as building on more established programmes. However, rather than appreciate the Council move to promote events and activities, Hatherley’s critique suggests resentment and a sense of appropriation and consequent alienation of original producers. A similar response in these grassroots circles arose during the development of the Manchester International Festival (MIF), “the world’s first festival of original, new work and special events”. The first two festivals alone cost £18.3 million in funding raised from the private and public sectors. Council Leader

³⁰ Bloxham was actually Chancellor of the University of Manchester – a figurehead role
Richard Leese was proactive in supporting the organisers in raising the profile of the Festival nationally and internationally. The Council provided funding and supported MIF to find additional funding from other private sector sources, such as Bruntwood, a commercial property company with a wide portfolio of interests in the Manchester area. This process of pulling together networks of public and private partners to sponsor cultural activities followed an existing pattern of practice dating from the city building era. The approach reduced the direct cost for the Council itself and evaded public criticism of events taking place during funding cuts. It also provided a Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) opportunity for commercial companies to involve staff in community-oriented events, to show that they were connected, bring staff together and make the companies themselves more engaged in the city, to make them ‘more paternalistic’ (Council Officer, 2011).

With the public-private relationships largely established to ‘reduce pressure on the public purse’ (ibid), disparate communities with little financial clout or access to resources were rarely included in this cosy circle. Discontent arose almost immediately with the launch of the first MIF. In 2007, a new grassroots arts collective called ‘Not Part of the Manchester International Festival’, emerged in reaction to the commissions-only Festival. This collective “decided to create from scratch a wholly unpretentious and open arts festival for everyday people to display the products of their hard work” to run alongside the MIF. Their issue with MIF was that “a lot of the creators who form Manchester’s day to day artistic pulse were not part of it” (Not Part of 2011). This fringe festival ran alongside MIF in 2007 and 2009. In 2011, it was renamed the ‘Not Part Of’ festival due to copyright issues with MIF. By 2013, it had disappeared.

In an analysis of inner cities across the UK, Mossberger and Stoker argue that the emergence of ‘policy entrepreneurs’ in 1980s Thatcher government, who took advantage of opportunities within government to try and ‘deal with’ inner city social problems, together with an often marginalised and relatively silent ‘public’, made urban politics a largely symbolic practice.

“In areas like inner-city policy, the absence of a strong lobby creates ideal conditions for pursuing moral crusades based on virtuous intentions. Governmental elites seize upon visible and emotional issues as a canvas upon
which to portray their own good intentions. At the same time, they legitimize their leadership, their ideology, or certain interests in society” (Mossberger and Stoker 1997:398).

While this analysis is focused on central government, the proposition aligns well with the activity of local leaders in Manchester. Following an ideology of economic development and marshalling what resources they had to hand, the Council representatives and those in their network created a new way of governing the city by bringing administrative strategies into the heart of cultural production. This top-down approach had a significant impact shaping how people responded to attempts to engage them in explicitly ‘cultural’ activity. Council support and engagement in cultural production risked absorbing the productive and creative energy of art and music in the city. To some extent, the totalising force of the Council stimulated the productive power of local ‘ethically free and rational’ actors to act creatively in opposition. The oak protest table and the ‘Not part of’ festival were not free expressions of creativity that ignored the Council but instead reactions explicitly against it. As Atkins found with men ‘cruising for sex in the gay village’ in the canal networks of central Manchester (Atkins 2013) and Rahman found among young black men in the Moss Side area of Manchester (Rahman 2010), Council attempts to control people’s activities did not stop them but did shape how they proceeded with their activities, often with unintended consequences.

Over six years the Manchester International Festival gradually rooted itself in the city and local protests died away. The Festival Director came from London with few existing relationships with local people. He drew the Festival’s energy from the city’s history and often forgotten architecture, reinvigorating neglected spaces. The Festival also instigated a community engagement programme in response to criticism about the absence of local professional artists (Director of MIF, Interview 2011). Civic influence over cultural production in the city continued with public food, art, music, gardening and dance events. This was part of an international trend aimed at stimulating economic income through funding cultural events in particular. Politicians and civil servants continued to emphasise “cultural (or creative) industries” (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005) as a way of stimulating economic activity, with creativity as mechanism for producing them (Putnam
1995, Florida 2004, Florida 2005). During the 2000s, this emphasis by Putnam and Florida on the importance of creativity and cultural activity as ‘business drivers’ led to a proliferation of ‘creative industry’ based regeneration projects both in the West and in the economically booming China and India (Hutton 2009). The effects of decades of mistrust between the Council and the post-rave coalition of local artists, musicians and activists eventually diminished over time with the introduction of outsiders (such as the Manchester International Festival) and a gradual appropriation and employment of people into the Council and related organisations.

It seems that the Council Executive approached the development of cultural capital using similar techniques to the ones they used for nurturing the development and property boom in the city, namely a core group within the Council co-ordinated a network of influential individuals who developed and represented cultural ‘assets’ to be exploited for economic purposes. The Cultural Strategy, Manchester International Festival, and many other ‘cultural events’ became Council deliverables, incorporated into the rhetoric of economic success of the city. This may explain the defensive reaction of Howard Bernstein to Leadbeater’s proposition that people should be encouraged to think creatively in all aspects of their lives not ‘just’ to produce cultural assets. The Council Executive seemed to approach culture as a tool through which structures of power could be perpetuated (Bourdieu 1994, Swartz 1997). In this process a certain kind of ‘cultural representation’ was created or at least appropriated rather than nurtured into emergence as Leadbeater suggested. Those in opposition reacted to the Council Executive attempts to ‘create’ culture.

A more nuanced perspective might acknowledge that the Council’s role was often limited to providing infrastructure and financial support for cultural events through road management, security and funding. During 2011 at least, Manchester Council itself did not lead on any of the hundreds of events going on except for the Manchester Day Parade (Head of Events, 2011). All the other activities were led by companies, individuals or community groups who sought support from the Council in making them happen. This approach also fits with the Executive’s style in building development – they did not lead on the construction of buildings themselves – instead they enabled and supported property developers to construct
their own buildings, leading to increased Council revenue through corporation tax, increased footfall in the city and increased profits for transport, complimentary businesses and entertainment venues. So authority that looks like direct Council control from afar, on closer inspection seems to come from ‘soft’ power, manipulation of the ability to control access to resources and some funding. A further dilution of control also comes from the nature of the activities themselves since cultural ‘assets’ such as art and music are largely made up of people who subvert situations and behave unpredictably.

Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 3, organisations are constituted of many individuals and agendas. Some methods of working are explicit and consensual but others are not. In city rhetoric and formal documents, the economic value of cultural events in the city was a key reason for support from the Council. However, during an interview with a PR Officer at the Council, a different picture emerged:

“We see events as being one of the key priorities for the city: there’s the cold hard financial economic reasons - that it’s good for a city to have events on because it brings people in, they spend money, they help local businesses, local traders... And then on the other hand, we’re not just economists, we’re also people who believe that culture is a good thing, as well as being good for economic health of a city, it’s good for the social fabric of a city and that’s something that we’ve seen with Manchester, that it’s brought together community groups ... So we see events as being something that drive the city’s success economically but also have a less intangible impact on the social fabric of the city, which is why we do it, and both those things are equally important.”

(Roger, PR officer, 2011)

Some Council officials recognised the dual value in ‘cultural events’ as ‘cold hard financial reality’ but also for the ‘social fabric of a city’. This insight pricks the bubble of the ‘Manchester Men’ rhetoric showing a softer face of the Council that recognises and values its citizens and their relationships.

Anthropologist Bray suggests re-thinking the concept of identity in terms of a “configuration of boundaries that are constantly drawn, crossed and re-interpreted by individuals in the course of everyday social interaction” (Bray 2004:1). While Council ambitions and strategies assert the importance of generating revenue for
the city through cultural activities, the daily practice of Council officials also focused on encouraging a sense of civic identity, of connecting with, and supporting local citizens. Howard Bernstein was defensive in response to Leadbeater’s exhortation to support citizens in being creative, but those organising the Parade sought to support and celebrate the diversity of the Manchester people. The Chief Executive and the Council Executive team did not dominate or control all parts of the local authority or how the citizens expressed themselves in the city. However they were situated at the centre of cultural activity in the city through access to funding, resources and political endorsement.

**MAKING THE PUBLIC MAKE CULTURE**

This final point argues that attempts by the Council to create cultural events as part of the local government’s administrative function, blocks out the independent emergence of *publics of substance*. By taking up civic space and resources with Council-led cultural representations focused largely on generating financial income for the city, the Council inhibited more organic and spontaneous forms of emergent publics. In her fieldwork among mat-makers in Pattamadai, south India, Venkatesan identifies an Indian ‘craft world’ in “the deliberate bringing by powerful elites of marginalized people and things to the centre of a social space (here, traditional Indian craft), re-creating them as valued objects of attention” (Venkatesan 2009:78). In Pattamadai, craft producers are brought into a vision of craft and they are expected to perform according to elite understandings of what makes a craft producer/craft community. People and activities that conform to the vision of a ‘craft world’ are recognised and people who do not conform are left out. In Manchester, Council attempts to ‘make’ culture introduced a similar legitimising process where officials and politicians had the power to decide who could culturally constitute ‘all things Manchester’. The parade was arguably a natural conclusion to a top down approach - the production of an event that appropriated local people into a vision of Manchester. The Council took a bold move in creating the Manchester Day Parade. They had to believe that people would want to contribute. Supporting or not supporting grassroots music or arts event did not have the same exposure as putting on a parade made up of hundreds of local residents across the city and watched by thousands more. I began fieldwork in the second year of the parade and heard reports of the inaugural year as a time of high
stress caused by the co-ordination of two thousand people into a coherent and decorative line up to walk along the parade route, but also the not-knowing about whether there would be a public there to attend and watch as people paraded past.

Marres (2005) draws out the political conundrum explored by Dewey (1927) and Lippmann (1927) on the nature of the ‘public’ in a political context. For Dewey, “the line between private and public is to be drawn on the basis of the extent and scope of the consequences of acts which are so important as to need control”. According to Marres, Dewey argues that “content was the only way that a public gets pulled into politics” and that “the indirect consequences of action that people are affected by calls a public into being” (Marres 2005:217 my emphasis). Similarly, the Manchester Day Parade called a public into being, a public to celebrate ‘all things Manchester’. But while the parade provided a contextual orientation point around which a public could be created, its nature as an act of celebration lacked the intensity and purpose imagined by Marres (2005), Dewey (1927) and Lippmann (1927).

Lippmann’s ‘phantom public’ is created when people who are usually ‘bystanders’ distracted with other things, pause and mobilise briefly to change difficult social situations. For Lippmann, the practicality of governance should be left to ‘agents’, who are held in check by the occasional mobilisation of ‘public opinion’. This occurs when large groups of people act en masse to change the damaging status quo. Lippmann uses voting as a typical example.

“Public opinion in its highest ideal will defend those who are prepared to act on their reason against the interrupting force of those who merely assert their will” (Lippmann (1927) 2000:59).

This observation is as pertinent today with the Arab Spring and democratic movements in Eastern Europe as it was in 1927. While Lippmann is concerned with revolutionary change, his proposition for a public that mobilises for a brief moment is interesting. A reference to ‘public opinion’, the ‘public’ and ‘people’ was a common refrain in discussions on the constitution of the parade. The parade makers created a trope of ‘public’ in their minds and produced a parade for this imagined public. Drawing both on Lippmann and Dewey, I suggest that a public was called into being by the Council in the production of the parade. This public
was composed of people gathered briefly to witness a celebration of Manchester devised by its ‘agents’ and disappeared again just as quickly. The imagined existence of this public drove the development of the parade for the organisers, both within the Council and among the parade producers at Walk the Plank. The Council’s motivation in engaging this public chimed with the politicians’ roles as state representatives and gave them an opportunity to create an image of Manchester for this public which they imagined themselves to represent.

In his ethnography of the free software movement, Kelty draws out a ‘recursive public’ whose role is to “assert itself as a check” on domains of power while remaining independent of this power. He argues that a “recursive public is a public that is vitally concerned with the material and practical maintenance and modification of the technical, legal, practical, and conceptual means of its own existence as a public; it is a collective independent of other forms of constituted power and is capable of speaking to existing forms of power through the production of actually existing alternatives” (Kelty 2008:3). So while Manchester Council created the parade where none had previously existed, there was the potential for it to become more than a Council object, to capture the imaginations of the public for whom it was created and who were themselves part of its creation. This public, once called, could have had a power and dynamism of its own. The ‘crowd’ has a power just in its very existence, possibly even containing a certain ‘wisdom’ (Surowiecki 2005). Certainly, the Not Part Of festival tried to respond to the Manchester International Festival in this way – producing an alternative festival that celebrated the voluntary and spontaneous production of art rather than its careful selection. The direct oppositional approach through which they established themselves dissipated as MIF adapted and evolved, and by the third festival, Not Part Of had disappeared.

According to parade organisers, creating an urban event focused on celebrating itself is something that only a few cities would have the ‘brass neck’ to do (Parade organiser, 2011). This ‘daring’ move resonated with thousands of people in Manchester. The estimates vary (and are subject to inflation by interested parties), but range from 25,000 to 100,000 people who turned up to watch the parade. Parade participants themselves performed in their hundreds, singing, dancing, waving and clapping and many in the audience turned up specifically to watch
their friends and family parade past. This ‘public’ were the people who needed to
‘know who the groups are’ (according to the politicians), to appreciate the scale,
colour and movement of the sections (so important to the parade Design Co-
ordinator), to be safely arranged on the pavements with easy access to parking and
toilets (the Production Manager’s preoccupation). For the parade organisers, the
public represented a point of orientation, a motivating mass around which they
mobilised. The Council achieved its ambition in creating a cultural phenomenon
within the city and this thesis is a record of that process. However, as discussed in
later chapters, this ‘phantom public’ had no identity beyond parade day itself.
People melted back into the different cultural contexts from which they had
gathered. While the potential for a mobilised and empowered public shimmered
there in the air on the day, it had no enduring force to keep it together, nor bring
about any change. For change was not the intention of the Council, they wanted
people to perform on their behalf, rather than take ownership of the cultural
identity, the Mancunian identity they claimed to celebrate in the parade.

Indeed alternative representations of ‘Mancunian-ness’ emerged in the Manchester
riots in 2011. Groups of people spontaneously gathered in the city centre to break
into, burn and steal from shops and buildings. These riots, which also took place in
London and Birmingham were alternately characterised in the press as criminal
gangs taking advantage of a sudden outbreak of lawlessness and an outpouring of
rage and anger from ‘powerless people who suddenly feel powerful’, largely
unemployed and disenfranchised individuals from the same communities as some
of the parade participants31. The Council neatly appropriated a civic response to
the riots when some people mobilised via social media and came into town with
brooms to clean up the damage.

A few months after the incident, the Council put out a press release announcing the
theme of the following year’s parade as a ‘City of Heroes’ explicitly celebrating the
heroic clean up provided by local citizens. The Council also took their cue from
posters which started to appear in shop windows with ‘I ♥ Manchester’ and
produced their own, including a 30 metre version hung from the top of Council
offices. I attended a Council meeting where they discussed how the parade needed
to ‘come from the community’. A Council official said that the people often got

31 http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-14463452
‘turned off’ when the Council became involved in activities and that ‘I ♥
Manchester’ had become a ‘bit too corporate and they had to pull back from that’
(Organisers meeting, November 2011).

Council attempts to create a public succeeded with the Manchester Day Parade. However the parade had a pre-defined thematic concept and structure and the citizens expected to fill existing frames. While the parade organisers were keen to accept all submitted ideas from community groups, these still went through a review and approval process vetted by the Council. Opportunities for a more organic form of self-expression were less encouraged. While cultural activities in the city were often self-originating, Council control over funding and resources meant they had final say over what happened. This production of a civic identity rather than support for a gradual emergence resulted in enthusiasm and excitement about the parade being short-lived and changed little about how civic identity was expressed and practiced in the city centre in the long term.

CHAPTER 2 CONCLUSION

Over the 2000s, many civic authorities turned the cultural realm into a vehicle for developing and delivering on their economic and political agendas. In Manchester, a dominant Council Executive, used to pushing through building development in the city centre, also focused its energies on ‘cultural development’ as part of their on-going commitment to generating economic success for the city. Their attempts to manipulate cultural offerings such as the Manchester International Festival initially led to a spontaneous outpouring of discontent from existing cultural producers in the city particularly from those who had experienced the Council Executive’s previous indifference towards grassroots expressions in Hulme.

The Manchester Day Parade was the Council’s boldest move yet to create a cultural feature to attract visitors and give an ‘economic boost’ to the city. In creating the parade, the Council brought a public into being which had the potential to be meaningful, to celebrate and demonstrate Mancunian-ness in contrast perhaps to more negative interpretations and manifestations such as the Manchester riots. However attempts to manipulate and control cultural production from the centre created an ephemeral cloud of public participation without any substantial depth and the audience faded away as quickly as it emerged.
In their analysis of Catalan festivals, Crespi-Vallbona and Richards found that “although stakeholder groups may make claims for legitimacy on different grounds, the common themes through which these claims are expressed helps to create an atmosphere of consensus rather than confrontation” (Crespi-Vallbona and Richards 2007:120). The overall impression from fieldwork was a shared consensus of love for the city and passion for doing things in the city. The conflicts emerged in the means through which ideas were expressed and the access to resources to deliver on these ambitions. There is this tension between supporting and developing a community to express itself, to provide demonstrations or insights of its cultural forms. Too much involvement can be overwhelming, too little can stifle or suppress.

Council officials and politicians sat at the heart of the city and the decisions they took impacted widely on other citizens’ abilities to express and develop their own ideas. The common theme for the parade participants was the process through which they engaged with the parade organisers, who were themselves commissioned by the Council. The civic officials set the scene for how the city came to be represented. The following chapters explore how attempts to engage with the parade by different groups of people were often mediated through levels of access to resources and decision making power. In this way they show how organisational structures have a significant impact on people’s ability to realise their ideas and adapt to circumstances as they arise.
CHAPTER 3: CONCEPTUALISING PARADE

“Created by Manchester People, commissioned by Manchester City Council and produced by Walk the Plank.” (Parade website, 2012)

In his introduction to the Anthropology of Organisations Reader, Corsín Jiménez (2007) uses the notion of ‘re-institutionalisations’ as a way of thinking through ethnographic explorations of organisations. He demonstrates how wider social dynamics are crystallised in organisations which are shaped by but also reshape the social structures that helped form them. As a social construction brought into being by diverse networks of related entities from politicians to Council staff, event organisers and arts funders, artists and community groups, the Manchester Day Parade provided a site for exploration into de-centered and distributed organising processes drawn from diverse cultural contexts.

Studying an entity that was organised enough to parade down a city high street, but not the product of any one organisation means the relational interconnections have real potential to provide insight into organisational ethnography. In particular, the hybrid nature of the Manchester Day Parade suggests that an ‘anthropology of organising’ captures the mobility of social structures better than an ‘anthropology of organisation’ which implies more static and bounded entities. Such an approach also offers insight into “the processes by which external interventions enter the life worlds of the individuals and groups affected” (Long 1990:35).

Analysing the parade with this proposition of ‘re-institutionalisation’ and drawing on De Landa’s notion of assemblages working at different scales (De Landa 2006) gives a conceptual framework to explore the different contexts of the parade. Each participating organisation, group or individual engaged with the parade based on their understanding of it. The parade also had its own context constituted of, but separate from, the combination of these entities. This analysis is situated directly on these dynamics in the parade and how each group came and went, leaving traces of their influences on its formation.

As I spent time with Walk the Plank, the Steering Committee, in the workshop with artists, in the café of a participating group, making with the Italian society group, I
paid attention to how they engaged with the parade on their terms and understandings, contrasting these perspectives with each other. Insight came from within the city, between connected groups and how they each engaged with the same event (the parade) in different ways.

Insight into the parade constitution starts with contemplating the multiple trajectories that brought it into being. In her analysis of networks, Strathern posits the following:

“The concept of network summons the tracery of heterogeneous elements that constitute such an object or event, or string of circumstances, held together by social interactions: it is, in short, a hybrid imagined in a socially extended state.” (Strathern 1996:521).

This insight can be applied to the parade as a hybrid of intersecting flows and ‘cutting the network’ creates parade as a hybrid entity for analysing the social relations which brought it into being. These hybrid entities exist where networked flows have been ‘stopped’.

Strathern draws on Latour’s work on Actor-Network-Theory which situates entities such as objects, people and theories as relationally connected (Latour 2005). As a political entity, an assembly employed to realise certain agendas, parades also speaks to Latour’s analysis in Making things public (Latour 2005) on how entities come to be represented. Latour collaborated in the production of an exhibition and volume that considers the many forms of civic congregation, which he calls dingpolitik to emphasise the tangible entities, or things, associated with public gathering and political engagement (Latour and Sánchez-Criado 2007). In a related interview with Sánchez-Criado, he proposed that parliaments are ‘things’ which have characteristics of communal assembly comparable to other ‘things’ such as supermarkets or virtual digital environments. ‘Techniques of representation’ are the features which characterise these things and describe how they are situated. He suggested comparing them to see what is transportable from one sphere to another and drew attention to the river featured in the related exhibition.
“Rivers make a difference, especially now; For instance, in Spain where the politics of water is very important. It makes sense to say that rivers are important political actors. On two conditions: one of them is that the river has to be made to speak through plenty of techniques of representation. The question is ‘what is the speech of this river?’ And the second one is ‘what is the role played by the river speech where people in charge of water management talk about it?’” (Latour and Sánchez-Criado 2007:366).

Latour emphasises the need to consider how the river is ‘made to speak’ by others and how it is mobilised in different contexts. Similarly, a parade is a ‘thing’ that is made to work in different ways based on who is representing it, why and how. Contemplating parade ‘techniques of representation’ reveals their organising processes and the kinds of political representation people seek in assembling a parade, both as initiators and participants. This kind of analysis also reveals underlying assumptions and ambitions involved in organising processes.

PARADES AS ASSEMBLIES

Parades have been part of English civic life for centuries. The historical origins of the term ‘parade’ derive from Vulgar Latin *parata*, itself derived from Latin *parere* ‘arrange, prepare, adorn’. In the 1650s, parade represented ‘display, show, military parade’ from Middle French, ‘a warding or defending, a garish setting forth’ from Italian *parate* and ‘a staying or stopping’ from Spanish *parada* (Harper 2014). In his account of the emergence of secular rituals in medieval England, Hutton (2001) shows how parade developed as part of a symbiotic relationship between the royal court and its ‘subjects’ as a group to be entertained and engaged. The Lord Mayor Show in London, dating back to 1214 is rooted in this historical context as a celebratory pageant to convey the newly elected Mayor to be ‘shown’ to the Sovereign. The election of the Mayor of London was part of ‘commune’ status assigned by King John’s Charter in 1215, one of the ‘oldest surviving democratic institutions in the world’ (Hill 2010, Reid 2011). The post was gradually adopted by many other cities across the UK. The autonomy of city mayors has waxed and waned with central government power dynamics and by 2000s (with the exception of the Mayor in London) Mayoral positions in England, including
Manchester, were largely honorific but still important for mobilising civic engagement at a city level (Garrard 2007).

For many years, Lord Mayor parades in Manchester were a key event in the annual civic calendar and Manchester’s photographic archives have a wide collection featuring parades over the decades, largely populated by public service officials such as police and fire attendants as well as school children and brass bands. In this context, parades are reminiscent of Hastrup’s description of theatrical performances as “telescoped social performances” providing a “social drama of heightened vitality because it condenses the agents’ energy, not because it transforms it into something different” (Hastrup 2001:39). The parade as a social drama highlighting civic relationships and providing an opportunity for public expression is a technique of representation with its own characteristics of style.

In El Alto in Bolivia, Lazar argues that civic celebration parades teach children both about civic celebration and about protest by taking to the streets.

“On these particular days adults parade as well as children, although not in such great numbers. Adults march in blocks of, for example, union affiliation or neighbourhood association. Children march along a defined route behind the school band, the baton-twirlers, and the school standard bearers (an honour for the best pupils of each year group). At the stage where dignitaries watching the parade sit, the band stands at one side of the road and the cheerleaders line both sides while the normal parade participants march through, in class groups and separated by gender. Sometimes they salute the dignitaries with a raised arm. This is the moment when the marchers have to concentrate on keeping in time, the key moment of display” (Lazar 2010:197).

This account reveals underlying social assumptions about a parade format: the community march by affiliation; the children sorted by school; the dignitaries provide the highlight of the parade route; rhythm and ‘keeping in time’ are important. While the children in Lazar’s fieldwork approached the parade process with a casual indifference, it also established the notion of street performance in their conceptual understanding of what it is to be a citizen. Furthermore Lazar
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argues that this performance of civic identity by walking through the streets leads naturally into taking to those same streets as a form of protest. So while local authorities use parades as a form of public civic expression, grassroots movements also use parades to assert a civic identity onto the streets of cities. A similar contrast emerged in Manchester between the rioting of 2011 and the parade and outdoor event celebrations organised by and through the civic authorities. Civic spaces as a location for public exhortation are another technique of representation.

In Manchester, the Whit Walks, a 150-year-old religious procession dates back to Manchester's foundation as an industrial city. Initiated perhaps by the 1821 Sunday school children's parade through the streets of Manchester to celebrate the coronation of George IV, from the mid-1820s until the 1960s, the 7th Sunday after Easter was a week of 'Whitsun' in Manchester and surrounding areas. Sunday schools and churches of Protestant, Irish Catholic and Italian Catholic communities from across the Greater Manchester region dressed children in their 'Sunday best' to walk from their local communities into their nearby urban centres. In the 19th century, this was also an excuse for rowdy celebration, with drinking, brawling and cock fighting a popular pastime (Malcolmson 1979). The different faiths of Irish Catholic, Italian Catholic and Protestant would parade on different days over the week. The photo archives in Manchester and nearby Salford’s local history museums are dominated by these Whit Walk celebrations – smartly dressed girls in white dresses, walking on cobbled streets through Victorian-era streets. In the background of the photos are the grand buildings in Manchester city centre, many of them still standing today.

The Whit Walk celebrations gradually diminished in popularity over the years but remained strong in the memories of Manchester residents, as I found through a small survey sample with visitors to the Manchester Histories Festival in 2012 (Visitor Survey, Histories Festival, 2012). People exclaimed enthusiastically when they saw the photos from the archive, particularly at groups parading into the city centre and congregating around Albert Square (a key location for the Manchester Day Parade outside the Town Hall where the politicians and civil servants gather). One visitor recalled with fondness the elaborate nature of the Italian children’s dresses and adornments. Several described how their only new clothes of the year were bought to wear first in the Whit Walk. One lady in particular, who grew up in
a “grey world with grey clothes and grey houses” said she delighted as a child in the colour and atmosphere of celebration that the Whit Walks would stimulate in Manchester.

The holding of parade events in Manchester therefore stretches much further back than the Cultural Strategy mentioned in Chapter 2. It was a tradition that emerged from Irish, Italian and English Church activities supported, rather than initiated by local government. Harney shows how the Italian diaspora also colonised civic spaces in Toronto as a way of asserting “group presence in, familiarity with and control over specific territories” (Harney 2006:26). Throughout Italy, the evening walk or *passeggiata*, was a quotidian practice of place-making reinforced by annual rituals in religious processions continued by Italian diaspora in their adopted countries. These activities provided inspiration for and influenced the development of parade formats. As urban centres developed, understandings of parade as civic display in Europe followed colonial contours, also emigrating to USA where parades as ‘pageants’ were used to establish a narrative coherence to the European settlement of the North American continent (Davis 1982, Glassberg 1987). In his analysis of Independence Day celebrations in seventeen states across Africa, Lentz (2013) notes that parades were used as a popular festival form to avoid ‘empty grandstands’. Officials’ attempts to engender national pride through celebration of ‘independence’ drew deliberately on American traditional urban forms of celebration dating back to the pageants of the 19th century.

In New York, Kasinitz and Freidenberg-Herbstein (1989) compare Puerto Rican and Black American parades. They find that the Puerto Ricans used parades to establish themselves as players on the New York landscape deliberately copying the Irish and Jewish models. By contrast, the Black American parade where people’s identities were more diffuse and harder to politicise beyond racial, lacked the clarity of geographical and cultural affinity to a particular area of the world. In Manchester, while the Whit Walks declined, other cultural and political affiliations continued to be reinforced such as through St Patrick’s Day when people with Irish backgrounds paraded through the streets and Pride, an annual parade which has attracted not just hundreds of gay and lesbian participants but also wider audiences both within and beyond the region. For the Manchester Day Parade, it was a combination of groups from different cultural backgrounds that was the
point of the parade. Minutes from the Council Committee which approved funding for the parade stated that “the Manchester Day parade would celebrate the cultural diversity and unity of Manchester residents” (Manchester City Council, 2009). The explicit celebration of ‘diversity and unity’ therefore becomes another technique of representation.

The extent of harmony between groups in cities can be detected through how the parades manifest on the streets. In Northern Ireland, several ethnographies describe how the protestant Orange order in Belfast paraded through the streets to assert their own identity via a historic imitation of similar parades in the Irish catholic community (Kenney 1991, Bryan 2000, Witherow 2006). In the ‘blood and thunder’ parades, Orangemen walked in formation and drummers traditionally bashed their drums so hard it made their hands bleed, all accompanied by a piercing tuneful whistling cohort (Bell 2007). In a city riven with conflict along Catholic and Protestant lines, these Protestant led parades often caused further conflict as the routes went through largely Catholic areas. In these contexts, parades were used to lay claim to civic spaces in a supposedly peaceable manner where elements of aggression were subsumed by the apparently celebratory aspect of the parade format. In Milan, as an alternative method for traditional protest, grassroots activists parade on 1st May. As one protestor put it, “we are able to represent ourselves without any mediation and with energy and potency, not in a way that only expresses the fact that we are overwhelmed by rotten lack every day” (Choi and Mattoni 2010).

The parades outlined above are all in opposition to something – Independence Day in many African countries declared an end to colonial domination. Orangemen, Puerto Rican, Black American, Irish and Gay parades staked claims on outdoor civic space for people who do not feel adequately recognised or lauded. However the differences between ‘parade organising’ overseen by civic authorities and parade organising as part of a grassroots movement and between civic celebration and civic protest, are often blurred. For example, Goh (2011) shows how a parade in Singapore progressed from celebration of a single event into a huge multicultural one as more and more people from many different backgrounds got involved. The parade initiated by the civic authorities was transformed in the process of bringing it into being. In Madagascar, a recent official civic attempt to
celebrate Independence Day was appropriated by citizens as an opportunity to celebrate family (Späth 2013).

Similarly the Gion matsuri parade in Kyoto, originally a religious parade organised by 32 districts, grew and changed until it ended up negotiating a balance between traditional rules and modern attitudes such as the inclusion of women. In this parade, the districts were self-organising and competitive. People cared, they argued about who got to be included (Roemer 2007, Brumann 2009). In cities across the world, local practices appropriate civic intentions and blending the interrelations between civic sponsored parade, state initiated parade and the spontaneous or adaptive responses from the parade participants. While the parade format can be very similar – groups of people walking through city streets to express or communicate something – each parade has its own dynamism.

This resonates with the spontaneous popular parades self-organised by community groups and societies in New Orleans (Regis 1999) for whom public performance is an important aspect of their self-expression. In some cases, parades were not focused on the content of the parade itself or on entertaining an admiring public. In Israel, Russian war veterans initiated a parade in 1995 on the 50th anniversary of the end of second World War in Jerusalem for commemorating ‘Victory Day’, traditionally celebrated in Russia, but not in Israel. Roberman (2007) describes 700 elderly people walking slowly along the main street followed by a few ambulances. This parade was a spontaneous response to draw attention to and commemorate something significant in the lives of some individuals who wanted to share this significance with others. They wanted recognition for their war effort and chose parade as the format through which they could gain this. There were no performances, bright colours or handmade structures; the emphasis of the parade was in the physical presence of the war veterans on the street itself. In her analysis of lesbian feminists in 1980s London, Green also draws attention to the desire to ‘be visible’ through marches and demonstrations in the city, not just to onlookers but ‘perhaps more importantly, to the marchers themselves’ (Green 1997:55).

The diversity of behaviour across the Manchester Day Parade and other parades makes it impossible to interpret participants’ motivations for getting involved as a single homogenous reason. However, a common thread running through many of
the parades is the urge to communicate, to celebrate identity or sense of self through public representation. For Rasnake, what is common to ritual and cultural performance is that “human groups set aside recurring moments ‘outside of time’ in order to negotiate the premises upon which social life (and the group’s particular social arrangements) is based, recreating and communicating among themselves what they see to be the building blocks of their joint existence” (Rasnake 1988:175). In this way, parade is a performed codification of a sense of self, enacted in a formalised way. So the Russian war veterans in Israel developed a celebration ritual to share their sense of pride in Victory Day with each other and the public. The Orange order marched through Belfast as an identity asserting ritual for Protestants. Puerto Ricans and Black Americans went on cultural pride marches in New York. The celebrations in New Orleans, Madagascar, Kyoto, Bolivia and Milan are processes through which people appropriated a parade mechanism for their own purposes, developing a codified procedure which connects better to their sense of self than the one initially offered. In this way the Kyoto parade accommodates women, the children of El Alto learn to protest through marching as do the grassroots activists in Milan.

However the specific configuration of each parade developed within the context of the circumstances in which it was embedded. Green emphasises the complexity of placing boundaries within or around a community. When the lesbian feminists participated in marches, it was their lesbian identity that they emphasised rather than their feminism. “The difficulty with the term ‘community’ is its implied static and homogenous character – in spatial, temporal and symbolic terms” (Green 1997:58). In her ethnography she shows how women moved between different aspects of their own identity based on discussion or arguments they were having with particular people.

Civic expression is not the only motivation for parade participation, just as the individuals participating emphasise different characteristics of their identities according to particular contexts. Tassi (2010, 2012) describes the level of detail that goes into the planning and commitment of the Cholo parade from individuals who stand to profit directly from participation. Motivations for parade participation can range from a desire to be acknowledged and represented on the streets of one’s city to seeking an opportunity to generation an income and
multiple combinations thereof. Whether the motivation is ethnic, religious, geographical or for a particular cause, parade is used as an opportunity for people to gather and declare a sense of themselves with others in their shared urban spaces. Contemplating parade participation through Bourdieu’s insight on ‘techniques of representation’ helps draw out the contexts from which parades in particular places emerge.

**Manchester Day Parade as a Parade**

In the following section, I consider more closely how the Manchester Day Parade was administratively and organisationally constituted. As discussed in the previous chapter, the Council had a tendency to dominate cultural activities in the city centre, to the detriment of grassroots initiatives. However while the parade started as a Council orchestrated initiative, once in motion, a more collaborative shape emerged. Da Matta (1986) puts parades on a spectrum where a military parade is at “the limit point of formality” and carnival, “the limit point of informality”. Church events play a mediating role between these extremes. His analysis maps well onto the Manchester Day Parade to help contemplate institutional and community interaction in the development of the parade.

Da Matta draws on the Brazilian cultural context to put public celebration on a continuum between formality and informality as varying techniques of representation. His argument is that military parades in Brazil are a perpetuation of the hierarchical nature of the society and carnival is a reaction against this social situation. He also emphasises that both kinds of parades have characteristics of each other - Independence Day has a *communitas* component, non-hierarchical in nature as friends and family congregate after the formal march. Similarly carnival has a hierarchical structure, with participating organisations competing to be the best school and participants in Carnival transforming themselves into nobles to show their aspiration. In Manchester, the Council’s processes and procedures did appear as formal and structured, while Walk the Plank and the community groups worked in a more fluid and informal way. However Council politicians and officials also had an adaptive approach to the parade development, responding to circumstances as they arose and Walk the Plank and community groups also had their own hierarchies and formal arrangements.
The parade's external appearance echoed a military style in that the parade streamed past Councillors and other VIPs positioned on the top of an open roof bus outside the town hall in a square deemed the 'heart' of the parade. Each community group was named as they approached the bus and exhorted to dance by the host Disc Jockey (DJ). Standing on the bus were members of the Steering Committee composed largely of Council politicians and officials, sponsors and other Manchester luminaries. The bus loomed over thousands of members of the public standing on either side of the parade route clearly marking out a distinction between Council politicians, senior officials and sponsors, and everyone else. This display was just the most visible evidence of a hierarchical relationship with the Council as orchestrators of the parade. The administrative power in the Council came from the Events Team. They were responsible for designing and commissioning the event and overseeing its delivery. They formally contracted Walk the Plank as event organisers, controlled access to resources and co-ordinated different elements of the Council as required, such as the press office, waste management or road planning.

The term ‘Steering Committee’ is commonly used for a particular group of individuals who oversee and steer collaborative events and projects and in this context provided a formal role for politicians who would otherwise have no direct say in the parade activities. Two elected politicians sat at the core of the Steering Committee surrounded by the officials representing these different areas. The politicians’ remits covered culture and the city centre and they officially played an overseeing role, whilst also making very specific demands such as making the parade theme ‘celebrating heroes’ or support for specific community groups. One politician was very focused on the parade being a ‘celebration of Manchester activities and achievements’ and at almost every Steering Committee meeting, he would ask, ‘and what has that got to do with Manchester?’ when a group’s ideas were described. These politicians were responsible for gaining approval for the budget and were effectively accountable for the success of the parade in ‘the Chamber’ and with the Scrutiny Committee. Their brief was to make sure the
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33 Very Important Person (VIP) is a term often used in event management for people given special treatment, usually a reserved area for viewing, drinks and networking opportunity with other ‘VIPs’.

34 A Disc Jockey or DJ plays amplified music and provides commentary at events and on the radio. The parade organisers worked with a local radio station who provided ample press coverage in the lead up to the parade and then the DJ in Albert Square on the day to amuse the gathered crowd.
parade fulfilled the ambitions laid out in Council minutes, namely to ‘celebrate the cultural diversity and unity of Manchester residents’ (Manchester City Council Minutes 2009).

The “imperative to connect” seemed to be an enduring ambition among the Manchester council executive as Green et al demonstrate in their analysis of Information and Communication Technology (ICT) projects in Manchester in 1990s (Green, Harvey et al. 2005:807). Arnold observes that ‘imagined communities’ created by administrative bodies then shaped how people in those organisations engaged with local people. Keesing (1994) uses this observation to explore how ‘tribes’ in Africa and ‘castes’ and ‘tribes’ in India, were constructed conceptually and institutionally out of highly complex pre-colonial social forms” (Arnold 1983, Keesing 1994). Similarly the Steering Committee worked to produce a diverse and unified version of Manchester community from their imagined understanding of one.

The parade organisers realised the imagined community by looking for and finding ‘community groups’ recruited through publicity, financial support, co-ordinating with existing Council relationships such as Neighbourhood Liaison teams and managing these relationships, both with the groups and the other Council officials. The parade was developed through iterative and regular group and one-to-one meetings, email and telephone exchanges between Council officials, Walk the Plank, sponsors, artists, project managers, community group representatives, and many more. There was largely a good and productive relationship between the parties involved but it was also clear that when the politicians asked for something to happen, it had to happen, unless a very strong argument could be made against it. Walk the Plank created parade sections such as the Yuri Gagarin motorcade in 2011 and a celebration of the 10th anniversary of the Commonwealth Games in 2012 at the request of the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee had a strong hold over how the parade took shape and by providing Walk the Plank with access to their resources, the Council also retained control over how and which ‘communities’ were involved in the parade. People were ‘invited’ to participate. For the Council, ‘community’ came as groups and organisations accessed through the Council networks, with many of these groups
run as Council services or supported by Council resources (such as community engagement workers, direct funding, use of Council buildings). These ranged from youth groups and schools to local special interest groups such as independent charities, dance or ethnic groups. Several ‘community groups’ were also established by or supported certain political factions in the city, affiliations which the parade organisers were sensitive to. Walk the Plank approached community groups through the Council communication networks such as newsletters and email either directly to the group organisers or via their Council liaison. Open invitations to participate were also issued through press campaigns and email lists promoting Manchester events. To a large extent, ‘community’ involvement was predicated on existing Council relationships. When I approached several women’s groups independently, as I was keen to follow a female interpretation of the ‘heroes’ theme in 2012, I found that that few had heard of the parade. The ‘communities’ constituted by the Council in a ‘community’ recruitment processes relied on specific configurations of circumstance – usually a proactive individual subscribed to the right email lists or noticing an article in the newspaper and following it up. Participation in the parade was structured through a Council designed engagement process. It was also subject to a selection procedure where groups submitted an application with their ideas on how they would respond to the theme. It should be emphasised however that the organisers did attempt to keep the selection process as open and fluid as possible. In the second year of the parade, Walk the Plank accepted all but 2 applications, an approach ratified by the Steering Committee. By the third year though, insufficient resources and an increased number of applications meant the rejection of some applications, albeit reluctantly.

In Chapter 5, I explore the experiences of two community groups in particular and how they engaged with the parade. Suffice to say at the moment that ‘community engagement’ for the parade followed a particular Council defined process. Informality came through how people could and did make parade participation on their own terms, but only within defined parameters. These parameters were set both by the Council and by Walk the Plank, as Council intermediary. However, just as Da Matta emphasises the informal processes that underlie apparently hierarchical structures, within both the Council and Walk the Plank, the apparently
structured approach was run through with informal networks and decision making processes. Walk the Plank in particular emphasised the importance of working in an open and fluid way, which I describe later in this chapter, and the organisers held onto this approach whilst working within Council structures. They provided a bridging mechanism between the Council bureaucracy and the variability of the community groups themselves. May, Director of Walk the Plank, provided the initial ‘creative’ input into the parade, ‘pitching’ proposed themes to the Steering Community and guiding the overall vision of the parade. Her brief was to make the parade attractive to people and feel fun and spontaneous. Inspired and enthused by Carnival practices, the rich colours and textures of Spanish town parades and the spontaneous anarchy of street theatre which brought and encouraged a flourishing of fantasy, May’s expertise lay in her ability to capture the imagination of participants. She was keen to encourage informality and freedom of expression in the community groups and so navigated a continuum between the formal processes of the Council and the spontaneous potential of informal expression.

The Steering Committee relied on May to inspire and enthuse others to participate in the parade, to capture people’s imaginations. This reliance kept the balance of power in Steering Committee meetings in tension as Walk the Plank could and did achieve changes based on the argument that the parade ‘needed’ certain aspects to ‘work’. On one occasion, Walk the Plank’s Director wanted to talk to the politicians as she was concerned about the recently announced ‘heroes’ parade theme. In August 2011, Manchester city centre had convulsed in rioting with shops being looted and burnt. When the riots ended, a group of citizens mobilised via Twitter and Facebook and came into the city with brooms to ‘clean up the mess’. A delighted Council declared these people to be ‘heroes’ and announced that the Parade theme for that year would be Manchester: A City of Heroes. When the Steering Committee met several months later, May persuaded the Councillors to de-emphasise the ‘hero’ aspect of this theme, which she thought was too restrictive. Instead she successfully persuaded them to a broader theme title of ‘The Sky’s the Limit...a celebration of heroic achievements’. In the main meeting, supported by both the officials she worked with day-to-day in making the parade and her own colleagues within Walk the Plank, May led a discussion on why a ‘City
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35 This is a pseudonym. I have anonymised quotes from interviews and recorded conversations as this was a commitment I made to people on starting the research.
of Heroes’ theme could not work. The discussion was very fluid, moving back and forth over similar refrains. On the one hand, the ‘City of Heroes’ theme press announcement had already been made; the Councillors had told people; the theme had emerged from the ‘grassroots’ I ♥ (heart) Manchester clean-up operation that occurred after the riots. On the other hand, parade participants needed to ‘go on a journey’; a ‘heroes’ theme was too limiting and ‘won’t have the ability to astonish people’ and part of the process was to ‘send people off to a place of imagination’ (Steering Committee Meeting, Nov 2011).

Eventually, one Councillor said, ‘we need to go back to the notion of Manchester Day, it is for communities of Manchester, their experience of history and a great spectacle – you do a wonderful job and I think you are right to have a strapline’. The Council officials quickly followed this lead by pointing out that a theme ‘helps internally’ and ‘directs and guides people’ both in the making and as an audience. The Councillors then deferred to May, ‘I take your word and experience’ but still emphasised that the theme could not be ‘so general that it has no relation to Manchester like Disney... it needs to build on the imagination of the local people’. The shift happened when the Councillors realised that the theme was important for the process and that no-one was trying to say that the parade couldn’t be ‘about heroes’ but the terminology of the strapline acted as a mobilising force and needed to be taken seriously as an orienting point around which participants could go on a creative journey. When the discussion moved on, a Councillor asked if there were ‘any artistic problems with sponsorship’ to which May replied, ‘our job is to encourage the sponsors not to do it in a way that we end up with a branded parade because people do not want to participate in a branded parade, our job is to do this creatively’ (ibid).

Walk the Plank played an intermediary role between Council and community representing the interests of both back to the other. They followed Council requests to structure the parade in particular ways but they also protected the participants so they could have freedom of expression, and they did this with the explicit support of the Council. During meetings, the politicians would say that they valued Walk the Plank’s experience in parade making and would often defer to points made in relation to producing a successful parade. The conceptual medium through which this negotiation occurs was related to creativity. Walk the Plank
used artistic and creative freedom as reasons for why they should follow one particular trajectory rather than another and the Council deferred to this. The work creativity was made to do here is discussed in further detail in Chapter 6.

Civic identities represented through public displays can be mobilised by civic representatives who seek to construct a public in the shape of their imagined communities. Often in newly formed urban spaces, intermediaries emerge to represent and negotiate these relationships. For Da Matta in Brazil (Da Matta 1986), church parades sit ‘in-between’ formal and informal celebratory events representing communities in public spaces. However just as the Christian oriented Whit Walks faded away in Manchester, many urban places no longer have a religious intermediary to inscribe social patterning on their civic spaces. In Chapter 5, I describe how an attempt by one spiritual group to stimulate community activity ended up alienating people. While the local authority in Manchester situated itself as the stimuli and resource provider to produce a public display, this could be to the detriment of grassroots activity, as discussed in Chapter 2. The Council may have commissioned Walk the Plank partly to provide a buffer between them and parade participants to encourage a greater sense of freedom since there was a self-consciousness to the Council officials' discussion around the ‘creative’ aspect of the parade and a concern with the parade not appearing too ‘corporate’36. Other motivations could have included outsourcing the risk, lacking the skills internally and an inability to move quickly and responsively to changing circumstances.

The mobility and flexibility through which parade are both formed and evolve provides insight into anthropology of organisation. In particular, the fluid nature of parades shows how organisations can be similarly mobile. In the following section, I put the Manchester Day Parade into context with the anthropology of organisation to suggest that focusing on an anthropology of organising helps to reveal the fluid nature of organisations. Reflecting on this brings out how people take a role-based approach to their activities that can change depending on their different contexts. In the Manchester Day Parade, each role had a set of responsibilities and the organising process was one of ‘engaged delegation’ as
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36 Manchester City Council was originally incorporated in 1838 under the Municipal Corporations Act 1835 and was referred to by Council officials as the Corporation of Manchester or Manchester Corporation. It is likely that ‘too corporate’ meant too much local government interference rather than commercial or capitalist interests.
these responsibilities were distributed throughout the productive network. The discussion of a parade as an event in particular provides a point of focus around which the organising process can be analysed.

**Parade as an Event**

Walk the Plank was an outdoor events company whose operational style was distinctly different from the Council. They were structured around event production and the organisational processes are usefully revealed through analysis of the parade as an event. In his classic “Analysis of a social situation”, Gluckman (1940) explores the ceremonial opening of a bridge built in Zululand by the Native Affairs Department. For Gluckman, the bridge is an apex, bringing together multiple interests of those attending – local Zululanders and expected users of the bridge, such as the local magistrate, people accessing the local hospital, farming interests as well as the local European clique who had designed and supported both the bridge and the hospital. The ceremonial process through which the bridge was commemorated aligned European and Zulu tradition. Gluckman argues that an analysis of this event slices through the different inter-relations between the groups involved, providing an insight into the social dynamics of the time. In particular, he observed that the groups and individuals involved acted by “customs of co-operation and communication” because the bridge opening associated them in a “common celebration”.

“All these group associations, including the whole gathering at the bridge, are harmonious in this situation because of the central factor of the bridge which is a source of satisfaction to all the persons present” (Gluckman 1940:25).

The alignment or conflict of interests in the production of parades however is just one insight into the processes through which they are produced. Just as Gluckman underlines the processual aspect of this event (namely all the different roles people had in the ceremony but also in the construction of the bridge), so this analysis focuses on the processes involved in the development of the parade.

Events are also time delineated processes working to different rhythms. Gell (1992) draws on Evans-Pritchard’s analysis of time reckoning among the Nuer to draw attention to the ambiguities in perceptions of time. Gell works with Evans-
Pritchard’s rather neat contrast between Nuer time concepts, at the microcosmic (domestic) level and at the macrocosmic (abstract) level. The time shaped by daily cycle of the ‘cattle clock’ and the annual cycle of seasonal activities is “concrete, immanent and process-linked”. This “ecological” form of time becomes macrocosmic with “durations longer than a single ecological cycle.” At the macrocosmic level time is “abstract, homogeneous and transcendent” capturing the micro units of Nuer social structures into a wider “framework of political units of differing genealogical definition and territorial scope, and causally subservient to them” (Gell 1992:16-17). Gell focuses in particular on how Evans-Pritchard outlines Nuer lineages as a fixed system “through which actual sets of persons pass in endless succession” (ibid:19, Evans-Pritchard 1940). The generational structure provides a backbone for Nuer social relations, just as the Nuer daily routine follows a rhythm set by an ecological context.

Gell’s analysis provides a useful theoretical frame for this thesis to contrast the formal organisational structures of those making the Manchester Day Parade and the informal day-to-day rhythms which were supported and shaped by these structures but also have their own energies and relations as well. Furthermore, it draws attention to the micro-cosmological time (which passes) encapsulated within structural time (which does not pass, although it may change). The ‘structural time’ in this context, compared with the political units of the Nuer, could be compared to the roles and responsibilities of the parade participants, the ongoing understandings and cultural contexts which are reinforced by habitual repetition and formal organisational hierarchies. Just as the senior generation of the Nuer pass expertise onto the junior generation, so those in Walk the Plank who claim long relations within the organisation or industry sought to shape more junior perceptions into ‘how things are done’. Defined roles were established but durational experience was also important. In this context, age was also less important than length of time spent in the industry itself, as we will see in the following episode. The ‘structural time’ of parade producers in Walk the Plank focused less on job titles and more on experience, both within the company but also within a close, interconnected industry of parade, firework and festival producers.
It was dark as I walked towards the brightly lit café but gradually I realised the knot of people standing smoking outside were all crew members of Walk the Plank, a welder, prop makers, a truck driver, a pyrotechnic. We walked into the bright bustling café and sat round a large table to a rousing discussion about life as a crew member on the parade and in the organisation more generally. It was perhaps the most insightful conversation of my fieldwork. Many topics, from the high female quotient in the organisation, to the relationships between more experienced and junior members, were spontaneously brought up by the informants themselves. They were articulate and intelligent providing an interesting contrast between the hard, physical, often dirty nature of their jobs and their erudite conversation and backgrounds. The nature of parade making seemed to attract thoughtful people, as I found throughout fieldwork.

I had arranged to meet Fleur for an interview and she had invited various other people along, of whom I only knew Dana and Charlotte. The others were technicians working with audio-visual and pyrotechnics. I had not met them before and could not be sure if they had worked on the parade. The crew only turned up on very busy days and in the focused, adrenaline fuelled atmosphere that characterised the run up to parade day, it had not felt appropriate to chat to them.

Of the women I knew, Fleur was responsible for setting up and packing down the parade workshop. I first saw her backing a huge truck into the small opening of the workshop space, delivering the Running Man. She was a straight talking, no-nonsense leader of the crew. They would materialise when large structural jobs were needed, clad in black hoodies sporting the skull and crossbones company logo. Male and female, they contrasted with the colourful, cheery artists who designed and built the parade shapes. Keeping to themselves, they smoked rollups with dirty fingers with a faint air of anarchy, reinforced perhaps by stories of what happened when they got going at the end of parade parties.

Dana was a welder, whose workshop was located in a disused building around the corner from the parade workshop. I first met her when she came into the workshop to repair the 4m tall Running Man structure. The Running Man was originally created in 2011 to promote the Wythenshawe Games which were to take place in 2012. However, during the course of the parade and in the following
months, the running man’s metal spine had broken and needed repairing. In the empty workshop in March 2012, he lay on his side waiting for Dana’s ministrations. Blue lights lit up the space as she soldered away bringing him back to life.

Charlotte was a prop maker. She was a recent graduate from a prop making course and been hired as assistant to Amelia, the parade’s ‘Design Coordinator’ and main creative lead. She had helped me make my ‘bin bag ballgown’ to wear with a handmade rat’s head for the parade in Year Three, which I describe further in Chapter 5. Charlotte had a very calm and laidback manner while making props and we worked alongside each other often in the workshop.

During our conversation at the café, the dynamics of the organisation became more apparent. Experience of the outdoor event industry counted more than gender, age or role within the organisation. Dana, Fleur and Charlotte laughingly described a situation where a young man recently started at the organisation became ‘cocky’, thinking he knew ‘how it was done’. He spoke in a patronising way to the women, perceiving them as ‘junior’ to him. It had taken a while, but gradually he ‘was coming round...understanding how it works’. I was struck by the confidence of these women - how they dressed, held their bodies, laughed at the erroneous behaviour of this cocky young man. The other young men in this group participated in the discussion, laughing and agreeing along with the women. I was among people who seemed certain in their world, of who they were and what they were doing. The cocky young man’s mistake was to over-focus on the hierarchy implied in his job title and on a misunderstanding of how gender played out (Group interview 2012).

The nature of outdoor events, with a continuous stream of unexpected and unanticipated happenings with unclear consequences, required a strong constitution and ability to respond quickly and calmly as situations unfolded. It also required an ability to wait around, to live comfortably in a “world of transit spaces, in-between times, pauses, moments of waiting or indecision” (Ehn and Löfgren 2010:9). Every outdoor event was different - different locations, crowd dynamics, vehicles, materials performances, performers, weather, seasons. People put significant effort into anticipating as many scenarios as possible but it was
impossible to prepare for every eventuality. All the experienced Walk the Plank staff I met had a calm approach to their work, and carried it out with humour and imagination. During the first parade, in the run up to the event and then on the day itself, I was baffled by the lack of apparent stress. Where was the arguing, the frantic panic, the visible signs of stress? I have been involved in organising many events and there is often a significant amount of stress – leading to hot tempers and flash arguments. While there was evidently performance related tension, a feeling of adrenaline in the air, the most visible sign of stress was eye drops dripped carefully into each eye of an event organiser during the regular meetings. One day, this organiser said to me, “What you need to realise, Jess, is that we do this every day, week in, week out, all year round. This parade is just one of many outdoor events for us. It is special - our favourite event of the year because it is located in Manchester - but it is one of many.” This perspective was repeated to me several times. The most valuable workers within Walk the Plank, were those who had so much experience that the stresses themselves were habitual, managed through routines followed repeatedly and shown to work again and again.

This experience provides a useful parallel with the lineage relations within the Nuer community (Gell 1992). Walk the Plank maintained an organisational structure with clearly defined roles for the different workers – project managers, producers, artists, crew – and people provided services based on these role definitions. But at the same time, the practical, day-to-day knowledge of more experienced members of the organisation, be they crew, artists or producers, also held significant sway and an authority which transcended these roles. The introduction of Amelia as Design Coordinator revealed the tension between these roles most clearly. She transferred her previous experience from television, theatre and more static events into more directly appropriate understandings of parade as a moving, outdoor event. She was very careful to defer to the experienced parade makers, to draw on their knowledge and expertise explicitly, to pay attention to what they said and incorporate it into her recommendations to the artists on how to proceed.

Running through the parade were twin conceptions of time. The durational emphasis on time served through which relationships were negotiated and developed and the fixed time based structure of the event cycle. The creation of a
specific event, with a clear goal, a tangible objective, acted as a mobilising force to deliver a process. Time and a ‘spot-in-time’, an event, was a useful tool, a mechanism to enable action. Walk the Plank had the capacity to deliver these events consistently well, drawing on the expertise of its capable crew and absorbing the potential stress from the commissioners.

Turner (1988) argues that performance or “social drama” is “a process of converting particular values and ends, distributed over a range of actors, into a system (which may be temporary or provisional) of shared or consensual meaning.” In his complex analysis, he draws on Moore’s representation of social dynamics as processes of regularisation (the maintenance of status quo) with processes of situational adjustment (changing of status quo), destabilised by a factor of indeterminacy (Turner and Schechner 1988:9-10, Moore (1978) 2000).

By conflating events and performances together, the Manchester Day Parade becomes both a concentration of social symbols and associations that are converted by a range of actors into a system of shared meaning. It is a form of situational adjustment which has the potential to disrupt or reinforce the status quo. Turner follows Schwartz to draw attention to people as individuals and “the whole array of personalities, the constructs they bring to and derive from events and their structuring of events”. This acknowledges the role of the individual on how events happen, unfold and are interpreted (Schwartz 1978:432).

The role of the individual in shaping events is the primary influence on the informal day-to-day happenings that impact on how plans unfold. Events are cultural constructions defined and shaped by particular individuals with (often competing) priorities and objectives. As we have seen, an influential politician mobilised enough support in Manchester to create an event, aimed at inscribing Manchester identity onto the streets. Similarly, the tensions that may reside between the different groups involved in the parade, and in particular between the council and their constituency (as described in Chapter 2) are made invisible in the common celebration of the parade. This fixed action, in time and space, can provide a focal point around which others congregate and circumstances develop. While Turner (1988) emphasised the ‘social drama’ in everyday life, this analysis combines the everyday dramas involved in the construction of the parade, and the parade itself as a one-off event. This approach lay at the heart of the council
Cultural Ambition. Council officials and politicians established target events to be realised at a future date and resources were mobilised to work towards those events, tucking in organisational objectives where and how they could into the event itself. Manchester Day Parade became a mobilising mechanism for action.

This approach contrasts with Borneman and Senders’ (2000) depiction of the Love Parade in Berlin. Less of an event than a happening, the Love Parade most closely resembles a machine, or a world of machine simulation, and participants take the metaphor of "machine experience" seriously. Over two days and nights the major experience is to alternate between silently standing and waiting, in no particular order for nothing in particular, and "raving," a highly choreographed, robotic movement to the sound and super-accelerated beat of "techno music". The authors state what the parade is not – not commercial, nor religious although it does have a spiritual dimension for its participants; not class based or status oriented; not exclusive, protest or slogan focused; “it intends to communicate nothing” (ibid:297). Instead, the authors argue that it is a form of entertainment that has taken the space left by organised religion, which originally used public ritual as a mechanism for carving out civic spaces in European cities.

“Since the end of World War II, however, traditional politics has not been the major beneficiary of this decline in the power of organised religious authority. Instead, entertainment has emerged as the field dominating the management of both experiences of transcendence and people’s affective attachments and identifications” (ibid).

The authors go on to describe Love Parade as a form of ‘political non-engagement’, where the experience sought is one of ‘sensuous mimesis’. In 2010, overcrowding at a critical junction under a bridge led to 21 deaths and over 500 injuries. The parade organiser ended the event ‘forever’ out of respect for the lost lives.

The Love Parade was a grassroots, organic activity which emerged spontaneously, grew rapidly and collapsed under the weight of its popularity. Borneman and Senders call it a 'happening' rather than an ‘event’, perhaps because of its lack of process and structured organisation. In contrast, in the Manchester Day Parade, the parade ‘producers’ Walk the Plank had considerable influence in how the parade shape emerged since they had considerable control over the resources, the
participating groups, the decision making on arranging the features, commissioning the artists and developing the themes. The organisational ethos and individuals involved were rooted in the street theatre and outdoor performance tradition. So Walk the Plank brought a grassroots, organic, spontaneous ‘happening’ ethic to the more formal event-driven approach of the Council. The focus of participating organisations on an ‘event’ as a shared goal allowed for apparently incompatible organisational entities to collaborate productively. The contrast between Walk the Plank and the bureaucratically organised Council is stark and yet they were able to collaborate and indeed brought different strengths to the collaboration. In particular, the formal administrative nature of the Council and its ability to control the management of civic spaces and public services such as waste management and road planning, as well as connect with the diversity of community groups across the city, was essential to the smooth running of the parade. Walk the Plank’s adaptability and versatility in managing rapidly changing circumstances as well as providing a quirky alternative vibe was similarly crucial.

PARADE AS ORGANISED ENTITY

The previous sections demonstrate how parades emerge in cities as a form of civic engagement and social consolidation both for the local authorities and distinct groups within the city. The nature of the parade shape, design, format and characteristics emerge from the dynamics of the people involved in its production. Parades usually involve civic authorities to some degree, even if just as a facilitating body to close the streets and provide first aid, resources or funding. In many cases, attempts by civic representatives to determine a particular shape or parade identity are changed by the participating groups. In Manchester, Manchester Day Parade was unusual in the extent of Council involvement in defining its theme and presentation although the other parades such as Pride or the Whit Walks also required state support. However, where the Whit Walks were church organised and Pride organised by people from the ‘Gay Village’, Manchester Day Parade took shape through the interplay between the local Council, Walk the Plank and Manchester citizens. Rather than represent ‘state’ and ‘public’ as polarised entities, the parade emerged as a co-production.
Each individual participating in the parade brought both themselves but also their contextualising organising responsibilities to it. Hybrid cultures combine elements of past practices, patronage networks, individual decision making and inclinations, rooted in one particular cultural context travel, shaping organisational practices as they move (cf. Haraway 1997). The Manchester Day Parade consisted of multiple groups with distinct cultural contexts, collaborating to varying degrees to put on the parade. Walk the Plank, the Council, the funders, each community group, all consist of individuals who brought existing cultural understandings to their discussions but also developed shared understandings during the production of the parade. The Councillors learned to defer to May’s experience when she talked about taking parade participants on an imaginative journey because they were impressed with the results of previous parades which had such positive feedback from press and participants alike. These Councillors and the officials understood that they needed to frame the parade in terms of economic and social value to gain approval for funding in the ‘Chamber’ and support from a media watchful of excessive public expenditure during a recession. Parade organisers understood their participation as a ‘role’ to be fulfilled within the context of their organisational responsibility and also their duty to the parade as a co-produced entity. Their organisations had its own dynamics and they were themselves individuals but their activities needed to be consistent with the role assigned to them and this could move between different organisational contexts. So while this thesis draws inspiration from institutional ethnographies, organis it is approached from the anthropology of ‘organising’ rather than organisation. It focuses on how people take on ‘roles’ as part of a collaborative activity rather than attempt to even define a tangible shape to an ‘organization’.

During the parade, people came together and quite specifically adopted a role as required by that context - as producers of creative energy, as funders, as commissioners, as community liaison persons. When circumstances required a particular decision or argument, the process followed the roles and individuals representing those roles. When the Councillors sought to define the parade theme themselves, picking up on a grassroots movement and coining the ‘City of Heroes’ theme, May questioned the appropriateness of this action and reclaimed the theme as her responsibility. But the Councillors also claimed the right to choose which
community groups were represented in the parade (even if they then approved them all) and to elicit special favours for particular ones. May also moved through different roles, as Director of Walk the Plank, as liaison with the VIPs, as nurturer and supporter of the artists and the community groups, as interviewee for press attention, as general trouble-shooter and ‘remover of log jams’. The influence of key figures in the making of this parade extended way beyond organisational parameters. These roles include a responsibility for delegation, to know who should be carrying out which activities and how.

When Council officials advised May on how to influence and persuade the Councillors in the Steering Committee in order to achieve certain objectives, they stayed within their roles. In their capacity as Council officials, they did not have the same freedom to push back in the way that May did as an external service provider. Corsín Jiménez sees the institution as "an assemblage of 'public' (political) interests where the opening up of the space for the emergence of publics becomes itself the institutional moment.’ He posits the "redistribution of the institutional fund of social interests as fundamental to the creation of (local) spaces of justice" (Corsín Jiménez 2007:xxviii). The hierarchical nature of the relationship between the politicians and the officials was enforced by democratic endorsement. Formally, the politicians represented ‘the people’ and so should have the final say on what the Council enacted as a local authority. This view was repeated to me several times. Informally, it was clear that the politicians had interests and inclinations which skewed towards one group or another, one perspective rather than another and the officials were sensitive to this. Rather than challenge it directly however, the mechanism for influence came through intermediaries such as Walk the Plank. As discussed in Chapter 2, this practice of achieving change through intermediaries was also very useful in the physical regeneration of the city when Council officials and politicians worked closely with building contractors.

Green et al describe in relation to ICT (Green, Harvey et al. 2005) how Manchester City Council also sought to develop similar networks to stimulate a digital sector in the city. The independent behaviour of organisations and individuals who established their own activities came as a surprise and also caused some chagrin. Officials wanted to engage with citizens in a proactive manner but they also
wanted to retain control over the particulars of that engagement. The authors’ analysis has some remarkable parallels with Council engagement of the Manchester Day Parade participants. The organisational structures of the local authority prohibited or enabled different forms of engagement and individuals largely kept to the roles allocated to them in the organisation. They innovated and adapted within their roles, using what capacity they had to achieve their agenda, including outsourcing the adaptiveness itself to another organisation.

Understandings about roles and motivations drive how people engage with each other when working together on a collaborative activity. These roles however rely on underlying assumptions which can be contradictory. In discussions with people, it became obvious that there were several different parade origin stories for the Manchester Day Parade which then affected how they engaged with it. The following accounts could presage completely different events and yet they all led to the Manchester Day Parade.

Strathern shows how the ‘prospect of ownership’ has the potential to cut into networks and disrupt or change the social relations inscribed within (Strathern 1996:521). So the field of commerce comes into a scientific discovery process and changes the inherent dynamics through claims to the patent relating to the discovery. The following narratives situate different potential ‘owners’ at the centre of a parade origins story. Several artists, the Parade Director and council representatives each represented the parade’s origin differently. These accounts as narratives but also as potential intermediaries in themselves had different strengths of power to disrupt or influence the organising flow. The accounts sit together, distinct and yet interwoven and it is only when one or other was acted upon, that its implication within the network is revealed.

THE ARTIST-LED ACCOUNT

An often mentioned version comes from the Manchester International Festival (MIF), the major arts biennale in Manchester in its third iteration at the time of the first Manchester Day Parade in 2011. In the second iteration of MIF in 2009, artist Howard37 presented Procession, ‘a public event’ as “a tribute to, and a showcase

37 I have used a pseudonym for all the MIF participants I interviewed, even though some were unconcerned about anonymity. This approach treats the informants equally in the thesis and provides a layer of privacy for everyone.
for, the city’s colourful outsiders, minority interests and half-forgotten relics” 38. Howard worked with community groups in Manchester to make floats for a mile-long parade incorporating boy racers, rose queens, brass bands and chip shop attendants. On 5th July 2009, they marched down Deansgate, in front of 25,000 people, to open the MIF festival 39. The parallels with Manchester Day Parade are too evident to ignore and many parade organisers mentioned it to me, including the Manchester Day Parade Director. The MIF Director however, resisted the connection between the two events. When I requested an interview explaining that I was following the genealogy of the parade, he emphasised that MIF was not related to the Manchester Day Parade and that the Council was already discussing a civic parade before Procession was developed.

THE ART CAR ACCOUNT

May, Walk the Plank’s Director attributed the parade’s genesis to both Howard’s influence and also to an Art Car parade that her organisation brought to Manchester in 2007, inspired by an American version and the first time such a parade happened in the UK. Its purpose was ‘about stopping the city in its tracks’ and ‘making people think differently about their car’. They gained Arts Council funding and commissioned artists to makeover cars ‘in a fun way’. One example was a golfer standing on green Astroturf (fake grass) on the roof of a mini, pretending to knock golf balls into the crowd. May said, “I loved it, artists loved it, audiences loved it and I really thought we could turn that into an annual event and grow it”. However the Councillors in the city were not keen on the artist led event – they thought it was ‘whacky and out there’ and lacked community engagement in the making process. While she was trying to elicit support for the Art Car event, May noticed a newspaper article where a Manchester Councillor called for a parade in Manchester ‘like the Macy Parade in New York’. She contacted him and this opened up a dialogue which shaped the Manchester Day Parade. The Councillor was emphatically not interested in the Art Car parade because he wanted a ‘parade that starts with the community’. Working together with the Head of Major Events at the Council and in response to a brief, Walk the Plank produced a ‘feasibility study’ to explore the process through which they would engage
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Manchester communities, including ‘hard-to-reach’ communities and after this study, they were commissioned to produce the parade. The study explored the financial, logistical and social potential of the parade.

THE STREET THEATRE ACCOUNT

Another founding story comes from two parade artists who were unaware of Procession. They instead connected the parade back to the street theatre days of Manchester International Arts (MIA), an influential and active community arts organisation which dominated the public arts events scene in Manchester in the 1990s, setting a standard for large-scale, dramatic street performance in Manchester. A key organiser for MIA told me about their community focused approach. For her, Procession the parade created by Howard, was popular with “luvvies at the cutting edge” but the majority of people were “stunned” as it was “so conceptual” rather than “something to cheer at” (Interview 2011). She described it as “a spectacle not a parade”. MIA’s street theatre events in Manchester were an attempt to bring in world music and European traditions, from Dutch barrel organs to Yugoslav dance groups to Catalonian festivals. The organisation would raise funding from EU, national and local sources to put on events which were family friendly and mobile on the streets of Manchester and its open spaces. MIA’s organiser suggested that the family nature of these events stopped the “awful behaviour in the city centre” where large groups of people gathered in the evening drinking alcohol.

During the late 1990s, MIA had put on several events working in districts across of Greater Manchester and aiming for a Greater Manchester parade for the millennium. They put considerable effort in community engagement and ran parades which followed a very similar structure to the Manchester Day Parade – developing an idea and inviting community groups to submit and develop sections with the support of artists. However the MIA organisers said that while they emphasised community development and social inclusion in their work, they did not put forward the economic value arguments necessary for political support at the Council, whose support dissipated after the formation of the Manchester International Festival. She also considered that her organisation’s consensus-based approach to decision making and collaborative working was not as effective in gaining Council support. In her view ‘pushers’ were more successful; people who
were prepared to ‘put themselves forward’ and ‘corner the market’. MIA did not have the right combination of political support, economic rhetoric or organisational approach to continue working in Manchester as the recession hit. They were not commissioned for the millennial celebration after all and funding for their annual events stopped. They moved their productive energies onto outdoor events in Cumbria instead and by 2011, the Council officer responsible for the parade claimed that Walk the Plank was the only organisation in Manchester capable of delivering a parade of an appropriate size.

THE COMMUNITY PROJECT ACCOUNT

Another version of the parade genesis came from a key politician involved in the parade, who attributed it to local parades in his constituency; Moston, a city suburb, north of the centre. So I cycled up to Moston to talk to a community liaison officer about the connection between Moston and the Manchester Day Parade. The officer referred to a ‘resident-led’ community cohesion event intended to bring nearby communities in Harpurhey and Moston together for a ‘Moston Day’ with entertainment that included a ‘Moston Monster’ parade. This version highlights civic pride about a local area, similar to the ‘celebrating Manchester’ emphasis in the Manchester Day Parade and included an aspiration to bring together people of different backgrounds in Moston. It was put together very quickly in response to a rise in racial tension that came with a rapid increase of people from ethnic minority backgrounds moving into a historically white Irish working class area. Here a ‘steering committee’ was established with representatives from different backgrounds – chairs of resident groups, community guardians, representatives from groups involved in local nature reserves and horticulture. The Council officer claimed that there was a concern that the celebration day was led primarily by the ‘Regeneration team’, unlike the carnival in nearby Crumpsall and when the funding ended, so did this annual event. The community liaison team tried to encourage the formation of a community group to support the event, similar to the people supporting the carnival. Crumpsall, the officer explained, was more middle class and had privileged status as the constituency of the Council leader. However, similar to the Manchester Day Parade, where the Council representatives created the ‘frame’ and asked local residents to populate it, the substantial organising work that went into the event resided with the Council and organisations paid by them.
While the event had disappeared from the local community’s annual calendar, ‘Harpurhey in Bloom’ in contrast won 11 awards for their flower and planting displays in their area, a completely volunteer led and organised activity. Residents could self-organise local activities, but Moston Day was evidently not one they wanted to spend their time on. As discussed in the previous chapter, civic celebrations and suchlike events provide a form of political capital for the politicians involved which runs as an undercurrent to their claims to stimulating economic and cultural capital as revenue drivers for the city (Chapter 2). Moston Day was potentially a similar attempt at generating political capital for the Councillor involved in the area, without grounding in the local community.

THE CITY RECORDS ACCOUNT

The parade organisation itself was led at the Council by Major Events team, supported and endorsed by two local politicians. The politicians were ultimately answerable for the event and funding in the Chamber of Councillors although the majority of Council work was discussed and developed in ‘Scrutiny committees’.

Minutes from the Communities and Neighbourhoods Overview and Scrutiny Committee meeting on 16th June 2009 indicated a concern with the MIF parade Procession; “it was considered that the parade did not present a positive image of Manchester and was not in the spirit of cultural diversity. It was agreed that the Committee should send a clear message that public money should not be spent in this way.” (Manchester City Council, 2009). The alternative representation outlined in May’s feasibility study was “made a priority... The Manchester Day parade would celebrate the cultural diversity and unity of Manchester residents” (ibid).

Each of these stories situates the narrator within their own organisational context – they make sense of the parade through their roles and priorities. All can be held as ‘true’ at the same time, even though they are partially contradictory. What they all show is that focusing on events as points of orientation and the roles of people played (or avoided) in working towards them provides an alternative perspective on the anthropology of organisation, encouraging analysis of organising as people work towards shared activities such as events.

The subtleties of these dynamics are perhaps best illustrated through the role of sponsorship in the parade. In 2011, I was appointed Project Manager of a parade
section for Sponserz\textsuperscript{40}, a multinational services corporation with a Manchester office keen to engage with the ‘city’. As providers of a large donation to the parade in the form of sponsorship, the Council and Walk the Plank were keen to provide them with a positive parade experience. The sponsors were assigned two of the best parade artists, a substantial budget and me as their project manager\textsuperscript{41}. The initial meeting to discuss the parade section was attended by Council officials, May, Laurie\textsuperscript{42}, the parade producer and Amelia\textsuperscript{43}, the Design Co-ordinator for the parade. The presence of all three indicates the significance of this particular ‘community group’. May opened this meeting with a short film presenting the previous year’s parade in all its glory and the group engaged in a discussion on what their new parade section would look like. Subsequent meetings were more like other community groups with discussion and making sessions between Sponserz employees and the artists. I describe the making process in more detail in another chapter (Chapter 4) but here I want to emphasise the increased attention the sponsoring organisation received compared to other community groups. I do not believe they asked for this special treatment, it seemed to just happen naturally as commensurate with their provision of financial support, even though the staff actually participating in the parade did not have the decision making power to provide the finance themselves. Meanwhile however, individuals from the marketing department did push to have the organisation’s brand name visible on the street, something resisted strongly by May and Amelia. Attempts by many groups to wear or carry banners with their names were refused as it would compromise the design integrity of the parade appearance. This resistance was accepted by the sponsors and the Council officials fitting in with Walk the Plank’s vision for the parade.

During 18 months of fieldwork working among the parade organisers, artists and several community groups, every person I encountered had a different understanding of the parade and motivation for participating. However, when people worked for a particular organisation, such as the Council or Walk the Plank,

\textsuperscript{40} This is a pseudonym.
\textsuperscript{41} After our first meeting with the Sponserz, Amelia suggested that they would make a good group for me to manage. I am an experienced project manager in other contexts (IT and community development) but this was my first parade experience. I think she applied the same instinct to pairing me with them as she did in pairing other artists, project managers and community groups together, a process I describe further in Chapter 4.
\textsuperscript{42} This is a pseudonym.
\textsuperscript{43} This is a pseudonym.
there was a commonality of approach consistent with organisational ethnographies that trace cultural patterns in places of work. The parade itself was distinct from these organisations and not controllable by them. The Council brought a public into being through introducing and funding the parade in Manchester, but once in existence it became more than a Council entity. As I demonstrate in Chapter 4, Walk the Plank conceived the parade as independent from them and worked with it by imagining many potential versions of it and trying to ‘push’ and ‘pull’ it into shape. These accounts not only describe the genesis of the parade, they also provide insight and clues into the underlying processes in the organisations within which the narratives are situated.

CHAPTER 3 CONCLUSION

In this chapter, I considered different forms of parade-like events from places across the world which all required organisers and participants, funders and an audience as critical components which combine to provide a parade focused on ‘displaying’ or ‘showing’ an aspect of the city to itself and others. The Manchester Day Parade sat at an intersection of multiple interests and organisations. Initiated and sponsored by politicians, but also owned and constituted by grassroots, it was both a representation of Manchester’s cultural diversity and a Council driven attempt to (re)make Manchester in a certain image. It was a “redistribution”, where “society holds out a mirror to itself and looks at its own image through the refracted lens of ethical idioms” (Corsín Jiménez 2007:xiv) For the parade participants and their audience, this parade celebrated Manchester and the diverse communities in the city. It called up notions of celebration, participation and community. As such it joined a wide diversity of non-military parades worldwide which function as civic, city-level celebratory events that aim to give narrative to identities in an urban landscape.

By analysing the parade as an event with intersecting trajectories, the parade works as an ethnographic moment, a re-distributive flow in an organisational context. It shows how Council politicians’ motivations for public celebration of civic identity were expressed through parade, connecting to a form of celebration in urban spaces used worldwide for similar purposes. As public representatives however, the politicians did not seek to achieve their ambitions through
supporting grassroots activity. Instead they drew on the city administration’s resources and established themselves in a Steering Committee to control the productive output. Council officers used their existing networks to provide community engagement and support in the recruitment of parade participants and Walk the Plank was brought in to appeal to people’s imaginations.

However at the same time, May at Walk the Plank had already conceived and produced her own version of a civic parade populated with cars decorated by artists and others had organised public dances and music spectacles of which the parade is just one of many in their summer programme. The Manchester Day Parade was not a product of one individual or organisation but an accumulation of many aspirations and intentions which collided and combined to produce something spectacular for a day in June every year. The process through which the parade was achieved could be described as ‘engaged delegation’, where activities and responsibilities were passed out to the many participating organisations, groups and individuals – from politicians and sponsors to artists and community members.

The Manchester Day Parade presents well as the cut form of a network of multiple flows (Strathern 1996:521). By looking through it to the relations that brought it into being, it becomes possible to see how roles and responsibilities impact on the final shape of a visible entity. It provides an opportunity for reflection and consideration on how different kinds of relationships impact on the social dynamics of the combining and separated relations in Manchester, how some people come to have more influence than others, often without explicit intention on anyone’s part. During the process of engaged delegation, existing organisational relationships and power dynamics interrupted and redirected certain flows and activities; sometimes usefully and other times impeding productivity. Drawing on Gell’s work on art and agency (Gell 1998), I will explore next how the parade became an object in its own right, indexed into social relations and with its own agency in the following chapter. I will also discuss how Council objectives in using the parade to generate economic or social benefits could work alongside Walk the Plank and parade artists’ understanding of the parade as a production in its own right, ‘art for arts’ sake’, a process which brought the parade entity to life.
CHAPTER 4: MAKING PARADE

In the previous chapter I presented the parade as a jumbled coalescence, an institutional moment to be interrogated for insight into the multiple socially contextualised trajectories that ran through it. At each stage of the parade making, different people came to the fore and the parade took on a more detailed shape based on their particular role, concerns and aspirations. This chapter considers Gell’s analysis of the art object (Gell 1998) to make sense of how understandings and definitions create stylistic characteristics of an entity, embedding it in surrounding social relations. Analysing the parade and social relations enmeshed by and in it as an ‘art object’ helps trace the dynamic processes from which it is emergent. I use discourses of flow to show how the parade emerges as an object, enacting and enacted upon as an independent entity.

IMAGINING PARADE

Walk the Plank, an outdoor events company described itself as a ‘creative force in cultural events’. With its origins rooted in pyrotechnics and street theatre, the company was experienced in putting on events in spite of British weather, health and safety minefields and the complicated co-ordination of thousands of participants. The Manchester Day Parade’s backbone was located in three women from this organisation, who all played critical and complimentary roles in the making of the parade. These roles did not ‘define’ them but were assumed within the context of the work at hand. At the same time, they brought their own character and experience to the roles they took on. May was Director of Walk the Plank and worked closely with Amelia, Design Coordinator commissioned to work on the parade in particular, and Laurie who, as Producer Project Director, was an extremely experienced project manager who had worked on Manchester events for decades, both at the Council and with the Manchester International Festival. This triumvirate were in constant communication as the parade shape developed, discussing, anticipating, exploring options and making decisions. Each took on a ‘lead’ role in overseeing aspects of the parade. A dynamic, imaginative leader, May effectively combined a charismatic and nurturing management role with verve and
imagination in the production of a coherent aural and visual experience for the parade. She provided the initial vision, defining the theme and verbally painting the parade for the Steering Committee to imagine as well as the leadership and enthusiasm that gave the parade organisation its positive energy. Laurie was the logistical expert, a practical and good-humoured woman who oversaw the parade production process. She was modest about her role in the parade design, deferring to May and Amelia, but her ideas and contributions, especially on what was achievable, were critical to the parade development. She co-ordinated the major parts of the parade, oversaw “the timeline” and managed the people involved. Amelia led on imagining the parade into existence. She worked with the initial vision supplied by May and 'knitted' the parade together, working with the parade artists and community groups to realise their ideas in such a way that they would have the height, colour and sound to look good on a Manchester city centre street. Amelia’s background of prop making for theatre, set making for TV, lead designer for street art projects and interior design combined with the trust that came from a 20 year working friendship with the Parade Producer, Laurie and an empathetic concern for empowering people to realise their own ideas, produced a distinctive design style on the parade itself.

Amelia described her approach to me as “keeping back...I steer and listen, suggest but not control or design. Instead I knit. If a stitch drops, I provide a stitch. I take an overview that is detached” (Amelia, Dec 2011). She was very particular about her terms and would correct me regularly. For her, the parade did not consist of ‘floats’ - this restricted it to a ‘Lord Mayor’ style parade. Instead the parade consisted of ‘entities’ or ‘elements’, with character, music and movement and she usually referred to them as parade ‘sections’, a term I adopted. When helping out, I produced a document introducing Walk the Plank staff to a community group and Amelia corrected my phrasing: she was not the 'Parade Designer', but the 'Design Co-ordinator', a careful nomenclature to emphasise a supporting rather than controlling role; similarly, her colleague Patty was not ‘running workshops to make/design parade elements’, she was ‘managing the space which artists run workshops in’. It was through these nuances and emphasis on role definition that I came to understand the careful and particular configuration of parade entity that Amelia sought to construct.
In Amelia’s view, the parade had ‘many masters’. This helped her focus and structure her approach to delivery. She felt a duty to the audience to make an ‘impact on the day’; the parade had to be technically and visibly safe; the community groups creating the work needed ownership and to enjoy the making process. Amelia needed to ‘tick the boxes’ of the Council and look after the artists so that they can do their best and provide value for money. She compared her role to ‘dealing with an octopus’, a one off experience that she relished. In developing the parade, Amelia claimed that the ‘process created itself’. She encouraged Laurie and May to look at the parade shape in ‘abstract’, freeing it, thinking about it in terms of texture and colour, as sculpture. She met with community groups and encouraged them not to be ‘formulaic, too literal, grounded (i.e. too low) or small’. She ‘met and matched’ them with artists, designers and puppeteers and then kept herself ‘in the background’ supporting the development process, learning about artists’ strengths and weaknesses.

In the first year, as Amelia’s approach came together, she said she was so busy that she didn’t step back from it and since it was the first parade of this type, there was no feedback on whether she was doing well or badly. Instead she was guided by instinct,

“There were no rules, I was just feeling my way, no-one said do x, y and z. There was no tickbox, just random intuition and what felt right. On parade day, it dawned on me, I know every single group, their journey..the artists and how the ideas developed”. (Amelia, Design Co-ordinator, Dec 2011)

In trying to understand her approach, I suggested that she was picturing the whole parade in her head, as she talked to people. She said that it was more than a picture, it was a 3D model with movement, colour and sound. She used the following metaphor,

“Putting on the parade is like making bread, the ingredients go into the bowl, you wait for it to rise, you give it a bash and wait for it to rise again. You pull and push and knead it, and it turns into a loaf of bread. It’s a cross between cooking and alchemy. You don’t know what the ingredients are until you’ve got them.” (Amelia, Design Co-ordinator, Dec 2011)
For Amelia it was important that the parade would be ‘good’. It would have ‘integrity’. As ‘the custodian of image’, Amelia demanded of herself ‘passion, determination and conviction’. The ‘essential quality’ was a ‘desperate determination to make sure it is as good as it could possibly be’. It became clear that Amelia’s determination to allow the parade shape to emerge naturally and to let the parade artists and their associated community groups to realise their vision independently was distinctive and unusual for someone leading on parade design. As Laurie said,

“Amelia does a huge amount of understanding where the group and who the group is and what the group can do and what the artist, and what the group needs in terms of the artist, so she’ll match the right artist to the right group in terms of their ambition and what they’d like to do and then she’ll shape it. They’ll say, we’d like to do X and she’ll be like, you know, ‘maybe that wouldn’t work’, but she has a very good way of working with people that’s not just saying ‘it won’t work’ but actually getting them to find out what does work and then owning it and it being their idea. So I think that’s really important because it’s not imposed. Because if it’s imposed then they can’t own it and then they are not going to put as much into it, but if they own it and if they feel very proud of that idea and they want to make it, then clearly the process is going to be much more in-depth.” (Laurie, Parade Producer, July 2011)

A critical factor that influenced the development of Amelia’s approach was the response people had to Procession (2009) an art piece made for the Manchester International Festival (MIF). When Amelia came to design the parade development process, she spoke to groups who had participated in Procession. She observed that people were told “you can all be chips” and “they weren’t given any more creative output”, they “had to be chips” (the section celebrated the first ever fish and chip shop in Oldham). Amelia said, “that really stuck in my mind as an appalling thing..artists are much more controlling because they are more self-centered and I just desperately don’t want to be”. She “turned the process on its head” so the group came first. The balance between structured and freeform creative development was a chosen approach, a particular process adopted by Walk the
Plank in order to foster a sense of creative freedom among the parade participants. It required strength and determination from key participants to hold back when necessary, to support as well as lead, to foster a sense of creative security, from which, through which, shapes emerge. This approach was distinctly different from the Council-led attempts to control the production of the parade itself as described in the previous chapters. It was this freedom to create that May protected in her discussions with the Steering Committee and to which they deferred on several occasions.

*Procession* was deemed an art-work by those who talked about it. Amelia, May and Laurie did not claim that Manchester Day Parade was an art-work but they did have people they identified as artists working on the parade. In distinguishing between “artist-led” parades and the Manchester Day Parade, May referred to the “Art Car Parade” where artists were invited to decorate cars in a variety of ‘wild and wacky ways’ to follow a similar route through the city. She also identified the Handmade Parade in a rural area north of Manchester where artists define the themes and overall designs of the sections and members of the community help make the work. Amelia described a “classic difference” between artist and designer, a view which was closely echoed by a lead parade artist, Bob. They both said that artists create their own “brief” and then “respond” to it as a problem with a set of challenges and questions. These briefs create parameters which help them decide what to do. Bob, maker of signature parade pieces such as Gulliver, a Ferris wheel, Concorde and the “Chinese train”, suggested that artists have “something inside them that they have to get out”. He, on the other hand, made work based on other people’s requests. Bob presented himself as a prop maker, even though his work was indistinguishable to me from the work of other parade artists who did self-identify as artists. A critical difference in the making process when artists are involved seems to relate to levels of control over the output.

Howard’s retention of control and overall authorship of *Procession* ended up inhibiting people’s abilities to be “more than chips” as Amelia mentioned above. In Manchester, the parade styles between Manchester Day Parade, Pride, Whit Walks and Howard’s *Procession* for the Manchester International Festival all reference the cultural contexts from which they emerged. Since Amelia explicitly contrasted Manchester Day Parade with Procession, I examine more closely to contemplate
the stylistic differences and what these might reference in the wider cultural
context. Amelia emphasised the emergent nature of the parades composed of
elements which she saw as drawn from the community groups that made up the
parade. So did Howard.

In 2011, interested in the creative process that led to Procession’s formation, I
interviewed Howard, the Manchester International Festival directors, Albert and
Steve and Doug, the Chief Executive of a local art house cinema and gallery. While
they had all participated in the formation of Procession, none was involved in the
Manchester Day Parade nor interested in its formation and development. I outline
an impression formed from these conversations below because these perspectives
on Howard’s parade draw out interesting parallels and distinctions between the
two parades. I develop this comparison further in Chapter 6.

The Turner prize is a national symbol in the UK for success in visual art, often of
conceptual nature\(^{44}\). Howard is described in the press as a ‘Turner prize-winning
artist’\(^{45}\). He has described himself as a facilitator and a catalyst for whom ‘the point
of my work is not me…art isn’t about what you make but what you make happen’\(^{45}\). I
met Howard in a ‘greasy spoon’ café in the expensive area of Highbury and
Islington in London one summer’s morning. Sitting at the formica table as I
entered, Howard jumped up to say hello. He was dapper, friendly, chatty and open.
Over tea and marmite toast, he told me that he was careful not to call the work a
parade. It was a procession – making it more ‘fluid and church-like’. For him,
parades were militaristic and he wanted to draw attention to the ‘non-political
aspects of the city, the blood donors, fencers, refugees and blind people’ and to give
the procession an ‘absurd tone’. He had created a ‘Social Parade’ artwork in San
Sebastian for Manifesta 5, a Biennale of Contemporary Art in 2004 bringing
together ‘local alternative societies and support groups’ and he wanted to create
something ‘more elaborate and less pointed’ for Manchester. His aim was to tell a
story with Procession, get together 15-20 ‘moments and ideas’ about the town and
create a narrative portrait of it as a place in time, bringing in constituent parts
including alternative realities and fantasy. He wanted to play around with culture,
be a bit cheeky and rude. “People don’t mind, they suspend belief and you can get


\(^{45}\) I have not provided references to Howard’s work as this would identify him
away with so much more than in a gallery”. He also came up with ideas that ‘not everyone would like such [things] as boys in souped up cars, goths, emos and people smoking…elements that are grating, involving people that you wouldn’t normally see in a procession”. Howard said that one Councillor “even went to the press” to complain about it, which actually raised the profile of the parade increasing its popularity and publicity.

Howard described his role to me as ‘provocateur’. His expressed aim as an artist was to ‘make ideas happen’ and most of his work involved drawing attention to people’s experiences in the form of ‘social engaged art’ (Bishop 2012). While both he and the Council officials were committed to people of Manchester ‘representing themselves’ Howard did not have an ongoing commitment to these communities, a relationship driven ultimately by the Council’s role as political representatives and civil servants. Rather than presenting himself as someone who was enabling Manchester society to project an image of itself into the public realm, he chose instead to project images that he saw in Manchester as overlooked, taken for granted or even anti-social. He focused on showing people’s ‘real’ lives and activities that did not ordinarily get highlighted or emphasised in a public way. Howard’s work with the community groups was part of an ongoing interest in the ‘beauty and strangeness of everyday’, in playing around with culture, seeing how far he can go with things, ‘taking them to the brink’. The key difference resided in ownership and authority. In the Parade, artists were put in service to the community to help them realise their projection of themselves into the public realm; in Procession, Howard explored his own problems or questions about society through a vision of his own making, supported and encouraged by the MIF producers. While Steve, the Festival Executive Producer was keen on a parade format and approached Howard since he had an existing body of work in that area, the artist needed to lead on its development to satisfy the MIF ethos.

Howard’s experience with Procession contrasts with the making of The Battle of Orgreave. In 2001, Howard worked with former miners from the community of Orgreave and actors to re-enact a critical dispute between the miners and police during UK strike action and counter-response from a Thatcher led police force in 1984. A film was made of the re-enactment and formed a central part of the retrospective art exhibition of Howard’s work at the Hayward Gallery in 2012. I
visited this exhibition and wandered round, past large textile banners, the ‘greasy spoon’ café screening a film of the day from Procession and into a room dedicated to the Orgreave work. From the Orgreave film, it is clear that the re-enactment takes on a momentum of its own which is quite scary but also exhilarating for Howard who claimed to ‘enjoy’ losing control. Some responses to the re-enactment were negative claiming that documentaries are better because they “are far more powerful, more informative and far less patronizing in recording working class life, allowing the subjects being studied to have a little of their own voices”\textsuperscript{46}. Howard’s attempts to engage with civic representation seemed to play with the very nature of social engagement. His approach in Manchester with Procession demonstrated his willingness to vary the levels of control he has over the making process (de Groot 2012). He set processes in motion and pushed them along, much like Amelia.

In putting Procession together, Howard and MIF Producer Diana watched parades and processions in the North West film archives and toured the city looking for its ‘human face’. Diana described her activities as follows. Firstly she ‘got a sense of what Howard wanted’ and ‘investigated what was out there’ by contacting arts officers and meeting with them. The arts officers were focused on supporting artists to fulfil social agendas such as healthy eating or working with hard-to-reach communities. Howard preferred to find out ‘what people were doing anyway’. A chance mention of the English tradition of rose queens in one meeting, reviews of footage in the North West film archives and Howard’s existing interest in ‘folk arts tradition’ together with Manchester’s music heritage led to a ‘list for Howard’ with the most interesting and likely groups of participants in a parade. Diana and Howard ‘went round and visited’ people on the list, ‘commissioning them to volunteer’ for Procession. Howard also had several set ideas, such as a steel band for a Joy Division song, which they sought to realise locally. Other inspirations came from reading about a group of young men drag-racing in a car park in Stockport and seeing black-haired, dark-clothed ‘goths’ hanging around outside the Urbis museum in the centre of Manchester. Both groups were invited to take part. Howard and Diana selected groups rather than inviting them to apply, as happened in the Manchester Day Parade. The least successful sections were the ‘things we tried to construct’, an experience shared by Amelia for the parade. They developed

\textsuperscript{46} Comment by ‘spartarotterdam’ on 22/01/12: \url{http://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2012/feb/20/jeremy-deller-joy-in-people}
a list of 20-25 ‘components’ and over several months ‘toured the various groups to make sure they were rehearsing’. They commissioned artists to work with children to create sections such as ‘My favourite thing’ which provided ‘some of the best bits of the Parade’. To interpret a child’s drawing of Manchester underwater, they ‘brought in an artist maker, Noah Rose who works mainly in steel’ (Diana, Interview 2011).

Howard wanted something that was ‘more social, less political’. For him it was not about sponsorship, creating a legacy or asking people to act a role. Howard contrasted Procession with the Manchester Day Parade, saying he ‘didn’t want people to pretend they were something else, to show instead what they were, rather than be a robot or alien’. In his view, the Council created a ‘positive propaganda version of the town’ but really the life of the town came from its streets – kids in bands, artists who have aspirations. Thirty years ago, he said, punks were vilified in the town and yet their cultural legacy has endured. He wanted to draw attention to those aspects of life which are not obviously celebratory but which make our lives richer and easier. For him, Procession ‘emerged’ just as folk traditions emerge.

Howard’s focus on highlighting existing cultural activities is echoed in many aspects of the Manchester Day Parade – its origins as a civic pride event, emphasis on the opportunity to ‘celebrate all things Manchester’ and the organisational structure which asks community groups to submit their own ideas following a theme. The difference lay in the control Howard sought over the ideas themselves. In the Manchester Day Parade, groups often ignored the theme suggested by the organisers focusing instead on parading in a similar way each year (e.g. the LGBT group used a rainbow motif every year). This deviance was acknowledged with rueful amusement by the parade organisers. When the Councillor emphasised the need for the Manchester Day Parade to ‘celebrate all things Manchester’ and asked what a proposed section ‘had to do with Manchester’, May would tell him that these groups considered themselves as ‘Manchester’ through their very existence in the city. Every section was representative of Manchester by being in Manchester. If some chose to express this explicitly, by commemorating the Lancashire bomber invented in the city for example, then all very well but if others chose to explore a flight of fancy, then that should also be encouraged and
respected. Independence and autonomy in the decision making process were perhaps the key distinctions between Procession and the Manchester Day Parade. Howard used Procession as a medium through which he would interpret the cultural activities that he and the MIF producer found on their travels. The people who participated became ‘material’ through which he made that interpretation although the space and opportunity was intended to support independent self-expression. May, Amelia and Laurie’s approach to the Manchester Day Parade was focused on supporting community groups to bring their cultural activity as they saw fit into the parade itself, to decide on how they wanted to be represented and be playful with that through the themes devised each year.

So while Procession and the Manchester Day Parade were distinctly different in organisational style. Howard and Amelia both articulated these events as ‘emergent’ entities which they helped into existence. This has resonance with Gell’s discussion on how art objects in particular retain a residual power which has a mobilising effect on the communities who engage with it. Both parade-like events as objects radiate an effect on those who engage with it. Self-expression and representation become matters of perspective and also indicative of the “constraints governing the production” (Gell 1998:215). The distinction between the parade as art or not fades when contemplated as “vehicles of complicated ideas” that “radiate meaning” (ibid) as Discussed in Chapter 1 and elaborated further below.

PARADE AS AN ‘ART OBJECT’

Gell suggests that we study the interrelationships between the artefacts themselves in an "inter-artefactual domain" (Gell 1998:216). Through understanding the inter-relationships between these culturally mediated objects, insight is gained into the people enmeshed in these same relations in which the objects reside. He argues that “culture” in some general sense is not responsible for the visual style of artefacts. “Culture may dictate the practical and/or symbolic significance of artefacts, and their iconographic interpretation but the only factor which governs the visual appearance of artefacts is their relationship to other artefacts in the same style” (ibid). It is a mistake, he argues, to think of culture as dictated from ‘head office’ providing injunctions which govern stylistic
relationships among artefacts. He uses small incremental changes found in Marquesan islanders’ ritual patterning, forms used in tattooing and inscribing on other objects, to demonstrate how variations in figurative style implicate variations in the social structures of the Marquesan society. Gell’s focus is on how insight into and from a community can be worked through using the relations between objects-as-persons and people, how certain patterns of relations are revealed in this process. He shows how the shapes of the motifs are all inter-related and can morph into each other with structured manipulation (reflection, rotation etc). The small variations between motifs reference the close-knit conceptions of self among the islanders but do not represent them. The design style shows "relations between relations of forms" (ibid). The forms are transformed into one another by various modifications and the style is the "complex formed by the relationships which hold between all these transformations or modifications" (ibid:215).

As Chua et al demonstrate, Gell’s ideas have a long-reaching effect on anthropologists’ analyses (Chua and Elliott 2013). In this edited volume authors consider the ongoing value of Gell’s observations. Tanner points out that Gell’s “model of the art nexus and his theorisation of art as agency has left us a powerful framework for comparison” (Tanner 2013). In this section, I draw specifically on Gell’s insights on style to position parades as art objects situated in webs of relations, mediating and indicate particular characteristics based on their cultural contexts. This helps align Howard and Amelia’s approach to parade making thereby revealing the organisational structures that influence how some works come to be identified as art and not others, and some people as artists and others as prop makers.

Gell’s analysis of entities which he calls ‘art objects’ brings out the similarities and differences in Howard, Diana, May, Amelia and Laurie’s approach to parade making and parade artists. All resisted the temptation of Councillors to dictate the visual nature of the parade, instead focusing on the parade as an entity in its own right and defining their own parameters for its production. Amelia’s attempts to ‘knit’ together (as she described it) the different ideas developed by community groups was similar to Howard’s attempts to knit together the ideas that he and the MIF producer ‘found’ in the city region. For them, the parade had an integral identity to
which they committed a nurturing role. Howard nurtured an abstract notion of ‘folk tradition’ which he identified in Manchester and sought to represent in *Procession*. May, Amelia and Laurie nurtured people in groups to explore a sense of themselves through the tradition of parade. This is not a distinction between artists and non-artists. This is a matter of style.

Each parade had a style which was derived from the context within which it was produced – the ‘stylistic principles’. The parades become artefacts of cultural contexts without being culturally representative and can be considered as distributed ‘art objects’ each embedded in a web of social relations in which they are implicated and impact on others (Gell 1998:216-20). Gell suggests following these relationships as they ‘index’ different kinds of forces and influences on the people around them. Understanding art objects as ‘persons in their own right’ emphasises their social relations and their status as an "index in artefactual form, so that to all intents and purposes it becomes a person, or at least a potential person. It is a concealed residue of performance and agency in object form" (ibid:68). The Manchester Day Parade lends itself well to analysis as an entity which looks like a Gell-ian ‘art object’ at multiple levels – the parade itself, the sections within the parade, the entities that make up a section, the materials used to create an entity. Conceptualisation of the parade itself as an art object, radiating power to mediate social relations, allows for an analysis of how notions of parade work in different contexts. The parade for the founding politician indexes different relations to the parade from an applicant whose proposed idea for participation is rejected. As discussed in the previous chapter, the critical index that emerged repeatedly was parade as an expression of social identity. The parades in New York by the Puerto Rican and the African American communities, the St Patrick’s Day parade, gay Pride parades, civic celebration parades in South American towns and villages, Carnivals as protest and the Gion matsuri parade in Kyoto, were all attempts to engage both oneself and the ‘audience’ in an experience – an invitation to witness and celebrate what people understand themselves to be (in each particular context).

For Gell, aesthetics become a way of describing the style of each particular cultural experience and so subordinate to "responses stemming from the social identities and differences mediated by the index" (ibid:8). He resituates art objects as
external clues to the internal workings of the collective consciousness of a community or the individual consciousness of a producer by combining socially connected art objects into “collectivities” and considering them through the concept of style, where "style is personhood in aesthetic form" (ibid:157). These collectivities have "strict parameters of stylistic coherence". The artist is still present, admired for his/her ability to create an instantiation of a particular styling e.g. Maori tattooing. But the style itself is culturally determined. Art is not synecdoche of a culture but synecdoche of a common style of a particular output of the culture (if coherent). The anthropologist needs to look for "axes of coherence" not in a piece on its own but in the context of a 'body of work' as a distributed object.

The ‘axes of coherence’ for Procession and the Manchester Day Parade draw on different parameters for their definition, at times in opposition to the other’s approach. Howard did not want people to ‘act out a role’ but gave little choice in individual expression in the parade itself. Amelia wanted people to express themselves but within a thematic context and according to the parameters of scale, colour and movement. These desires contain apparently similar conceptual understandings of how a parade should be about celebrating civic identity but their stylistic execution varied significantly. For Gell, "Artworks are like social agents, in that they are the outcome of social initiatives which reflect a specific, socially inculcated sensibility...the artworks are shares or portions of a distributed social object corresponding to all of the artworks in the (Marquesan) system, distributed in time and space" (ibid:220). This analysis provides a conceptual framework for placing Howard’s Procession (2009) and ‘not-Amelia’s non-italicised, non-dated parade’ as ‘art objects’ in the Gellian sense - shares or portions of a distributed object. Both funded, in part, by the Arts Council, both bringing together community groups to represent themselves in the street, both using people-known-as-artists to make the sections, both drawing on ideas around representation of Manchester.

Gell’s proposition of a tangible entity that represents an evolving consciousness combines well with an analysis of flow. An effective combination of these two understandings allows for the parade to be both enmeshed in the social world but also a particular artefact from it. While Gell’s analysis focuses on tight-knit
communities with centuries of detailed and layered cultural rules, the civic parades discussed here do not need to be from similarly small communities to produce an artefact from the social dynamics of its context. Each is a crystallised form of agency, instantiations of the multiple flows of people, place and thing combined to produce a tangible entity. The ‘socially inculcated sensibility’, the distinctive shape drawn, came from how people interpreted Manchester into a public form and what roles, skills and abilities became appropriate for doing this.

**PARADE AS AN EMERGENT ENTITY**

"Yet there is a sense in which artistic creation, rooted as it may be in the negotiated and partial practices of "flow" in everyday life, also achieves itself by standing out from that background of fluid improvisation of forms and becoming a foreground that crystallises into a new shape" (Strathern and Stewart 2009:xii)

Ingold asserts for the fluid character of life processes - the role of an artist is to ‘join with and follow the forces and flows of material that bring the form of the work into being’ (Ingold 2010:17). He draws on Deleuze and Guattari who similarly emphasise matter as in movement, in flux, in variation - ‘this matter-flow can only be followed’ (Deleuze and Guattari 1987:451). ‘Following’ is ‘itineration’, a constant improvisation that is ‘consubstantial’ with one’s own life. Ingold’s analysis partially chimes with my ethnographic experience. The parade organisers sought to guide, push, pull the parade into being rather than control it. The materials of the parade in this context were not just the bits and pieces that were stuck, stapled and tied together to construct elaborate edifices, the colourful and bold outfits and the solid wheeled platforms upon which the parade rested. They were also the processes, understandings and ideas that brought these materials together in particular ways. In their introduction to Guiffre’s analysis of art and creativity in Rarotonga in the South Pacific (Giuffre 2009), Strathern and Stewart accept Ingold’s argument for improvisation and the generative process from which art production emerges. But they also emphasise the tangible nature of the objects that emerge from this ‘fluid improvisation’ (Strathern and Stewart 2009:xii). It is this combination of fluid responsiveness and tangible outcomes which I want to explore further in this section.
Rockefeller argues that the term ‘flow’ needs to be used carefully as it can imply a certain ease of movement, particularly in relation to globalising movements of ideas, people and objects. “Places, agency, and perspective, not to mention the complex nature of large-scale dynamic organisations, get swept up into what seems like a crystal-clear invocation of dynamism” (Rockefeller 2011:568). He suggests this neglects the agency of locals who are affected by this globalising concept of movement and asks “in what terms locality has always been constituted by mobility and how the current state of supermobility is reconstituting localities and being enacted by people in places” (Rockefeller 2011:568). Rockefeller is concerned by analyses of global flows that leave out contextualising details at a local level. It is the procedures, rules and barriers of local bureaucratic systems combining with materials, people and understandings that combine to provide insight into how global forces impact on local contexts. This fieldwork shows how parade makers use barriers and obstacles as a form of feedback and to give the parade its shape. They mobilise the local parameters to guide their activities. A perspective on ‘global flows’ gains nuance by contemplating how obstacles and problems in local contexts shape multiple flows into something particular.

Flow can be interpreted as the movement of meaning between cultures and within them (Kroeber 1952). Meaning comes both in tangible form, through objects, money, goods or intangibly through ideas, concepts or information technology (Appadurai 1990). When related to people, flow can become about the physical movement of people in a geographical way leading to changes in cultural dynamics, but also how people are affected by the ongoing changes to cultural meaning for both those who have not moved and those who do (Castells 1989). The primary focus here draws on the metaphor of a flowing river which does not just transport concepts and idea but also includes rocks, pools and eddies where alternatives can obstruct and flourish (Hannerz in Rockefeller 2011:571). In particular, I want to focus on how the parade makers employ strategies to produce a show that will go on no matter what.

A critical backdrop to the engagement of Manchester communities in the parade was the diminishing funds available to fund cultural activities, as one of the worst
recessions in recent history and swingeing public sector cuts nationally started to bite. In Year Two, this was manifested through fewer resources available to fund supplementary community engagement activities to wrap around the parade and in Year Three, after a significant voluntary redundancy programme at the Council, disappearance of many community liaison officers themselves. As one of the few cultural events still funded in the city however, the parade remained popular and Year Three in 2012 had the most applications to date. Community groups worked up their ideas around the specified themes, filled in the application form and submitted it to Walk the Plank for review. It was a bright cold January day in 2012 when Amelia, May and Laurie met to discuss the community group submissions for Year Three, themed “The Sky’s the Limit...a celebration of heroic achievements”. May hosted the submission review meeting in her home on Dutch wooden barge. We sat down around a large dining table in the centre of the boat to a marathon six hour meeting. Over tea and cake, Amelia, Laurie and May verbally spun the parade into a shimmering mirage before us. Drawing on their experience of the parade artists’ existing work and the character of the community groups which had emerged in the previous year, Laurie, May and Amelia created a vision with words. Amelia picked each submission up, outlined the idea (written in ‘no more than 500 words’), talked about how it could work and which artists might work best on it. May and Laurie pitched in their ideas, verbally sketching the section out. Shape, colour, movement and sound spun in the air between us as they worked through the pile of papers. However, there was no expectation of the final parade looking like the structures imagined in the room. Each idea was anticipated and imagined in its own terms.

“Society is a suspended form that precipitates particular actions, through which the illusion is gradually realized” (Hastrup 2007:198 her emphasis). Hastrup argues for a dialogue between agency and imagination – that agency is driven by a succession of imagined and anticipated scenarios. She also draws a distinction between description of an event and its consequences, arguing that creativity resides in the ability to act "without incorporating an anticipated consequence into the perception of the action, or to make the event break free of the frame while still allowing it to be recognised” (ibid:201). She posits imagination as the link between action and history for both anticipation and creativity, “because imagination is
what makes present actions meaningful by making anticipation possible; and because imagination also makes the creative agent perceive that intention and consequence are not one and the same” (ibid:204). Parade making by the trio from Walk the Plank seemed to embody this imaginative production; a succession of imagined scenarios anticipated without becoming expected.

The consequences of the proposed structures were also discussed. The Friends Club application form described a Viking Ship with shields decorated to celebrate their successful campaign to eliminate a debilitating disease worldwide. The trio were concerned about doing another ship. In the previous year, themed “A Voyage of Discovery”, the lead structure was a huge ship, whose sails had proved challenging in high winds during the parade itself. A different ship might also be ‘another nightmare’. The possibilities in how to develop this section to match the idea described by the community group were worked through but without conclusion. The intention and the possible consequences were discussed together, but there was no finality in the discussion, no decision made. The Friends Club submission was placed in the ‘Maybe’ pile and the next one picked up.

This avoidance of decision making in the early stages of the project is critical to the development of the parade. As Laurie says,

“I think what’s hard is having freedom to put some things together and see what happens. Not put things together and make sure that will happen. If you put creative people together.. sow the seeds, stand back, let it happen.. it is a voyage of discovery and it literally is. Be quite free about being able to allow things to happen and if you define it too early, you get yourself into a bad position where it’s too early to make those decisions, you’ve got to wait and be patient. You learn, you can’t push that but you can push that...And the more you do, the more you understand. If you make a decision too early, you won’t enable that to happen.”

So the anticipation was there, the imagining was there, each section of the parade was created in the room but there was not a direct and responsive action to the sections. They disappeared from view, only to be recreated again and again as the parade developed. By the end of the meeting, I emerged blinking in the evening
dusk, my head swimming with the glorious spectacle of not just one parade, but many possibilities of parade.

The shape of the actual parade entity emerged through the gradual erosion of these many possibilities. A subsequent meeting held at Walk the Plank’s office decided on which entries were to be approved for funding. This meeting was largely budget focused i.e. how much should be allocated to each section. In Year Two, only two submissions were turned down for funding. In Year Three, several more were rejected and the reasons provided were that there was not enough budget to support all the applicants’ ideas. I had submitted an idea for a community group from my local area. During the imagining of the parade, the trio discussed their concerns about the health and safety of the older people in this community group. They depicted 80 year olds in a mile long parade, in uncertain weather conditions, possibly too hot, cold, rainy, windy, with no real shelter and patchy food provision. As they pictured that particular section, I realised how unrealistic my expectations were about submitting an application for this group (which I had persuaded them to do). The group were turned down ‘due to lack of budget and the number of applicants’, but possibly also due to these anticipated potential consequences. By imagining possibilities and projecting outcomes, the organisers would chip away at potential problems before they became such. With a parade of such size and complexity, they felt unable to deal with any groups were not robust enough to be self-sufficient.

This co-production of the parade imaginary held throughout the project. As artists were paired with community groups whose ideas were approved for funding, they too massaged and worked the participants’ ideas into being. The parade not so much constructed as possibilities were eliminated. Options disappeared and the parade shape emerged, reminiscent of the ‘sculptural form’ Amelia referred to. The development of ideas depended on group / artist dynamics, materials, practicalities of production, people available to do the work, budgets, timing and personalities and varied widely across the parade. The context of the ideas themselves such as the extent to which the idea itself came from a ‘group’ as a whole, or from the person who filled in the community application form also varied significantly. Every time a section was discussed, it was imagined in detail but few decisions were made by the parade organisers in relation to each section.
Once an idea was approved for funding and inclusion in the parade, the responsibility for its production passed to the parade makers, the community groups and the artists they paired with. The parade organisers focused on preparing for possibilities that the different sections generated. During that particular meeting in January, the treasures of Manchester communities’ ideas lain before us, the possibilities were unlimited. These possibilities became more and more restricted as the parade development progressed and different decisions were made around content, colour, materials, participants and movement. Time and resources available, weather, the size and height of the workspaces, the flexibility of the materials chosen and many other factors also narrowed the options available for parade making.

“I see the theme as a starting point and a way of bringing stories and meaning into the parade. The audience won’t necessarily get the stories that have powered the groups’ journey from ‘we want to be in the parade’ to ‘here we are with a Lancaster bomber that we made in pieces that we are going to do a special dance with’. It’s great if people do know the theme and they can then try and work out what the stories are but some of them are either tenuous, odd or inexplicable. For example, the young people who made those amazing headdresses, absolutely lovely section of the parade. How did that fit in with ‘A Voyage of Discovery’? Well it didn't really but it looked great and they had an amazing time participating and sometimes we have to be big enough to go, ‘that’s fine actually, that’s fine’. If it was an artist led parade, the artists decide on the look of all of it and then people make within sections. It's like, this is going to be the cake section, so you can make cakes. But we start from the groups and their ideas far more and so you do get, say, Pammy from District 3 going, ‘I want to build a train’, and she won’t be shifted from that.” (May, Walk the Plank’s Director, 2011)
May carried a nuanced understanding of how groups and individuals will engage with the parade, similar to Amelia’s. In the above passage, she discusses the theme of the second parade, ‘A Voyage of Discovery’, featuring a collection of planes, trains, boats and spacecraft but also depictions of scientific discovery, social innovations, a giant recycling monster, bands, choirs and campaign groups. She compares the Manchester parade with an ‘artist led parade’ where the theme instructs the development of the different parade sections. In her parade, the theme is an organising metaphor which groups can choose to engage with at varying levels of intensity. For her, the parade provides groups with an "opportunity for imaginative journeying", following their own inspirations and insights and guided by an artist rather than led by one. The parade organiser’s role is to provide a suitable context within which this process can happen. The organisers of the parade follow Hastrup's pattern – they take pleasure in imagining the parade’s eventual constitution, but without expecting it to become as they imagine it (Hastrup 2007). They separate open anticipation from expected consequences. Yet at the same time, they prepare for possible consequences that emerge from these anticipations.

The parade context each year was unique with a different theme and contextual understandings developed for a particular time and date with different combinations of activities and participants. Each parade became an instance which combined ongoing flows of activity into a one-off coalescence of these multiple flows. All the entities within the parade are also one-off coalescences. Parades become, like Kroeber’s civilisations, “limited processes of flow in time” (Kroeber 1952: 404 in Hannerz 2002). The parade makers know this. They know that the parade will happen, that all the elements within it will take a very particular shape on the day and also that they cannot be sure exactly what that shape might be. For Badiou and Deleuze, an event provides a synthesis of past and future, it’s “the becoming of becoming: the becoming(-One) of (unlimited) becoming” (Deleuze cited in Badiou 2005, Badiou 2007:38). An event is where unlimited possibilities for what the event might be, harden into the one event that it actually is. If, for example, it rained on parade day, the event would have a very different feel than a parade on a sunny day. The parade makers respond to this uncertainty by

47 For Kroeber, culture was synonymous with civilisations (Kroeber 1952)
following established processes and through preparation – they have strategies for how they will act for different scenarios and these strategies are based on experience from past parades and similar outdoor public events. They imagine scenarios and then prepare for them but do not expect them to occur in the way they imagine. Indeed they expect them not to occur that way but in another variation which incorporates factors that they could have not anticipated. This is a very specific stylistic approach to parade making which contrasts with Howard’s style for Procession.

This way of working is usefully conceptualised as a form of flow. The parade makers flow over, through, under and around obstacles, boundaries, barriers. They have an objective and their ability to deliver this objective is predicated on their ability to harness, ride and weave together the multiple flows of goods, people, ideas and activities using these as resources to construct a parade narrative. This sense of mobility runs through the rhetorical and physical embodiment of the Manchester parade. The ‘imaginative journey’ was a collaborative effort between the parade organisers, artists, the community groups, the local city Council and the audience who come to watch, applauding as the parade proceeds past. But this notion of journeying is only the most obvious alliance with the metaphor of flow. During fieldwork, the parade organisers would not be deterred by anything. Their organising attitude was that problems could and would be surmounted, people’s concerns addressed, possible consequences anticipated and mediated. During one particular knotty situation where Walk the Plank’s Director was negotiating between several different parties and waiting for approval to move forward in the next phase of parade development, she described her challenge as ‘like a log jam’. There were ‘lots of logs all jammed together’ and she kept ‘pulling away logs and nothing happened’. Eventually she ‘gets the right log out and a whole load come down at once’. For her, these blockages were issues such as waiting to see people, to have the right conversation to make things happen and to get certain people together for the ‘decision to be valid’. Parade day was inevitable and her response to problems was to work around them.

This approach insists on an adaptive attitude to parade participants who do not conform to the defined theme. If ‘young people in the amazing headdresses’
produce a section which is not directly related to the theme of ‘A Voyage of Discovery’, then the organisers adapt, they are ‘big enough to go, ‘that’s fine, actually, that’s fine’. A preparedness to adapt runs throughout every aspect of the parade development and it seems that the parade is only possible because of the organisers’ capacity to respond productively to obstacles. Their problems range from the Council not releasing funds or confirmation for the parade to go ahead, effectively preventing the organisers from working with the participating groups, artists or organisers, to overhanging branches and wires on the parade route which need to be cut or rerouted less they catch on the higher structures, to last minute fallouts and dropouts, artist conundrums or structure/costume development falling far behind schedule.

The duality of holding the imagining of the parade precious but still connected to the practicalities of making it happen allowed for a fluid and responsive development. It contrasts markedly with the approach used by curators of a 1989 exhibition in the London-based Science Museum. In Behind the Scenes at the Science Museum, Macdonald (2002) followed the development of a Food exhibition, a new approach to exhibitions which focused on the visitor experience. The ‘Food team’ were again three women, who similarly imagined and anticipated different kinds of exhibits. While ownership and authority over the parade structure was accepted as a negotiated process, in contrast, at the Science Museum, the Food Team tried to retain control over the development of the exhibits. Their intention was to create an exhibition in the shape of their imaginings. However a series of significant setbacks, where their vision was compromised by practicalities at one point and the Director’s negative reaction at another point, led to a ‘Rethink’. In this review of their imagined exhibition, they decided on a “rigorous conceptual framework” to guide their decision making, and a number of the more “social and interesting bits” fell away. With the production largely outsourced and the chain of imaginings from one individual to the next leading to distortions of understanding, the final exhibition was very different from the one imagined by the team. The exhibit designers, graphic designers, interactives team, carpenters, photographers, printers, academics, other curators and of course the senior management all
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contributed to this reshaping of the exhibition from the initial one imagined. However the responsibility for delivery and final decision making still rested with the Food team.

Macdonald identifies an ‘authorial puzzle’ in the “sense of disjuncture between the imagined new gallery and the one that materialised…the apparent ‘flatness’ and even ‘seriousness’ of the finished exhibition contrasted with the heady enthusiasm and joking which had characterised the early days” (Macdonald 2002:93). Her ethnography addresses this puzzlement, demonstrating how the additional actors entering the frame had unintended impacts and consequences on the Food team as they sought to realise their vision. The approach of the Manchester Day Parade organisers was very different to the exhibition described by MacDonald. In the parade, the organising team never attempted to realise a fixed imaging of the parade. Indeed, Laurie, May and Amelia did not see themselves as the primary agents in making the parade at all. For them, the parade had a shape that was emergent and they sought to respond and influence the emerging shape, but the shape itself had its own agency. It was the combination of the collective intentions of the community of parade makers and distinct from all of them.

In her discussion on agency and imagination, Hastrup states that “by investing their own interests and actions in filling out the form, social agents make the community happen. Without a sustained (and shared) illusion about the social space in which one participates, no action makes sense” (Hastrup 2007:198). Drawing on the imaginative work of Laurie, May and Amelia we can see that the self-conscious and deliberate separation of the end product from the imaginings, and that the ongoing illusion, formed through anticipation for each section and how they combine to create the parade was a delicious part of the experience for them. The parade shape was conceptually held through collaborative consensus and this drove action but this shape was not fixed or prescriptive. In the same way, Laurie, May and Amelia created a framework for the parade which was sufficiently flexible to allow multiple potentialities, for the parade shape to have a structure but yet still be emergent. For them, the development of the parade was a journey, and the frame moves along with the ‘act’ (ibid:199). Macdonald shows how the Food team’s attention to certain aspects of the exhibition, trying to make it interactive, fun and accessible to children, distracted them from other depictions of
the exhibition, which they had not expected. The exhibition was sponsored by a major supermarket, Sainsburys, and the final exhibition was criticised in the press as dominated by the Sainsburys brand. As Macdonald points out, the political dimension came as a real shock to the Food team who did not envisage this particular reading of the exhibition at all. By allowing the parade freedom and its own agency, the parade organisers could step back from it far enough to see its multiple forms and anticipate reactions to it. This distance gave them a valuable opportunity for perspective. They could prepare for consequences without expecting them. As discussed, the social context influences significantly on the nature of the emergent objects. The Food team’s inexperience at making exhibits in this way would have contributed to their difficulties. Part of the Manchester Day Parade success lay in the experience of the parade makers.

In his discussion on flow, Hannerz identifies “boundaries, and the flows which shape them or dissolve them”. This leads to ‘flows of cultural accumulation’, negotiated through how different contexts rub along together (Hannerz 2002:9). The parade became the cultural accumulation of barriers and openings, obstacles and opportunities. Its final appearance was the culmination of thousands of tiny actions and decisions taken and not taken by the hundreds of people involved. The Manchester Day Parade organisers were critical to this process in managing, guiding, influencing the flow of the parade, but they did not claim to be in control of it. They adapted to situations constantly and this adaptation was their strength and essential to the delivery of the parade. There was not even a sense of negativity about problems, obstacles and restrictions. In Latour’s distinction between matters of fact and matters of concern, he argues for contemplation of the natural and social worlds as spaces for consideration rather than fixed tangible entities. He proposes “to learn how to feed off uncertainties” (Latour 2005:115). Just as the river flows over rocks, the parade organiser flowed over problems. Just as the river creates borders, the shape of the parade came from what barriers could be overcome and which ones had to be worked around. Uncertainties as obstacles and boundaries created the ultimate shape of the parade.

Ingold (2010) suggests that trying to trace back connections from object to people in order to find the index essentialises and abstracts the object. He critiques Gell’s
situation of an object as an index in a web of social relations (Gell 1998) preferring to ‘read things forward’, to follow along in the ‘conditions of possibility’. He argues that instead we should start with the ‘fluid character of life process’ wherein ‘boundaries are sustained only thanks to the flow of materials across them’ (Ingold 2010:12). However it is useful to reflect back on the dynamics of the situation that led to certain directions rather than others. May’s adaptive approach to the parade sections as they developed allowed for their existence even when they did not align with the parade theme. These sections emerged through productive improvisations situated in the social contexts of those communities and form the residue of these encounters, embodying that relational dynamic.

I agree with Ingold that the objectification of our world is unproductive. However I think there is value in working through the process of how headdresses or trains become objects which then have their own tangible impact. The train from District 3 turned out to be a ‘nightmare’ for the parade organisers. The community group ran out of funding before it was finished so extra money had to be found for them. It was made from wood and so too heavy to push around the parade route and ended up being abandoned. This object became an instantiation of particular combinations of flow, making sense in particular ways. The wooden train in the parade is the residue left as a trace, a record of the social dynamics between a community group and parade organisers. It is also an artefact which has its own ongoing impact - in how people struggled to push it along in the parade, in its abandonment on the side of the parade, as an expression of a community group’s autonomy in the making process and an indication of their inexperience in how to make an object which could function as a parade entity. This is how the tree becomes wood, to follow Ingold’s analogy. Rather than have Gell and Ingold in opposition, as Ingold’s paper might suggest, I would instead put them on the same continuum, providing a perspective on how objects, ideas, concepts and events are formed as unstable instantiations of crystallised possibilities.

As discussed previously, Gell argues for the index as ‘congealed residue of performance and agency in object form’ (ibid:68). The anthropologist needs to look for "axes of coherence" not in a piece on its own but in the context of a 'body of work' as a distributed object. Applying this to the parade, the coherence is in the
momentum towards a fixed and immovable goal. The way the goal is achieved is by flowing over and through challenges as they arise. The objects that are produced as part of the parade are, following Ingold, emergent, fluid and following threads of imaginary and materials, combined into particular instantiations. But also, drawing on Gell, the shape of these objects are the multi-layered flows hardening in particular ways, becoming frozen, encapsulated in a time and place. Looking at this body of work and the practice through which the work is developed, flow emerges as a dominant cultural dynamic through which the parade organisers and artists work, an operational aesthetic if you like. Procession and the Manchester Day Parade shared stylistic characteristics such as this emergent adaptive process even if their origins and results were very different.

The rhythm of flow in the development of the parade is just as significant when it does not occur, where participants do not allow themselves to be captured by the parade flow dynamic or are unaware of its importance in the parade making. The parade organisers and artists shared a similar sensibility about how to approach problems and challenges, not just in what they did but in how they talked about them. Issues and frustrations were outlined in project meetings with the proviso that 'I’m just getting this off my chest'. Solutions were proposed by everyone around the table, people were very supportive and generous about the parade participants even those who asked for or expected special treatment. Many of the community group members however, did not demonstrate the same flexibility. Some became overwhelmed by the task, by the responsibility of what needed to be done and actually became quite stressed (indeed I struggled to remain calm when I volunteered as stage manager on parade day). In many cases, people did not turn up to help with the making, leaving the artist to effectively construct their whole section on their own or with volunteers who had nothing to do with the community group itself. Those who volunteered in the making stage seemed to have a similar approach to the organisers and artists. They were calm, friendly and approached problems with alacrity. One particular lady was known to the organisers as a ‘one woman parade section’. She participated as a volunteer in the workshop in the first year and surprised them all with an extravagant outfit which she made at home and kept secret. The following two years, the organisers would speculate to themselves about what she would come up with next. There were
several regular volunteers who similarly worked comfortably alongside the parade artists and organisers, both in the making and as stage managers on the day.

It seems that the distributed nature of the parade may well be its greatest strength. With no one owner or authority, the parade makers have no choice but to go with the flow. This organic and iterative approach also worked well in the development of free software, a similarly distributed development process. Kelty (2008) heralds a truly transformative method of collaboration where key individuals work across organisations, often secretly, to produce free software that provides the underlying infrastructure for the internet today. "Free Software..is a response to the collective challenge of creating regimes of governance that required – and encouraged – reliable, empirical knowledge as a basis for their political legitimacy (and) ...the infrastructure by which individuals come to inhabit and understand their own governance, whether by states, corporations, or machines" (Kelty 2008:305). Kelty shows the transition from a Western IT community of 1970s using proprietary, commercially dominated systems, controlled by large corporations, to the 1990s and 2000s, where the sharing of IT knowledge and resources is an inspiration to others outside the IT world, heralding social movements using internet technologies. These conceptual shifts came gradually, each building on its predecessor to challenge notions of intellectual property, commercial and creative collaboration, peer relationships and collaborative co-ordination. The people involved formed a self-directed loose coalition of academics, hobbyists, IT professionals, self-taught programmers and open source evangelists, to create a technology that can be owned by no-one, making it free for others to use and adapt as they need to - several key individuals led the process, but no-one was 'in charge'. Each programmer who participated in developing free software worked this global movement into their local context, contributing individually to a collective phenomenon.

The approach to parade making in the Manchester Day Parade gave a similar impression that no-one was in charge, the parade had its own momentum and a focused objective – the show would go on. Everyone worked towards that shared goal and this provided a mobilising force that overcame difficulties. How people responded to these challenges was shaped by the organisational contexts of the people involved. A willingness to adapt and flex the underlying processes was a
distinctive characteristic which ran through the primary organising contingent – from the Council officials that supported May in challenging the politicians’ emphasis on a ‘City of Heroes’ theme to the use of ‘spare’ funding to bring in artists that could share their experience, to picking up people’s ideas for themes and weaving or knitting them together into something coherent. Howard’s approach to *Procession* was similarly adaptive, responding to stimuli such as goths hanging around Cathedral Square or watching film archives of folk traditions. The process through which the ideas were realised however was different due to the artistic context from which he practiced. I explore this contrast in more detail in Chapter 6.

**CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSION**

I have shown that experienced parade makers have a particular approach to developing Manchester parade which integrates Ingold’s emphasis on ‘following’ emergent processes with Gell’s positioning of objects as indexes in a web of social relations. Making parade involves fluidity, the capacity to overcome, incorporate and go around obstacles, to flow on regardless because the show must go on. The making process leaves residue in the form of objects, which are instantiations, frozen in time and place, of the collaborative flow. These objects then become obstacles themselves, to be negotiated and managed. The parade making process contrasts sharply with development of a food exhibition at the London Science Museum where the organisers remained too fixed to a particular vision. While they also had ambitions for interactive, fun flexible aspects, these were all gradually squashed out by a restrictive development strategy. Object definition came from the *context of the making*, rather than from the object itself. For others, usually absent in the making process, the object comes as a finished piece with its definition already attached. This separation from the making process, from the nuances of object definition in context, has significant impacts on understandings of the social relations in which the object is enmeshed.

The use of the flow metaphor in this context adds a micro layer to its more common use in relation to globalisation. The development of free software internationally is a good example of the flow of ideas, objects and activities at a global level and how people worked locally to contribute to this global movement. The fluid process through which parade makers adapt and respond to different
forces demonstrates how local circumstances shape and are shaped by influences brought to bear on them. By combining these ideas of flow, we can respond to Rockefeller’s critique, claiming a neglect of how locals engage with global flows (Rockefeller 2011). In particular, we can show how some people may get left out and others participate in social activity. In the Manchester parade, the people who have an accommodating, adaptive attitude could work comfortably and collaboratively in the parade production. Those who struggled, who felt overwhelmed or neglected were not so much ignored as just fell away from the making process. Similarly, those left behind by globalising forces are often the ones who fail to mobilise or engage with the current of activity. This chimes with Venkatesan (2009) when she contrasts how two Muslim mat-weavers in an Indian Tamil town, Pattamadai who win a craft award for their work try to take advantage of their elevated status. The one who humbly appeals to her work as a contribution to the indigenous craft is successful in gaining approval and a plot of land. The other who claims his higher status as a reason for qualifying for a land grant is not recognised. How people adapt and manipulate the forces around them has a direct influence on the shape of their life journey and as I argue in Chapter 6, can implicate their ability to be creative.

The organisers of the parade could have defined a theme and dictated every section within the parade, asked artists to construct floats, costumes, props and colours according to this plan. This is how Howard produced Procession even if his ultimate aim was to support people to show themselves to the city. Instead the parade organisers took a trickier path. They involved ‘community groups’, whose nature and constitution varied significantly across the parade, asked them to have a vision for their section and then produced it in collaboration with artists chosen for a skillset that matched this vision. The organisers still imagined the parade, repeatedly, as the parade shape developed. They still took decisions which affected the dynamics of the parade and the shape that emerged. But their imaginings remained fluid, responsive to the emerging and autonomous agent, which was the parade itself; responsive even to a volunteer who materialised as a ‘one woman’ parade section on the day. It was this management of the parade as a self-forming entity with its own social agency, which, perhaps, gave it the energy and verve that the Food exhibition at the Science Museum lacked.
This ability to be responsive and adaptive is a stylistic strategy, developed through experience, which the organisers employ to enable self-representation for people who are not necessarily literate in public forms of display. It deliberately resists the temptation to force people into particular activities despite the potential reduction in coherence as a parade in its entirety. Yet it still provides a structure through processes and role definitions that support the development process. Attention to the role of serendipity, to chance occurrences and unexpected happenings was also part of the development process. This approach is one kind of organising practice which the Manchester Day Parade organisers found to be effective in achieving the results they aimed for in the first year, so they replicated it in following years. It contrasts with Howard’s organising approach which seems to problematize the nature of civic engagement by deliberately manipulating it. In the next chapter, I consider how attempts to control community activities more directly in a particular community group involved in the parade, led instead to disengagement from the group altogether.
Chapter 5: Whose narrative is it anyway?

In previous chapters, I have explored the visions of parade organisers in realising the parade. The council politicians sought a parade that represented all things Manchester; Walk the Plank sought to bring a parade into being by responding to parameters and inspirations as they emerged. At every stage, understandings and assumptions about the nature of parades, events, performances and happenings combined with individual and role based motivations from organisational contexts to influence the shape of the parade as it came into existence. These combinations happened among the community groups themselves as people came together to develop their parade section.

This chapter draws on fieldwork among people who organised two different parade sections in Year Three of the Manchester Day Parade, themed ‘The Sky’s the Limit...a celebration of heroic achievements’. One group, Synergy, a café and art space in the basement of the Methodist church’s head office put forward an idea for celebrating their night time café. The unfolding nature of this section is contrasted with another group, the Verde Society who put forward an idea to celebrate the work of Dante, a famous Italian writer. Drawing on discussions in previous chapters, this chapter shows how an explicit attempt to make a parade section representative of a community group, illustrated more about the social relations between the individuals and the cultural contexts within which they were embedded. The style inherent in the making process itself reveals the characteristics of the organisations involved.

Community groups on parade

Down the steps and along a corridor, the walls decorated with bright, amusing artwork. Left into a large room with a café in one corner, chalkboards advertising sandwiches and a large selection of cakes on the counter. Next to the café counter stands a DJ booth with dark-wood cabinet and table in front, displaying knitted and crocheted curiosities and trinkets. Mismatching tables, chairs and sofas scatter across the room, the tables laid with gingham cloth. Green-fronded plants line a long window overlooking a
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small courtyard. A bookstand stands near the doorway with leaflets and posters sharing news of events and activities. The room had a warm glow, a gentle buzz as people sit reading, chatting quietly or working on laptops. (Spending time at Synergy, Fieldwork notes, 2011)

I first noticed the Synergy art café in Year Two walking past a friendly artist outside the parade workshop. He was sitting next to an oversized table covered in blue and yellow tissue paper and laid with large dishes and cups. During the parade, this table was accompanied by the artist riding a customised bicycle with a long metal pole extension at the front, carrying a suspended acrobat dressed as an owl twirling through a metal hoop. Intrigued, I approached the organisation and was welcomed by Arts Co-ordinator Penelope and Charity Manager Ally.

Synergy was situated in the basement of the Methodist UK headquarters in Manchester’s Northern Quarter and its café emerged in response to the changing nature of the Northern Quarter. This area had become a centre for urban creativity after decades as a dreary unsafe place just north of the city centre. Originally the haberdashery and textile focus of the city, its close proximity to the city centre, combined with low property prices, made it attractive to urban developers. They introduced Manhattan-style loft apartment living during the property boom of the 1990s, an activity encouraged by civic leaders focused on regenerating the city centre (see Chapter 2). The geographical location and low rents had led to independent shops, clubs and bars springing up giving the area an eclectic and bohemian feel and reinforcing the regeneration appeal. By 2010, aspects of the Northern Quarter still felt edgy with its collection of dingy pubs and porn shops. However this was counterbalanced by boutique clothes shops selling altered second hand clothing, stylish restaurants, bars and tea shops specialising in cakes or chocolate. The Northern Quarter was perhaps the only place in the city where a younger generation managed to make their mark on the urban landscape - from the 1990 ‘Madchester’ years with the first wave of record shops and lively clubs and bars (Milestone 2000) to a more recent rise in vintage/retro tea shops and locally brewed beer specialities, favoured by young tattooed people with sculptured hairdos and multiple piercings.
Synergy had evolved gradually over several years and its founding stories differed depending on whom I spoke to. I did not know about the religious association initially, nor did the parade organisers from Walk the Plank. Occasionally people would say ‘Synergy, they’re Christians aren’t they?’ and someone would reply, ‘Really? Are you sure’ or ‘No, they are not’. It seems I had stumbled across a case of ‘the emerging church’, a rich and vibrant movement in Christian communities in UK, Canada and US. This movement is focused on the deconstruction of traditional models of Christian worship and the emergence of a much more freeform, adaptive and ‘post-institutional’ form (Ganiel 2006, Bielo 2009, Labanow 2009, Cox 2012, Bielo 2013). Synergy was an instance of this movement, formed by two charismatic ministers and other like-minded Christian people in Manchester. They were supported by the Methodist and Anglican Churches to ‘explore new ways of being church in the city centre’ (Minister’s blog, 9/2/951). This group of ‘spiritual’ activists set up a ‘Night Café’ in the basement of the church head office in 2006 as a ‘ministry’ to develop ideas and principles informed by the emerging church movement. Open from 2am to 5am, the cafe provided a place of refuge for club and pub clientele who had run out of money, lost their friends, got too drunk or high or just wanted a space to retreat from the ‘vomit and fights’. “We were welcomed into the warm space, where we bought hot chocolate and delicious cake. There were industrial sized rolls of paper on the floor and plenty of crayons and here we all were; adults, merry and playing like kids. 4am Scrabble, art installations on the wall and good music.” (Contributor to Now Then Magazine, 25/11/11).

While the hosts focused on people feeling vulnerable or lost, the cafe became a space for people to wind down after a heavy night and have more fun. Gradually a group of regulars emerged saying ‘this would make a great art space’ and ‘we could do a gig here’. For Tim, the Minister who took over Synergy several years later, its identity came about in a very “organic and entrepreneurial” way. The ministers established a place for people to be creative and said to the regulars, “do whatever you like with it”, inviting them to express themselves in an open way, without “fear of being told off or told not to do something in particular or in a particular way” (Tim, Interview 2012). People started creating artwork, art exhibitions and gigs in the café space. Synergy provided a physical venue to support creative expression
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and this generosity of spirit led to a flourishing of the Night Café into a day café also, drawing a loyal band of people who saw it as a “home away from home” (Tim, Interview 2012). These people moved from customers to workers/makers/entertainers in the day café, in the exhibition space and music venue, bringing their friends with them. As the Night Café became a day café, the ‘Synergian’ community was born, a hybrid of artistic and religious expression.

Synergy’s outward appearance fitted well with the Northern Quarter ‘hipster vibe’ and the emerging community moved easily between other bars and cafes in the local area, both socialising and working. By the inaugural Manchester Day Parade in 2011, a vibrant community had developed and the parade embraced as an opportunity to “see your creative ideas turned into something huge and enjoyed” (Arts Coordinator, 2012). As discussed in Chapter 1, Corsin Jiménez analyses ‘redistributions’ to help us think through “how people organise their social life in virtue of the image they have of themselves and of their human capacities” (Corsín Jiménez 2007:7). Art enthusiasts and Methodist people came together at Synergy in a context where their moral and activist sensibilities aligned. While their focus was different, the people involved were part of the same generation and their values underpinned by similar ethics around free expression, the importance of friendships, ethical and environmental responsibility and enjoying life on their terms. There seemed to be synergy between their understanding of how art, music and performance provide a space for connection and self-expression.

There are many similarities at Synergy with the generational analysis of UK and US people born between 1982 and 2000 described as ‘Generation Y’ or ‘Millenials’ (Eisner 2005, Martin 2005, Glass 2007, Shih and Allen 2007).

“Not only do Millennials look different with their body piercing, tattoos, lack of wrist watch and their electronic decorations – iPods, Blackberrys and laptops (Hira 2007) – but they behave and think differently as well....Millennials are described as confident, independent and individualistic, self reliant and entrepreneurial (Martin 2005) and at the same time socially active, collaborative, team oriented and used to having structure in their lives as a result of the type of parenting they have received (Glass 2007; Shih and Allen 2007). This manifests itself in a desire for clear...”
directions and managerial support in what to do but at the same time ‘a demand for freedom and flexibility to get the task done in their own way, at their own pace’ (Martin, 2005:40).” (Shaw and Fairhurst 2008:368).

In Shaw and Fairhurst’s study of training methods at MacDonaluts, they claim that the fast-food chain has a high turnover of young employees and so provides insight into the sensibilities of the Millennials or Generation Y. Their depiction of this group resonates strongly with my findings at Synergy. Not only through the physical appearances of many people in the café but also in how they worked together.

When Amelia, the parade Design Co-ordinator and Laurie, the Parade Producer talked about Synergy, it was evident that they viewed the ‘art café’ as a space where artists socialised and participated actively in the organisation. However by the time I arrived at the café in 2012, few artists were still involved. I heard reports of a fabulous parade section in the previous year when people had great fun making a giant Alice in Wonderland tea party and how a local filmmaker recorded their parade section in a flickering film montage. In the following year however, many participants had drifted away and did not engage with the parade section for 2012.

During a later discussion with Synergy’s Director, Tim, I tried to make sense of the differences between the previous year and the year I got involved. I suggested that while Year Two had been a celebration of what they do i.e. run an arts café, Year Three was supposed to represent who they were. I proposed that self-representation at an organisational level had caused tension through differing attitudes towards art and religion. Perhaps this tension had resulted in a lack of engagement in the production of the parade section itself? Tim replied that this was partially correct. In his view, conflict over self-representation was part of an ongoing issue dating back to the organisation’s original founding. Attempts to address a lack of alignment between artistic and religious expression in the organisation had been a “bit like a supertank turning exercise” and I had arrived at a critical part of the turning (Tim, Interview 2012).

In an attempt to understanding the constitution of Synergy, I also interviewed one of the founding ministers. He described ambitions to develop a dialogue between religious and non-religious people through art. However while people did engage
with the art-café, interest in religious spirituality did not progress. Instead the ministers found two factions emerging in Synergy which operated more or less independently of each other. The founding minister left when he started noticing attempts to downplay the religious element (such as covering up a sign with Christian written on it). Tim came in as the new minister determined to re-establish a faith-based ethos at the centre of the café’s activities.

When I arrived, Synergy was six years old and initially I did not notice the religious and artistic elements operating as relatively independent entities within the same organisation. The café and art space had many events and activities including exhibitions and murals on the café walls. A collection of ongoing groups, such as the knitting club, life drawing group, book group and scribble group, met regularly in the café space. The scribble group went out into the local streets and drew pictures of what they saw. The running club, a group of women who lived in the city centre, ran along the canal network after work. Benedictus, the spiritual group involved in forming Synergy met regularly there to pray. Evening events included the Smart Club (supporting scientists and academics to perform comedy), plays and gigs. Just as I started fieldwork, Charity Manager Ally went on maternity leave and Penelope was promoted from Arts Co-ordinator to Charity Manager. Like Ally, Penelope was passionate about the organisation’s emphasis on arts. She developed exhibition themes, made commissions, designed layouts, wrote accompanying texts and promotions, hosted launch evenings and ran related events. She worked in collaboration with other events in the city such as the Manchester Science Festival and with other volunteers interested in different kinds of art activities. She also took on many administrative responsibilities in the running of the charity.

I was welcomed into Synergy and started to help out. When I did find out about the religious connection, I was embarrassed to ask people about their religious orientation so would wait until clues came up. The faith groups and individuals showed an affiliation to art practice, ranging from a former ballerina to a group that would meet to pray for their creative work. However I saw no evidence of religious engagement from the arts staff or volunteers. There seemed little crossover between the people developing art-related activities for the café’s gallery and entertainment and the religious element of the organisation, other than through Tim as manager of the organisation.
The apparently harmonious relationship between the café workers, the religious folk and the art-minded individuals brought together through a shared ‘Millenial’ outlook, based on solidarity and free expression, was actually drawing from fundamentally different attitudes. Underlying their apparent synergy was a fissure, a gap in perspectives that widened gradually over several years as the religious founders tried to align faith with artistic activity and others tried to practice art without explicitly relating it to religious sentiment. While everyone tried to maintain the goodwill and enthusiasm that brought them together in the first place, this tension was not being reconciled.

The ‘supertank turning exercise’ mentioned by Tim was an attempt to bring faith back into dialogue with the art community in the café but instead it seemed to drive them away. The gulf widened in the production of the parade section, when comparatively few people attended to the section construction or participated in the event itself. It seems that the stylistic character of the parade section came through the absence of participants, indicating distance between people in Synergy itself. An attempt to interpret the meaning of the community group itself (for the 2012 parade), rather than represent what they did (in the 2011 parade), played a critical role in this separation.

LOOKING FOR SYNERGY

It took me a while to notice that people deferred to Tim for significant financial decisions and work related activities and that actually he was ‘in charge’ as line manager for all the café staff, as well as Penelope as Arts Co-ordinator and then Charity Manager. The organisation’s legal framework had recently been restructured. Its structure was defined as a café raising funding for a charity to do community engagement with an arts focus. The downstairs basement of the Methodist Head Office provided a café setting for charity activity. Tim was a Methodist minister and described Synergy to me as “his parish”. He played down role as Director of the organisation and his managerial responsibilities, instead focusing on engaging people at a spiritual level.

Tim had taken over from the religious founders of Synergy and his purpose was to bring a closer connection between the art and spiritual aspects of the organisation. This had proved hugely challenging. The existing community were fully engaged in
a Synergy art community of their making and felt a strong sense of ownership over it. Penelope, the Arts Co-ordinator described a continuous line of people with a ‘Synergian’ sensibility handing over from one to the other as people left. Her instinct for a ‘Synergy person’ was well-honed. When she met someone who ran a library of ‘zines’ (self-published artistic work), she could ‘smell Synergy’ so asked him to do a residency at the cafe. Martha, a volunteer arts co-ordinator and Peter, the cafe manager also had a similar passion for the Synergian community.

Few of the cafe staff and art community, if any, were religious and the religious aspect of the organisation felt like the proverbial ‘elephant in the room’. Key people involved in running the organisation knew it was funded and supported by the church but there was little evidence of it in the cafe itself and non-religious people did not talk about it, except to say that there was a disconnection between them. It seemed that the art community involved in Synergy wanted to minimise the faith element while Tim and his trainee minister were passionate about spirituality, clearly comfortable in their religious identities (wearing T-shirts with religious comments and images on them) and keen on engaging in a dialogue with the non-religious people there.

Tim would correct me if I said Christian, his focus was on spirituality. For him, Synergy was a “watering hole”. People were attracted to it because it gave them sustenance. To be a watering hole, it needed to “carry an aura, like thin places where the spiritual realm is close” (Tim, Interview 2013). For him, art helped provide this ‘aura’. Tim compared the watering hole approach to boundary and centre sects. In a ‘boundary sect’, people patrol the boundaries and determine who is in and who is out. Baptism and communion are ways of keeping people in or out of the sect. Using an analogy, he explained that this is similar to keeping sheep in fields with walls, like in Yorkshire. In the “centre sect, what is in the middle attracts people”. They come and stay because they gain something from being there. This is similar to keeping sheep around a watering hole without surrounding fences, like in Australia. Synergy was a place to provide inspiration stimulated by the art on the walls and in people’s lives. Art had a place to play in Synergy but the purpose of Synergy was more than art. He was not keen on “art for art’s sake”.
The ‘supertanker turning exercise’ mentioned earlier was an attempt to refocus the organisation on faith and spirituality, drawing it further into the established community. Rather than being a true collaboration, the religious element felt that they had been side-lined, even though they had initiated, funded and hosted it. They faced a predicament – they did not want to alienate or deter the flourishing community they had helped create, but they did not want to just support people doing ‘art for art’s sake’. Tim’s ‘supertanker turning exercise’ came with the insight that Synergy “isn’t about art”. It is about “people, individual growth, a dynamic creative community that says yes, and a go-getting community”. For Tim, creativity and art were “vehicles for engaging people” but “others were more focused on art for art’s sake” (Tim, Interview 2013).

Disruption in the organisation reflected an ongoing negotiation of emphasis between art and spirituality. How was the café to be represented to visitors? Tim was largely happy with the art programme and Synergy’s practices, but he did want recognition and appreciation of the value that spirituality brought to the community space. For Tim, this Synergian community was part of a generation “apprehensive about the world of faith” and “not taught how to believe”. In his view, they were influenced to some extent by Muslim/Christian years of conflict to believe that religion was controlling or trying to hoodwink people. “If you say church, people cut off. At Synergy you can have a conversation before the shutters come down” (Tim, Interview 2013). When Tim started work at Synergy, he inherited a situation where there was substantial engagement from non-religious people, drawn through a shared vision of community, collaboration, support and goodwill. But when he tried to reveal or connect this activity to the Christian tradition, he encountered resistance.

While Tim wanted to downplay his managerial responsibilities, his authority over the staff activity and the related power dynamics probably affected his attempts to engage people on spirituality. The spontaneous coming together of like-minded people became formalised into working relationships, where some people had authority over the actions of others. When I started fieldwork, these formal structures were starting to chafe. A critical factor in producing tension was the separation of the cafe from the registered charity, a decision which the religious founders took. So where previously there was a fluid connection between setting
up art exhibitions, workshops and events so nurturing the Synergy community spiritually, whilst also working the cafe and nourishing it through food, a distinction developed between those who worked in the charity and those who worked in the cafe to serve the charity. The cafe people described their role as to ‘just’ serve food and appeared to believe their thoughts and ideas weren’t as valued.

Tim was focused on art as a method for engaging people and through his more senior decision making role in the organisation was in a position to insist on this. In Kondo’s ethnography (1990) in a family-run Japanese confectionary company in the 1980s, she describes the employer’s commitment to nurturing their staff by sending them to an ethics retreat to “become better human beings and better servants of the company” (Kondo 1990:47). The organisation decided what kind of employees they wanted to nurture and put processes in place to achieve it. When Tim sought to engage in dialogue with staff on the similarities between artistic and religious sensibilities, he overlooked the dynamics of the employer-staff relationship. Since he approved holidays, time off, working practices and many other dynamics between the cafe and the charity, it must have been difficult for staff to say to Tim what they were ‘really’ thinking about religion, particularly if it was negative.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the style of an organisation comes to impact on its activity. Entities emerge as relics of social dynamics in organisational contexts which then affect how the people involved, progress with their activities. The relational dynamics and organisational structures at Synergy affected how the parade section developed. In the previous year, Synergy people could participate more easily in the making process because the work took place in the cafe and they “could pop over whilst it was quiet” (Pete, Interview 2012). When the parade section was developed in the workshop in the southern part of the city, there was much more opportunity for disconnection. People muttered to me about how they did not have time to get over there after work and they were “not allowed” to go during their working hours. In the previous year, there were a substantial number of artists involved in the freeform arts based activity. By the following year these people were no longer involved.
The organisational structure of Synergy and the underlying attitudes towards art and religion which shaped this structure then impacted on how people within the organisation engaged with each other on a daily basis. The hierarchical relationships inhibited people’s abilities to speak and act freely. In the following section, I consider how the dynamics running through Synergy affected its tangible emergence as one of the community groups in the parade. I then contrast these dynamics with those in the Verde Society community group.

**MAKING WITH SYNERGY**

Paying attention to the timing of Synergy activities produces chronological account of ‘events’ which impacted on unfolding situations. As discussed in Chapter 4, attitudes, ideas and activities created a structure which impacted on and shaped subsequent behaviours. How and when these occurred is just as significant. The organisation of activities into ‘events’ large and small, from parade day to meetings, workshops, emails and encounters helps to bring light how certain implicit understandings about religion and art became explicit and an issue. In this section, I travel through the initial set-up meeting for the parade to parade day and examine how overarching issues materialised in the parade making process. I also note how the dynamics of other parade makers encountered Synergy, bringing their own organisational and contextual understandings which affected how people engaged with and misunderstood each other.

The Synergy entry for the parade in Year 3 centred on a celebration of the Night Cafe. Since the theme that year was ‘The Sky’s the Limit...a celebration of heroic achievements’, the application form described those involved with the Night Café as ‘superheroes’. Since Synergy was popular with the parade organisers for their enthusiastic involvement in the previous years, they were awarded leading artist, Michael as their parade artist. Michael was unusual for the Manchester Day Parade. He was employed as part of the ‘Elevate’ programme using funding from the Arts Council via Manchester City Council’s Cultural Strategy team. The team needed to ‘use up’ left over funding before year end and the Manchester Day Parade fitted perfectly with the aspirations of Cultural Strategy team – namely to engage local communities in arts projects. Michael was an artist from London with a good reputation for producing large high-quality sculptural structures.
In 2012, four months after the application form was submitted, I attended the first Synergy parade meeting with Penelope, Tim, Pete the cafe manager, Tod on a student placement, Michael the artist, Laurie, Amelia and Pam (Walk the Plank project manager for Synergy’s parade contribution), Ian and Niamh (freelance artists) and a representative from the culture team at the City Council. Laurie and Amelia had attended many set-up meetings with multiple community groups. They had invited Pam and the Council representative leading on the Elevate funding for this particular parade section. We gathered in Synergy’s meeting space, a colourful room with art on the walls just adjacent to the main café area in the basement.

Laurie and Amelia led the discussion at Synergy, emphasising critical aspects from their experience of what did and did not work on ‘the street’. When Tod mentioned working with youth groups as part of Synergy’s outreach ambitions, Amelia warned against using the parade development time for community work since the “money spent needs to be reflected on the street on the day”. She had already watched several budgets on other sections ‘disappear’ on ‘making days’ for community groups, providing little for materials and artist time to produce something with the requisite scale, colour and movement. As discussed previously (Chapter 4), Laurie and Amelia were very supportive of community groups and keen to help them realise their ideas. However in this case, they did not seem to notice in their enthusiasm, that they were overwhelming Synergy with the number of people they brought to the meeting; with the focus on parade management challenges and with the sheer number of opinions round the table. By the time the spotlight fell on Penelope to provide more detail on their application, the dynamics of the meeting felt very dominated by Walk the Plank opinions and perspectives.

Penelope told me later that she felt intimidated by the number of people there and uncomfortable with doing a brainstorm about what the parade section should look like. Tim told me later that Amelia’s comments on the requirement for high quality sections stuck with him through the whole process and led directly to his perception that ‘professionalism’ had taken over the development of Synergy’s parade section. Michael told me later that he was surprised by the number of people present at the meeting which was ‘more like a committee meeting’ rather than the group of artists he was expecting. Ian told me later that he and Niamh had only just interviewed for the role of assistant artist to Michael that morning and
were invited to this meeting without knowing which of them had got the job. It was only sometime later that they found out that Michael planned to recruit both of them. My own reaction to the meeting was that it focused largely on procedure with very little on the content of the parade section itself. It seemed unfair to ask Penelope, Tim and Pete to bare their souls about their organisation to such a large group of strangers. That said, Penelope gave a good description of Synergy describing the development of the organisation from the Night Cafe seeking to rescue ‘lost souls’ in the Northern quarter to a daytime cafe with art exhibitions, gigs and a welcoming respite from the streets above. She described Synergy as ‘a many headed beast’ as she talked through the variety of community groups and activities going on. Michael nodded and asked a few questions. Synergy was holding a community meeting a few days later and so it was agreed that more insight would be gained there and the meeting ended.

The dynamics of this meeting created a context from which people made decisions and acted, or did not act. Impressions were formed about what was expected. Each participant in the meeting had particular understandings of the parade, the process and the organisations involved and spoke from that context. Meanwhile people were misunderstanding each other or putting weight on certain observations that had not been intended. For example, the flexibility shown by the parade organisers on May’s boat in the early days of the parade development, as discussed further in Chapter 4, was not so evident in this discussion. From my own participation in the parade in the previous year, I knew how adaptable the parade organisers could be. I knew that they responded productively to changing circumstances and if people insisted on something happening in a particular way, then they tried to accommodate that. However the people at Synergy did not have that same awareness and perhaps took certain things as immovable, such as not spending too much time on community engagement as part of the making process, rather than asserting their own priorities. This discussion therefore had a critical effect on what happened next.

The notion of the many headed beast was repeated several times after the meeting. Pete, the café manager and also an artist, drew a monster with many heads and showed it to Penelope. After the meeting I chatted to Tod, who was training to be a youth worker and was on a student placement with Synergy from a college in
Morecombe. He aimed to go out into the local community and bring ‘young people’ into Synergy (youth work is usually aimed at teenagers). Over the following months he discovered that cafe policy on young people welcomed them as customers or when taking part in organised activities. If it was quiet and they were well-behaved, then they were welcome. However any obstructive or disturbing behaviour meant they would have to leave. The troubled and challenging young people Tod wanted to work with were unlikely to comply with these demands and he eventually abandoned any attempts to engage with young people. He focused on the parade development instead, despite his annoyance at this state of affairs. There were clearly limits to the form of community engagement that Synergy as an organisation was prepared to engage in. Penelope also described a similar incident when she first started at Synergy and spent an evening painting over anti-religious graffiti drawn by people during a workshop. The many heads were pulling in different directions.

I returned to Synergy a few days later for the community meeting and met people from all the various community groups. It was a rare occasion when the religious and non-religious elements of the organisation came together and was apparently the first community meeting for a long time. It was chaired by the trainee minister working alongside Tim and the religious element of the organisation became evident to me for the first time. It started with a bonding exercise where we worked in small groups to construct a tower using straws and marshmallows. Then we sat back in a circle and introduced ourselves to the room.

The running club members said ‘we used to be creatives who run and now we are runners who are creative’ (indicating their newfound passion for running). Someone said they were from Artisan, a group of ‘creatives who eat together and pray for each other’s projects’. In this context, creative appeared to mean people who provided innovative input into projects in advertising and digital media, businesses that dominate the Northern Quarter. A trustee introduced herself as supportive and a ‘critical friend’. She said that since Synergy was a registered charity, they were “trying to be more transparent about how people get involved”.

The cafe staff introduced themselves as being ‘on the other side of the counter - we see all sorts and it’s never boring’. It seemed like they were downplaying their role and contribution to the Synergian community.
Other matters were discussed before coming to the parade discussion, several focusing on spiritual issues as if Tim was making the religious element more explicit to the wider community. Pete, the café manager, observed later that putting the parade discussion at the end of a meeting was a "bad idea because by then people will agree to anything because they want to go home". Penelope asked me to help with the brainstorm so I stood in front of a flipchart with a pen while she elicited ideas from people on what could be in Synergy’s parade section. Despite the different orientations of the people there, a rather consistent non-employee perspective on Synergy began to emerge. Few people there had participated in the Night Café, which was ‘on hiatus’ anyway, so the original plan to focus the parade section on the ‘superhero’ founders gained little traction. The discussion moved rapidly onto why people liked coming to Synergy, what they enjoyed about it and how it contributed to their lives. It seemed that Synergy provided people with a space for self-expression; through its nurturing presence, people felt able to develop and flourish in new ways.

This event again created a context out of which the parade section design developed. In her subsequent email to Michael summarising the discussion, Penelope presented the findings as follows:

“Synergy wants to represent itself as an agent for transformation for city-centre users, helping to transform the negative aspects of city living (apathy, anger, stress, claustrophobia) using our tenets of community, creativity and spirituality. Whilst originally seen as a ‘battle between good and evil’, our discussions on Thursday led us to realise it’s more of a dance between light and dark - not destroying or vanquishing, but transforming. Whether this comes from people looking at the city with fresh eyes by joining the running club or Sketchwalk, being both entertained and educated at a Smart Club event, or feeling stimulated spiritually in a way unique to Synergy by joining Benedictus or joining a film night discussion, we see Synergy as a catalyst for helping people be released from the rat race.

One idea put forward was for a central structure, perhaps a cage, in which individuals are held, looking generally monstrous, grey and dull. Upon release, they come into contact with the Synergy protagonists (the superheroes of the
piece) and are transformed into brightly coloured new incarnations of themselves. This could be effected with the rat race/butterfly type outfit I've attached a very crude doodle of - or at least taking the idea of literally turning the rat race into something beautiful and creative. I quite like the idea of loads of giant rats scurrying about the place getting shazzammed into butterflies with designs symbolising our various strands.

The other possibility for a giant beasty within the parade is the multi-headed hydra that is Synergy itself, with each head depicting an element of the organisation. A friendly monster spreading a bit of calm and jollity through the city.” (Penelope, email correspondence, 4/4/12)

This representation captures beautifully the discussion of the evening in particular; Synergy as a place of calm and welcome, where people could feel at home. The focus on Synergy staff and volunteers as superheroes had shifted onto a focus on the people who come to Synergy and find succour there. This move puzzled Tim, who ‘felt like he had missed a meeting somewhere’ and could not understand how the shift had happened.

As it turned out, the parade section depicting what Synergy meant to customers and community became increasingly problematic. Synergy staff were asked to work on something that represented what they meant to others rather than how they understood themselves. This contrasted with the previous ‘Alice in Wonderland’ theme which emphasised the tea party aspect of the café. Furthermore, the interpretation of Synergy’s activities began to reveal the fissures between the art and faith communities in a way that a representation of their activities did not.

Penelope’s email and the initial setup ‘committee meeting’ conversation were the two main influences on Michael’s subsequent idea for the parade section. He was based in London and ‘very busy’ according to Laurie from Walk the Plank. He was not due to return to Synergy until he had a ‘pitch’ in place a month later, so I went down to London to see him and his work. We met in an art gallery in the crypt of a church and chatted surrounded by his ethereal and meticulously crafted pieces. There were several foot high male figures made entirely of gold filigree leaves, large thumb prints in wax and copper and a stunning life-size man’s torso hanging
in the air, with what looked like a serpent tail (it was a water trail). Film footage of a man swimming in water could be viewed through a small hole in the wall, as if he was moving through the crypt itself. The craft and time involved in the production of these pieces was evident and highlighted the role of Elevate funding to raise the production quality of other artists by putting them in contact with people like Michael. This attention to detail however, was to have unexpected ramifications later on in the production of the parade section as Michael focused more closely on the quality of the work than the engagement of the Synergy community themselves.

When Michael returned with his assistant artists to Synergy to present their ideas, only Penelope, Tod and I were present to hear their pitch. Michael showed us pictures on his laptop as he did not want to print them ‘just in case’, but Penelope declared herself ‘smitten’ and that was that. Penelope told me later that Synergy ‘can be seen as a bit twee and cute’ and she thought it would be nice to temper that with a more edgy parade representation.

The parade section was a narrative incorporating the many different comments people had made both in the committee meeting and from Penelope’s synopsis. Party rats and people weighed down by the pressures of rampant consumerism were liberated by the giant teapot of Synergy with the book group, scribblers and running group celebrating alongside. While Michael had encapsulated a consensual view of Synergy drawn out of the community meeting and described to him by Penelope, only she was present to hear the proposal and no further opportunity was available to change the ideas developed. The design became fixed and did not change for the duration of the parade section development. The drawings Michael produced very closely resembled the final parade section that went down the street on parade day.

As discussed in Chapter 4, the parade organisers and artists used a very fluid and adaptive process to bring the parade into being. To some extent, their role was to push and pull objects into being which had their own dynamism and emergent properties. Drawing on Gell’s understanding of art objects, once created the parade sections were enmeshed in the accompanying set of social relations impacting and impacted upon by the forces around them. At this moment of acceptance by
Penelope, the Synergy art object was brought into being. However its existence was not clearly owned by anyone except for Michael. It was a hybrid, an amalgamation of many different meanings, a reflection of how people engaged with Synergy and an interpretation of their activities. As the defining artist, Michael’s own practice informed it also. It drew on his own experiences, in the materials used, the structure and method of making and in the vision he clearly had of its final launch down the parade street. However, this vision was separated from the people at Synergy who ended up as workers on the parade section rather than proponents of it. The ‘prospect of ownership’ significantly influenced how people engaged with the section (Strathern 1996:521).

Penelope asked me to visit each of the community groups and ‘enthuse them’ about participating in the parade. This was the first year they had been actively involved and she was not sure if they would participate in the making. In my rounds of the community groups, it seemed there were only a few regular members in each and for most the date of the parade did not fit with their existing schedules. Those who could have helped with the making were put off by the distance to the workshop from the Northern Quarter and the daytime making hours – ‘we’re at work’ was a common refrain.

The unavailability of community group members associated with Synergy unfortunately coincided with Tim telling Synergy staff they could only help on the section after work or on weekends, alienating several who then did not participate at all in the making process. Furthermore, Penelope had a very casual, laidback style of community engagement. She would send out emails asking people to come, ‘if you can’, rather than exhorting people to come because they were really needed (in stark contrast to the Italian society group which I describe in more detail below).

A core group of Synergy people never did emerge for the making and Michael became the centre of the parade section, based at the parade workshop and rarely visiting the Synergy café himself. Gradually my time in the Synergy café diminished as I focused more and more on the making of the parade section, as did Tod, the student on placement. He and I formed the primary volunteer cohort for the Synergy parade section. There were sporadic visits from Penelope, Tim and other
Synergy regulars. Tim became enthusiastic about making harnesses for the burdens and Tod focused on the fake body and balloon stuffed bag and bamboo structure that loomed several metres high.

Penelope was immediately enthusiastic about being a party rat and asked me to be one too. She was worried about finding enough people to meet the numbers required for the section so I volunteered my son as well. Most of the Synergy regulars chose to be party rats as did the artist who made the heads. The seven of us formed the most cohesive element of the parade section. In the end, the whole parade section constituted about 12 Synergy people in total, some of whom I met for the first time on parade day.

It seemed a shame that the Synergian community were not around to benefit from the wealth of experience and ideas as well as provide labour and support to the development of the substantial parade section. The lack of regular and active participation infuriated Tod who was commuting from Blackpool every day. He and I were the key workers on the parade section and yet neither of us were directly associated with Synergy itself. Tod grew more annoyed by this disengagement as the weeks passed and few Synergy people materialised to help. He had already been disappointed by the refusal to let him engage with young people and he was also concerned by the apparently hidden religious element of the organisation. He had spent several hours working on a funding application only to discover that it could not be submitted because Synergy’s charity status had a religious purpose, making it ineligible for the proposed funder.

Tod was a passionate and engaged worker who took his responsibilities very seriously and he was concerned by what he saw as a dysfunctional relationship between the art and religious people at the heart of Synergy. In a study assignment, he produced a critique of the situation which he shared with Tim, Penelope and the charity trustees. It was partly through his annoyance that I came to understand the underlying rift between art and religious sensibilities as leading to a disconnection from the parade activities. Tod’s vocal disapproval may have also contributed to the stronger and more public emphasis on the religious element from Tim. Within a year of the parade finishing, Tim had hired a Christian Arts Co-ordinator when the woman who replaced Penelope left, citing lack of
support. Penelope had left to become a tattoo artist a few months earlier so this was the end of a continuous line of people handing over what it meant to be ‘Synergian’ that had begun with its formation.

Michael compared this casual dipping in and out of the Synergy people to the dedication of amateur dramatics. His background was largely in theatre, set design and costume making, as well as advertising and later the contemporary art world itself. He was used to arguments over design, to stress and exhaustion as people worked day and night to get the job done. Certainly the ‘artist community’ anticipated by Amelia, Laurie and Liz when they assigned the additional ‘Elevate’ funding to Synergy never materialised. Tim, Penelope, Pete and Martha, (a volunteer Arts Co-ordinator) never seemed to register that their casual approach to making the section may have caused consternation among the parade artists working on the project. They were all busy people with jobs at Synergy and their own projects to develop and focus on. They did turn up and help on a number of occasions, so they probably felt that they were contributing sufficiently.

Indeed it is likely that Michael’s ‘professionalism’ which concerned Tim, had led to a sense of security but also detachment as parade section took shape, outside Synergy and away for the daily flow of the Synergy community. Pam, the project manager assigned to Synergy by Walk the Plank, was also an extremely competent organiser, anticipating and solving many problems before they even properly emerged. She asked her friends to help on the parade section when labour was needed, one of whom also became a regular volunteer.

Michael’s introduction to the Manchester Day Parade as a successful artist also inadvertently encountered the ongoing debate within Synergy about the role and nature of art itself. For the non-artists such as Tim, ‘art for art’s sake’ was an approach they were actively trying to move away from, focusing more on the use of art as a method for engagement. With the parade section located in a warehouse far away and the primary making activity a complex knitting together of willow, fibreglass and MDF, which only Michael knew how to do properly, it was almost the antithesis of the Synergian way.

Furthermore artists, such as Penelope and Pete, the parade section perhaps did not offer a sufficient level of autonomy and self-expression to be appealing to them.
Pete, who had been an active participant in the previous year, parading down the street in a suit with a teapot head, barely materialised during the making stage until one day he was persuaded to be the giant rat. A few days before the parade, he turned up at the workshop with rat feet he had molded and painted of his own volition. He and Michael had bonded over a late making session and Michael talked regretfully about the timing, wishing that Pete had come around sooner.

Pete told me later that he might have engaged better if Michael had invited more input from the team. “We are all creative”, he said. “Last year was different. The team was bigger and more creative. We all had a thing to do. Not here. We had to go to the workshop and find time and then be shown what to do”. It seems that Pete desired a greater freedom to adapt, to develop their own ideas in the making process. He did turn up a couple of times but no-one was there. He got on with it, but he knew that others would have just turned around and walked back out. Their section the previous year was “exciting and humbling” for him. The thought of it had ‘petrified him’ but it had put a big smile on his face. While Pete was impressed with Michael’s work, he did not think an artist of his calibre was needed on the Synergy section, except perhaps as a mentor.

Parade day itself was fun but also quite a perfunctory affair for the Synergy community. People came to put on their outfits, some of which they had made or put together themselves, but mostly made for them by either me, Tod or the artists involved. Most of the party rats had attended a choreography session, so we walked, posed for photographs and generally looked casual and uncaring, as suggested by Michael. It was great fun! In the previous year, I had walked alongside the parade as a Stage Manager completely ignored by the watching crowds. This time, shielded by the rat head mask, I could laugh and prance around with the others in the parade section, noticed but invisible at the same time. As directed by Michael, we rats were not allowed to have any contact with the rest of the parade section (since we were representing party rats who had not been liberated by Synergy’s welcoming vibe) so it was not until the end that I saw the teapot surrounded by the scribblers, book group and running club wearing papier mache hats of oversized pens, books and trainers. The teapot itself was ridden by Ian, the assistant artist, with a member of the running group tucked in at the back.
surrounded by shopping bags filled with balloons and fibreglass rods strung with organic fizzy pop cans.

In the photographs afterwards, our parade section was visually very impressive – the rats, people carrying towering poles hung with shopping bags, the shining white teapot encircled by people from the different community groups, waving to the crowd. Within half an hour of returning however, the Synergy people had changed back into their day clothes and disappeared into the crowd. I was waiting outside for my family and by the time I returned into the workshop, everyone had gone except the muttering artists annoyed that they were left to tidy up and pack down the section. When I interviewed people from Synergy over the coming weeks, they were unanimous in declaring the parade section impressive and well-executed but there was little of the excitement and joyfulness that ran through their depictions of the previous year.

Chapter 4 discusses how differences in style between art objects can provide insight into the social context from which those objects are emergent. The contrast in accounts between the Synergy parade section in Year Two and my experience of the parade section in Year Three were startling. The flickering art film made of the Alice tea party from Year Two made by an artist friend for Synergy shows the staff from Synergy walking and waving much like we did in the following year. Yet the underlying concept for the parade section, depicting what Synergy was (in Year Three) with what Synergy did (in Year Two), was distinctly different. Similarly the making process, the extent of participation and the level of emotional engagement with the parade section showed a marked difference.

Making the Synergy parade section in Year Three revealed underlying tensions from differences in perspective that were startlingly far apart in a small organisation. For as long as the religious people kept their faith to themselves, the wider community could co-exist and collaborate with them. Once faith became part of the relationship dynamic and started to encroach on people's freedom of expression, existing ways of working and collaborating began to falter.

The lack of engagement with the parade section was a symptom of a much wider malaise within the organisation. It was this malaise which allowed the other dynamics, such as lack of available time, the distant location of the workshop,
Michael’s professionalism and intimidating artistic expertise become unsurmountable issues. Synergy had failed to be the attractive waterhole with no fences aspired by Tim. People did not dispute or argue, so much as just disappear. The tensions inherent in the accommodating arrangement at Synergy that aligned different understandings and interests, emerged in the making of the parade section.

This experience was repeated among other community groups in the parade. During the making process of both Year Two and Three, several artists complained to me about lack of engagement from community groups and it’s likely there was a similar situation in each case, namely a wider malaise in that community group translating into a casual attitude towards the making process for their parade section. One artist, frustrated by members of a youth group not turning up to help, was working on puppets based on a 1990s pop band – famous well before the young people in the group were born. When I asked who decided on the characters, the artist said, the ‘youth worker’ and pulled a face.

Ian, Synergy’s assistant artist said that "the hardest job was addressing the attitude – getting people to buy in. They see you as the one that is going to do it. You’re there to represent them externally and it’s the organisation that they belong to that has got you in. The staff have other jobs and lives and we get paid to work. They don’t have this attitude of ‘we’re all in this together’" (Ian, Interview 2012). This insight holds true for the relationships in Synergy. When the organisation developed from a Night Café into a collective activity between the art oriented and religious people, the non-specific relationships allowed for productive collaboration. When the organisational structure was imposed with religious intent enshrined in its objectives, the entity that was Synergy continued to exist but the flourishing community dissipated leaving a hollowed out structure behind.

In her analysis of IRCAM, a music conservatory in Paris in the 1980s, Born (1995) shows how charismatic and strong leadership can, often unintentionally, cause less confident individuals to reduce or edit out aspects of their own experience and potential contribution. At IRCAM, use of popular music tropes was actively discouraged, so many musicians did not incorporate and even hid their popular influences when composing. Michael was a charismatic and competent artist with a
very clear vision for the parade section. Tim had a clear vision for how Synergy should work as an organisation. They took on positions of authority against which the other participants reacted. Synergy had evolved as a collaborative, responsive activity but as it matured into an organisation, its processes ‘hardened’ and ended up alienating many of the fluid and adaptive people who became involved when the organisation was much more freeform. The stylistic characteristics of the process of organising were revealed in the making of the parade section.

I will now contrast this situation with the other ‘Elevate’ community group, the Verde Society, whose focus and coherence in the making process provided insight into a different stylistic arrangement, a set of relationships among people whose lives were no less complicated but whose engagement with the parade seemed much clearer due to the leadership of community group organiser who orchestrated the whole making process.

**COLLABORATIVE MAKING WITH ‘THE ITALIANS’**

Sennett (2012) argues that the act of collaboration is a craft which requires a specific skillset and a “cooperative frame of mind”. For him, cooperation is “an exchange in which the participants benefit from the encounter” (ibid:5). It requires ‘dialogic skills’ – listening well, behaving tactfully, finding points of agreement and managing disagreement. He draws from Bakhtin’s proposition of dialogic exchange as a “discussion that does not resolve itself by finding common ground” but still leads to a better understanding (Bakhtin 1981, Sennett 2012:19). At Synergy, a combination of underlying tensions, laid-back and somewhat shy personalities, existing methods of practice, assumptions and understandings about roles and responsibilities all combined to lead to a lack of engagement with the parade section.

In this section I explore the work of the Verde Society which was almost diametrically opposite. Strong characters led to a different kind of engagement altogether. Carmel, President of the society, was skilled at encouraging collaboration leading a disparate group of Italian expats into a joint endeavour that was one of the most impressive in the parade. This group were fondly referred to by the parade organisers as ‘the Italians’ and evidently respected for their ability to mobilise as a large group of people. These factors resulted in the additional Elevate
funding and the assignation of the second leading artist, Nina, in the Year Three parade.

I first came across the Verde Society towards the end of Year Two when a large white horse materialised in the workshop carrying a stuffed male figure dressed in blue and red. He was Garibaldi and part of the Verde Society’s celebration of the reunification of Italy. Upon expressing interest, I was invited by Carmel to a meeting with six key women involved in developing ideas for the parade in a cafe near Manchester University. They were working on their application for Year Three, deciding which Italian hero they wanted to celebrate. They were spoilt for choice. On their shortlist, was Gallipoli, da Vinci and Dante. Donna was part of the society and an artist. She had printouts of paintings depicting Dante’s La Divina Commedia (more commonly known in the UK as ‘Dante’s Inferno’) and his journey from ‘Inferno’ (Hell) into ‘Paradiso’ (Heaven). These were rich lavish sumptuous images, which I knew Amelia would love.

Sure enough, several months later, I sat on May’s boat and listened to Amelia, May and Laurie weave visions of devils and angels parading through Manchester city centre. Just as Synergy were assigned Michael with his track record in large, ethereal sculptural forms, the Verde Society were assigned Nina with international parade experience in Trinidad, India and London, famed for her expertise in painting on silk. Silk painting for parades is a specialised design process, successful because the strong fabric holds rich vibrant colours, moves beautifully in the wind and can be sewn to large structures to bring great presence on ‘the street’. To welcome the Olympic torch in London, Nina produced a 120m silk wave for athletes to run through, painted in sections by school children.

In Spring 2012, a handful of Verde Society people gathered around a table in a side room at the parade workshop to ‘brainstorm’ the parade section for Dante’s Inferno. Donna’s printouts were pinned on the wall and several books on symbolic art scattered across the table for inspiration. One book contained 1920s graphic art by fashion designer Erté (Tibbetts 1995). A year later, when I interviewed Donna, she flicked through Erté’s beautiful stylised drawings of women in lavish costumes and showed me page after page where his design matched the final parade costumes very closely. It was this kind of closeness to Donna’s ideas and
inspirations which marked Nina’s development of the parade section throughout the process. At Synergy, Penelope had a similar vision of rats transforming through contact with the café and Michael also translated this vision onto the street. As discussed below, how these visions were realised in the making process was directly affected by the context of the individuals participating, the organisational structures around them and the many cultural settings they moved through.

At the brainstorming session, the ages ranged from 30 to 72, all women and from different parts of Italy. The President, Carmel, had left Italy in the 1960s on a short trip and ended up in Manchester, as she put it, escaping the pressure of marriage and children. She maintained ties with her family in Italy, worked in an engineering firm with Italians and was a long-term active participant in the Verde Society, part of an international network for the Italian diaspora. Maude, a sensitive and perky artist from Cheshire was relatively new to the group. While not Italian speaking, her father was part of the post-war Italian migration to the North West and she felt sufficiently connected to her Italian roots to be part of the society. Several other older women were also part of this post-war migration, together with their husbands, now retired or passed away and the Verde Society had been part of their lives for many years. Donna, Elena (the society’s treasurer) and other men and women in their 40s and 50s were part of a younger group who had come for work or education at Manchester University and settled there.

In different contexts, the participants in the Verde Society’s section moved from a representation of the Italian community in Manchester, to ascribing an innate Italianness in their behaviour, to participating in non-Italian networks in the city, such as the universities or workplaces. In their effort to conceptualise the dynamics of movement and interconnection as ‘regimes of mobility’, Glick Schiller and Salazar (2013) highlight the importance in not seeing “rootedness in territory and culture, and cosmopolitanness as oppositional” (ibid: 187). There was a playful self-consciousness about being Italian, from Carmel and Maude in particular, seen as both a strength and weakness, desirable and difficult at the same time. Carmel would talk about how argumentative the Italians were and a challenge to co-ordinate and lead as a group. Maude would talk about how she felt Italian and not Italian at the same time. Donna was more preoccupied with the artist community and the challenges she found in being accepted in that context. She demonstrated
little interest in the wider Italian community or ‘Italinnness’ in our discussions. Instead she talked about the use of religious iconography and art, about materials, shapes, colours and designs.

Glick Schiller and Salazar emphasise civic states’ attempts to maintain their authority over mobilities and also over their meaning as a central concern for projects of biopolitics and governmentality. The authors are concerned with the relationship between those who can move around easily and those who struggle to, and argue that “these unequal relationalities are shaped by the social, political, cultural and economic relations of capital production as they play out within specific local contexts” (ibid:195). The people who participated in the ‘Verde Society’ parade were part of a community where a relationship with Italy was a common thread but only one aspect of their connectedness with each other. It was convenient for this group of people to become a ‘community group’ to represent themselves to the wider world, particularly to the local government when seeking resources or representation.

As discussed in Chapter 3, parades provide a medium through which groups of people can assert a common identity, but in this case it seemed that the parade was a medium through which people with something in common could come together for a time. The notion of assertion, of claiming space and celebrating a civic identity was not evident in the way in which they engaged with the parade section. The Italian community had paraded in the city for over 150 years in the Whit Walks and continued with their own religious parade earlier in the year. Association and representation had become routinized with parading together a habit and method of inward social integration among an expat community. The formation of a community group shaped the way in which people themselves engaged with each other; a process I elaborate in more detail in Chapter 3 and 4 with regards to the formation of parades themselves.

Since people involved in the society were diverse in their ‘Italinnness’, the organisers worked with national Italian symbols. In Year Two, they celebrated Garibaldi, champion of the reunification of Italy in 1852 and in Year Three, they focused on Dante Alighieri, author of La Divina Commedia, (Alighieri 2010 (1321)) and credited with inventing the modern Italian language. In Year Four, I heard that
the Verde Society participated in the parade with a ‘celebration of Italy’ using banners to represent different key cultural sites in the country. The notion of a national state helped create coherence to the Verde Society and provided a certain stability of identity representation in a way that the more spontaneous gathering in Synergy did not. Attempts by Tim to align art and religion through a notion of spirituality could not overcome other stronger cultural structures in play. Furthermore, the Verde Society provided representations of Italian history and culture rather than examining their own role as a community group. As discussed earlier, it was Synergy’s attempt to interpret their status as an organisation which enhanced uncertainty.

In Dante’s text, he takes an explorative journey through Christian Hell, Purgatory then Heaven in 100 verses or *canto*. The Roman poet Virgil guides him through the first two realms and his ‘ideal woman’, Beatrice guides him through Heaven. As he travels, the alliterative poetry provides a metaphor for one’s relationship with God.

> "What reason here discovers I have power
To show thee: that which lies beyond, expect
From Beatrice, faith not reason’s task."

Dante Alighieri, *Canto 18*

Dante also mischievously named and categorised the Italian ruling class of the time into the different realms according to his assessment of their behaviour; he was exiled in the furore that followed. Over the following five centuries, the rich and evocative description has inspired generations of writers and artists, some of whose dramatic paintings Donna printed out and brought to the brainstorm meeting. It was no wonder that Nina enthusiastically embraced this idea to share her silk painting expertise. However, while many Italians have heard of Dante’s work, studying it as schoolchildren, few present remembered much detail during the brainstorm. Nina led the discussion, with Donna providing insight into Dante’s work just as she evidently had in previous email exchanges between Nina and the society committee.

The parade section structure followed the three realms in Dante’s journey beginning with one large devil in red surrounded by smaller red devils, ending with Beatrice in a large wedding gown, surrounded by angels in blue, with people
in purgatory in the middle writhing along with long tangled arms. During the brainstorm, Nina showed us her sketches of wing shapes and costumes for these different characters. Accompanying the large devil were the ‘Circles of Hell’ representing different vices such as lust, gluttony, anger and heresy. Accompanying Beatrice were six mature ladies representing wisdom and based on the Brazilian ‘Baiana’ costumes commonly used in parades worldwide. (Several Italian women later muttered to me that these were not ‘Italian-style’ dresses.) Nina put us into groups to work on different sections with Donna assigned to Beatrice’s three metre high dress to garb a wheeled tower. Maude and I were asked to come up with motifs to represent vices on the Circles of Hell hoop skirts. When I suggested painting pizza on the gluttony dress, Carmel interrupted saying there was to be ‘no pizza, pasta or mandolino in this parade!’ Carmel was from north Italy near Milan and regarded these three items as stereotypical representations of Italy when instead they were ‘just’ from southern Italy. She was passionate about representing the ‘cultured culture’ of Italy, bemoaning British understandings of Italian life formed largely through Italian-run cafes and restaurants serving mainly pasta and pizza. Maude and I fumbled on with the Circles of Hell, drawing on our layman’s understanding of gluttony, greed, avarice, lust and others. These were all replaced later by Donna whose in-depth understanding of Italian culture as an art graduate and teacher in religious symbolism produced sketches and paintings of skirts decorated with cakes for gluttony, pigs for lust, snakes and snowflakes for traitors. Nina copied directly from Donna’s drawings for the skirt designs.

So while there were attempts to align Italians from different cultural and geographical contexts, the interests and preoccupations of the lead participants in the society still came to dominate. The collaborative process in developing the Verde Society’s parade section was predicated according to two main criteria – how well known and respected individuals were to the main organisers (Carmel and Elena) and how determined and committed individuals were to the integrity of the idea and its production (Donna, Maude and Margarita, who wanted to sew costumes for her friends). Underlying the ‘Italian’ representation in the parade were the personalities and preoccupations of the few individuals who drove it
forward, varying their Italianness as it suited them, including ignoring it altogether.

Carmel, a slight, dynamic older woman, spent most evenings on the phone organising and emailing. She was clearly ‘in charge’. She would tell me how Italians were extremely opinionated and the best way of working with them was to tell them as little as possible, as late as possible - *chi mi ama, mi segua*, which she translated into ‘he who loves me, follow’. In her view, Italy ‘reached the top with dictators such as Caesar’ and now functioned in ‘organised anarchy’. For her, relationships were managed by talking to individuals rather than groups and she was amused by an English tendency to have meetings to make decisions. “Never go to a committee with one idea because you will come back with three!” (Carmel, Interview 2012). It was with this rule of thumb that she managed engagement in the parade. She oversaw the development of the section, allocated responsibilities and resources and chivvied everyone along. Design was not her responsibility she said, and deferred to Donna and Nina in all design decisions. During the brainstorm, she declared, ‘I do not care, as long as we can get the people together to do it!’

Donna was passionate about being faithful to the theme. Parade success relied on size, colour and movement so while specific details of the Dante story could have been glossed over, Donna’s commitment to the story’s integrity ensured small details featured everywhere. Her vitality at the beginning of the development process led to Nina misunderstanding her capacity at making, something which had significant consequences in both the production of the parade section and its overall appearance52. Maude usually produced her artwork at home, so she much enjoyed the community and co-working aspect of the section development. As an ‘honorary Italian’, she did not have rich family connections, nor spoke the language. She was also very vocal in her opinions and had disagreements with people. However she was warm and kind, turned up regularly, worked hard and

---

52 The design and making of Beatrice’s dress highlights the challenges in distributed ownership of the productive process, particularly when people work together for the first time. Heaven was to be represented in part by a 30ft high woman in an elaborate dress. This structure involved a woman standing on top of a wheeled platform, wearing the dress around her arms and torso with the body of the dress extended another 25ft foot down around the platform. During planning meetings Donna drew a beautiful sketch for this large dress and Nina delegated the making of this dress to her. Over the following weeks, it became apparent that making the dress was proving challenging for Donna. However Nina did not realise or properly appreciate the extent of the problem. She seemed to assume that it would be resolved because her experience of parade making was that it would be resolved, because problems always were. Sure enough, the project manager for this community group pulled together a making team from her own connections and a dress was made just in time for the parade.
drew on her own art experience in textiles to help with the making. She chatted and asked questions while we painted the silk and helped create a jovial and fun atmosphere.

These women formed the core working group of the parade. Two men also came regularly, Maude’s husband and an Italian astrophysicist at the university. All were willing and helpful workers on the section. Others came along when they could ‘fit it in’ to their existing schedule. Italian-speaking people would materialise en masse in the workshop at certain points and whole families came along on parade day itself. I was also welcomed into the group, as were other volunteers. Carmel would encourage me to join the society and come to their events since I expressed an interest in Italian culture.

Several Walk the Plank people said ‘the Italians’ were fun but challenging to work with because they would keep contradicting each other. After each decision, they would come up to them privately and say, ‘Don’t listen to her, listen to me’. My overall impression of the group was that they vocalised their ideas and concerns, disagreed freely with each other but did not allow their different perspectives to have a detrimental effect on ongoing relationships.

**PEOPLE AS EMERGENT ENTITIES**

In critiquing the discourses of flow, Glick Schiller and Salazar assert that “when binaries of difference are constructed between fixity and motion, social life cannot be seen as processes in which both fixity and motion are relative and interrelated” (Glick Schiller and Salazar 2013:186). Difference needs to be grounded in a broader historical perspective that moves beyond binary logics. Being Italian was only one aspect of the lives and characteristics of the people in the Verde Society but it was a common link that brought people together.

Moore (1994) locates aspiration to difference in the desire to belong. People use differences of others to highlight commonalities between them and increase their social connectivity. Differences become a way through which social structures are formed, as people distinguish between different forms and they associate practices to different origins. Tension (both positive and negative) emerges as friction (Tsing 2004) when people’s self-understanding moves from the implicit to explicit.
Once together, the relations between the Italians were shaped by the character of the individuals involved and their other cultural contexts such as age groups, specific areas of Italy, length of time in Manchester, class, education and interests. The structure of the organising process that brought them together into a ‘society’ with a ‘committee’ also had a restrictive impact on the relational dynamics.

Similarly, being religious was only one aspect of Tim’s life at Synergy and being artistic only one aspect of Penelope’s life. Yet these differences were mobilised by both the individuals themselves and people around them and impacted on how they related to others. Which ‘difference’ to focus upon became shaped by the organisation that brought the people together, and in Synergy’s case became the moment of cleavage. A call to ‘binary logics’ became how delineations were made – between art and religion in this case. For as long as members of Synergy focused on the café as a place to drink tea and have fun, there was coherence in its representation. In Year Three, when the parade section became a reflection on the role of Synergy and an interpretation of what it meant to others, existing internal wranglings on how and if they should emphasise the Christian ethos were laid bare in the making process.

The dynamics of the personalities involved and the extent of their commitment to each other shaped how these disagreements were managed. Members of the Verde Society could lay claim to the rich heritage of Italian culture and declare this association on the streets of Manchester. People disputed with each other and argued freely but carried on making anyway, due in part to an understanding of Italian cultural identity reinforced by the mobilising, assertive charm of Carmel. Her understanding of how to manage the Italians, regardless of how Italian this trait actually was, worked in this context. In Synergy, Tim’s control over people’s work schedules, Penelope’s laidback approach, asking people to come along ‘if they can’, Michael’s unclear making activities in a workshop distant from the café, combined with limited time and disposable incomes of many staff and visitors to use public transport or take time off work to participate, failed to produce a mobilised force and instead reduced participative making to a minimum.

When Penelope emailed Michael with a description of the ‘Synergian’ community, she did so as the Arts Co-ordinator of the charity and when she approved Michael’s
interpretation of the group with his depiction of ‘party rats’, she also did so Arts Co-ordinator. However her perception of Synergy as ‘a bit twee’ also influenced her enthusiasm for the more edgy character of the parade section. As a trainee tattoo artist at the time, as a member of the progressive millennial generation, as an interesting and complex person situated in a particular time and place in geo-historical cultural contexts, her sensibility born from all these factors influenced her reaction to Michael’s drawings and engagement in the parade section development.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION

An ethnographic way to ‘make sense’ of these tangled lives and motivations is through organisational ethnography, which seeks coherence in the inter-relationships among people focused on a collaborative productive activity. Working through the scales of the parade, from the city Council vision of an event to ‘celebrate all things Manchester’, to the parade organisers and artists who work to help realise the ideas of the community groups, to community groups themselves constructed based on shared interests between diverse individuals, there are relational dynamics that run through all their activities. One dynamic is the different roles that people take on, assigned, adopted and interpreted, that make the organisation of a very complex and large-scale event possible. Another dynamic is the nature of collaboration, different kinds of leadership and how comfortable people are with the process. Anthropological coherence into ethnographic engagement with these complex flows can come through analysing a specific, time-delineated event such as the Manchester Day Parade. Comparing the stylistic differences between parade sections over time provides insight into the concentrated coalescences of collaborating individuals within the parade itself. These groups transcend organisational structures while also being bound by them, suggesting an anthropology of organising as a more appropriate way of analysing these social contexts.

At Synergy, the Parade came at a difficult time in their community dynamics and a lack of engagement in the parade section was born from this circumstance. This tension between representation of the café and interpretation of the organisation itself extends Bourdieu’s observation on techniques of representation as discussed
in Chapter 3. He emphasised the features which characterise ‘things’ as gatherings of people. In attempts to ‘re-present’ group activity to the outside world, the emphasis on certain features rather others can bring out underlying assumptions and misunderstandings. Furthermore acknowledging representation of a community group as being just one interpretation of ongoing activity, demonstrates a nuanced understanding of mobile and ever-changing organising processes.
CHAPTER 6: CREATIVITY IS THE ENGINE, IDEAS ARE THE FUEL

“Reference was made to an article about the Manchester International Festival in the Guardian newspaper on the 15 June 2009. The article stated the procession aimed to represent the city’s minority and ‘outsider’ groups and would contain floats of ‘unrepentant smokers’, ‘boy racers’, ‘big issue sellers’ and ‘goths’. The Committee condemned the use of a float with ‘unrepentant smokers’ and was critical of the use of public money to fund the [MIF] parade, which was inconsistent with the Council’s views and policies on smoking.

Members were also critical of the use of "boy racers" in the parade, given that constituents had raised concerns about their dangerous driving habits in residential areas. It was considered that the [MIF] parade did not present a positive image of Manchester and was not in the spirit of cultural diversity. It was agreed that the Committee should send a clear message that public money should not be spent in this way.

There was some discussion around the references in the article to ‘outsider’ groups that were to be represented on the floats. Members commented that these groups were part of Manchester and its wider culture and as such, the article and the procession should not portray them as ‘outsiders’. (Manchester City Council minutes, 16th June 2009).

On 16th June 2009, just a few weeks before Manchester International Festival produced Procession on 5th July 2009, the Communities and Neighbourhoods Overview and Scrutiny Committee at Manchester City Council discussed Manchester Day. ‘CN/09/36 Manchester Day Update Report’ was item six of six matters discussed in the meeting and it neatly encapsulates the relational dynamics radiating from the Manchester Day Parade as an entity embedded in the webs of significance discussed in chapter 4.

The Council members “expressed disappointment” that a previous commitment to “developing the concept of Manchester Day” had not progressed. The council officials clearly responded to this observation since the minutes subsequently note that “the council had engaged with key stakeholders and were (sic) hoping to apply the lessons learned from the organisation of the Procession parade of the
Manchester International Festival”. An article written in a national newspaper, the Guardian, about the planned MIF production of a parade as artwork for the Festival had stimulated a fierce response among Council politicians. Council officials were called to account for their failure to develop a parade as part of Manchester Day and instead there was to be a parade for the Festival with several challenging sections such as “floats of ‘unrepentant smokers’, ‘boy racers’, ‘big issue sellers’ and ‘goths’”. The MIF parade’s premise of celebrating outsiders was itself a challenge to the politicians’ concern with representing Manchester as a place of unity and cultural diversity.

It seems that council preparations for a Manchester Day ‘concept’ had been interrupted by artist Howard’s production of an artwork which celebrated Manchester with a parade that the Council politicians thoroughly disapproved of. Their response was to produce a ‘Manchester Day Parade’ containing elements of Howard’s organisational approach but rather than celebrate outsiders, it would focus on unity and cultural diversity. When commissioned, Walk the Plank as Manchester Day Parade producers were ‘strongly told’ by Council officials that their Parade should not be ‘artist led’ but ‘community led’ (May, Parade Director, Interview 2011).

“A theme is something expansive, open and sitting in, leading you to a world of imagination and complexity and layeredness, rather than literal, closed, specific. It’s also about poetics isn’t it...There are groups who need a bit of a pushing, a little bit of an idea that makes them go, ‘oh, I hadn’t thought about that’. People will tend towards something that is literal and naturalistic, particularly in Britain in the 21st century because they’re fed a diet of TV, and the opportunities for imaginative journeying are more limited...So I think it is our job as artists or an arts organisation to provoke something that goes away from literal and naturalist and towards the poetic, metaphorical, imaginative.” (Parade Director, Interview 2011)

When emphasising ‘opportunities for imaginative journeying’, Parade Director, May described artists as provocateurs pushing people who would otherwise be ‘too
literal or naturalistic’. Similarly Parade Design Co-ordinator, Amelia claimed community groups could not think in a 'big 3D creative way'. For her, the Parade needed artists to achieve a particular level of quality and standard and also to make it “uncomfortable, playful, tricky, not what Councillors think necessarily” (Design Co-ordinator, Interview 2011). However Amelia was also not too enamoured with Procession either. In discussions with community groups during the Manchester Day Parade development she had gained the impression that Procession did not give people enough autonomy to express themselves. Amelia was committed to supporting the development of their ideas rather than the selective (curatorial) process used by Howard for the MIF production.

In this chapter, I draw on artist Michael’s depiction of ideas as ‘kernels of stories’ to explore the differences and similarities in producing Manchester Day Parade and Procession, the Manchester International Festival artwork. When he was making the parade section for Synergy, Michael considered his role to be developing ‘stories’ from the ‘seed idea’ that came from community groups (Interview 2012). By positioning ideas at the centre of the parade production process, it becomes possible to understand how the parade could involve artists but not be an artwork and the Manchester International Festival could present a procession as an artwork but not a parade. Gell’s art object as a ‘vehicle of complicated ideas’, brings these two entities together.

In their analysis of the relationship between art and anthropology, Schneider and Wright (2013) find shared concerns about the involvement of people in art production and in ethnography. The art world's deliberations about participation and collaboration are reminiscent of 1980s anthropology debates over subjectivity. They draw on art critic, Dave Beech's observation that to enter as a participant in an artwork is to enter into a set of social relationships that often have a specific form within which you are required to play a defined role. Involvement in artworks leads to “the simultaneous creation of a particular kind of participant subject” (Schneider and Wright 2013:11)

The parade organisers attempted to move away from people as subjects in an art making process. However the development of ideas into tangible parade-like entities was something artists were skilled at and participants were not. Attempts
to ‘reset’ the dynamics of the artist-community group working relationships by insisting on the idea coming from the group, in many cases reverted to artist-led activity when the making started. The value of art practice lay less in the idea itself and more in the ability to realise the ideas into something which met parameters such as scale, colour, movement on the street on parade day.

As an ‘arts organisation’ Walk the Plank was commissioned by the Council to orchestrate the Parade. They walked a tight rope between satisfying the politicians’ emphasis on a community-led parade and their own commitment to an ‘imaginative journey’ and supporting artists to take people on that journey. While MIF artists pursued their own ideas and were supported by MIF to realise them, Walk the Plank faced the challenge of using Council funding to pay for artist involvement in the parade in the face of politicians’ discontent on how inappropriate artworks ‘use public money’. This involvement was validated by making a call to an artist’s role as ‘creative’. The artists moved through different roles themselves as businesswomen ordering materials, bookkeepers managing receipts, performers alongside parade structures and make-up artists for parade participants. In the parade context, ‘creative’ was a role assigned to them to do a particular kind of work. ‘Providing creativity’ became a useful way of valuing artist contributions to the parade development.

In order to include artists in the parade but not to dictate to participating groups, the Manchester Day Parade producers developed an approach that was ‘artist guided’ rather than ‘artist led’. This became an appropriate compromise between the Council wanting to restrain artist dominance over the parade (so that it would not turn into something like Procession) and parade producers trying to keep artists free to create according to dictates of colour, scale and movement. A satisfactory consensus between Council officials, politicians and Parade producers emerged which put artists in service to community groups as creative guides.

Design Co-ordinator Amelia said that while it was important that “everybody feels encouraged, people also wanted the Parade to be marvellous”. Since people “are not always clear about what they want, sometimes democracy needs control”. For her, the ‘creative layer’ was to generate ‘buzz’, a stimulating atmosphere to make sure people had a great time, and inspire consolidating experiences, especially in
terms of groups from more deprived areas. She sought out artists who were experienced and who understood how to get the best out of these groups. The artists needed to be supportive and nurturing as well as controlling the section development. For Amelia it took “a lot of juggling to get people in the right place” (Amelia, Interview 2011). In MIF, the artist was given freedom to develop their ideas as appropriate, in the Parade artists negotiated a tricky path of being both supporting and challenging (although Howard did also need to be supportive of the community groups to persuade them to participate in Procession). This requirement was further complicated by Council politicians wanting artists to help community groups realise their ideas without any provocation. They were looking for a representation of the city, rather than an interpretation of it.

The following discussion brings these negotiations to light and helps make sense of underlying assumptions about creativity. During the parade development, May and Laurie, the parade producer, would meet up for parade planning meetings with Council officials at the large rented building just outside the centre of Manchester where many Council staff worked during the renovation of the town hall buildings. We would sit in plush offices overlooking the city landscape as officials from the Press Office, community engagement and the Events management team came in and out at different times, consecutive meetings blurring into one. There was a friendly atmosphere as they discussed the challenges in delivering the Parade.

At one planning meeting in particular, May, Laurie and Terence, the Council press officer discussed the politicians’ preoccupation with ‘celebrating all things Manchester’. The Council politicians would often follow a description of a parade section with the question, ‘And how is this relevant to Manchester?’ May was concerned that overly focusing on the city itself was too restrictive and would say so to the politicians. The parade organisers would often discuss how to rhetorically position the Parade to fit with the politicians’ requirements, who they met at the more formal Steering Committee meetings once every few weeks.

During this particular planning meeting, the parade organisers were discussing the politicians’ focus on how sections needed to be about Manchester and May said “we can’t tell the community to be about Manchester”. Terence, the press officer clarified “it’s not ‘about Manchester’, it is ‘giving a sense of what it means to be
Mancunian”. Laurie pointed out that a celebration of 150 years for a particular group is not necessarily about Manchester and then said “because it’s creative, it’s subjective”. Terence replied, “it isn’t about creative, it’s internal. What it means to be Mancunian, to come together”.

By emphasising ‘what it means to be Mancunian’, Terence, May and Laurie settled upon a rhetoric that would resonate both with the politicians, who wanted the Parade to be about Manchester’s history and activities, and the parade producers, who wanted to give community groups freedom to interpret the parade theme more broadly. Laurie made a call to the ‘subjective’ nature of being ‘creative’; the press officer reposted that it was not creative, it was ‘internal’. By the end of the meeting, they had reached consensus that part of an internal sense of ‘being Mancunian’ was to express one’s identity on the streets of Manchester in whichever form suited most. This approach is resonant with parades in other cities, as discussed in Chapter 3, where civic pride was a key motivating factor for public expression.

The difference between Laurie and the press officer’s interpretations were subtle. Laurie was focused on the freedom of expression for a community group based in Manchester, to celebrate their presence in the city without being about the city. Terence was focused on an inner sense of ‘being Mancunian’ which he saw as distinct and separate. This contrast echoes the differences between approaches in the Manchester Day Parade and the Manchester International Festival. The Festival sought to enable artists to explore what it is to be in society without being about society. Procession was actually an exploration of what it meant to be ‘outside’ mainstream society, hence the use of the term ‘outsider’. Since the Parade requested by the Council officials focused on expressing what it meant to be Mancunian and was intended to emphasise unity and diversity, the notion of being in or out was not acceptable. The Council focus lay on a literal representation of the city by its citizens rather than an interpretation of their urban experience.

This contrast reflects the argument outlined in Chapter 2 made by creativity analyst, Charlie Leadbeater to the Manchester leaders on how to support all their citizens to engage in cultural activities as productive and satisfying endeavours (Leadbeater 2009). He argued that “by culture we do not mean Manchester’s offer
of art and music, but the wider sense of people’s values, especially their aspiration and ambitions, how they get things done, and especially, how they collaborate” (Leadbeater 2009:16). Drawing on this insight, civic attempts to use artists to produce a parade to represent the city risked missing an opportunity for artists to help interpret, or try to make sense of, people’s values and experiences as part of the city.

May’s statement that she preferred to ‘go away from literal and naturalist’ towards ‘poetic and imaginative’ suggests emphasis on the interpretation of an idea rather than representation of a group. This approach is similar to Gell’s depiction of art objects as “vehicles of complicated ideas, intended to achieve or mean something interesting, difficult, allusive, hard to bring off etc” (Gell 1996:36) as discussed further in the Introduction and Chapter 4. It seems that art objects may be created when going from representation towards interpretation. I argue that guidance on how to make this transition was sought from artists and referred to as ‘creativity’.

In interview, the Council Press Officer, Terence presented artists as both people who could ‘come up’ with creativity and ‘bring it out’:

“We deliberately made the theme vague so it could mean any number of things and there was a group in Wythenshawe where the young people themselves came up with this idea of Gulliver’s travels because I think the film had just come out and they wanted to build this massive Gulliver. So this idea to have a great big Gulliver made and pulled along was not us telling them, ‘this is what you do’. It wasn’t the artists telling them ‘this what you do’, it was a young people’s group that said well, “why don’t we do that”. So it was about people using their creativity or creative ideas, then working with organisations. So we’ve got community groups, we’ve got the artists, who are kind of coming up with the creativity, to bring that creativity out”.

Terence also suggested artists help make ideas tangible.

“Because, there’s no point in you being the most creative person in the world, but you have to deliver. There’s lots of great ideas with this parade, it’s really creative this parade, but true creativity means that there is a parade, you know. You can be really creative you know, with jet packs to the moon, but if
that doesn’t end up with something on the street that people enjoy, then you are wasting your time. So for my mind, there’s no point in being creative if it’s not going to actually deliver something”

At the same time, he also recognised the collaborative emergent process in making the parade.

“And yeah, lots of people want to claim credit for Manchester Day as in any good creative idea, but in many respects it sort-of grew, you know, it grew organically, there were lots of things that came into play.”

Parade Producer, Laurie described community groups from the previous year to the politicians as 'more confident and skilled...they already want to talk in February about their creative ideas” (4 months before parade day). In discussing whether to include charities in the Parade, she also said that it was easy to say no to them as it is a “creative parade - charities can participate as long as they do it in a creative way e.g. dress as stars”. When asked about the legacy of the parade, Laurie said:

“The legacy is in their [community groups’] confidence in being able to go off and do things themselves outside of the parade and create their own things, you know, locally to them and it also gives the way forward for people getting involved next year, starting to create projects, getting more people involved in their centres or in their groups as part of that, so this becomes a focus in a way, an enabling thing ... because as you know some of those projects started 4 or 5 months before the parade, it’s a good thing for them to hook onto and then skill up other people and lots of people have the confidence to do something they have never done before and feel very proud of it.”

For Laurie and Terence therefore artists were valued for their ability to ‘bring out’ an internalised, hidden or unrealised creativity, particularly to give people confidence to realise ideas themselves. This confidence lay in interpreting their own lives and activities and learning processes for expressing this interpretation in a parade-like way.

When I asked parade participants to define creativity in interview, there was a remarkable consistency - creativity was seen to reside in all people, ‘It comes out of
a person, it is already there. You can’t force it. It is in every person and every place.’ (Volunteer manager). It was a collaborative and joint activity. ‘A multitude of people working on what each wants it to be. From the smallest involvement of a child doing stapling to a huge beautiful thing – it all has to happen on the smallest and largest scale. Creativity lies in leaping in, not knowing what you are going to do.’ (Project manager). It was a process with a tangible outcome. ‘A process with an end result. Something about enrichment, realising you can do something you couldn’t before, releasing something always within you, realising something...you don’t learn anything, you just realise you know it’. (Project manager). An essential aspect of being human. ‘An ability to make new things from old things, physical or conceptual. Aren’t we all creative, isn’t that the nature of being human?’ (Production Manager).

Among these descriptions resides an understanding of creativity as something ‘within you’ that comes out and shapes the generation of ‘new things’. It seems that the artist provided an enabling service, supporting others to ‘bring their creativity out’. The artist did this by ‘pushing’ people along on an ‘imaginative journey’. As Ingold observes, “it is in the binding together of lines, not in the connecting of points, that the mesh is constituted” (Ingold 2009:38). Creativity as a process rather than an attribute allows for tangled relations to take particular shapes and not others. Returning to Sennett’s observation on cooperation as “an exchange in which the participants benefit from the encounter” (Sennett 2012:5), attention to turning ideas into tangible entities enables a productive focus on output where creativity is a way of thinking through the generative process rather than a character trait held by certain individuals.

PARADE ARTISTS AS ‘CREATIVE GUIDES’

As discussed in the Introduction, ‘artist’ was a role category assigned to particular people working freelance for Walk the Plank. They were introduced to community groups, to the Council, to me and in publicity material as ‘parade artists’. They were drawn from a wide network of freelancers who worked regularly with Walk the Plank, as well as others who applied through a recruitment process specifically for the parade. I spent months working alongside several of these artists and found a commonality of approach similar to the attitudes of the parade organisers themselves. This was characterised by an intractability on problems and issues, a
willingness to explore and use alternatives, open-mindedness, a determination to deliver regardless and a making process that relied on both structure and serendipity – using processes to produce work but at the same time willing to go with chance occurrences or circumstances that arose.

However I also found that while the parade producers referred to these people as ‘artists’, most did not self-identify in that way. Many had theatre backgrounds and described themselves as prop-makers or makers of costumes or special effects. Several were community artists, making a living through work in schools and community centres. Others were musicians, students or worked in bars. Most combined different kinds of paid work both within and outside art and making realms. A few self-presented as artists in some contexts and not others - Niamh was a maker performer, Trisha was a textile artist, Ian reworked old furniture. The two people from London, brought in to ‘elevate’ the parade quality were also ambiguous in their artist identities. Nina did not have an artist qualification but had worked her way up in the parade world by apprenticing with a famous parade maker in Trinidad. Michael had worked initially in fashion and theatre design before developing his preferred art practice. He combined producing commissioned work for public display with exploring his own interest in ‘birth, life and decay’. These people worked in an ‘artist’ role and their purpose was to lead on the ‘making’ of parade sections. As I discuss in the Introduction, ‘making’ referred to the transition from idea into real, tangible entities, a process guided by artists.

Whether they self-described as artists or not, the parade artists I encountered had a very similar making process. They worked with community groups to interpret their ideas into sketches and then structures and costumes, incorporating parade requirements around scale, colour and movement. In her analysis of the artistry of leadership, management theorist, Sharon Parks claims that ‘the artist necessarily works in a profoundly interdependent relationship with the medium—paint, stone, clay, a musical instrument, an orchestra, a tennis court, a slalom run, or food’ (Parks 2005:210). She asserts that if a leader, like an artist, ‘can understand the nature of the system that needs to be mobilized (the underlying structure and patterns of motion), he or she can become artfully adept at intervening in ways that are more rather than less likely to have a positive effect in helping the group
to move to a new place, creating a new reality’ (ibid). The label ‘artist’ in the parade was a term used to identify people who would help interpret ideas and then use strategies drawn from art practice to work with ideas, community groups, materials and emerging circumstances.

The artists sat in a web of relationships between the project manager, community groups, sources of materials, inspirations and other artists. As discussed in Chapter 4, the making process for the parade section started very open and fluid. Firstly an artist was paired with an idea submitted in the ‘application process’ and its associated community group by Amelia, the Design Co-ordinator, in discussion with May, Parade Director and Laurie, Parade Producer, all from Walk the Plank. This trio considered factors such as making practices, communication skills, temperament and any requests made by the groups themselves when matching a group with an artist. The artist researched the community group behind the idea (usually via internet) and considered different ways in which it could be realised. At this point they usually sketched out some drawings. They would meet with the group members to show their drawings (sometimes several options, other times just one sketch). They might also have photos and examples of their previous work, swatches of fabric and other materials to show. A few artists would wait and produce drawings after they met with the group.

In some cases, the initial idea was translated relatively quickly into a drawing which became the basis upon which the parade structure was developed. For Bob, once the idea was finalised, his responsibility was to produce something that ‘looked like the drawing’.

“From the start of the job, you need to know that they know what they’re expecting. I think a drawing is probably the easiest, most straightforward way of doing it and then they understand what they’re going to get and you understand what they understand they’re going to get. And then at the end of it, if you give them what they’re expecting, then everyone’s happy” (Bob, 2011).

In other cases, the idea had a slower transition. The artist discussed the group’s objectives, their intentions and the story behind the idea. This led to new interpretations of the group’s proposed idea which may or may not have
resembled the initial application form. As described in Chapter 5, tension emerged when understandings differed, such as the disconnect between the Christian minister Tim’s expectation of superheroes for Synergy and the artist Michael’s subsequent development of party rats. Michael took his cue from Penelope’s interpretation rather than the original idea described in the application form. Bob’s emphasis on making the structure look like the drawing was his attempt to ensure people were not surprised by the end result. However as I found out when I helped Bob make the train, the process through which the final structure ended up like the drawing was still open and the making was adaptive and responsive to the materials.

In Year Two, I worked mainly for Bob. I was project manager for the development of the Sponsorz Chinese style train which provided an excuse to hang around and help Bob with his various jobs, from painting the silver figurehead of the leading ship structure before it was mounted onto a lorry, to attaching bamboo to hold up the giant Gulliver's massive hands. As project manager for the Sponsorz section, I also attended most of the planning sessions in the development of their ideas. For the first group meeting in 2011, I cycled over to their offices in a large white modernist building just outside Manchester city centre. May, Laurie and Amelia had gathered together with about 20 people from Sponsorz and from a Manchester museum, also sponsored by them. May gave a lively presentation about the parade in the previous year and talked them through the Voyage of Discovery theme for that year. Then she invited ideas from the room. Silence. It seemed that people were not sure who had the authority in this context. Who was responsible for producing the idea for the parade section? A senior figure who authorised the sponsoring of both the parade and the museum spoke up, suggesting different forms of transport. More people in the room contributed. The sponsors were an engineering services organisation and had recently won a contract to supply trains to a rail company. A train quickly became established as a primary idea. They also talked about their work in power generation and transmission. Someone suggested wind turbines and power stations. Each time someone said something, Amelia and May would agree and combine the idea with the other ones being suggested. Gradually consensus built over a ‘cityscape’ showing how power was used in cities in different contexts. A Sponsorz employee, later introduced as ‘our artist’, held up
a sketch he had just produced which showed a wind turbine sitting on a hill with a train emerging from a tunnel underneath, and a power station and electricity pylons in the background. This process was reminiscent of the adaptive, fluid idea development described in Chapter 4 as a form of flow.

At a subsequent smaller meeting with Amelia and Bob, the Walk the Plank artist, the Sponserz sketch came out again with several more sketches showing people dressed as traffic lights, wind turbines, power stations and electricity pylons. During this meeting, the staff also requested that the train was made in the ‘style of a Chinese dragon’ - lightweight and held up by bamboo poles so they could move it around easily. In response, Bob created a drawing of the train, using bright blue and silver colours and Amelia suggested training by a local Chinese martial arts centre on how to give the train the dynamism of a Chinese dragon. Over several weeks, the idea built up in layers, with different people contributing. Some suggestions were not picked up, usually for reasons of scale or practicality in the making process. For example, early on in the idea development, I suggested making a cross section of the train, which Bob said would be too detailed and not easy enough to ‘read’ on the street.

Bob used these drawings and ideas to develop the train, adapting the making process to the materials’ capacities. He made a train shape from fibreglass rods tied into hoops and connected together to form a tunnel shape, with bamboo poles holding up each hoop. He commissioned another maker to produce a shiny blue fabric with silver windows to overlay the structure. The Sponserz engineers helped out on two ‘making days’ with activities such as gluing cardboard circles together to make wheels and learning how to make the train move under guidance of experienced Chinese dragon operator, Mr Chang. The sketches formed the basis of costumes created by Sophie, a textile artist and the Sponserz staff came with their families for costume fittings. Sophie’s designs were wonderful, playful representations – the wind turbines wore white tabards and leggings together with cycle helmets with large white spokes attached; the power stations were two fibreglass hoops connected by padded brown nylon and worn with two straps over the shoulders. On parade day, the Sponserz people gathered on the street to enact the vision that emerged in that first meeting, the combined work of many people involved.
At each stage, the Walk the Plank organisers and artists encouraged the Sponserz staff to think more broadly about the ideas in development, to step back from literal interpretations and consider the spirit of the idea. The facilitating role of engineering in a city was an abstraction of the organisation's activities; the 'Chinese dragon' style interpreted the movement and energy of the train whilst also making it light and portable. It was hard to tell where the suggestions originated as the people would 'riff' off each other, the idea building and developing through discussions both in meetings, via email, phone and through insights with individuals in meditative moments such as washing dishes or on the toilet. During the making process, Amelia advised the Sponserz staff to wait until Bob had some 'tangible lumps' (her term) before coming to the workshop. Bob's role in this process was to create something specific out of the ideas generated, drawing from his own imagination and field of practice. It was this conversion from idea to tangible reality that was a critical part of the artists' contribution.

**IDEAS AND CREATIVITY**

May emphasised that the 'job' of artists and arts organisations was to provoke 'something towards the poetic, metaphorical, imaginative'. The theme in Year Two was 'A Voyage of Discovery' and it also provided a metaphor for the parade making process. At formation meetings where May constructed an image of the parade by talking through it, she held the room gripped with her vivid description of the parade. It would start with a galleon, similar to the ship on the Manchester coat of arms\(^{53}\), surrounded by mermaids, waves and fish. These would be followed by explorers and discoverers – Aztecs, Indians, Arctic explorers reflecting points on the globe. The discovery section focused on people and culture, with Jasmine tea and chopsticks for China and Garibaldi, the unifier of Italy on his horse. Medical discoveries – a beating heart and a massive hospital bed would follow. Scientific discovery was represented by DNA molecules and environmental figures. Flight and time travel, discovery in the air, was represented by the Wright brothers and HG Wells followed by Gulliver as an explorer from literature. Personal discovery

---

\(^{53}\) The Manchester 'coat of arms' is a distinctive 'heraldic' emblem found above fireplaces in Manchester Town Hall, on documentation and other formal representations of the city. Initially, the politicians queried the ship idea as Manchester is not a coastal city. Then they were reminded of the ship on the coat of arms which was introduced to commemorate the building of the Manchester Ship Canal. Other motifs include worker bees which are also found on the main mosaic floor in the town hall and cottongrass which refers to Manchester's textile history as 'Cottonopolis'. The Council politicians and officials were very aware of the city's history, especially its critical status during the Industrial Revolution.
would come via the tree of life. The description changed as the configuration changed.

Each stage of the parade development combined these emerging ideas which gained detail and became physically tangible as parade day drew near. May described this as an imaginative journey, progressing from an initial strapline, ‘A Voyage of Discovery’, populated by ideas from the community groups and then developed and embellished by artists. The ‘job’ of the artists was to keep these ideas open to ‘push’ people towards things that they hadn’t thought about already. Their challenge lay in trying to maintain the integrity of the idea from the community group.

Previous chapters developed the Manchester Day Parade as a viable field for anthropological analysis. The parade works as an art object embedded in a web of relations, formed through intersecting flows, shaped by the different organisational context from whence they came. The parade was a crystallised form of these relationships which has its own effect on people and circumstances. The emphasis on realising ideas appeared throughout fieldwork and the role of artists and creativity were wrapped up in these expectations. People identified as ‘artists’ provided the role of ‘creative guides’ to help realise the ‘ideas’ of ‘the community’, a public brought into being by Council officials to ‘celebrate all things Manchester’. This was achieved by orienting around the ‘ideas’ involved in making parade. The parade itself, the theme and each section started as ideas to be realised on the streets of Manchester. May aimed to encourage people to have ideas that were ‘layered and complex’. She sought out artists to bring their experience and understanding of how to develop ideas to the groups and people in the parade, who she considered tended towards the ‘literal and naturalistic’. In Year Three, when May clashed with the Council politicians over their proposed theme of a ‘City of Heroes’, she used the argument that people would be too literal, arguing that ‘no-one wanted a parade full of David Beckhams’. ‘The Sky’s the Limit...a celebration of heroic achievements’ as an alternative theme provided more room to manoeuvre in the development of ideas. This call to the realm of ‘poetics’, or making with imagination was a place where artists were represented as comfortable to roam.
As discussed in Chapter 4, a critical characteristic of the parade development was the organisers’ ability to approach boundaries and obstacles as parameters in a creative ‘flow’, working with, around, over or through them. Contemplation of both the overall idea of the parade and the individual ideas within, was a critical part of the ‘knitting’ process (Amelia’s term), combining these flows to produce a sense of this city called Manchester. Artists and art organisations, comfortable with working in imaginative spaces, helped make a parade which was not too ‘literal and naturalistic’ by using idea development as the organising process. Their assignation of artists as creative guides to realise ideas into tangible ‘lumps’ for the Manchester Day Parade provided a conceptual frame through which artistic experience could be incorporated into the Parade production.

Furthermore, through discussions with organisers and artists in the Manchester International Festival, a comparative insight emerges in the emphasis on ideas as the point of orientation in both the Parade and the Festival. Both were arts organisations committed to the realisation of ideas into events in the city of Manchester, as well as further afield. The situation of artists as enabling the successful realisation of ideas in both the Parade and Manchester International Festival provides insight into what is meant by creativity in different contexts. In particular, artists’ capacity to help interpret ideas into something tangible is the creative element valued so highly by others. Where stylistic differences in the Manchester Day Parade and Procession were evident in the parade making process, as discussed in another chapter, the orientation around ideas as a driving force reveals stylistic similarities and perhaps indicates why both events were situated in realms of art and creativity albeit in different ways. The interpretation of ideas into tangible reality approached in an adaptable and emergent way becomes an indication of what it means to be creative.

It is useful to consider the organisational contexts of Walk the Plank and the Manchester International Festival to contrast how artists were expected to work with ideas. It seems that both organisations approached their practice around ‘the idea’. There was also an emphasis on artwork as relational, the art happening in the moment it is experienced rather than in the object or the artist (Bourriaud, Pleasance et al. 2002). Howard’s artwork Procession which preceded the Manchester Day Parade was born out of this kind of practice. Indeed his work is
commonly cited as an example of socially engaged practice (Bishop 2012) an art movement focused on public engagement. However, as discussed in Chapter 4, while the parade producers recognised Procession as an artwork, they did not represent their event as artwork even though it involved artists.

My interviews with the MIF Director, producers and artists in addition to Manchester Day Parade organisers and participants unlocked this “authorial puzzle” (Macdonald 2002:93). In the Festival, the artists’ ideas took centre stage and the Festival mobilised around delivering on the artistic vision. This approach produced Procession, an artwork which looked similar to the Parade but was actually underpinned by a different process of making where the participants were ‘enveloped’ within the artist’s vision. Steve, MIF’s Executive Producer described his role as to ‘work closely with the artist, work with shaping the idea creatively, making sure it stayed true to the original vision and that the ideas did not get lost’ (Interview 2011).

In his account of how Procession came about, Steve described how Doug, Chief Executive of a Manchester contemporary art gallery was inspired by the Las Fallas parade in Valencia where people parade with large sculptures and then burn them54. Together they went to Valencia and ‘started to think’ about artists who could deliver this in Manchester. However as a ‘curatorial idea’, not led by an artist, it was ‘not a good starting point’ so they ‘took a step back’. Instead they decided to look for an artist who worked in the ‘public domain’ and was used to engaging with people. They sought out Howard and talked to him without pushing their own ideas on him. For Steve, this was important learning for MIF – ‘do not think of the idea before talking to the artist’. Howard was ‘already interested in post-industrial towns in the North’ with strong music scenes and their initial discussions lay around how to picture the city through music. However since ‘Howard likes talking to people’ this idea was too limiting and so it ‘transmogrified into Procession’.

(Steve and Doug, Interviews 2011).

Howard worked closely with Diana, a Producer from Manchester International Festival who had previously worked on several art projects that involved local people and had been recommended to the MIF team. As Producer, Diana was

54 http://www.valencia-cityguide.com/tourist-information/leisure/festivals/the-fallas.html
responsible for overseeing the development of the idea together with Howard. For Diana, the main difference between *Procession* and Manchester Day Parade was that *Procession* 'was Howard's project'. He was the lead artist who interpreted the whole thing, 'it was his manifestation really'. She continued,

"While May was about giving ownership to people participating in the parade, in *Procession*, even though people were very much representing themselves, they were all enveloped within, represented through Howard's eyes. I mean he didn't want them to pretend to be anything other than who they were, but he effectively curated that representation of Manchester." (Diana, 2011)

The emphasis on developing an idea, taking inspiration and influence from different places and responding adaptively and iteratively to the production process is similar to the Manchester Day Parade, but in MIF's case, the artist controlled the whole process. The Parade, established by politicians partly in opposition to *Procession*, emphasised the ideas of Manchester communities. Artists were still mobilised and involved but they were asked to realise the community groups' ideas rather than their own.

However, while the initial idea may have come from the community, this idea was very much a starting point. The development of parade sections into something tangible required many more steps to realise and these actions were led by the 'assisting' artists. The following section contrasts the emergence of *Procession* and the development of the Manchester Day Parade to explore how the artists' role in the parade lay in their determination and expertise for developing ideas into something particular.

**CONTROL OVER IDEAS**

The distributed ownership of the making processes in the parade contrasts sharply with the approach to making in the Manchester International Festival. *Procession*, the Manchester International Festival 'artwork' that preceded this parade in 2010 had a similar configuration of artist + participants + project management as the Manchester Day Parade and yet is represented as an artwork, within artist Howard's repertoire and formed part of his 'retrospective' in 2012, a standard
artist exhibition tradition reflecting back on an existing body of work. There is a distinct difference between how Howard as an artist was presented and understood and the Manchester Day Parade artists. The former was the idea-originator for an artwork, the latter recruited to support others to realise their ideas. Yet the production process was remarkably similar.

The Festival followed similar processes as the Manchester Day Parade in helping realise ideas into tangible entities, drawing on inspiration, working with people and materials, producing something impressive with movement, scale and grandeur. I also interviewed Albert, Artistic Director of Manchester International Festival several times over an 18 month period. He described the ‘joy’ of his job was to look around the world at people at the top of their game and ask them ‘what’s your dream project, what do you want to do?’ When working with artists like Howard, MIF ‘put a team around them’ – researchers and producers to ‘provide resource and intelligence to make it happen’ (Albert, Interview 2011). Albert saw his role as an enabler, creating space around artists, listening to them, being honest, paying attention to details and ‘not letting people be derailed by politics or good intentions’. His own talent was for ‘framing things’, creating contexts which emphasised and highlighted the work itself through discussion with artists, putting people together and finding the right venues and spaces. His orientation focused very much on realising ideas of artists themselves, rather than realising others’ ideas and using artists to facilitate the process.

Lileth and Gerald, whose activities are outlined briefly below, were evidently focused on developing their own ideas. Lileth’s MIF production brought together several well-known artists for a play which explored her life of a performance artist. In the play, Lileth performed the role of her mother and re-enacts her strict and brutal childhood experiences as the daughter of two partisans, national heroes in the Second World War. Lileth was famous for her challenging artworks which often involved self-harming or long endurance, such as washing animal bones, cutting a star in her stomach or staring at people for long periods as part of a performance piece. I travelled to Antwerp to spend the day with her as she prepared to perform in the touring MIF play. She described the sparse and disturbing production as “a cleaning up, seeing things in a good way”, freeing her
from her childhood troubles. She was also focused on working through her own ideas and inspirations. When asked ‘what drives you to do your art’, she replied

“Something that came from my upbringing is an extremely strong sense of sacrifice. I have a very strong feeling that I am here on purpose. I have a purpose. I have a function to do and I have not much time to do it...I want to sacrifice everything to give a message to something which really elevates spirit.”

Lileth had a clear sense of direction about her art practice and focused on provoking and challenging people through her work. She buzzed with ideas about different activities, her new long endurance retreat in upstate New York, a project in development, as well as where she went for inspiration and relaxation to recover from the intensity of her work. She had such a clear focus on realising her own ideas and ambitions, it seemed obvious that she would not be interested in developing others’.

Similarly Gerald, founder of an ‘immersive theatre company’ with two MIF commissioned productions, explained in interview that ‘unless I initiate something, I don’t engage.’ He dreamt of creating a theatrical experience which one could “experience by yourself”. His immersive productions situated the audience in the action rather than observing from seats. He had many ideas for different theatrical productions and worked by finding the right physical space and then ‘the building carves out the version it wants’. He would walk around prospective buildings, letting them lead him and thinking about where was safest, where was dangerous, where were the corners and nooks, what was the natural flow. For him it was an ‘organic process’ to which he let himself go (Gerald, Interview 2011). His MIF production on a building site in Salford took people in groups of 20 on a journey through a set to help find Dr Who’s crashed time machine.

The emphasis among people from the Manchester International Festival was very much on their own ideas as entities to tap into, give themselves over to and allow themselves to follow. The Manchester International Festival encouraged artists to follow through on their visions and positioned its organisational structure around an emphasis on the artists’ intentions. Yet in the same way that Howard took his inspiration from the Manchester communities and worked with people to visually
represent themselves, artist Michael sought to combine the many ideas coming from the community group and other artists. In the figure below which I drew as he spoke, he described a continuum between art and design. He situated the Manchester Day Parade in the middle, “slightly closer to the art end” as it was someone else’s commission but he had the opportunity to express his ideas within it (Michael, Interview 2012).

Michael's art and design spectrum

Michael worked on projects across this spectrum, both developing his own and producing work based on specifications by others. Whether focused on developing an existing brief or on his own work, he made something tangible out of an idea, something which met the parameters involved. For the parade, he combined ideas and descriptions from Penelope about Synergy with ‘assistant’ artists, Niamh, Ian and his own to develop a story for the parade with colours, shapes and details providing the scale, movement and dynamism required for an effective and exciting parade. The making process was split according to the expertise of the three artists involved. Niamh already had substantial expertise in making parade sections particularly anthropomorphic forms using wicker, fibreglass rods, padding and latex. Ian worked well with wood. While Michael was nominated lead artist, he repeatedly emphasised learning from Niamh, Ian and other artists.

Fieldwork in the workshop with artists making parade sections revealed a similar adaptive approach as Gerald’s in responsiveness to materials, letting them ‘carve out’ the versions they want. There was also passion and commitment from parade artists who sought to ‘elevate the spirit’ similar to Lileth’s commitment. The parade organisers themselves used an adaptive approach in developing the parade shape. It is more appropriate to situate the differences between the parade artists and the MIF artists in organisational approaches to their activities, rather than between the artists themselves.
Using Michael’s spectrum, differences between the Manchester Day Parade and Manchester International Festival lay in the extent to which artists were given freedom to develop their ideas, the perceived genesis of those ideas and the process through which they worked them out. Since artists relied on organisational structures to support their activities, the organisation shaped their developing work. Many of the parade artists would relish the opportunity to have a team put around them to realize their own ideas and visions, perhaps to create a vision or projection of themselves in order to confront or challenge social values, as Lileth did; interpret how a building might come to life, as Gerald did; or challenge assumptions of representation like Howard.

### Comparison of MIF and MDP development process involving artists

In her analysis of participatory art practice, Bishop observes that “the worlds of music, theatre, film literature, fashion and theatre have a rich vocabulary to describe co-existing authorial positions (director, author, performer, editor, producer, casting agent, sound engineer, stylist, photographer), all of which are regarded as essential to the creative realisation of a given project.” (Bishop 2012:9). Walk the Plank, whose origins lie in street theatre and performance, drew their working arrangement from a structure where the final result is recognised as collaboration between many different people. Even though the development of Procession was similarly collaborative, the final artwork was framed as Howard’s vision. Contemporary artists end up positioned at the centre of their work, others’ participation in the making process made invisible when the work emerges into the public realm, even though artists “continually engage in dialogue and creative negotiation with other people” (ibid).

This approach invokes the role of gifted individuals revealing what is sensed by the community - “the creative individual expands the community’s awareness of itself” (Hastrup 2001:40). The artwork resides in the social engagement (Arnold 1983) and the artist plays the role of creating tangible experiences and metaphors which
provide the community with an opportunity to reflect on itself. In the Manchester International Festival, artists were supported to reveal their interpretation and understanding of a world through self-expression, developing their own narrative into a tangible entity which can be shared by others. In the Manchester Day Parade, artists supported community groups to share their sense of themselves, with the artists drawing on their own repertoire of inspiration, ideas and experiences to develop a tangible entity that seeks to express and represent the community. The purpose or intention of the activity drove how the artist role was manifested and represented but the end result was something tangible, visible for others to witness and experience.

The parade artist’s role was to guide the development of an idea, working with a sense of scale, colour and movement as parameters. Their contribution ranged from the early discussions on how to conceptualise the representation sought by the community group to deciding how and where to apply a brush, make a cut, structure a wooden frame. This sensitivity to possibilities, limits and boundaries was their role in the parade production process and what Walk the Plank protected in their discussions with the Council politicians. Furthermore, as discussed in Chapter 4, Walk the Plank also worked with parameters in the development of the Parade itself, either working around them or finding ways of getting through them. The success of production resided both in an awareness of parameters and a proactive method for surmounting them.

CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION

People involved in Manchester Day Parade and Manchester International Festival both put ‘making ideas happen’ at the centre of their activities. In the Parade, artists oriented their activities around ideas submitted by community groups for what they wanted to happen on parade day. While the Council were focused on representations of these groups, the artists encouraged interpretations of the community groups’ values and interests. In the Manchester International Festival, the organisation oriented itself around artists and their ideas and interpretations of life, particularly questions and problems they want to interrogate through art practice. In both cases, the organisers situated these ideas as part of a creative process in which they engaged. Steve, MIF Executive Producer contributed to the
idea development 'creatively', Amelia, MDP Design Co-ordinator needed artists to think in a 'big 3D creative way'. For them, creativity was a generative process, a productive activity which led to an end result that met certain criteria.

In part to protect the parade artists' contribution from doubting politicians, Walk the Plank emphasised the artists' role as 'creative'. As demonstrated in Leach's analysis of creativity as residing in the 'intellectual' domain in Western contexts (Leach 2005), for as long as emphasis on the development of ideas rest on the individual seen to initiate the project, then distinctions can be maintained between those who are creative and those who are not. However when there is an emphasis on the collective and collaborative nature of shared projects, the important role of the artist as 'idea champion' can be maintained, but a sense of creativity can be distributed across everyone involved in the activity. The Manchester Day Parade, in its distributed nature, takes some steps towards delivering on this potential.

By approaching creativity as an adaptive process, it is possible to incorporate the multiple perspectives developed in anthropology. It fits with Hastrup's creativity as new possibilities (Hastrup 2007), with Ingold's representation of creativity as improvisation (Ingold and Hallam 2007), with Leach's comparison between Euro-American exclusivity and the dispersed creativity found among Nskini speakers (Leach 2004). In the Manchester International Festival, artists were supported to reveal their interpretation and understanding of a world through self-expression, developing their own narrative into a tangible entity which could be shared by others. In the Manchester Day Parade, artists supported community groups to share their sense of themselves, with the artists drawing on their own repertoire of inspiration, ideas and experiences to develop a tangible entity that sought to interpret and therefore represent the community. But also in Manchester City Council, officials and politicians adapted to regulatory, financial, organisational and interpersonal challenges in stimulating economic development and social cohesion in Manchester first through infrastructure development and then through cultural production.

In this way creativity becomes an approach, or engine, used to develop ideas, or fuel. Parade artists, MIF artists and, council officials work creativity to mobilise their own or others’ ideas using the skills they have developed to respond
productively to circumstances as they arise. These ideas provide kernels or seed stories to narratively shape the emergent entities. The realisation of ideas into tangible reality leads to compromises and these compromises are culturally and contextually determined, feeding the dynamics of the process and shaping the end result.
CONCLUSION: ON CREATIVITY

Throughout this thesis, I have contemplated understandings of creativity both as an emic term among parade makers in Manchester and as an analytic term used by anthropologists. In particular, I noted how parade makers employed creativity as a way of introducing an adaptive, free-flowing interpretive process to designing the parade, rather than a prescriptive, deterministic approach.

As the only major event in Manchester produced directly by the City Council, the parade celebrated 'Manchester Day' and combined efforts from Council officials, arts organisations, private sponsors, freelance artists and community groups to produce large-scale parade sections, comprising structures and costumed people, dancing and performing to music and song on one single day in June. In 2011-2, I spent 18 months as an anthropologist working with people as they put on the parade, contributing as a project manager, artist and community member in the parade itself. By situating the Manchester Day Parade as an art object, I analysed how it emerged from cultural contexts whilst not being singly representative of any. I considered how attempts to 'make' culture in the city were absorbed and reinterpreted in unexpected ways.

As one participant put it, parade is 'an opportunity for imaginative journeying'. This analysis took its own parade through the streets of Manchester, into the halls of power and the civic spaces where people gathered, into the workshop where the parade was brought into being and into the imaginations of the communities encouraged and engaged by the Council to celebrate 'all things Manchester'. Analysis showed how ambitious city politicians initiated the event and exerted power over the parade shape and direction. It also showed how an arts organisation insisted on certain parameters to ensure a quality experience.

This thesis found that orienting the parade around 'ideas' was an effective way of structuring collaborative activity. While seeking to realise ideas such as the parade themes or interpretations and representations of community groups, people transcended organisational structures while also being bound by them. Throughout the parade, the way in which ideas were developed relied on the relational dynamics across organisations and the roles people played within them. These contestations, negotiations and conflicted views nevertheless still managed
to produce a successful parade each year. In this context, creativity was an adaptive process aimed at achieving something tangible, a final result which everyone could value (for whatever reasons). Ownership of this kind of creative output was dispersed of necessity. It was neither one person's vision nor the vision of one group.

This analysis has also shown that creativity is problematic as an analytical term because it is so value-laden. The term creativity is picked up and used without proper consideration of what is actually meant by it. What is constituted as creative or as creativity, always changes according to priorities and values, not only in the field but in analysis also. When anthropologists, policy makers, government bodies and others employ terms such as creative and creativity, their underlying assumptions need to be interrogated. In particular, people rely on organisational structures to support their activities so the organisational context inevitably shapes their understanding and representation of creativity. Furthermore, organisations are not themselves bounded entities but organising flows that intermingle and obstruct people's ability to realise certain aims and activities.

The proposition that creativity is a character trait inherent in certain individuals, such as artists and sectors, such as film or music, is misleading. Art practices are associated with creativity because their currency lies in the practical realisation of ideas. Artists are sought out for their ability to interpret and develop ideas into something tangible. So while everyone has the potential for creativity, artists have developed their capacity for creativity into professional expertise. Similarly, the proposition that creativity is associated primarily with novelty is also misleading. While new ideas are the focus of certain industries, it is their realisation into something tangible which gives them value. Just as everyone has the potential for creativity, everyone can have an idea. Turning this idea into something in particular is a learned skill. By refocusing creativity as an adaptive, productive process, the term is liberated from these associations. This allows creativity to be claimed in unexpected places and by unexpected people; targets even of the cultural and creative economic agendas of local, national, European and worldwide governance bodies.
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