Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

You are free to download this draft of my book, which is due for publication by Profile in the summer of 2007. Please read it, comment on it or pass it on to your friends, but I would be grateful if you referenced it, if you use ideas from it in anything you write. If you want to comment on it please do so through the website: wethinkthebook.com

Many thanks

Charlie Leadbeater

Chapter 1 – Going Barefoot

They used to have to close when the sun went down, the shops in the little village of Bahurva in the Indian state of Bihar. When darkness fell virtually everything had to come to a halt – wrok, reading, cooking – because the vaillage had no electricity. Ritma Bharti has changed all that. Largely thanks to Ritma more than 750 solar powered lanterns have been installed in shops, schools, irrigation facilities and medical centres. Now thanks to the lanterns that Ritma built and maintains children learn to read at night, nurses can see patients and shops, like the one run by Ritma's husband, can stay open late into the evening.

Ritma does not have a degree in solar power engineering. She has no paper qualifications. Indeed, she can barely read, write and count. Ritma is an alumni of a remarkable educational institution in a village called Tilonia, in Rajasthan, called the Barefoot College, which was set up in 1971 by Sanjit Bunker Roy after a famine in Bihar that killed thousands of people. Roy turned his back on his life as the son of a wealthy Delhi family to set up an institution that would give India's illiterate villagers greater control over their lives by helping them to learn how to provide heat, light, clean water and food for themselves.

Roy could not afford to employ professionals to teach the villagers. Anyway the city-based experts were not equipped for the task. They could only teach in classrooms and they did not want to work in villages with the poor. So Roy trained a small group of from the village - -barefoot teachers and engineers – who in turn went on to teach others, who in turn became barefoot engineers, teachers and doctors in their villages. Two generations of families have now become barefoot professionals of one kind or another thanks to the college. Thousands of poor villagers have acquired the skills to use simple technologies to improve their lives.

Each night more than 4,000 children who tend cattle by day attend night classes with barefoot teachers in education centres lit by solar powered lanterns built and installed by barefoot engineers. They drink clean water from one of the more than 1,737 hand operated water pumps which have been installed since 1979, providing water for more than 325,000 people. Those pumps are maintained by 1,200 barefoot mechanics. More than 1,000 education centres and schools have been electrified by barefoot engineers. The 30,000 sq ft Barefoot College campus was designed by Bhanwar Jat, an illiterate farmer, working with 12 other barefoot architects. Using Buckminster Fuller's designs, Rafiq, a local blacksmith fabricated more than 150 geodesic domes to be used as schools, dispensaries, telephone booths and community centres.

Out of a mixture of instinct and necessity Roy had hit upon an ingenious self-help solution to rural poverty. But he did much more than that: he devised a new, low cost, way of organising ourselves which could have revolutionary consequences far beyond rural India. His barefoot philosophy scrambles up the cast-iron categories of top heavy, industrial era organisations. In the barefoot world demand generates its own supply, because the consumers can become producers, the learners can become teachers, when they are equipped with skills and tools and motivated to help themselves. The professionals and experts do not have all the answers; committed amateurs – like – Tilonia's barefoot engineers - can devise their own effective solutions so long as they can get access to the knowledge and resources they need. Roy's lack of formal resources – no money, buildings, nor professionals to work with – meant he had to become an organisational revolutionary.

Charles Leadbeater
Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

When Roy started the Barefoot College in 1971 he was a maverick. But the same philosophy is at the heart of mass, participatory approaches to collaborative working that are being fed by the rise of the Internet and low cost technology, the spread of knowledge and education, the ethic of participation and self-help. High tech versions of barefoot thinking are at work in eBay, the trading system, and Wikipedia, the online encyclopaedia, Linux, the open source software community and computer games, such as the Sims, blogging, podcasting, Youtube and many forms of citizen activism. Running through them are some common threads: the spectators want to take part, not just sit on the sidelines; the consumers are becoming contributors; the audience wants to take to the stage. Many new organisations, utilising new technology, will thrive on this spirit of mass participation. If the 20th century was the age of industrial work, mass production for mass consumption, then mass participation will be one of the defining features of the century to come.

The way we organise ourselves in future will not just be an extension of the industrial era, corporate organisations we have become used to – Ford and Toyota, WalMart and Microsoft - with their hierarchy, targets, divisions, civil wars and myriad humiliations for workers and consumers alike. A growing band of organisations in future will resurrect ancient ideas and meld them with new technology. One such resurrection is the idea of the "commons" a feature of village life for centuries: a common resource, like a wood or grazing land, held in loose, self-regulated shared ownership for villagers to graze their flocks on. The likes of Wikipedia and Linux organise their activities around a digital version of the commons. At least one part of our complicated future could be a peculiar mixture of the peasant and the geek, the pre-industrial and the post-industrial combined. That recipe, blending the interactive technologies of the Internet with the habits of the village, may be particularly potent in Asia, where over the next few decades hundreds of millions of people will leave villages to live in cities and connect with one another using mobile phones and computers. They will carry with them village habits and social networks that will combine with the latest wireless and mobile technologies. Out of that new kinds of organisation will be born quite unlike those that grew up around railways, cars and steel, from Detroit to the English Midlands and the Rhineland.

One of the best ways to navigate your way through this world of mass participation and creativity is to adopt the vantage point that Bunker Roy took in India more than thirty years ago. That means flipping the world on its head. Thanks to low cost technology many more consumers can become producers at least some of the time. Good ideas will come from amateurs as well as professionals. Innovation will not just flow down a pipeline, from experts working in their labs and studios, to passive consumers waiting in the line. Innovation is a social, cumulative and collaborative activity; ideas will flow back up the pipeline from consumers and they will share them amongst themselves. That is why the next big thing will be us: our power to share and develop ideas, without having to rely on formal organisations to do it all for us.

But to go barefoot as Roy did you first have to think barefoot. Industrial era organisations have enslaved our imaginations. We cannot image being organised without having an organisation. We cannot imagine work getting done without someone being in charge of a division of labour. We have grown up in an era of standardisation: mass production for mass consumption. But we are moving into a time when with the help of cheap, distributed technology there will be more production by the masses, for their own ends. As a consequence, innovation which has long been seen as an elite activity, undertaken only by special people, in special places will become more like a mass activity, often involving large collaborations of professionals and amateurs, designers and consumers, sharing their ideas. Increasingly we will think together.

We-think will change the was we work and consume; it will change the way leadership is exercised and where new ideas will come from. More leaders will have to be like Bunker Roy, inspirational and visionary, but humble and self-effacing. More work will be self-organised and self-motivated to tap into people's ideas and imagination. Industrial era organisations like to broadcast at people, issuing instructions to their workers and regarding their consumers as targets for their marketing and wallets to be emptied. Barefoot organisations are more convivial. They work through dialogue and interaction, co-creating value with and among their users. Industrial era organisations see themselves mechanistically: they are value chains or pipelines. Barefoot organisations are more like rolling creative

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

conversations. They are organised without that requiring top-heavy organisation. The claim that we can successfully self-organise ourselves will strike many people as utopian and fanciful, especially in light of the myriad failures of cooperatives and communes. Yet in many areas of our lives we rely on old forms of volunteer self-organisation such as clubs. Scientific inquiry has long relied on the sharing of ideas among peers. In many rural communities mutuals and cooperatives still organise the marketing of agricultural products. Those old forms of mutual endeavour take on a new life when they are combined with the power of the Internet, which allows mass participation to be taken to scale. One of the best models for how this kind of collective self-organisation is another barefoot activity: a day on the beach.

The Beach Ethic

Beaches are ordered without being controlled. No one is in charge. Beaches are model civic spaces: tolerant, playful, self-regulating, democratic in spirit, mildly carnival-like. Underlying the beach's appeal is a simple idea: the beach is a commons where people can self-organise in play. As a day on the beach unfolds everyone takes their spot, adjusting minutely to where everyone else has pitched their towel, tent or windbreak. There are no zoning regulations, fences nor white lines to tell you where to go (admittedly this is not true of some beaches in France and Italy.) The order emerges as each new family joins the throng. Yet that order will not be exactly the same two days running.

On the most popular beaches people spend all day in close proximity but they are generally civil and considerate. They do not interfere with one another and disputes between neighbours are rare. Excessive noise is frowned upon. People generally avoid stepping on one another's towels or invading impromptu football pitches. Other than the odd lifeguard to look after safety no one is in authority. Perhaps precisely because there is no one in control people take it upon themselves to self-regulate. Parents look out for one another's children. Complexity theorist have a fancy name for this: they call it emergence, when an overall order emerges from a system with many participants; no one person is in charge; each participant is adjusting to their local conditions (the people on the towel next to them); yet a stable organisation emerges from these thousands of interconnected decisions.

Adaptive and self-organising communities rely on more than good communications between neighbours and peers to make sure everything works. An overall order emerges from a mass of localised decisions only if there are some simple norms and goals to provide a skeleton structure. On the beach those norms stem from the common goal of having a good time, relaxing with your family and friends, not being at work. It is easy to understand what everyone else is trying to achieve. That is what helps people to get on. Beaches are egalitarian in spirit. That is not to say there are no posh resorts. But generally a beach is a bad place to show off social status, armed with only a towel and trunks. There is no room for BMWs, Mont Blanc pens and other signifiers of wealth and prestige. Beaches are places where ages, sexes and classes mingle. Both Karl Marx and Queen Victoria liked a trip to the Isle of Wight. Beaches are democratic because barriers to entry are almost non-existent: having a towel helps but even that it is not essential. People take pleasure not just in their physical surroundings but the atmosphere in which everyone else is having a good time. People read on beaches in droves but few work. Thankfully beaches are hostile to most forms of modern technology. Beach life is egalitarian because the technology is resolutely cheap and simple: buckets and spades, nets and kites, good for toddlers and grandparents. The technological acceleration that has so enriched and disrupted the rest of our lives in the last thirty years has passed the beach by.

Not only do we like what beaches do for us an individuals we like the kind of society we become on a beach: civil and playful, active and open, above all self-regulating. There are neither managers nor guardians telling us what to do. The public beach is an example of self-organising, peer-to-peer, commons-based production of pleasure. And of course it is not alone: public spaces of all kinds thrive on this ethic of mass self-regulation and participation: festivals, carnivals, parks, libraries exhibit many of the same features.

This book is about what happens when the beach ethic of mass self-organisation gets taken into work. What emerges are highly participatory forms of organisation that function like a latter-day commons, a meeting place and shared resource for millions of independent contributors. But the future is far from certain for these fledgling

commons, like Wikipedia, the online encyclopaedia and Linux, the open source software project. In England the village commons were enclosed into private property to encourage more private investment to raise agricultural productivity and provide more food for expanding urban populations in the 18th and 19th century. Now the same argument is being used – often quite erroneously – to justify enclosures of the digital commons that are emerging from Internet culture. The argument of large corporations, such as Microsoft and media companies such as News Corporation, is that the digital world will work better if everything can be turned into private property, to be protected and controlled. One of my aims is to show how dangerous and wrong-headed an idea this is. Were these emergent commons to be parcelled up and fenced off then mass, participatory, barefoot solutions could become all but impossible. We would return to our familiar, dull roles as consumers and waged workers, but we would be largely denied the opportunity to be participants and contributors. We could buy, have, make and acquire, but we would find it much more difficult to enjoy collaborating, participating, contributing and playing.

To understand how dire this world of digital enclosures could be, imagine finding your favourite public beach had been bought by Microsoft. You would only get onto the beach by buying Microsoft towels or windbreaks. You would be told where you could lay down your towel according to how much you had paid. If you wanted to surf as well as sunbathe it would cost you more. Kite flying would require a permit. Every two years you would find your equipment was no longer compatible with the beach's sand. You could not modify your windbreak yourself, because key aspects of the design would be kept secret. You might have a reasonable time but the commons would have been turned into commerce and you would not be a player but a consumer, passive, dependent and no longer in control.

Every weekend in corporations all over the world millions of people rush, a smile on their faces, to leave work and get to a beach. Something similar is increasingly happening on weekdays as well as the beach ethic challenges the corporate work ethic. People want to engage with open, collaborative barefoot organisations because they are the working equivalents of the beach. Industrial era organisations thrived on Max Weber's protestant work ethic and rational forms of scientific organisation presided over by experts. Organisations of the future may well be infused with more of the beach ethic of self-organisation. That is another reason for us to think barefoot in future.

Chapter 2 – Pigs Can Fly

An online encyclopaedia created and maintained almost entirely by amateurs attracts more people than the New York Times online, carries more content than most other encyclopaedias combined and threatens to dwarf similar services offered by large publishing companies. A computer programme started by a wispy Finnish computer science student and initially developed almost entirely by unpaid volunteers is the main challenger to the computer operating system created by Microsoft's, one of the world's largest corporations with the best-funded research teams.

Most email depends on a programme created by barefoot programmers and most Internet transactions depend on servers running what might be called barefoot software. The world's record industry has had its business model upended by a bunch of hackers creating file sharing systems that have as their common currency the MP3 file, an innovation given away for free by its creator, a publicly funded German computer scientist. The main alternative to the might of Wal Mart is not another hypermarket chain but a trading system through which millions of participants buy and sell with strangers, by setting their own prices, advertising their own products, doing their own deals and deciding how to ship their products. The most successful computer games outsell Hollywood blockbusters because they allow the players to fiddle, tamper and change the action, creating their own characters and storylines. These player-developers then contribute their innovations, for free, back to the larger community playing the game. Computer games generate more revenue than films in part because they mobilise unpaid player-developers in their millions. The most powerful super computer in the world was not created by IBM but by amateurs pooling the downtime of their personal computers to search for signs of extra terrestrial life. An army of millions of amateur clickworkers, working for free, were as effective as Nasa in finding craters on Mars.

Charles Leadbeater
Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

At the start of the 21st century this should not be happening. The last decades of the 20th century witnessed the triumph of the market and corporations. Cooperative and collaborative values were in retreat. In an increasingly materialistic and venal world, people do not do things for free: there has to be something in it for them. And if there is nothing in for them, then they have to be told, instructed what to do by managers. Those are the only two ways to get things done: markets and hierarchies, incentives and instructions. Yet in field after field we are witnessing the same phenomenon: large groups of committed and knowledgeable amateurs, working without pay, are creating highly collaborative forms of organisation, which operate with little hierarchy and bureaucracy and yet mobilise resources of a scale to match the biggest corporations in the world.

Linux, the open source software programme, is one of the biggest challengers to Microsoft. Wikipedia, the online encyclopaedia, attracts more traffic than the New York Times and its news reports are as trusted as those of the BBC. Apache is the citizen software that runs on more webservers than proprietary software produced by Sun Microsystems. eBay traders buy and sell more than 25m items a day, in volumes to match the biggest global retailers. In the UK more people use eBay than vote in local council elections. The Sims, the computer game, is as big at the box office as Star Wars in part because 90% of the content for the game is now generated by people who play it. The biggest super computer in the world has not been created by IBM but by the SETI project to track down life beyond our galaxy. Many more projects of this kind are in development in law, education, banking, betting, drugs development and politics.

Everything we have been told about organisations and work tells us this should not be possible, especially in an age of rampant consumerism dominated by large companies. Yet here are large groups of people voluntarily committing their labour together, without seeking financial reward or being told what to do, and managing to create complex products and services that millions of people rely upon each day. It should not be possible. Pigs, famously, do not fly.

We are told that to be organised we need an organisation. Yet all these are complex and highly organised activities without a single organisation being in charge of everything that goes on. We are told that to make sure order is maintained someone has to be in control. Yet these activities seem ordered precisely because no one seeks to be in control and so people have to exercise their sense of responsibility, adjusting to one another, sorting out disputes as they go. The order comes from within these communities not from the top. To get complex tasks done reliably we have assumed we need a clear division of labour, so everyone knows in advance what they are supposed to do, whose job it is to do what. Yet in these non-organisations people seem to voluntarily distribute themselves to work, as and when it needs to be done. They find their own niches to work in alongside other people. Consumers, we are told, are happiest when they are being treated like Kings, waited on hand and foot and offered the widest possible choice. Yet in these vast communal efforts the consumers willingly become workers, devoting some of their time, effort and imagination to develop products for one another. They do not want to be just passive recipients but players and participants, at least some of them do, some of the time. They do not just want more choice but more say. These are activities of mass participation rather than mass consumerism.

We have come to expect that innovation will come from special people – boffins, geeks, designers, artists – working in special places – labs, garages, studios. They create their inventions and push them down a pipeline to waiting consumers. Every invention has a moment of birth and an inventor who can say, in advance, what their clever gizmo is for. Yet in these new endeavours innovation is the work of multiple authors. It is cumulative, collaborative and often depends on the contributions of intelligent users. It takes place all over, not just in specially designated zones. We expect that innovation will not take place unless people have the financial incentive to be creative. That means they have to be able to patent and protect their intellectual property so they can exploit it commercially. Strong patent protection is the basis for innovation, we are told. Yet in these swirling swarms of creativity innovators share their ideas quite freely and welcome it when others borrow what they have done, to improve upon it. They put a lot of unpaid effort into their innovations and then, bizarrely do not seek to profit from them, nor to control their use.

Charles Leadbeater
Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Sitting in your office at Microsoft, working your socks off, meeting constantly updated plans imposed by impatient managers who want you not just to deliver relentless growth but to do so with a smile on your face, while endorsing all the nauseating corporate brand speak, it must be bewildering. You are being beaten by a bunch of people who mainly work from home, create products for free, because they enjoy it and with no one telling them what to do. When you are on a plane to Redmond, Seattle, Microsoft's head quarters, to account for your latest deviation from the corporate plan, hoping to save your bonus, these open source guys are probably in the pub, and they still do a better job. How did that happen?

It happened because the barefoot philosophy that Bunker Roy developed in Tilonia is scrambling up the logic of managerial capitalism. Consumers turn out to be producers. Demand breeds its own supply. Leisure becomes a form of work. A huge amount of creative work is done in spite, or perhaps because, of people not being paid. These new non-organisations pose a huge challenge to the established organisational order and the professions and managers who design, control and lead them. They embody a new ethic of collaborative, shared effort, often not motivated by money. As a result these scrambled organisations excel at practical tasks – sharing knowledge, providing news, trading goods and services, innovating new products – which large, hierarchical organisations thought were their terrain. You do not have to buy into alternative, hippyish, altruistic values to believe these collaborative forms of work are significant. They matter because they get things done, usually at very low cost. These collaborations are especially effective at a form of rolling, mass innovation. Given that innovation is at the heart of capitalism's dynamic that is a pretty significant development. We have found a new way to innovate together, at very low cost and mass scale, globally. These collaborations are not designed for mass production, so much as production by the masses. They are emerging, designed for an era in which creativity could become a mass activity not just an elite one.

The truth is that most traditional commercial organisations do not want their consumers to become contributors. They quite like them passive and so dependent. They do not want their staff self-organising, they want them to be aligned to the corporate plan. They do not like it when innovation comes from all over. They want ideas to emerge in orderly fashion from their R & D labs so they can control them. Industrial era organisations were designed for a heavy, slow world. They do not want to face competitors designed for an era when ideas flit about like pollen carried by swarms of bees. Leaders quite like their self-image as lonely, harsh, authoritative figures, cut off from the organisations they drive into corporate battle. The idea that you might be able to lead more effectively in a far more open, transparent and conversational way ruins all the fun.

The irresistible force of collaborative mass innovation is about to meet the immovable object of entrenched corporate organisation. This book is about that coming conflict and what will emerge from it.

The Self Assembling Bird's Nest
Larry Sanger and Jimmy Wales had a problem. The free online encyclopedia they had set up – Nupedia – was growing at snails pace. Nupedia relied on voluntary contributions but had such an elaborate system for peer review that only highly qualified contributors could get their material accepted. After several months only a few articles had made it through the process. On January 2, 2001 Sanger had dinner with a computer programmer Ben Kovitz who explained a new development in websites called Wikis which he thought might breathe new life into Nupedia. Wikis are websites that can be edited by any user, using nothing more powerful than a standard web browser. They allow people to dip into a text, contribute to it, leave their mark and exit. The text then grows as a collective creation, and collaborative piece of work, being edited by several hands. Sanger immediately saw the potential for using a wiki to rescue Nupedia and he quickly persuaded Wales to set up a wiki version of the encyclopaedia. The reviewers and editors on Nupedia did not like the idea. In common with professionals in many other walks of life, they felt under threat and resisted. They did not want their work to be associated with something as low-brow as a wiki, something that anyone could edit. There was, they complained, no guarantee of quality. So Wikipedia was launched with is own domain name on January 15th 2001. A month later it already had 1,000 articles and reached 10,000 by September. By March 2005 the English Wiki had more than 500,000 articles, many of them based on

multiple contributions. In its first four years Wikipedia attracted 2m entries, in 105 languages. Nupedia meanwhile was closed down and only ever attracted 24 entries.

Wikipedia is an dizzying collaborative creation. Anyone can edit it, take away the information and use it. There are no editors, fact checkers or proof-readers, at least not ones that are paid. An encyclopaedia is an august body of knowledge, a bit like a monument, compiled by experts through an editorial process few know about and at great expense. Wikipedia is a constantly evolving account of a huge range of things, continuously updated and mainly compiled by a breed of committed amateurs, through a process which seems completely transparent. The Encyclopedia Britannica has 44m words of text. Wikipedia already has 250m. Quantity, of course, does not necessarily equate with quality. It is not Wikipedia's aim to replace encyclopaedias or to supplant all forms of expert knowledge. Many critics argue Wikipedia's democratic approach gives it a populist edge: the contributions on popular culture such as Coronation Street or Barbie dolls are sometimes far longer than those on art or politics. Wikipedia has had its problems. Some small sections of the site – the section on President George Bush and the war in Iraq - had to be closed down because contributions to them became a kind of political warfare. The site has suffered some vandalism, inaccuracies and some people have tampered with entries to self-promote themselves or attack others. It is far from perfect. Yet on the whole Wikipedia is an easy to use, well organised, starting point for research on many subjects. Attempts to doctor it will be found out, probably more easily than reporters on the New York Times making up quotes from invented interviewees. It is not the final story on that subject but often a good place to start. And it invites you to contribute because you are giving something back to the community you have drawn from.

What is remarkable is how Wikipedia manages to make it all work. It is as much a social innovation as a technological one. Wikipedia recruited its first full time employee in January 2005. Its annual running costs are less than $100,000. Wales, a former options trader, bankrolled it in its first four years to a tune of about $300,000, a pittance compared to the money that venture capitalists poured into the Internet during the dot.com boom. One secret of Wikipedia's success is that it is very easy to use: costs of entry are virtually zero. Anyone can take part, you do not have to show your credentials at the door. (Imagine a company that allowed people to come to work for it first and only asked questions about their credentials, once they had seen the quality of their work.) But because there are so many people swarming over the site you had better be reasonably sure that what you are going to add is accurate, because not then other people will correct it. That process of peer review is not in itself new, it will be familiar to most academics and scientists. But Wikipedia is taking it to scale for three main reasons. First, everyone contributing is in effect asked to sign up to Wikipedia's norms and values to adopt a neutral point of view and not to grind an axe. As Wales explains, this helps to set the tone in which discussions take place, a common goal that people can join in attempting to reach. Second, the peer reviewing system does not descend into chaos, grind to a halt, nor allow through rubbish because it has evolved very delicately. When individuals get into a dispute about an entry they can propose a vote on the issue. If that does not work there is mediation, then an arbitration committee and finally Wales himself might have to make a judgement. This set of checks and balances means the whole community is governed by consent. Although there is vandalism the community is largely self-healing: it sorts it out itself. Third, the community has developed its own social structure. Not all Wikipedians are equal. Those involved in the project for longest form a kind of aristocracy. Policies and strategies are openly debated, posted online and voted on. That commitment to transparency means it is very difficult for a group to change strategy without anyone else knowing. Few managers in large companies could bear to operate with the transparency of Wikipedia. Most of the work is actually done by about 1,100 people. Outside that core group a few thousand more make more than 100 edits each a month. Then there is a long tail who have done little more than add an entry here and there. The power of communities like Wikipedia is this sliding-scale of contribution. Traditional companies do not have good ways for people to make occasional contributions when they feel like it. Employment contracts are too cumbersome for that. But Wikipedia has the flexibility to mix committed and occasional contributors seemingly effortlessly.

Charles Leadbeater
Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Wales is an unlikely looking leader of a rebellion: self-deprecating, softly spoken and charmingly modest. When I met him in July 2005 in Oxford and in May 2006 in Norway he was wearing ill pressed black trousers and the same a black cheesecloth shirt embroidered with a red pattern (I assumed it had been washed in between.) He looked like a folk singer. "Wikipedia is governed in a set of different ways," he explained. "In part it is anarchy, really no one is in control of the content, its up to people to sort it out for themselves. In part it is democracy because some things do get voted on. There is also an element of aristocracy: people who have been involved in the community longer, who have acquired a reputation, have a higher standing in the community. And then there is monarchy - that's me – but I try to get involved as little as possible." Wales' aim is that Wikipedia should become the Red Cross of information, a global resource, to put the extent of knowledge contained in an large encyclopaedia in the hands of everyone on the planet, for free. Already it has more than 1,000 articles in 100 languages. In some African states, Wales explained, teachers are downloading Wikipedia onto CDs which they then take to villages with a PC but no Internet connections.

Listening to Jimmy Wales spin his tale of Wikipedia's birth and growth I imagined was like listening to Henry Ford on the eve of his launching his moving assembly line at Highland Park in 1913. Until Ford came along car production had been an odd-ball activity. The US produced 7,000 cars a year, mainly from small workshops owned by rich people and they were then sold to other rich people. No one had dared think cars could be for the masses. They could not see how that might be done. But for most of that decade, Ford a renegade outsider and his team of engineers, had been experimenting with a fundamentally different approach to production, with the aim of creating a product for a mass market of mid-Western farmers. A bit like the encyclopaedias of today, the car workshops of 1913 used only skilled craftsmen to make bespoke products. Ford wanted to use a rag-bag army of barely literate workers to achieve the task. To most of the rest of the car industry it must have sounded crazy. Yet most of the ingredients of Ford's mass production system were already around to be borrowed: the moving line came from the meat packing industry; the interchangeable parts came from the machine tool industry; the scheduling skills came from railroads. Ford's genius was to understand how they could be brought together. Ford created a new way to see organisations: how to mobilise resources on a mass scale, to make standardised products for mass markets and in the process bring about far reaching social and economic changes. What Ford did for the industrial economy Jimmy Wales is doing for the knowledge economy. And like Ford he is doing it by borrowing ideas from many different sources. None of the organisational ingredients that make up Wikipedia are in themselves new: peer review comes from academia and science; the wiki was a tool developed elsewhere on the net; the encyclopedia is a well established form; the way Wikipedia settles disputes borrows from other, older communities; the barefoot philosophy of amateurs doing jobs previously reserved for professionals was pioneered by social entrepreneurs. What is new is the way that Wales and Wikipedia has put it all together. Even now most people cannot see how the mass of people could become participants in innovation rather than merely consumers. Yet just as Ford transformed the way we made products, so Wales and others of his ilk are transforming the way we create ideas, together.

To underline just how different is Wikipedia's approach to organisation, consider what it does not do. There is no Wikipedia head office and no research lab in the woods. There are no corporate perks, learning programmes, nor memos from head office about travel expenses. Wikipedia might exclude trouble-makers but it has not downsized large swathes of its workforce. There is no human resource department in charge of recruitment. People recruit themselves. Their role depends on their enthusiasm and skills and the judgement of their peers. Wikipedia does not have to employ consultants to devise knowledge management programmes to get people to share ideas. People do that automatically. Had large corporations adopted Wikipedia's recipe the entire knowledge management industry of the last ten years might have been redundant. What to Wikipedia comes naturally has to be forced, engineered and aligned in most organisations: that is a measure of how dysfunctional they are. There is nothing to outsource to India because everything was open source from the outset. (Strictly speaking Wikipedia operates under a GNU Free Documentation Licence, which allows rival sites to set up using the same software. As of summer 2005 one rival existed Enciclpedia Libre.) Companies are always in search of a better fit with their elusive customers. In Wikipedia the customers are contributors and designers of the content. They are fused together. Wales will not

hand over the community to his offspring. He could not appoint his best mate to become finance officer, with rich stock options. Contributors to Wikipedia work through peer review the whole time. They do not have to subject themselves to embarrassing 360 degree career reviews or submit to sessions with a personnel manager. In short, Wikipedia does not carry the dispiriting and dysfunctional baggage of life in big business. It is a self-organising community that works for non-commercial motives. It should not work, but it does, and because it does we have options for how we work together that we never had before.

Wikipedia resembles a bird's nest lovingly constructed from millions of little pieces of information, each laid delicately together to form a robust, safe structure, which is nevertheless comfortable for its inhabitants. Yet it is a bird's nest that assembles itself, as if the grass and twigs themselves knew exactly where they should go.

The End of the Value Chain
How different from the main way we imagine traditional organisations as "value chains" made up of iron links. That image tells us all we need to know about what organisations were for and how they had to be set up to do their job. Each step of an activity, from conceiving a product through to its manufacture and distribution, was a link in the chain. The final link was the transfer to the consumer. By that stage the product – a fridge, washing machine, Apple iPod – embodied all the value that had been invested in it – labour, raw materials, design and software. Each link in the chain represented a transaction: people, machines and raw materials to be added had to be paid for. The goal of management was to organise the links in the chain as efficiently as possible, to know where in the chain your link fitted. It was assumed – at least until the late 20th century – that value chain organisations worked best when most of the links were vertically integrated, with a company controlling most of its supply chain, with jobs and tasks, organised hierarchically. Working in one of these organisations was simple: if you want to know what to do next you followed your detailed job description and if that did not give you the answer, you turned to someone in authority to ask for directions.

We should not sniff at value chain organisations. They have achieved a huge amount in the last century. They organised a complex range of activities, often within a single organisation, sometimes under the same roof, to produce goods and services at prices that many people could afford. The car, television, fridge, telephone, cataract operations, maths lessons - all might be the preserve of the rich had we not invented ways to make them on a mass scale and at low cost. In the past three decades it has sometimes not been clear whether these value chain organisations have been falling to bits with the growth of networked production, outsourcing and constant restructuring, or whether on the contrary they have been tightening their grip through business process re-engineering and downsizing. Hierarchies are flatter, job descriptions for some skilled workers are vaguer, the working day is more flexible and the boundaries of organisations have become more porous. Organisations are interacting with one another in new ways as partners and suppliers. As products become more technologically complex, so firms have had to look outside for new sources of specialist knowledge. Good companies recognise they make better products if they engage with their users earlier in the design process. Consumers increasingly want products that look and feel distinctive. We will continue to rely on value chain organisations in many walks of life.

Yet our modern, networked, versions of value chains organisations – Toyota, Wal Mart, Nike, Cisco – are value chains nevertheless and they are haunted by the same questions. They say they want to give workers more autonomy, yet more people seem to feel more insecure and frustrated at work and less committed to their employers. Management jargon about empowerment and alignment washes over people as a form of double-speak. In an increasingly democratic age, the unaccountable power of many chief executives is an anachronism. For all the talk of corporate social responsibility, company life seems hollow, little more than a race to deliver the numbers on time. True these organisations now give consumers a bewildering array of apparent choices but even that can be bewildering, especially when what you really want is a bit of support or advice. More choice does not necessarily mean better customer experience. Many consumers now find companies more unyielding and less personal.

Charles Leadbeater
Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Wikipedia, Linux, eBay and the host of other non-organisations are more like barefoot communities than value chains. They are more like self-organising collaboratives. They are a quite different way of organising ourselves, often without the heavy hand of an organisation. Others are following where these pioneers have led. In industry after industry workers, entrepreneurs and investors will be asking whether there are open, collaborative alternatives to the standard corporate model: could you do in your industry what Wikipedia has managed to do for the encyclopedia business? There is a viable alternative to corporate organisation and the market. It is not centrally planned communism, but new forms of barefoot, cooperative endeavour emerging from within knowledge rich global capitalism. It is proving particularly effective as a way to share and create new ideas. There is an alternative. It works. Pigs can fly.

Chapter 3 – The Genie is Out of the Bottle

Nick Jaffe has finished for the night. He puts his earphones to one side, closes the lid on his laptop and sits back in his chair, his nightly communication to his worldwide audience complete. He is not quite sure where they are, nor how many of them there are, but he knows they are out there because his nightly sessions – a mixture of music, chat and ranting – are being downloaded. Nick Jaffe is not broadcasting. He is a podcaster and just 13 years old. His studio is his bedroom. For him taking part in mainstream radio would be like going to a restaurant with his parents wearing a suit and tie.

Nick Jaffe produces media in a way that someone twenty years his senior could only have dreamed of. He consumes media in a completely differently way as well. He rarely watches television or listens to the radio. He acquires most of what he wants to watch from the Internet, from sites such as Youtube. He most likes short films and comedy sketches which no one over the age of 15 will have heard of. He carries most of what he wants to watch onto his iPod, his device of choice. He gets the content from various aggregators of podcast materials and through recommendations from his mates. He does not like material being pushed at him. Nick Jaffe's media life is pretty much a seamless cycle of production and contribution, reviewing and sharing, watching and listening.

How could Nick Jaffe's entry into media production affect organisations as mighty and powerful as the BBC or CNN? By 2005 it became possible to follow a breaking international news story, almost as it happened, without ever having to open a newspaper, turn on a television or listen to a journalist. Instead, you could, turn to accounts provided by swarms of barefoot reporters, contributing their slice of the story, online, often with the help of photos taken with digital camera phones. CBS, the US news network has just a handful of foreign correspondents and most of them are in Washington waiting to fly to places where the news has already happened or to events that can be planned for. So when the Asian tsunami struck across the Indian ocean, over a Christmas weekend, when news is supposed to not happen, CBS was a bit stretched. The worst hit places were far-flung. When the mainstream media turned to their usual sources for information – aid agencies, governments – they found they too had little idea of what was going on. The most telling and graphic images of the tsunami, which really explained what it was like to be in Banda Aceh when the wave struck, came from digital cameras operated by tourists and locals. On the web you will find tens of thousands of video clips of the tsunami and its after-shocks.

When London's transport system was hit by terrorist bombs in July 2005 Christine Armanpour, the legendary CNN news reporter could be seen on television, standing in a non-descript London street, in an exchange of thinly veiled mutual ignorance with an obscure "security analyst." Neither had a clue what was going on. While Armanpour was stuck on the street would be reporters were already on the scene: citizens caught up in the action. Once we might have accepted that Armanpour was "live" and "on the spot" in London. But now we grow quickly frustrated: we know when people are just filling space. The London street scene might as well have been a digitalised backdrop. A television reporter in a suit, standing outside a building, speculating about what is going on, is no longer good enough. Our expectations of authenticity and immediacy have risen sharply. The new standards are being set by barefoot reporters, citizen journalists, bloggers, people who want you to know what it was like for them. They have something to contribute, in their voice, for their slice of the action. That morning as Armanpour

floundered in the street in about four hours following the bombs the BBC received 20,000 emails, almost 400 photographs and four video clips from people who wanted to tell their part of the story, add their piece of information. They did not want to be in the limelight, to displace Christina Amanpour; they just had something to add to the picture. The following night the main BBC evening news led with a piece of video footage shot from a camera phone, taken by a participant in the drama who for their sake of their fellow citizens became a citizen reporter for a few hours.

That is all a far cry from the profession I joined when I started work at the Financial Times in the mid 1980s. Then readers were allowed to contribute to the newspaper in only two ways. They could write a letter to the editor, which we would cut in half and condescend to publish if there was enough space. Or if they were particularly well connected the editor might agree they should write an article for the comment pages. Those two, carefully policed zones, were the only places journalists allowed readers into their closed world. I spent most of my time avoiding readers in case I found out they were not that interested in my long articles about the future of the European steel industry. The journalists performed on stage; the readers were the audience. Now it turns out that many readers do not want to be just an audience. They also want to take part. That does not mean they want to take to the stage themselves. Nor do they want to take part all of the time. But many want to be able to have their say and connect with people who share their interests. Thanks to mobile phones, podcasts, blogs and what will come after them people can communicate, even if only to very small audiences online.

We have grown many more eyes and ears. Weblogs, podcasts and mobile phone text messaging have given people new voices. The Internet and communications networks provide the nervous system to link them together. People who were once consumers, prepared to leave it to the professionals, are now becoming participants creating and distributing, critiquing and recommending content. The action is no longer just taking place on the stage but among the audience as well. We have crossed a threshold. From now on swarms of barefoot journalists will be alongside the professionals on any story of note and on many more that are not of note.

Niche news will thrive. In 2004 a customer of US cycle lock manufacturer Kryptonite, found his super strong bicycle lock could be opened with the help of a ball point pen. He posted his findings on bikeforums.net, where it was read by 400,000 people. A video version was downloaded more than 3m times. Retailers started clearing their shelves and shipping products back to the manufacturer. Kryptonite replaced at least 350,000 products at its own expense. The story really took off when professional and citizen journalists joined forces and the story got taken up by the New York Times. More us will work in this mix, where amateurs and professionals, consumers and producers, can find themselves swapping roles and sharing ideas.

Newspaper organisations can be drawn in a series of straight lines: copy gets written, edited, printed, distributed and read. The content goes from the journalist via the editors to the reader. There is no flow back up the pipeline. The blogsphere is criss-crossed with lines and links. Readers are simultaneously writers and publishers. They market one another's content by word of mouth. Everything works by lateral links. There are no artificial deadlines set by the necessity of distributing news on paper, by road to breakfast tables. Content gets created when people feel something needs to be said. A newspaper's content expands and contracts depending on the advertising available to sustain it. The blogsphere expands and contracts as news demands. A blog or podcast gets distributed if people find it interesting. News used to be broadcast, from the top down. Now it is also generated, laterally, by word of mouth, from the bottom up. It is more like being part of a conversation than sitting and listening.

So far so good. But it is one thing for there to be a welter of reports, gossip, clips and photos. It is another thing for it to be brought together, ordered, classified, tested, in a way that means it can be trusted and made part of a bigger picture. Much blogging is drivel. If Pro Am reporters are each contributing their slice of salami, how do you put it back together into a single sausage? Many Big J journalists' response to the rise of citizen journalism is to argue "they cannot be trusted, they are not proper journalists, there is no quality control." Big J journalists as with other professionals do not see that people these days often feel able to make up their own minds about quality and

credibility without having to turn to professionals for advice and judgements. These free-form communities are developing their own capacity for structured self-organisation to deliver reliable products. The most impressive is probably OhMyNews, the citizen news service in South Korea which has thousands of regular contributors. We are just at the start of the rise of citizen-media. It could herald far reaching changes in the way our societies work.

Nick Jaffe is not going to displace Christine Armanpour, at least not yet. But he announced the arrival of a new media environment, one that will disrupt and reconfigure the world of mass-produced, industrialised media. In a sense we are moving from an era in which information and media was produced for the masses, to one in which it will also be produced by the masses. The corollary of that is that we are moving from an economy of mass production to one in which innovation and creativity also become mass activities, rather than being confined to an elite of journalists and broadcasters, special people, working in special places. The audience, at least a large chunk of it, that used to simply watch and listen, passively, how wants to and is able to take part, to have their say. They will no longer just sit slumped on their sofas; they can take to the stage themselves, become part of the action, at least some of the time, in a way they want. If the last fifty years have been about the creation of cultures, organisations and infrastructures for mass media consumption – the couch potato society - the next fifty will be about mass media participation.

More than a passing fad
The means of media production are becoming increasingly widely distributed. The iPod generation do not just want to watch and listen wherever they are, increasingly they also want to create and contribute. More than 1bn people worldwide and rising have the capacity now to become mini-media producers. Some may be professionals freelancing in their own time, most of a rising breed of Pro-Am producers: amateurs like Nick Jaffe, who do it because they love to not because they are paid, but who operate to high standards of production. They want to do it well, judged by the standards of the communities they operate in.

Those mini-media producers are linked not just by infrastructure but also by shared platforms and commons, such as MySpace, the web site aggregator, Second Life, the mass player immersive computer game and Wikipedia, the online encyclopedia, which allow them to exchange, share, combine and review information.

These communities allow a long sliding scale of contribution. Industrial era information producers can only really work if the people contributing are employees, journalists, for example: professionals with the skills to use the very expensive equipment required to make media content. In this world the producers were employees, who worked 9 till 5, five days a week. Viewers and listeners did not get much of a look in. But the new media communities, the likes of Wikipedia and Second Life, allow a sliding scale of contribution: people can either contribute a lot (most edits on Wikipedia are made by a little more than 1,000 core contributors) or a little.

These new media communities can only extend the range of potential contributors by adopting a modular design for their products. Wikipedia is broken down into tens of thousands of particular articles. Linux, the open software programme, is broken into many thousands of smaller modules. That means people can contribute to just the piece that interests them, where their skills are relevant, without having to be involved in the organisation as a whole. As long as the modules fit together, like lego bricks, then it doesn't matter.

Participative media is encouraging new kinds of personal freedom - individual activities like Nick Jaffe's – only because it is also creating new kinds of social production: more or less tightly knit forms of collaboration to create, aggregate and distribute content.

Production by the masses creates millions of markets with a few consumers, whereas hit-driven industrial era production was designed to create a few products – songs, TV shows – with millions of consumers. And these markets behave much more like conversations – they encourage an interplay between producer and consumer – not just an exchange of goods and money. People who want to be participants and players want different things

from people who just want to be couch potatoes. Players in any game want equipment to play with, a pitch on which to play, people to play with and some shared rules by which they play. Couch potatoes want good service: anytime-anywhere media, at the flick of a button. Commons based production offers something much more fundamental and potentially radical: tools that allow for mass participation.

There are several reasons for thinking this is more than a passing fad scurrying across the margins of the economy. First, these new collaboratives are emerging in information, software, entertainment, culture and media, which are among the fastest growing sectors of the developed economies. These sector are not marginal but central to modern economies and indeed modern life. Second, while these new patterns of organisation are still emerging, the larger ones - and there are plenty that stay very small – nevertheless seem to have some powerful and durable features. They are driven by cheaper, more distributed technologies. They speak to values of individuality: they allow people more scope to express what matters to them and makes them distinctive. Third, they do not depend – as earlier efforts at collaborative self-organisation did – upon people buying into alternative or altruistic values. These collaboratives grow because they work: their chief selling point is their practicality. If you want to buy anything in the world the best place to go is probably eBay. People do not use Linux open source software just because they do not like Microsoft; they do so because it works. Youtube is not just an interesting experiment; is allows amateur film makers to find an audience. Fourth, these social and collaborative ways of organising have powerful economic benefits in terms of competition: they are very low cost compared with traditional media. Online games that mobilise the contributions of thousands of players get a very low cost workforce of co-developers. These collaboratives often provide the most potent competition to incumbents and their established high cost models. Imagine a start up coming up with an alternative to Microsoft's Powerpoint programme. No venture capitalist in their right might would back it, no matter how good the software. Why take on Microsoft? Competition to powerful incumbents often will not come from the market but from groups of amateurs who will carry on innovating even when there is no money to be made.

These new collaboratives are finding ways to respond to their own weaknesses. Wikipedia is still not as accurate at Encyclopedia Brittanica, which is also not as accurate as most people thought. One objection from traditional media stems from the cacophony of the material available on vast sites like Youtube and MySpace. How do people find their way to what they might want? Don't they need a navigator? Isn't that a role that only skilled professionals – like journalists – can play? Well perhaps, but it also turns out that the best of these communities work by allowing people to flag and recommend what might be relevant. Content is self-sifted by the participants. A similar but slightly different objection is about quality. Many of these collaboratives work only because they have low or non-existent barriers to entry: it is very easy to take part and contribute. But they how can these very open, easy to access self-organising sites be trusted, if there is no one looking after quality? Don't we need gatekeepers – professionals like journalists and regulators – to inspect and assess for quality? Again these collaboratives seem to be evolving their own, distinctive solutions to these questions, relying on self-help and peer review to trial, debate, test and sift good ideas from bad. On November 15th, 2004 for example Robert McHenry a former editor in chief at the Encyclopedia Britannica published an article mocking Wikipedia as the "faith based encyclopedia" highlighting in particular an article on Alexander Hamilton. Hamilton's biographers disagree on whether he was born in 1755 or 1757. Wikipedia glossed over this debate fixing it at 1755. McHenry argued this showed it could not be trusted in the way a professional produced encyclopaedia could be. But within hours of McHenry's article being published the reference was corrected and over the following days all dates and references in the article were checked. Within a week Wikipedia had a version which was clean and correct. Ironically McHenry's critique had triggered precisely the collaborative self-correction mechanisms which should make Wikipedia so robust over the long run. Rapid feedback, peer review, many people looking for problems and providing solutions, provides a recipe for rapid improvement and high quality.

It is still early days but it seems likely that these highly social and distributed forms of media production, sharing and consumption will be durable. The dot.com boom was fuelled by venture capital money looking for the next big thing. Too often it found a better way to get pet food to people in a hurry. What we are witnessing now is a wave of

social innovation fuelled by a mixture of cheap technology, amateur passion, simple economics, individual expression and loose collaboration. The lack of money, at least at the outset, is part of what makes this wave so powerful and durable. In media and culture, lack of resources is as likely to produce radical innovation as a well funded corporation, look to the margins for the next big thing, not the mainstream

So What?
During Communist rule in Poland amateur film making clubs thrived in steel works, dockyards and factories. They made not just documentaries or home movies but fully fledged feature films. Film making was encouraged in part to divert people away from idle chit chat or trying to find out what was going in the West. Marysia Lewandowska, the Polish artist based in London has spent several years looking at the experience the film makers and at a talk at the Institute of Contemporary Arts in May 2006 she explained. "What they were really doing by making films was learning how to be free, how to make something that mattered to them."

Lewandowska's insight also applies to the rise of social media. By making things that express themselves, however modestly, people are learning a new kind of freedom of expression and creativity. Freedom is not to be measured by how much you can buy, the choices available to you as a consumer. Personal autonomy is also about what you can be, how you can express your distinctive sense of self. Social media allows a vast expansion of that kind of freedom. That is why these new forms of collaborative endeavour will prove to be so much more significant than the first Internet boom.

The first Internet boom, in the late 1990s, seemed to offer a revolution but actually just promised to get dog food to your door more quickly. Why should these new collaboratives offer anything more substantial? Or to put the question in a slightly different way: is this just a way for kids to display pictures of themselves on the Internet and for bands to market their MP3 files or could it bring larger, more significant benefits to society?

First, it is good for personal autonomy. How we consume information, what news and views we get access to is fundamental to how we see the world and make decisions. The kinds of cultural activities we engage with has a huge bearing on who we think we are, where we come from, the story we tell about ourselves. Seen in these lights traditional mass media suffers from several limitations whcih stem from its economics. The high capital costs of creating systems for creating and distributing content - employing hundreds of journalists and others in expensive office space in London, buying printing presses and building studios etc — means media organisations need to find big markets to attract advertising or win support for public subsidy. That may mean, however, the number and range of views and voices traditional media can air are too limited : there isn't enough time, money and capacity to reflect the diversity of what people have to say. New, more distributed, forms of production and sharing allow many more views to be garnered from many more sources, often from those that would not pass the tests of return on investment or public value. A related critique is that high capital costs puts media organisations in the hands of only a few people — corporate owners or state appointed executives. Concentration of power is a bad thing if it suppresses diversity and debate. As yet more distributed forms of production have escaped this problem: Jimmy Wales does not decide what happens in Wikipedia in the way that Rupert Murdoch can influence his editors and empire. If distributed media allows for more diversity of expression then it should also create a more open, contested culture. It should be possible to see any issue — and so our own role in it — from several different vantage points. That in turn should help to make us more self-aware, reflexive and critical.

Social production recreates the possibility that people, like the Polish film makers, can find a sense of autonomy through work, albeit not work for a corporation. People who produce, for free, new computer games, encyclopedia article, software, music, films are finding ways to express themselves through voluntary labour. That is why social production offers the possibility of a deeper sense of freedom based on participation not just consumption; taking part not just consuming. It also allows a wider range of motivations to come to the fore. Most people have diverse motivations. They are neither purely altruistic, completely self-interested, nor obsessed by the power and status conferred by hierarchy. Non-market, social forms of production allow people to do things because of their passions,

interests and skills rather than because of the financial rewards or because they are told to do so by their boss.

Second, social production of media should be good for democracy and the quality of debate in the public sphere. Television and mass media have provided the information backbone to our public life: that is where issues are debated, politicians and others appeal for our attention and occasionally our votes. Yet concentration of ownership gives undue weight to the views of a few. The passive send-and-receive broadcast model means that people are treated as targets for well-honed messages rather than as citizens and participants. The need to reach large audiences with well produced commercials requires money and that in turn creates opportunities for corruption in party funding. Politics is turned into a spectacle, part of the entertainment business, searching for an audience: George Galloway's appearance on Celebrity Big Brother is just the most recent and infamous example of this trend.

The media commons would make it far easier for people to have their say, to voice their views and to get organised: it promotes basic democratic values such as self-organisation, free association and self-regulation. Modern political parties, themselves creatures of the industrial era, now find themselves constantly outflanked by social movements and campaigns, often born by self-organising networks. These new forms of political engagement are not based on send-and-receive models of communications; they are more like vast rolling conversations. We have already seen in the US and the UK that bloggers and campaigners can provide an important new check on the power of traditional media, forcing newspapers and news channels to pick up stories they have ignored or dropped. The rise of blogs-come-political campaigns such as the Daily Kos, which emerged out of the ruins of Howard Dean's failed presidential campaign, show that social media can get organised and have an impact in its own right.

Third, in the long run commons based media should be good for equality and global development. At first glance it is far from clear why there should be any connection between media, poverty and equality. Why should people who need clean water, food and HIV drugs be at all concerned with how middle class kids in the developed world share their MP3 files? About 25,000 people a day die from diseases caused by lack of clean water. Set against that challenge the debate over the merits of social media versus traditional media seems besides the point. But at Yochai Benkler puts it in The Wealth of Networks:

"Information, knowledge and culture are core inputs into human welfare. Agricultural knowledge and biological innovation are central to food security. Medical innovation and access to its fruits are central to living a long and healthy life. Literacy and education are central to individual growth, to democratic self-governance, and to economic capabilities. Economic growth itself is crucially dependent upon innovation and information. For all these reasons information policy has become a critical elements of development policy and the question of how societies attain and distribute human welfare and well-being. Access to knowledge has become central to human development."

Stacked up against that challenge how does traditional media fare compared with social media production? Proprietary systems for owning and controlling knowledge limit its flow and direct it to where people can pay. That is why so much pharmaceutical research is devoted to diseases of the rich and corpulent and so little to diseases of the poor. In most scientific and cultural fields one person's output becomes another person's inspiration or input. If proprietary controls – such as patents and copyrights – put up the price of inputs, then it will price out of the market some innovators who cannot afford to pay the fee to license access to the knowledge. The alternative to proprietary systems for spreading knowledge and ideas has been international versions of traditional public service broadcasters, often state funded and at times politically motivated.

Barefoot media offers some distinct advantages. As Amartya Sen has argued good government depends on democracy and democracy depends on the free flow of information. To the extent that social media production is less easy to control than traditional, concentrated broadcast media, then authoritarian regimes have fewer options to keep their populations in ignorance. Common based media is relatively low cost and so more readily applicable to problems of the poor. It does not rely on employing high cost, professional journalists or researchers. Open and

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

collaborative models encourage self-help and self-reliance. Wikipedia's example is just the leading edge of what could become a new global information commons, stretching from information and media, into culture and science.

The new forms of structured self-organisation – We-think - witnessed now across fields from software and computer games, to music and basic information sharing – could bring our societies very large benefits in terms of competition, efficiency and innovation, freedom, democracy and social justice. But they also pose a significant challenge to all institutions – not just media organisations – that have relied on high barriers to entry and professional control of knowledge and information. Doctors, teachers and journalists, the organisations that employ them and the places they work are all being changed by this trend from centralised to more distributed activity; mass markets to niche; broadcast communication to conversation; consumption to participation; passive to interactive. This is a world in which as Benkler puts it :

"All the means of producing and exchanging information and culture are placed in the hands of hundreds of millions, and eventually billions, of people around the world, available for them to work with, not only when they are functioning in the market to keep body and soul together, but also, and with equal efficacy, when they are functioning in society and alone, trying to give meaning to their lives as individuals and as social beings."

The continued rise of social media production will not necessarily compete with, still less displace traditional media corporations. Indeed they could complement one another and many corporations will see opportunities in creating their own versions of social media, witness News Corporation's purchase of My Space. The computer games industry shows that proprietary ownership of the core game can be combined with massive subsequent player development: Electronic Arts increasingly provides not just games but platforms and tools for communities to develop games. Second Life, the highly immersive game created by Linden Labs, takes this one step further and allows players together to create the environment. Large computer companies such as IBM are very successful in making money from the open source Linux operating system, by selling related services, rather than software. The point as far as the media is concerned is that the whole domain of media production has expanded: the range of possible contributors and distributors has widened. In other words all sorts of interesting hybrids, collaborations and complements are likely to emerge from the interaction between traditional, industrial era media and the new commons based systems of social media production. It does not have to mean war. But it could because these emerging models present a huge challenge to the established incumbent models of Hollywood, the music recording industry and broadcasters, both public and commercial.

The media industries have relied upon high capital costs for creating and distributing content for their competitive advantage. In the old days they could see the competition coming from a long way off because it needed a lot of money and equipment. But over the last decade that has all changed. It is becoming harder and harder to spot where the competition is coming from in a world in which a twenty year old college drop out can write a file sharing programme on a borrowed laptop which eventually upends an entire industry's distribution and business model: Napster. We now live in a world where any newspaper reader can also become a commentator and publisher. Where bands can create a following online without a recording studio or a record deal.

In this world, not surprisingly the incumbents have sought out new ways to shore up their position. High capital costs no longer provide a sufficiently high barrier to entry. So instead over the past two decades there has been a massive expansion in the coverage of intellectual property, copyrights and patents, to make new forms of social production too costly or too risky. This extension of intellectual property is presented as merely protecting creators against theft. But one motive is protectionist in the economic sense: a rearguard action to protect an incumbent business model against disruptive, low cost competition. All of this will make it much harder for consumers to become producers and participants, to cut, paste, add, amend, share.

Modern societies have developed in the context of mass media and industrial information production, which have shaped our view of where ideas come from, how debate takes place, who can be a media producer and who merely

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft — We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

a sofa born consumer. A genuine shift is underway, from production for the masses to production by the masses, which will mean as Benkler puts it:

"Information and communications are core elements of autonomy and public, political discourse and decision making. Communication is the basic unit of social existence. Culture and knowledge, broadly conceived, form the basic frame of reference through which we come to understand ourselves and others in the world….the basic components of human development depend on information and innovation and how we disseminate its implications."

The rise of social, commons based media production allows us to imagine how we could reorganise ourselves, promoting greater freedom, democracy and possibly justice, while also promoting innovation and efficiency. Nick Jaffe is at work in his bedrooms. So are millions of others. The genie is out of the bottle. It is not going back in.

Chapter 4 – The Next Big Thing is Us

A single grain added to a pile of sand can cause it to collapse. But spotting which grain of sand will play that role is very tricky. That is why most of the computer world did not notice in September 1991 when Linus Torvalds, then a computer science student in Helsinki, released onto the Internet the first version of a computer programme he had written. When Torvalds left the source code for Linux on the net he asked his fellow software enthusiasts to take it away and tamper with it, make criticisms and propose improvements. With proprietary software – the kind produced by Microsoft – the source code is kept hidden. You buy a "machine readable" version of the code which cannot be adapted. Eventually the geeks responded in droves to Torvald's enticing invitation. Through tens of thousands of voluntary contributions, over many years, authorship of the programme became shared: it is no longer solely Torvalds' invention. He set off a process of mass, participatory innovation. A decade later, about 15m people around the world were using a version of Linux, which had become one of the main competitor's to Microsoft's operating system. The programme runs systems for companies, public services and government around the world, including in China. The Brazilian government has made Linux its standard operating system.

This programme has emerged from a organisational mutant: a mix of a cult, movement and insurrection all rolled into one which defies easy description. A little more than a decade after Linux was first released there were 430 user communities in more than 72 countries and more than 120,000 registered Linux users, many of whom help with the programme's development. In the first ten years the programme's core grew from 236,000 characters to more than 122 million, a 516-fold increase. New sub-systems that provided additional functionality were added at the rate of three a month. Yet despite this rapid innovation and the burgeoning scale of the endeavour, the Linux community has hung together and the software it produces very rarely crashes. It should not work, because no one appears to be in charge, there are no job descriptions, work schedules and bonuses for good performance.

In particular Linux, Wikipaedia and other mass collaborative endeavours raise a set of questions which seem incredibly troubling, seen from within the world of managerial, industrial capitalism.

• Why do people participate ? Often they are not paid, they are not told to do it by a figure in authority, they do not have a financial stake.

Eight Rules of Open Organisations
A kernel to get things going…
A community has to start somewhere. It has to have a focus that attracts other people to join in. With Linux that kernel was provided by Torvalds himself in the form of his first rudimentary programme. No commercial company would have dared put out something as unfinished as the first version of Linux. But for potential contributors that was an attraction. It meant there was enough to work on, but still a lot of gaps to be filled in. They could add something. It is impossible to add something to a perfectly honed and finished product. To get an open source

community going requires identifying an opportunity and putting up a first, promising stab at addressing it: a kernel, a site, a way of working, a piece of code that will attract other contributions. Communities form around kernels but rarely create them. Attractive kernels usually come from odd, unusual and entrepreneurial people – the likes of Wales and Torvalds – not from mainstream businesses targeting mainstream markets. A kernel is a base camp for the start of a long collaborative climb.

Motivate and attract contributors…
People need a reason to join a community and to keep coming back. Goals and values certainly matter. Linux is idealistic and inspiring: a community underpinned by an ethic of shared exploration. It treats contributors as peers rather than as expendable employees or contractors. People get a sense of self-worth from contributing. As they contribute they get a sense of status from the community. But Linux also depends on being deeply pragmatic and problem-solving: it allows software programmers to get together to do what they love, speaking a language only they understand. It delivers the goods. That is why people keep coming back to it. They get something tangible out of it: better software. A community high on ideals but which fails to deliver practical benefits will soon collapse. Low barriers to entry, easy to use tools…

Communities thrive by attracting a mass of people who can make many distributed and decentralised contributions. That means it has to be easy to take part. Wikipedia took off because it is so simple to contribute. Nupedia failed because contributions were difficult to make. Linux and Wikipedia do not check people out before they are allowed to contribute. They get checked out as they contribute. There is no lengthy recruitment and interview process. It is very easy to get involved. It is also easy to pick up the tools to start creating content. The blog is an easy to use tool for self-expression. The camera phone becomes an easy to use tool for reporting. In open source, this self-help approach is as much a matter of necessity as principle. The first versions of the Unix operating system, on which Linux is based, were created by Pro-Am programmers, Ken Thompson, Bill Joy and others in the 1960s. They could not afford to provide tech support. When they sent the programme to people, usually on floppy discs, they included a set of tools so users could sort out problems themselves. It is like a baker selling a cake but including the recipe and some basic ingredients with the package. The more that easy to use tools are distributed to a community of knowledgeable users, the easier it is for them to start creating their own content. Giving people tools carries a risk that would worry many companies. What participants choose to work on and how they decide to use the tools cannot be mandated from above. But innovations coming from users of products are becoming more important. That is how the users of mobile phones worked out that SMS was a channel for texting messages to one another. It was not an application the phone producers had ever spotted. Give the users tools and they will tell you what they are for. This highly distributed approach to innovation – giving people tools, inviting them to decide what they work on – would still not add up unless the many contributions people make are brought together. How does that happen?

Crowds need meeting places.
The contributors to Linux do not work in the same office, but they work on the same commons. The idea of the commons as a base for collaborative productivity is ancient. Farmers and fishermen have relied on commons for centuries. Swiss villages, for example, still have codes for jointly managing shared grazing land and woods. Orange growers in southern Spain and rice growers in the Philippines share irrigation systems. These are resources held in shared ownership, which people can access so long as they are members of the community and abide by simple rules. Linux, similarly, is an open source programme governed by a special rules of ownership. This is not the place to go into the details of open source licensing but the basics are that anyone can take away the source code and even tamper with it. But they cannot restrict anyone else's right to use the programme and they are expected to contribute back to the commons any improvements they make. Common resource, like grazing land, have fallen out of favour because it is assumed they easily fall prey to over-use: no one owns the common pasture, so no one has an incentive to look after it and people start to over graze it. Eventually it becomes unusable for everyone. Linux turns this on its head: in the case of Linux, the sheep grazing the commons shit out more grass. The more the commons is used, the larger it gets.

Self Distribution of labour

Open source ownership then becomes the basis for something even more powerful: open source styles of working, based on an accelerated process of peer-review that quickly identifies, and then irons out, bugs and promotes good ideas. Linux is akin to an open meritocracy. Being the boss's best mate does not count for much. Torvalds assumed that as people started to use the programme, they would try it out in different settings, find different ways in which it did not work and so discover how it could be improved. The more people tested it, in different situations, the more bugs would be found and if the users had the skills and tools to improve the programme themselves, then innovation could take place on the spot, where the problem had arisen, instead of being sent back to head office for repairs. Many thousands of Linux contributors have made a long tail of smaller contributions, highlighting bugs. These provide the starting point for more ambitious innovations that are mainly the work of about 400 lead programmers who have earned a reputation for writing good software. The only way to get status in the Linux community is to be respected by your peers by making contributions that other people find useful. A traditional software company might employ these lead programmers to work full time. But it would find it much more difficult to mobilise the long-tail of mini-contributions that eventually add up to something far more substantial. This ability to allow many thousands of people to make mini contributions is a vital organisational innovation.

Encourage people to build on your ideas…

Open source products are designed to evolve and accrete from the combination of many thousands of small contributions and a few large ones. Open source is not about creating beautifully designed, perfectly honed products. A good piece of code in an open source project is one that can be built upon by other people. The aim is constant improvement and refinement. That only takes place with dialogue and debate. In many larger organisations the ethos is the corporate parade ground: speak only if you are spoken to, name rank and serial number. These communities are like vast unfolding conversations. A pragmatic, fix-as-you-go, approach to innovation – release early, test, learn, adapt, improve, release again – is made all the easier when there is lots of rapid feedback, because testing it fast and cheap.

Think Lego…

But then all the bits must fit together. How do they all add up, creating a whole that is greater than the sum of its parts? As Linux has become more complex, so it has been broken down into a series of interconnecting modules, like Lego bricks that click together. That means a team of programmers can work on just one module without necessarily knowing what anyone else is doing. As long as all the modules click together the programme as a whole should work. The way in which the modules click together, however, the interfaces between the bits, depends on some clear, simple, central design rules. Those rules usually do not come from the community but from a small core team, in this case Torvalds and some of his lieutenants. They design rules and protocols which allow mass innovation to add up. Linux is far from the first product to use modular design principles.

Modularity has been a feature of computer development since at least the 1960s when IBM was developing its system 360 computer. Fred Brooks the person responsible wanted everyone involved in the project to be kept abreast of what everyone else was doing. Daily notes of changes were shared with everyone. Pretty soon people were starting work by sifting through a two-inch wad of notes on design changes. By the time that wad was 5 feet thick Brooks decided he needed a different approach. The costs of communication and coordination had spiralled out of control. Miscommunication and misunderstandings grew. Adding people to the project did not solve the problem: more work got done, but more misunderstandings and so more bugs were created. Brooks decided to break the S360 into discrete modules – Lego bricks – which could be worked on separately. A core team set visible, central design rules, which specified what modules were needed, how they should to click together and what they should do. That meant that module makers could concentrate on innovation in their small world, while the core team could look after the architecture of the system as a whole. New and better modules could be fitted in without the entire system being redesigned.

Modularity takes off, however, when it is combined with open ways of working. Then it enables a mass of parallel experiments, with different teams working on the same modules, each proposing new solutions. That is how Linux gets the Holy Grail: a mass of decentralised innovation combined with overall coherence. Everything is done independently but it all fits together.

Conversational leaders…
Many large traditional organisations make modular products. Modularity alone cannot explain why Linux all fits together; motivation also counts. In Linux people want it to all fit together because of the way the community governs itself. In many large organisations people seem to be at war with one another.

Torvalds embodies the norms which encourage people to contribute and share. The open source ownership of the project, the fact that Torvalds gave his creation away, set the tone for the way the community behaves. It is all based on reciprocity. Even self-organising communities need leadership, but of a very distinctive kind. Torvalds is the acknowledged leader of the Linux community, just as Wales is the monarch of Wikipedia. But they are not leaders in the manner of corporate chief executives. They tend to be quiet, self-effacing, modest and self-confident. They lead by establishing values and norms. They do not need to hog the limelight, claim all the credit or have a big office. They lead by setting the context for many thousands of other people, at all levels of the community, to take decisions for themselves. Their particular style of top-down leadership allows for a mass of highly distributed bottom-up initiative. Proposed improvements have to gain a following, especially among respected peers. In some open source communities, such as the one that creates Apache, the software which runs most web servers, improvements are voted on by a committee, which has a revolving membership. These communities work because they have ways to raise and resolve conflicts, usually quite transparently, which promote good solutions, establish a common sense of direction, hold people together and in extremis, punish bad behaviour.

The New Model
Henry Ford created his revolutionary approach to mass manufacturing by combining many ingredients that already existed in meat-packing, machine tools and railroads. There is nothing new about many of the ingredients in Linux, which draws upon a long history of mutual organisation. People have worked side-by-side on the commons– usually in the shape of land - for millennia. Peer review of work is an established academic discipline. Democratic voting procedures are common in most membership organisations. Many products are designed in modules that can be clicked together. Software has been distributed with tools for users since the 1960s. None of the ingredients is new. What is distinctive about Linux is the way these ingredients have been brought together so that open source ownership of the programme has spawned open source styles of working and innovation on a vast scale, very rapidly. Ford's combination of techniques created a product that in turn uncovered untapped demand at the outset of the modern industrial revolution. Linux works for an age of the Internet, in which people want autonomy and control as well as a sense of community and connection.

So what have we learned about when these collaborations built on mass creativity work? A group, possibly quite a small one, usually creates a kernel that invites further contributions: it's a base camp, not the peak. The project must be regarded as exciting, intriguing and challenging by a critical mass of engaged users with the know-how needed to contribute to it. It must be very easy for disaggregated contributions to be made, because it very easy to take part. Tools should be widely distributed, experimentation cheap and feedback very fast. That enables a constant process of trialling, testing and refinement. The product should benefit from extensive peer review, to correct errors and verify good ideas. Contributors should get a tangible sense of satisfaction from their involvement. No one should have to wait for a long time to find out whether their idea has been approved (a feature of life in big organisations.) Tasks should be broken down into modules around which small, close-knit teams can form. That allows a huge diversity of experiments to run in parallel. There should be clear rules for how the modules are brought back together and the good ideas are separated from the bad. Ownership of the project has to have a strong public component, otherwise it is difficult to see why sharing would make sense.

Lets go back to some of the questions we started with.

Why do people commit their time to projects from which they are unlikely to get direct financial benefit? Open source taps a wide range of motivations. Some are high minded and altruistic, but most are problem solving and pragmatic. These communities are a good way to get things done if you are sharing music, playing games, swapping ideas, writing software. If you are a hot shot programmer being part of an open source community is one of the few opportunities you have to show off your skills. But if that is what you love doing, then it probably does not feel like work at all. While some companies – Microsoft – see open source as a threat, others – IBM – see it as an opportunity. For many small companies, contributing with others to a shared development platform is the only way they can afford research and development.

How do these communities pull together without a hierarchy being in charge? One part of the answer is technical: the products fit together like Lego bricks, because they are made from modules. But the main answer is political: these communities have effective ways to govern themselves, to review and sort ideas. That process is legitimate and effective because it is organised by peers not by men in suits in a far away office. Leadership plays a critical role not so much in making decisions but in laying out the rules and norms through which the community governs itself. These communities are joined around simple animating goals: Linux is for you if you like writing operating programmes; Wikipedia is about sharing knowledge and building a shared encyclopedia. Clarity of purpose helps prevent mission drift.

How do they move forward without splitting into fragments but also remain open to new people and ideas? The pragmatic, open, problem-solving ethos, borrowed from science, means that people are always looking for better ways to build upon one another's work. The larger the community, and the larger the area it can fan out to cover, the more likely people are to bump into other interesting people. The spirit of decentralisation and independence means people can speak their minds. Debate cannot be closed down. Entry costs are low, so new members can join easily, so long as they have something to contribute. These communities keep at bay the deeply conservative reflexes which cripple traditional organisations. They do not have departments, budgets or corner offices with a view. Traditional organisations encourage group think, discourage people from really speaking their minds and so tend to defend the past. Open source communities are designed to carry on searching for better solutions. They do not stay put.

There are also many situations in which pure open source approaches will not work. When there is no kernel nor shared platform to form around; experimentation is costly and time consuming and so feedback is slow; decision making becomes cumbersome or opaque, beset by complex rules; leaders become distant, capricious or arrogant; yardsticks of performance are so fuzzy that its often a matter of personal taste whether a proposed innovation is really an improvement. This is not a recipe that will work every time, in every setting. This model works for software, where there is a source code.

Chapter 5 – Open by Accident

The best business idea of the last ten years came about by accident. At least that is the impression Jeff Skoll gives of the growth of eBay, where he was one of the first employees working closely with the founder Pierre Omidyar. Skoll's account is that a mixture of luck, laziness and necessity lead eBay to adopt a radical low cost, community-based business model. In many respects there is nothing new about e-Bay: it simply applies the scale and ease of access of the Internet to the age old flea market, to connect sellers to an unimaginably large pool of buyers. In other respects, particularly the way the company has been built upon a community, it marks an organisational mutation that could play havoc with traditional, top heavy, process driven, businesses. The fact Omidyar and Skoll stumbled upon the model for e-Bay by accident rather than design was crucial to the company's subsequent success. In 1995, eBay had about 122 traders. A decade later it had close to 122m, with 25m items for sale at any one time. If eBay had been designed traditionally, from the top down, it would have been too rigid to respond to the emerging needs and ideas of its contributors. Instead, because Skoll and Omidyar could not afford to have

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

central research and development, customer services and a swanky headquarters, eBay had to be built largely bottom up. One of eBay's most creative resources are the participants. They create the value, using the platform and tools e-Bay that provides.

Sitting in air-conditioned offices with panoramic views across San Jose, amidst the cultural desert of Silicon valley, Skoll exudes none of the hype and hubris associated with valley entrepreneurs. He is Canadian, understated, alert and neatly turned out. An unlikely visionary he is fidgety and highly intelligent. "Traditional companies did try to copy us but each time they did, they just treated people like wallets," Skoll explained. "They did not see them as a community of participants, and so they did not really connect with them. They just saw the users as a bunch of transactions to be managed. People did not stay loyal to eBay because the technology was better but because they wanted the sense of community."

eBay has created a shared trading platform, laid down some rules and norms and then provided participants with tools that make it very easy to take part. As in Wikipedia, there are few barriers to entry. Anyone can trade almost anything. Most of the action, and so the value, comes from interactions within the community that operates on the common platform that eBay manages. The value does not flow from e-Bay down a pipeline to the consumers; eBay is not a value chain like Wal Mart or a Tesco. Skoll and Omidyar had to think about the task from the other way around because they lacked the resources for a traditional solution. They could not afford a large customer-services call centre. So they had no option but to see the users as participants, contributors and players, creating collaborative solutions, for themselves. eBay is a market place but also mass self-help on a global scale: the barefoot philosophy taken into business.

After launching the original site – the basic architecture of which Omidyar devised on this home computer over a Labor Day weekend in 1995 – the team were inundated with questions from people trying to work out how to make the auction system work. Omidyar is not a workaholic. He did not want to answer detailed questions from eBay users. So he set up a bulletin board through which people could get their questions answered by other users. eBay participants learned from one another what they could do with the site. They had to make it up as they went along: there was no manual. Omidyar provided the kernel that triggered massive innovation in use. In the site's early days it was mainly attracting collectors, people with shared hobbies, who were used to swapping tips with one anther, not just buying and selling. Those norms of mutual self-help helped to forge the eBay culture.

The most basic tool for any eBay participant is an item for sale form, an idiot proof ticket to the trading system that describes what you are selling. But as soon as people are given tools it becomes very difficult to predict exactly how they will be used. The eBay rating system is a prime example of a recurring story with innovation: the authors of an innovation often do not understand how their new product will be used. In February 1998, just before eBay went public, the company introduced a system to allow buyers to rate sellers using a stars rankings. Skoll imagined buyers would use the rating system to warn other participants that a seller was untrustworthy. Instead buyers started to use it to praise as well as to complain. They liked having a say. They did not want to be treated as dumb wallets. As a result, good traders built up reputations that meant they were more likely to be trusted by future buyers. A reputation built up on eBay cannot be transferred to another platform. People with good reputations, the major traders, had an incentive to stick with eBay. The tool thus provided a way to lock in traders to the eBay community that gave them status. That was not eBay's intention. It was a stroke of accidental genius.

Innovating through co-creation with participants requires a lot of trial and error, adaptation and adjustment. You have to give people tools to play around with and see what they pick up on. Rapid learning is much easier if you get fast feedback: make a lot of small mistakes early to avoid making big mistakes later. eBay the company made lots of mistakes which Skoll says stemmed from thinking that the company was the repository of all knowledge and the source of the best ideas. When eBay the company unilaterally decided to make a change to the site - to divide up the Barbie Doll section into dolls and accessories say – it might have made sense to the specialists in marketing. But not necessarily to the Barbie participants. "Most times when an idea came top down from eBay the company it was

a mistake. When it came from the community up it was much more likely to succeed," Skoll reflected. "You can only lead a community so far. It has to be very interactive. It helps to have a few simple rules, to set a few guidelines and boundaries. But then you have to have faith in the people using the system, that they have the intelligence to work it out for themselves. It's not up to eBay the company to tell people how to present what they are selling or how to ship it. They can work that out for themselves." So not only do many of the best ideas come about by accident, they do not come from the company at all. They come from the community that the company services.

The almost organic relationship between company and community changed dramatically when eBay the company went public. Many members of the original communities who got the site going felt cheated. The company had to start taking decisions about what it would not allow to be traded, including firearms and fake Rolexes. Many people now regard eBay as just another company, running a trading system or market. However community is still what distinguishes eBay from its competitors.

The same culture is at the heart of Craigslist, no nonsense website that is a blend of shopping, gossip and flirting, which attracts millions of visitors a month. Craigslist started in 1995 as an email from Craig Newmark sent to other people in San Francisco alerting them to upcoming events. The service proved so successful that Newmark decided to turn it into a website. Soon people started emailing one another and they wanted to start selling stuff as well. Eventually something that started just as a hobby that was sustained by volunteers, turned into a company, which is funded entirely by charging companies to post job advertisements on the site. By 2006 there were more than 160,000 such job ads per month. Craigslist operates city-based forums, which in 2005 were attracting postings at the rate of 1m a month. "We think of ourselves as a community service," Newmark explained. "We just have a business structure out of necessity."

If it sounds ramshackle that is because it is. Yet the impact of Craiglist should not be underestimated. In 2005 Craigslist carried more than 5m new classified adverts a month. Goldman Sachs the investment bank warned that Craigslist could be a major threat to newspapers dependent upon classifieds. On Craigslist not only do people get their ads posted for free, to a very wide audience, they also get to interact with the buyers. What newspaper allows you to do that? In 2005, Craigslist attracted 2.5bn page views per month. It was operating in 175 cities across the world. Ten years after its start this mass, self-managed, hybrid mix of commerce and community had a staff of just 18 working out of an old Victorian house in San Francisco. Neither Bain, McKinsey nor News Corporation had seen Craigslist coming. It was too marginal to be on the radar and that was because it was not a proper business, with investors, shareholders, products and buildings. Craiglist's only asset is its community of participants. That is why it threatens to be so revolutionary. Craigslist is proof of how rapidly the margins can become the mainstream. Craigslist's strengths and purpose, according to Newmark, include:

• Giving people a voice
• A sense of trust and even intimacy
• Down-to-earth values followed through in action
• Simplicity
• No charges, except for job postings
• Freshness of the material
• No banner ads
• Providing an alternative to impersonal, big-media sites.
• Being inclusive, giving a voice to the disenfranchised, democratizing .
• Being a collection of communities with similar spirit, not a single monolithic entity.

What mainstream business would have that as its mission statement?
Newmark, like Jimmy Wales of Wikipedia and Linus Torvalds, is ironic, self-deprecating, physically unimposing and slightly whimsical. When I met him in 2006 he refused repeatedly to be enticed into making grandiose claims for Craigslist. "Really it is very simple," he explained. "Give people to the tools to help themselves and the decent, law

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

abiding majority will sort out the tiny minority who do not want to follow the rules or are intent on creating trouble. It is just about helping people to get stuff done." Newmark describes himself as Craigslist founder and customer support rep.

The Spectrum from Open to Closed

Open source is a rebellion against the established corporate order of proprietary ownership of software and ideas. It is sparking a ferocious conflict between pure open source and at the other end of the spectrum pure closed, commercial forms of organisation: Linux, in one corner, Microsoft in the other. Open source is a damning critique of everything that big business stands for and an essential challenge to monopolists such as Microsoft and Monsanto that make it very difficult for new commercial challengers to emerge. More open source style challengers emerge in other areas, such as biotechnology, education, law, politics and financial services. In virtually every field it is now possible to imagine open source style alternatives to traditional organisations. Sourceforge.net, the online repository of open source projects now lists thousands and they are growing the whole time. These open source alternatives often attract talent, excite the imagination and allow people to self-organise in a way that traditional organisations cannot imagine.

Yet our organisational future will not be a 'yes' or 'no' choice, open or closed, public or private. Between traditional, pure and closed organisations at one end of the spectrum, where ultimately the boss rules and the company owns all the assets, and the pure open end of the spectrum, where the community owns and no one tells you what to do, a vast and very fertile middle ground is opening up. eBay, Craigslist and many other organisations are starting to operate in this space. It will spawn a rich array of new hybrids. At the edges of this middle ground we will find traditional companies seeking to develop more open and interactive approaches to innovation with communities of developers and users. Phillips the giant Dutch electronics company, for example is redesigning its famous national laboratory in Eindhoven, where much of the early work on the light bulb was done, to accommodate a range of outside companies. The Phillips national laboratory used to be like an intellectual fortress, surrounded by high fences and barbed wire, to make sure all the secrets were kept safe. Now Phillips wants to create a campus where its researchers will work alongside others, sharing ideas. Nokia, the Finnish mobile telecommunications company, has an online forum through which it works with thousands of smaller developers, on applications for mobile services. The forum has elicited more than 1m contributors from user-developers. Intel, the semi-conductor giant, has adopted open and collaborative approaches to innovation, with hosts of developers to make sure the technologies it developers meet their needs.

At the other end of the spectrum we should expect open source initiatives that started life with a group of volunteers to become increasingly dependent on corporate support. IBM and Hewlett Packard are donating thousands of hours of developer time to open source platforms. Many smaller software companies are finding that collaborating to develop a shared software platform is the only way they can do research and development. Linux itself is the basis for a mass of commercial activity. The Linux community supports a range of companies such as Red Hat and VA Linux which make a good living, selling services linked to the implementation and application of Linux software.

Nor will organisations have to occupy just one position on the spectrum. They could attempt to adopt open, participative approaches to some aspects of their work, closed and commercial approaches to others. The computer games industry, for example, develops the core to its games in house, at great expense. But once the game is released, as we will see, that is the basis for massive open innovation among players. Equally innovations that start as open, shared knowledge amongst a group of user-developers – an example we explore in the next chapter is the mountain bike – can then become the basis for commercial businesses. Organisations such as the Institute for Microelectronics in Leuven, Flanders, one of Europe's most impressive industrial research facilities brings together researchers from more than 300 international semi-conductor companies in pooled research projects. Teams of researchers from several companies join forces to thrash out solutions to shared problems with technologies that might be three to five years from the market. The companies contributing to these projects each

have rights to use the combined knowledge generated. How they exploit this shared knowledge base commercially is up to them.

In the long run the most effective way to make sure open source style working prospers is to expand the base of people and organisations that adopt it. If open source remains just for software geeks with an altruistic bent, then it is likely to remain an interesting but marginal pastime. To make a big impact on the way we organise ourselves open source style methods – collaborative, distributed, co-created ways of working – have to migrate into schools, health systems, banks, governments. They have to move from the margins to the mainstream. Open source conceived as a rebellion against the established corporate order has to become a way of transforming traditional corporations. Companies based on communities, like eBay and Craigslist, challenge all organisations to think again about some very basic questions about how they work, innovate and treat their consumers. Lets start with the changing relationship with consumers. In the era of mass creativity the very idea of the consumer may be misleading. If more production and innovation is goping to be done by the masses, not just for them, then we need to see consumers as participants and contributors, demand can create its own supply.

Chapter 6 – The Audience is On the Stage

Where Did the Mountain Bike Come From?
There was a time when there were only two kinds of bikes. There were the clumsy, heavy bikes of the kind men used to ride to go to work in factories and there were racing bikes, as ridden by your elder brother and Eddie Mercks in the Tour de France. Racing bikes were glamorous and sleek, but uncomfortable to ride, with narrow saddles, thin tyres and handlebars that made you bend forward. Like greyhounds, they were too fragile for potholed city roads and for riding along country tracks. Then in the late 1970s, a new kind of bike started to appear, one with a robust frame; thick tyres with a deep tread; straight handle bars with rubber grips; as many gears as a racing bike and ferociously tight brakes. They were mountain bikes. Like most great innovations the mountain bike was adopted so quickly that it soon seemed as if it had been around forever. But where had the mountain bike come from? Standard economic and business theory would tell you the mountain bike came from a clever entrepreneur or innovator working in their garage who emerged one day covered in grease, with his new invention. Having spotted a gap in the market, an unmet need, the entrepreneur's new product would have been hugely successful and attracted mainstream manufacturers in search of their share of the profits. But that is not how it happened. Nor did the mountain bike emerge from the well-funded research and development laboratory of a mainstream bike maker, after months of laborious testing and exhaustive market research to "find" and then "fill" a gap in the market. Standard business theory does not have much useful to say about the emergence of the mountain bike.

There was no lone inventor and no moment of birth. The mountain bike was created by groups of avid users – passionate, Pro Am bikers – not the manufacturers who were quite happy selling products they knew well, through familiar channels, to consumers they also seemed to know well. Bike manufacturers had no incentive to innovate. Mountain bikes were developed when young cyclists in northern California started to take their bikes onto mountain tracks in search of new challenges. Traditional commercial bikes were not designed for this kind of terrain, so the rider-developers put together their machines, mixing strong, old-fashioned bike frames, wider tyres to provide grip and drum brakes from motor cycles. These mutants were called "clunkers." Only the riders really understood what they needed and had the skills to make a product that met their distinctive needs.

For several years Pro Am bikers built clunkers for one another in their garages. Commercial manufacture began in about 1975 but even then only on a tiny scale. A year later there were half a dozen specialist assemblers in a part of northern California that lent its name to Marin, the company that became the best-known mountain bike producer. In 1980 a leading mountain biker, Mike Sinyard, founded a company to bring the first mass produced bike to market. Perhaps two years later, almost a decade after clunkers first hit mountain tracks, the incumbent bike manufacturers finally followed suit. Soon mountain bikes were being used in cities as much as on mountains. As the mountain bike went mainstream so the rider-developers went in search of ever more dangerous environments in which they

could test innovations, riding at night and in all climates. These lead users continue to develop their own innovations, which tend to spread into the mainstream industry between four and six years later.

By 2004, mountain bikes were big business. In the US alone mountain bikes and related equipment accounted for 65% of all bike sales. A category that did not exist thirty years earlier and which had been invented by passionate users was worth $58bn dollars. No one in the mainstream bike industry saw it coming. The biggest disruptive innovation in modern biking history came from the users who saw themselves as innovators, not from the boffins in R & D.

With hindsight it is not hard to work out which users were most likely to become innovators. They were the most passionate and the most knowledgeable. They had been riding off road for longer, spent more of their time with their bikes, rode in more challenging terrain, competed in races and acquired more technical know-how. They did not just ride bikes, they understood how they worked and welcomed the technical challenges of improving them. Not only did they have the motivation to innovate, they had the tools as well. Many of the early user-innovators were engineers and so able to deploy skills they used in their day jobs. Riding clunkers week-in-week-out meant they had a way to carry out experiments in real time. The costs of innovation were low and the pay offs high. They enjoyed what they were doing.

The mountain bike story does not fit into the way we usually tell the history of innovation as a string of heroic inventions. In this conventional history every invention has a moment of birth when it comes into being. The inventor can usually say what the invention is for and how it should be used. That traditional focus on invention as the source of innovation leaves us hopelessly ill equipped to understand not just the mountain bike but the rise of barefoot organisations – the likes of Linux, Wikipedia, Craigslist and many others - that succeed by mobilising masses of volunteer contributors and innovators. These organisations do not have research labs and yet they innovate at scale because they turn their users into creators, combining their many small contributions into larger complex products. Once we realise users can be innovators we have a different lens on how technology spreads, productivity improves, society changes and how we could organise ourselves in future.

Users as Innovators
Histories of innovation invariably focus on the race to invent something and end when the invention goes into production, as if the interesting part of the story is complete. Yet what makes an economy more productive is the rate at which a technology spreads and how cleverly it is used. Invention is just the starting point for a much longer process, in which most of the value is created by people applying technology. Obsessed by when and where technologies were first invented, we pay too little attention to how technologies are adapted, extended, remodelled and re-used. Periods of rapid invention, when lots of technology is being created, rarely correspond with periods of rapid productivity growth. That usually comes much later – often thirty or forty years later - and because consumers in their millions have helped one another to work out what a technology is for. They incorporate the technology into their lives, itself a vital part of the innovation process.

Today, more people that ever can be involved in that wider process of innovation in use. Thanks to the falling costs of technology, cheaper communications, rising educational attainments and longer life spans, more people have more time and capacity to be creative, if only in small ways, than ever before. Ideas do not just flow down the pipeline from the back room boys to consumers. Increasingly ideas are flowing the other way: the consumers are increasingly a source of creativity. In the process they stop being mere consumers and become participants and contributors. The idea of the consumer and indeed mass consumption as the basis for economic activity might have to be thought. Instead we should start to think of ourselves as contributors and participants.

Just as we thought we knew what organisations were for, we thought we knew what consumers were for. They were the end of the line, the consummation of the production process, the final link in the value chain. In traditional organisations value is created through a series of transfers and transactions. The consumer looks for the good they

want – a fridge in the white goods section of a department store – they choose one, hand over their money and take away the item in question. The act of transferring the good from the producer to the consumer confirms its value in the eyes of the consumer. The more choice consumers have, to find the product that best meets their need, the more likely they are to be satisfied. Consumers choose the good they want, pay for it and then take it away and use it. Of course latterly companies have devised all sorts of ways to get consumers to do more of the labour themselves, through self-service; tracking your own package; assigning your own seat; putting together your own furniture. Some companies have even started to listen to users earlier in the design process. Yet these are just modifications to the basic "value chain" view of the world: consumers are transactions to be managed.

Yet the language of supply and demand, consumer and producer does not make sense for a world in which Wikipedia and Linux are built by the people who use them. These collaboratives are not just the by-product of cheaper technology and easier communications. They have responded to a yearning people have to become contributors, participants and players. They do not want to be well-served but dependent and passive. They want a voice and some tools to allow them to self- provide. The more participants can do this together, peer-to-peer, drawing on one another's expertise and ideas, the more shared ideas and innovation there will be. The transfer and transact model of value creation makes little sense in a world where most of what we consume are services, information and entertainment, cultural goods and brands. These often depend on the consumer investing in the process themselves: their identity, hopes, skills, know-how. More of the time we create value together through our interactions, dialogue and sharing. When organisations start to engage people in this way, people who used to be just the users quickly become contributors and that unlocks a vast new source of innovation. But they key is not to just increase the menu of choice but to deepen opportunities for participation.

This is a tremendous potential competitive advantage. Organisations built on high levels of member participation tend to have very low costs: Wikipedia has just one employee, Craigslist just 16 yet they both support communities with millions of participants. More important community-based companies can become instruments of mass innovation. The consensus amongst academic studies on innovation is that only about 25% of new product introductions are a success. The overwhelming majority of product innovations fail. That is because innovation is beset by uncertainty, mainly over whether consumers will take up a new offering. Innovation is so risky because it is so hard to get inside the heads of the potential consumers, to know how far and how fast they will take up a new product. Companies are constantly seeking ways to close this gap, through better market research. But as long as the gap remains the risks of innovation will be dauntingly high for most companies. Organisations built on a strong member community, eBay for example, often find good ideas coming up from the member base. The link between the company and the community, producer and user is much tighter. That makes innovation a lot less fraught. One of the most powerful examples of this approach to innovation is the rise of the computer games industry.

Game On
Near the height of the dot.com boom in 1999 I was invited to meet a Californian hippy entrepreneur in his London penthouse flat in west London. He was dressed all in black, with the mandatory pony tail, long beard and incense burning at various points about the room with views over the city. Over the following couple of course he outlined a vision of creating an online world in which people would immerse themselves by adopting characters and live out online lives. He wanted to target people with religious beliefs so they could form vast online religious communities, replete with cathedrals and mosques, which would then retail religious items to the players. He figures religion was a vast untapped online market. I left feeling slightly dizzy and bewildered. I told the potential investors who had asked me to talk to him that they should pass on the opportunity because the buy was clearly a nutcase. How wrong I was.

About the time I was dimissing this opportunity a young English couple were creating a site designed to appeal to bored young teenagers where they could adopt an online pet. Within six months of its launch Neopets had acquired almost half a million users. By 2006 about 30m people, about 80% of them below the age of 17, pets had been created. The average players spends almost three hours a week on the site. Once someone has created their

pet, they endow it with skills and characteristics and then set off to engage in battle, take part in competitions, furnish a home or simply socialise. The land these pets inhabit, Neopia, has shops, a stock market and currency. There's also a weekly paper, the Neopian Times, in which almost all the content is created by the site's uses. The Neopian Times gets thousands of comic strips a week, poems and stories a week from users who can access it in 11 different languages. The community is not entirely self-organising. The backbone to the site is maintained by a staff of about 130 working in Los Angeles and Singapore. They set a few central rules that help to keep order: pets are not allowed to marry; some posts – about sex or Osama Bin Laden – are ruled out. There is no advertising but instead products are placed around the site. It is an odd mix of community and commerce, fantasy and banality. The computer games industry now outsells Hollywood largely because it encourages massive user participation in co-creating games. There is no better example of co-creation than the Sims, the most successful computer game ever. The Sims grew out of a game called Sim City, which allows people to design a city and watch it grow, prosper, decline and collapse. The Sims translates that into a home, with a family, for whom the player is responsible. You create your family and watch them sleep, eat, argue, marry, make love, fight and die. The original version of the game, launched in 2000 quickly developed into an online community, with players swapping tools, software and artefacts to put in their online houses. Hundreds of websites now display many thousands of collectible items that are available to the millions of players. One estimate is that 90% of the content of the game is now created not by the game's original authors, working for Electronic Arts, the computer games giant, but by a large and innovative sector of the playing community. One player-created tool that allows a player to draw in an edging to a floor rug has had hundreds of thousands of downloads. The 3D Sims Online launched in 2004 was designed from the outset as a community-based game. Five months before the game was launched, Electronic Arts released tools to allow players to create their own content and characters. By the time the game was launched one estimate was that about 50,000 such items had been created. The Sims online is not just a game but a platform to support a vast, rolling do-it-yourself community of gamers who develop and share their ideas. The point is not just to play the game but to add to it and share ideas.

The Sims is not pure user driven innovation. It did not come about entirely through self- help. The kernel to the online 3D game cost $15m to develop. The information infrastructure to support the community is also costly: it has to deal with more than 30,000 request for information a second. The Sims's is not open source. A player has to pay Electronic Arts an entrance fee to join the game and the community: like eBay it is a managed commons. But knowledge about the Sims is not just held in the heads of its original creators who ship their ideas in the form of packaged software to a waiting audience. The Sims community is a distributed, self-organising body of knowledge in which players are constantly training one another and developing new content. In the Sims community most of the value is co-created among the players, with the help of Electronic Arts' platform and development tools. The original transaction – when the gamer bought the software – was just the entry ticket into that unfolding process. Will Wright, the game's original creator, explained why the players want to contribute to the game not just consume it: "The currency is exposure and recognition for their ideas. People are spending time creating cool objects – a lot of them are not spending so much time playing the game. How do we build the most thriving community online? We have to let the business model flow from that." The Sims business is built on the Sims community, which provides the rolling innovation that extends the game's life and enriches the content. A game's official release is the moment when the innovation initiative passes from the in-house development team to the community of player-developers. If a computer game has 1m players, it just needs 1% of those to be dedicated player-developers for it to have acquired an unpaid development team of 10,000 people whose main incentive seems to be to show off their skills and make the game more enjoyable to play. They are not in it for the money. Computer games are another glimpse of the emerging participative culture.

The Pipeline in Reverse
Consumer contributors are vital to innovation. Disruptive innovations, which upset traditional markets and business models – like the mountain bike – often start in the margins of a sector, with innovative users with distinct needs. User innovators will also be critical to radical innovation. A radical technology is one that has very broad but so very uncertain application. It marks such a big break, no one quite knows what it is for. History tells us the

inventors are often very bad at guessing how such technologies will be used. The inventors of the telephone, for example, thought people would use it to listen into live performances on the London stage. They did not think it would be used for conversation. Thomas Edison created the phonograph because he thought people would want to keep a record of those conversations, just as telegraph messages generated a ticker tape. He had no idea it would be used for listening to music. In our own generation no one in the mobile telephone companies predicted that SMS messaging would become one of the main forms of communication among teenagers. They thought it might be used in an emergency. In all these cases and more the technology in question had many possible applications. It was the users who worked out what it was for.

Mainstream companies operating in mainstream markets often have very powerful incentives not to innovate. The way to get promoted in a large company is to go to the board with a proposal for an incremental improvement, to an existing product, aimed at existing consumers that the company knows well, and which it can sell to through familiar channels and which offers sure-fire returns. No one in their right mind would go in saying: "I've got a great idea for an embryonic product, in a marginal market, aimed at consumers we do not know and I am not sure it's going to work, but the pay offs might be great." That way lies a career in ruins. Big companies have inbuilt tendencies to reinforce past success and they tend to overlook smaller, emerging markets. In those markets innovation is often carried forward, as in mountain biking, by people who do have an incentive: the passionate Pro-Am developers. Twenty years ago no one in their right mind in the big record companies would have dared to suggest promoting a form of music in which black men in inner city ghettos revelled in their anger at the world and glorified violence. Rap started as a Pro Am activity, with people recording songs at home, distributing them on tapes, often by word of mouth. Twenty years later Rap was the dominant form of popular music in the world, inflecting many other aspects of popular culture.

Timothy Chan may know a bit about where this is taking us. I met him in a plush, private dinning room, in an exclusive restaurant designed for Shanghai's new rich, half way up a skyscraper, that sits on a plot of land that ten years before grew vegetables. Now Pudong grows skyscrapers. Chan's cherubic face and engaging eyes belie his ambition and drive. He wants to build one of China's most successful companies and what he stumbled on, in 2001, was a way to distribute content to millions of Chinese consumers and get them to pay for it, upfront. Chan used China's rampant culture of illegal file-sharing to his advantage. His company, Shanda, is not so much customer driven as customer created.

In 1999 Chan left his job as a government adviser to start his own business at the height of the dot.com boom. Chan, his wife and three friends set up an Internet business in his apartment, raised some venture capital funding and started to fiddle around. They got nowhere and in 2001, virtually broke, they launched themselves into multi-user online games on the back of a game they bought from Korea. It went stratospheric. By 2004 Chan's company Shanda had 170m registered users and 60% of the Chinese online games market with 10m regular players. When Shanda launched its first home grown game it recouped its $1m development costs in a single day of playing. A key to Shanda's success (Chan's contacts in the government have been pretty important as well) has been providing users with a platform for participation and contribution. Shanda distributed its content quickly and cheaply by giving away the basic game software. The company expects the game to be copied over and over again. The players spread the game through a sibling system of distribution. There is neither a sales force, nor a marketing department. However before someone can start playing a game they have to activate it, which means logging onto one of Shanda's servers, providing a credit card or a pin number from a pre-paid card purchased from a newsagents. The games are mass social events. More than half the participants play from Internet cafes with other people. Shanda specialises in multi-user games, in which a player adopts a character in a fantasy society. The more players, the more action: Shanda provides the playing field, or to be more accurate, usually a battlefield. Chan explained the appeal while crunching through a duck pancake: "The average user plays for three or four hours a day. They concentrate on building up their character and profile in one game. More users means more distribution, which means more action, which attracts more players. It is a virtuous circle."

When a player runs into payment difficulties they lose access to their character. In that situation they have two options. They could buy a new character quite cheaply but that would mean starting all over again, building up a history from scratch. The alternative is to get on a plane to Shanghai, stay overnight in a hotel and queue outside Shanda's offices in Pudong to reclaim your original character, complete with all its history and store of reputation. That costs ten times more than the first option. Nevertheless every morning about 500 people are in line outside the Shanda headquarters. To support this vast undertaking – 9,000 servers, in 60 cities and 30 provinces, used by tens of millions of people a week – Shanda employs just 600 staff. Those are the new economics of barefoot organisations: small bodies of professionals can support vast swarms of participants, so long as the users have the tools they need to support themselves.

Consumers are becoming innovators. The fastest growing consumer markets with the youngest consumers are in Asia. Two thirds of India's 1bn population are below the age of 25. The Philippines has become a centre for innovation in the mobile phone industry because the mobile phone is so ubiquitous and inventive consumers have developed all sorts of ways to trade, share, buy and bank using simple SMS message systems. But most innovation could come from China, assuming consumers have the freedom to experiment. By 2010 China should have more than 200m Internet users and 500m should have mobile phones. A rapidly emerging market on that scale will produce a raft of user-led innovations. The business models that will work in these rapidly growing, but low income economies, will not be the slow moving, top heavy models that developed in Europe and the US in the industrial 20th century. They will operate at low cost by mobilising participants in their millions. The 20th century gave us cinema, still dominated by a few companies based in a narrow strip of Los Angeles, making products for the fast emerging markets in US cities. The fast emerging markets of the 21st century will be found in China and India and that is where the new business models, forms of participative consumption and culture are likely to be created.

Chapter 7 – The Pro-Am Revolution

Star Gazing
On the night of February 23, 1987, light reached Earth from a star that had exploded on the edge of the Tarantula nebula 168,000 years before. The supernova was so large it was the first to be witnessed by the naked eye since 1604. In the Chilean Andes, Ian Shelton an avid amateur astronomer took a photograph with a 10" telescope and went down in history as the man who discovered supernova 1987A. That night two other dedicated amateur astronomers were at work. Albert Jones, a New Zealand veteran with more than half a million observations to his credit had taken a good look at the Tarantula nebula earlier but had seen nothing unusual. Another amateur Robert McNaught, photographed the explosion at 10.30 UT in Australia. (UT is Universal Time, the standard astronomers use, the equivalent of Greenwich Meantime.) Together these amateurs played a vital role in confirming a theory that explains what happens when a star explodes.

Their collaboration is just one example of how dedicated, educated and well-equipped amateurs – Pro-Ams - are changing their fields from astronomy, software programming, to music and politics. Free-form organisations such as Wikipedia and Linux, e Bay and Craisglist, are thriving precisely because they tap into this Pro Am culture. Big organisations, led by professionals, often feel threatened by new amateurs. Doctors do not always like patients who come armed with information about their condition. Big J journalists frown on mere bloggers. Big companies like to see their consumers as targets waiting to be hit. There are few better examples of how Pro Ams can transform a field of activity than modern astronomy. It is a morality tale professionals in other walks of life should take heed of. Astrophysicists had theorised that when a star like the one in the Tarantula nebula exploded most of its energy would be released as neutrinos, low-mass, subatomic particles which fly through planets as if they were not there. The theory suggested neutrinos should exit at high speed and arrive on earth perhaps two hours before the light. The night of February 23rd a large storm of neutrinos from Shelton's supernova was detected by labs in the US and Japan at about 7.35 UT. According to the theory the first light should have arrived at about 9.35UT but the labs did not have photographs. That is where the amateurs came in. Jones checked his meticulous records and confirmed there was no sign of an explosion when he was looking at Tranatula at 9.30UT. That meant the neutrinos had

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft − We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

already arrived yet the light had not, just as the theory predicted. McNaught's photograph taken at 10.30UT made the light of the explosion clearly visible, just as the theory predicted, more than two hours after the neutrinos. A key theory explaining how the universe works had been confirmed, thanks to three amateurs working in different countries, combined with professional physicists in the US and Japan. The skilled amateurs were as important as the professionals.

Astronomy is fast becoming a science driven by a vast Pro-Am movement working alongside a much smaller body of professional astronomers and astrophysicists. They are building on deep amateur foundations. Astronomy, like most sciences, was started by amateurs. Copernicus, who moved the sun to the centre of the universe, was only a part-time astronomer. Johannes Kepler, who discovered that planets orbit in ellipses made most of his money from horoscopes. Yet by the 20th century the pendulum had swung decisively in favour of the professionals, for one simple reason: scale. Professional astronomers had access to huge telescopes, like Jodrell Bank in the UK or the Mt Wilson Observatory near Pasedena where Howard Shipley established that the Sun is located to one edge of our galaxy and Edwin Hubble determined that the galaxies are being carried away from one another into cosmic space. Professionals probed the outer depths of space, home to the most troubling scientific questions. Amateurs, with their puny telescopes, concentrated on closer, well known and brighter objects: astro tourism.

In the last two decades three linked innovations have given the Pro Ams a host of new ways to contribute. A disruptive innovation made powerful telescopes affordable for the average astronomer. John Dobson, a one time monk and lifelong star-gazer designed a crude but powerful telescope using discarded materials. Dobson's philosophy was pure open source: "To me it's not so much how big your telescope is, or how accurately your optics are, or how beautiful the pictures you can take with it; it's how many people in this vast world less privileged than you have had a chance to see through your telescope and understand this universe." Dobson refused to profit from his invention, which he never patented. Soon many companies were making telescopes based on his design. Observers armed with a Dobsonian telescope could invade the deep space that had previously been the preserve of the professionals. Then along came a relatively cheap, highly light sensitive computer chip, which could record very faint starlight much faster than a photograph. Amateurs who attached this chip to a powerful Dobsonian found themselves with light gathering capacity to match the giant telescopes of many professionals. It is a slogan of open source software programming that "many eyes make bugs simple": the more programmers looking at a problem, the easier it should be to solve (so long as they organise themselves in the right way.) The same is true of some aspects of astronomy. Thanks to Dobsonian telescopes and the new light sensors the earth acquired hundreds of thousands of new eyes, recording events in deep space that would have gone unnoticed by the much smaller body of professionals. The Internet vastly amplified this distributed capacity for exploration.

Before the Internet, an amateur who thought they had made a discovery would telegram the Harvard College Observatory. Once the professionals there had checked out the claim, they would mail a post card to observatories around the world. The professionals were the gatekeepers of knowledge. These days if an amateur finds something interesting they can email the image to friends, colleagues and professionals, within minutes. New discoveries are openly debated and assessed. Crude Dobsonian telescopes armed with CCDs had given the Earth thousands of new eyes; the Net provided the optic nerves to knit them together.

In the 1990's, these three innovations started to spawn new forms of endeavour. Astronomy used to be done in "big science" research institutes. Now it is also done in loose Pro-Am collaboratives. Many amateurs continued to work on their own and many professionals were still ensconced in their academic institutions. But global research networks sprang up, linking professionals and amateurs, with shared interests in flare stars, comets and asteroids. Groups of Pro-Am astronomers tracked the weather on Jupiter and craters on Mars as accurately as professionals. They detected echoes from colliding galaxies, and more than 1m contributors, in more than 200 countries, are contributing their computers' idle time to analyse data than might be evidence of extra terrestrial life. Together they have created a super-computer larger than anything IBM could make.

There are limits to what Pro-Ams can do. Amateurs do not produce new theories of astrophysics. Sometimes amateurs do not know how to make sense of the data they have acquired. Yet the future of astronomy, and after it other sciences and professions, will be as a Pro-Am activity, with dedicated amateurs and professionals working in tandem, motivated by the same sense of excitement about exploring the universe. For many professionals this poses a worrying challenge. Some will seek to defend their endangered monopoly. The more enlightened will understand that knowledge is now much more widely distributed and not controlled in a few ivory towers. The most powerful organisations will combine the know-how of professionals and amateurs to solve complex problems. That is true in astronomy, software development and online games. It should be the path our health, education and welfare systems follow as well.

Pro Am Power
Some of the most powerful movements reshaping our world are driven by Pro Ams: people who engage in activity for the love of it, but perform to very high standards. Their motivations are avowedly amateur but the standards they set themselves are comparable to those of professionals. They want to be taken seriously, as players and contributors. Movements that mobilise this Pro Am ethic will be hugely powerful.

The Jubilee 2000 debt campaign, which changed the way we think about debt, development and trade, started life with one campaigner working in a shed in South London in the mid-1990s. By the year 2000 it had a petition with 24 million signatures, spawned a network of 69 national campaigns and mobilised hundreds of thousands of people in protest in the UK. At least $36bn of developing world debt has been written off as a result. Pro-Am activists are reshaping the way democracy works. They are the lifeblood of the local and global single issue movements which now animate politics, while traditional party politics becomes ever more professionalised and media based. Linux and Wikipedia are sustained by Pro-Ams as is much of the computer games industry. Rap music started life as a Pro Am activity which people sharing home made tapes.

The 20th century was shaped by the rise of professionals in most walks of life. From education, science and medicine, to banking, business and sports, formerly amateur activities became more organised, knowledge and procedures were codified and regulated. As professionalism grew, often with hierarchical organisations and formal systems for accrediting knowledge, so the term "such an amateur" came be to a form of derision. Pro-Ams are turning that on its head. Pro-Ams are knowledgeable, educated, committed and networked by new technology. They scramble up the categories that divide and rule our lives. They work at their leisure. They learn by playing. They relax by undertaking challenging tasks. They are unpaid and yet they set themselves very high standards for what they do. Pro Ams are motivated by values that we thought were near exhausted. They do what they do for the love of it: for the pleasure of taking part, to make a contribution, to win a reputation from their peers, for the thrill of the challenge. They are not in it for the money. Pro Ams yearn for more than a Jekkyl and Hyde experience of being mere workers by day and them consumers by night. They want to be contributors. Traditional organisations with their hierarchy, bureaucracy and complicated sets of financial incentives cannot reach these simpler and more powerful motivations. Free-form organisations like Wikipedia and Linux are so threatening and perplexing because they are designed to tap into the Pro Am ethic. What they have done is find a way to transform what might have been individual, leisure activities into organised, mass activity.

For Pro-Ams, leisure involves deploying knowledge and skills, often built up over a long career. Most Pro-Am activities take place outside normal working hours in the evenings, holidays and at weekends, in leisure time. Climbers go climbing at weekends; amateur actors act; software programmers programme. Leisure is usually defined as a form of relaxation that allows people to recuperate from work. Yet Pro-Am leisure is a very serious activity involving: training and rehearsal, competition and grading, and so also frustration, sacrifice, anxiety and tenacity. Pro-Ams report being absorbed in their activities, which yield intense experiences of creativity and self-expression. They provide people with psychic recuperation from – and an alternative to - work that is often seen as drudgery. Leisure is traditionally regarded as the antithesis of work: a zone of pure freedom and spontaneity. Yet much Pro-Am activity is characterised by a sense of compulsion and effort. Pro Ams feel they have to do it, get up early, make sacrifices, put in the hours.

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Pro-Ams spend a large share of their disposable income supporting their pastimes, whether through travel, equipment or entering tournaments. They are avid consumers, not least because Pro Ams can now get hold of technology – like Dobsonian telescopes – that was once the preserve of professionals. Amateur composers can now get software tools that only orchestras could afford ten years ago. Amateur photographers can afford cameras that only professionals could use. As technology has got cheaper, smaller and more usable, so it has encouraged more Pro Ams to take up pastimes that once might have been beyond their means. So Pro Ams spend much of their free time as consumers actually being mini-producers. Pro-Am musicians and photographers want to use their instruments and cameras to produce work that other people want to hear and see. They have shadow careers that they turn to once their formal and public career runs out of steam. They might be a health official by day but an amateur garden designer by night. As one Pro Am mountain climber put it: "When I meet people and say what I do, I say I am a financial analyst. But when I talk about who I am, it is a mountain climber."

Pro Ams do not tend to be loners. They build collaborative organisations – clubs, mutuals and now networks – because it is very difficult to be a Pro Am on your own. To be a Pro Am requires the systematic acquisition of skills. That involves learning from coaches and peers, which in turn requires social organisation so that skills can be passed on and accredited, through clubs, networks, events, competitions and performances. To enjoy going to see a film, one might only need the time and the money to visit a cinema. To join a film club requires more than time and money: it depends on a strong desire to learn more about film and to identify yourself with a community of fellow film buffs. As the investment is significant, so the benefits to the individual have to be durable: a lasting sense of identity, achievement and satisfaction. Pro-Ams seem to get far more intense, pleasurable and satisfying experiences from these activities than they do from work, formal learning or passive consumption. Active leisure, which engages people's minds and bodies, has big pay offs for psychic and physical health as well. As the Pro Am mountain climber put it: "When I am up a mountain it is just me and the mountain, everything else fades away. Everything that was so complex before becomes so simple."

Getting a fix on the scale of Pro-Am activity is tricky not least because it is a hybrid category not recognised by standard research techniques. As a result estimates of Pro-Am activity rely on proxies such as volunteering. British figures suggest that club membership and community participation is holding up well, especially in volunteering, in contrast to the decline charted for the US by Robert Putnam in Bowling Alone. Traditional forms of association have dwindled - membership of Women's Institute for example fell from 442,000 in 1972, to 240,000 thirty years later. Yet new networks have risen: membership of environmental group rose over the same period from 750,000 to close to 6m. According to the British Social Attitudes Survey for 1998, about 21% of people were members of community groups and 26% were members of sports and cultural groups. About 23m adults a year undertake some form of volunteering, contributing close to 90m hours a week. Volunteering has almost doubled in the last decade. Among important volunteer Pro-Am organisations are: the Samaritans with 18,000 Pro-Am volunteer counsellors who devote 2.7m hours a year; the Women's Royal Voluntary Service which 95,000 volunteers who deliver more than 9m meals on wheels a year; Neighbourhood Watch which covers 27% of households and Victim Support which has almost 15,000 volunteer Pro-Am counsellors. About 95% of criminal cases are dealt with the country's 26,000 Pro-Am magistrates. The St John's Ambulance is run by about 43,000 Pro-Ams and trains more than half a million people a year in first aid.

In science there are estimated to be at least 4,500 independent archaeologists, not counting the tens of thousands of men who go out with metal detectors at weekends. The Natural History Museum estimates that 100,000 amateurs are actively involved in nature conservation, through a myriad of specialist societies and clubs. More than 1m people are members of wildlife groups in the UK. The Family Record Centre in London estimates there are 387,000 active members of family history societies in the UK. The Demos Pro Am survey found that perhaps 58% of the British population engage in an amateur activity regularly and rate their skills as reasonably good. The "hard core" Pro-Am population is likely to be a subset of this. Combining our estimates with those of other surveys a reasonable stab is that between 15% and 25% of the population at anyone time are hard core Pro Ams.

Charles Leadbeater
Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Their number is only likely to grow. Pro-Am culture is being driven by a powerful set of social and demographic factors. By 2020, mean UK household income is projected to be more than £44,000, up from about £27,000 in 2002. More income means more spending on experiences and services, proportionately less on basics. Future generations are likely to be better educated. More than 50% of men over the age of 65 have no educational qualifications, compared with less than 10% of those under the age of 30. Those with more education are better equipped for the learning involved in Pro Am activities. The extended life span should give people longer, healthier lives allowing them more time for second and third careers, after their children have grown up. A woman born in 1850 would have had little time for herself. A woman born in 1950, whose eldest child reached 18 in the 1980s, might have 30 years of healthy life without direct child care responsibilities. By 2020 there will be 5m more people in the UK population over the age of 45, a prime group for many Pro-Am activities. A more open and socially fluid society means people want a sense of individual fulfilment and identity that comes from their hobbies they engage in. Greater insecurity at work means that people are increasingly likely to turn to these shadow careers in their 40's and 50's. Cheaper and high quality technology puts powerful tools, once the preserve of professionals, into the hands of amateurs.

Pro Am Benefits

Pro Ams are more than a new exotic social species of do-it-yourself enthusiasts. They bring wider benefits to society: they help build communities, drive innovation, sustain democracy, empower poorer communities and contribute to culture. Henry Ford's model of organisation was built on the new character of the factory worker. Wikipedia, Linux and their like are substantially built by and for the Pro-Am.

Pro-Ams thrive in communities, where they learn to play with, compete against and perform to others. The volunteer organisations that sustain Pro Ams also help to generate social capital, lasting relationships and friendships that help to provide the social glue and basis for cooperation. As local community has dwindled as a source of shared identity, so Pro Am tribes have become more important. We engage with people who share our view of the world without having to live next door to them. Sharing Pro-Am interests is the new basis for community. This inbuilt impulse to collaboration lies at the heart of the economic power of Pro Ams.

The user innovation we explored in the previous chapter will often start with groups of Pro-Ams. What has already happened in some sporting fields, such as windsurfing, will spread to other sectors. In 1970's Hawaii, top amateur windsurfers were trying to outdo one another by jumping from the top of large waves. Invariably, they fell off in mid-air because they could not keep their feet on the board. Then two of the leading protagonists, Larry Stanley and Mike Horgan, decided to try a different approach. Several years before, Stanley had built an experimental surfboard with footstraps. When he adapted it for jumping it worked immediately. "I could go so much faster than I ever thought," Stanley recalled. "When you hit a wave it was like a motor cycle rider hitting a ramp; you just flew into the air and you could land the thing and change direction. Within a couple of days ten other people had boards with improvised straps." The idea was promiscuous. High performance windsurfing started from that Pro-Am innovation. By 1998 more than a million people were taking part in the sport that Stanley and Horgan created. Disruptive innovation often starts in marginal, experimental markets that are often too small to sustain traditional approaches to R & D. That is where Pro-Ams come in. Dedicated amateurs pursue new ideas even when it appears there is no money to be made. They do it because they love to.

The more Pro-Ams there are in a society the healthier its democracy is likely to be. While participation in formal politics and membership of political parties has declined, there has been a parallel massive growth in single issue and pressure groups campaigns. The fact that people can pursue amateur hobbies without state censorship or interference is a vital measure of freedom. People with passions get drawn into civic life and so are more likely to have a stake in a democratic process that defends this freedom of association. Pro-Ams are also spawning the most powerful new forms of political engagement. These bottom-up, forms of organisation are cheaper, more agile and more fun than formally structured parties. They transforming the way we do politics.

Pro Am creativity will flow through culture in future as well. File sharing sites such as Napster and Kazaa gave people the chance to share music made by established artists. New generations of these services will allow people to share their own creativity. With Sibelius, the software that allows composers to orchestrate their work, someone can play a keyboard connected to a computer and see the notes he is playing transcribed automatically onto a score. With a few more clicks the melody can be orchestrated for a full symphony. Sibelius started in the early 1990s as a heavy-duty software programme for professional composers. The software has been used for the music in countless feature films. It did not take long to infiltrate education: now 60% of UK schools use a simpler and cheaper version for students and teachers. Think of what that means for the average music teacher: the task of staging a school musical just got a lot easier. Writing scores for the school orchestra, often with an odd assembly of instruments, has became simple. Children doing their GCSE music courses can now use the simple version of Sibelius to compose for themselves. They do not have to learn composition by listening and writing out notes in long hand. They can learn by doing. Thanks to the Sibelius community web site they can publish and share their work online. There some amateur composers are selling their compositions, from online stalls. Many in the community just want to share their work. In 2005, just months after it was created, the site had 45,000 scores contributed by members, with 20 new scores arriving every day. You can listen to Mathew Scowcroft, 16, from Melton Mowbray, playing his first published oboe work : "The train was beautiful on fire, fireflies attracted by the embers, amid the chaos." Jeremy Silver, Sibelius' chief executive, who looks more like an enthusiastically earnest English teacher than a business man explained: "Sibelius is really a tool for the extension of the imagination and we want to take that to as many people as possible. The fact that the professionals use the top of the range version still matters a lot to the product's standing and credibility, but the real impact comes from when it spreads to hundreds and thousands of people, especially children. Then it could transform how they can be creative, together."

Pro-Am power is not confined to the high-tech, developed world. It is at work in some of the poorest communities as well. Many of the social and medical advances achieved in the rich, developed world in the 20th century – especially in health and education – relied on providing people with access to professional expertise: teachers deliver education, doctors cure disease. In the developing world professionals are scarce and these top down, welfare state style approaches are too expensive, which is why the most imaginative social innovations in the developing world employ Pro-Am forms of organisation, such as the Barefoot College.

The outstanding example is Bangladesh's Grameen Bank founded in 1976 by Muhammad Yunnus, a Bangladeshi economics professor, to provide very poor people with access to micro-credit to allow them to improve their houses and invest in businesses. Traditional banks, reliant on professional expertise, regarded poor people seeking small loans as unprofitable. It did not make sense to employ a professional banker to make a small loan to a poor peasant. Grameen has succeed by orchestrating Pro-Am expertise. Grameen employs a small body of professionals who in turn train an army of barefoot bankers. Village committees administer most of Grameen's tiny loans. By 2003, Grameen had lent more than $4bn to about 2.8m Bangladeshi's including 570,000 mortgages to build tin-roofs for huts to keep people dry during the monsoons. Had Grameen relied on traditional, professional models of organisation it would only have reached a tiny proportion of the population. The Pro Am, self-help model is being replicated by social entrepreneurs across the developing world. In India, Jeroo Billimoria, has built up a national emergency telephone service for street children, built almost entirely on training children to advise one another. In Peru, social entrepreneur Martin Burt is creating a self-sustaining school, in which the children operate a farm and so earn enough money to employ teachers. In the Mbuya Parish of Kamapala, the capital of Uganda, Margrethe Junker, is leading an aids support network, for more than 1350 clients, with just 230 volunteers, 77% of whom are also clients of the service themselves. "We had not option," she explained. " We had such huge need and no doctors, we just had to do it by organising people to do it themselves. The more people become involved as contributors, the better they feel." Low-cost, self-organising networks might be the height of organisational fashion on the US west cost but they are a matter of life-and-death in places like Mbuya Parish, Kampala.

Charles Leadbeater
Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Knowledge once held tightly in the hands of professionals and their institutions is flowing into networks of dedicated amateurs. The crude, all or nothing, categories we use to carve up society – leisure vs work, professional vs amateur – will have to be rethought. The Pro-Ams will bring new forms of organisation into life, which are collaborative, networked, light on structure and largely self-organising. Professionals - in science and medicine, war and politics, education and welfare – shaped the 20th century through their knowledge, authority and institutions. They will still be vital in the 21st century. But the new driving force, creating new streams of knowledge, new kinds of organisations, new sources of authority, will be Pro Ams.

Chapter 8 – Open Work

Open Work
Seb Potter is a pasty pale young man who eats too much take-away food and spends far too much time at his computer. He programmed his first computer at the age of eight and has not stopped since. Potter is an unlikely looking organisational revolutionary: baggy jeans, skater T-shirt, trainers. There is no reason why executives in large organisations should take any note of him. Yet the way Seb Potter works says something about how jobs are evolving which even large and conservative organisations will eventually have to take note of. I met Potter in a pokey conference room in a run down and over-crowded building in Brighton where Get Frank, the web development company he works for, is crammed into two tiny rooms, with developers working cheek by jowl, the office cluttered with bikes and workstations. It looks more like a student flat. Perhaps it should be no surprise that radical organisational innovation would start in marginal and overlooked places such as this and not in the work pods of the corporate mainstream.

Potter got involved in open source software development as a student in 1998, when he helped to launch an online community called Evolt to bring together amateur and professional web developers. Evolt started with 24 online collaborators who had never met face-to-face, but started to converse with one another, through a discussion group hosted by a magazine website. Frustrated by the magazine's new owners' plans for the website, they decided to create their own alternative to share ideas. Potter recalled: "It was really very simple. We just exchanged emails and agreed it was a good thing to do. We divided up the tasks among ourselves, depending on who could do what and within a month we had a fully functioning website which people could visit to get tips and advice to make life easier if you were developing a web site. We just wanted to make it easier for people to solve web development problems they faced."

When the community got started contributors would vote on what should go on the site, using email. By 2001 the site had 3,000 signed up members, and Potter and co decided it needed a more formal system of committees, to oversee different aspects of its work. Occasionally members would get together face-to-face in a London pub for a "beer-volt." Once a year there was a big conference. A couple of the original community members got married. By 2004 the Evolt community had 7,000 contributing members worldwide. "Most people hear about Evolt because they've got a problem to solve," Potter explained. "If you go onto Google and type in 'web development problem solving' Evolt comes close to the top of the list. The more people who get involved adds to the number of questions that get asked and the amount of knowledge that gets generated in the shared knowledge base." GetFrank encourages Potter works for, encourages him to spend at least a quarter of his work time involved in these open source projects because the company gets access to software they could never afford to develop on their own. Frank Byford, GetFrank's founder explained: "We are very small so open source software gives a small company like us access to a potentially massive research and development capacity. It makes R & D affordable for small companies who collaborate." For Potter, though, the motivation for his open source work is far more personal: "I love problem solving and if you are into software then pretty much the only way you can do that is to get involved in open source projects because proprietary systems are closed. Open source communities judge you on the ideas you have and the contributions you make not on what you look like. If you have good ideas you get recognised."

Charles Leadbeater
Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Traditional companies find it almost impossible to tap into the passion and imagination of people like Seb Potter. That is why open source communities are going to change the way we work, in all organisations, even those quite unlike these communities. As Potter puts it: "For me work is the oddity. Work is a kind of compromise. I feel most myself when I am doing this open source stuff. When I am doing this and give it my full attention then everything else around me fades away and I become completely focussed." Most managers in large companies can only dream of creating a work environment like the one the Evolt community seems to have created, without design and almost by accident. How can a group of 7,000 people work together, sharing out tasks, building up a knowledge base, set of tools and services, without needing an office, a management hierarchy, a knowledge management programme or an organisation chart? Seen from within the walls of the traditional organisation it does not make sense. But in time these open approaches to work will become the new common sense. They will expose just how odd, distorted, dysfunctional and unpleasant it is to work for large corporations.

The Soulless Organisation
Organisations exist to get work done. Any successful organisation must do three things well. It must motivate people to work, to make the most effective contribution to the collective endeavour. It must coordinate the work of many people to make sure it all adds up and takes places in the right order, to fit together. It must innovate by learning, adapting and evolving with the demands of the environment around them, exploring opportunities for change. Sounds simple. Yet traditional corporate organisations are in continual crisis over their shape, structure, management, pay systems and ethos because they find it so hard to fashion an approach to work which meets all these challenges – motivate, coordinate, innovate - at the same time.

In closed, industrial era organisations people were allocated to tasks by a division of labour, with work divided into manageable chunks. This allowed workers to become specialists in their particular task, while the central design ensured all their efforts could be brought together. If a worker was not clear what to do next, he could have a look at his job description, which would describe the role. If that did not provide the answer then he could ask someone in authority to provide guidance. The way we work now, in many respects, is nothing like this caricature of factory age work. People no longer have to work at the same time and in the same place to be producing the same item. Work has become dispersed to networks of contractors. Management hierarchies are flatter and working practices more flexible, at least for some. Detailed job descriptions are a thing of the past in many organisations. Workers can be deployed wherever they are needed. The coordination of these networks of far more flexible workers has become an art form in itself, involving logistics and international communications. The psychological contract, what both sides expect from work, has changed as well. In the US and the UK employers seem less committed to providing stable jobs for life. Relationships between workers and companies are less secure and stable, more cynical and short term. In Europe and Asia traditions of stable employment have been more enduring. But even there they are under pressure to change.

Underlying all this change in working life are two competing trends, which many feel makes life impossible for them. Big organisations with big brands, need consistent products, services and processes – often on a global scale – to deliver a consistent customer experience. Wherever you go – Starbucks, Coke, Microsoft – must mean the same thing. That means work has to be highly systematised. The workers have to follow common rules and processes. Product launches have to be planned meticulously, like a military campaign, from the centre. Yet at the same time all organisations – public and private – face a challenge of innovation and adaptation, as new technologies, competitors, consumer trends and kinds of organisation emerge around them. Responding to that changing environment means bending or breaking rules, trying to do new things or at least old things in a different way. Innovation requires variation, experimentation and acceptance of failure, not activities that a high quality, brand-led company can easily tolerate. This balancing act is complicated because these days workers are far less compliant. They have higher expectations of how they should be treated, especially younger, well-educated knowledge workers, who will make up the majority of the workforce in developed economics. Our culture has told them they should be in control of their lives. They want to extend their sense of authorship from how they design their living rooms to how they design their careers. They want to feel autonomous, able to take the initiative and be rewarded with a sense of

achievement and ownership. They want their work to belong to them. These younger generations of workers have essentially democratic values: people in authority have to earn their respect, be open to question and justify their decisions.

The kind of angst these tensions create can be seen in corporate offices all over the world, but they seem most troubling in large US corporations. In 2005 I spent a few days advising a division of a very large US multinational software company. On my first day I sat in an airless, windowless room, barely large enough for two people, which had just been redesignated as the "ideas space." The previous "ideas space", which had been decked out with orange bean-bags, had just been taken over by extra tele-sales staff, to flog more product, because targets had been increased. Everyone seemed to be strapped to their desks, even for lunch. That day my task was to talk to each of the senior managers to find out what their main challenges were. It was not difficult to get them to talk. My pokey little room became a kind of confessional. One after the other they told a story with some common themes. It ran something like this.

The people here are great but the organisation seems soulless. Young, fleet footed competitors are emerging the whole– Google and Linux – and we are embarrassingly slow to respond. We are one of the biggest companies in the world yet in reality we are following the lead of smaller companies. Coming up with new ideas is pointless because all the decisions get made on the West coast of the US. We have no space for innovation: we just deliver products to market, according to a plan set down somewhere else. One of our main tasks is to report back to headquarters with detailed plans but the numbers in those plans are semi-fictional. When we exceed the numbers we get congratulated and when we fail there is an inquest but no one has the courage to point out the plans never made sense in the first place. No one seems to have enough time. Executives are either on a plane to the US to get their marching orders or in conference calls. Most executive time is spent serving the hierarchy, trying to fight it or simply working out what is going on at headquarters. No one seems to be very happy. Most people have their eyes on another job somewhere else, preferably soon. People with families find life pretty intolerable. The Soviet Union's plans had nothing to compare to the detail of those that ruled this corporation.

Many large organisations seem to be like this: they are engaged in a low intensity civil war. Much of the paraphernalia of modern management is an effort to square the circle: to make organisations that are top down and financially driven, appear to be more humane, democratic and bottom-up. New forms of open, collaborative organisation are emerging because they resolve these tensions between efficiency and innovation far more effectively than the traditional corporation. These new kinds of organisations answer central questions about work – Why do I do this? Who is in charge? What do I do next? – in a very different way. That is why organisations based on open work are proving so potent.

Why Work for Free?
The perplexing thing about Linux, Evolt and other open source initiatives is that skilled people give their time and effort for free to create a complex product that they give away for free to anyone who wants to use it. Why do they do it? One answer might be that it is just really a way to get a good job: a bit like work experience. Young software programmes use their participation in these communities to show off their skills to their peers. That way they build up a reputation, which at some stage they translate into a well-paid mainstream job. There may be something in that but many of the people who take part in these projects are not after jobs because they have jobs already. Another possibility is that they are motivated by dislike of the opposition – particularly Microsoft – and they buy into the altruistic and egalitarian values of the open source movement. But this only applies to a minority, surveys suggest, and dislike of an opponent is rarely enough to generate creativity. According to surveys of open source programmers, participants contribute to these projects for three main reasons. First, they want to solve a problem. Seb Potter was attracted to Evolt because it provided a better way for him to develop the kind of software he wanted. His employer, GetFrank, regards it as an effective way to share development costs with like-minded smaller companies. Second, individual programmers see it as an investment in their own skills and learning. By taking part in these communities they refresh their own ideas and human capital. Third, they seek a sense of

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

authorship and recognition. Seb Potter likes the sense of achievement he gets, the way he feels in flow, when he is working on open source projects. Open source taps into a richer range of motivations – pragmatic, practical, ethical, personal – than large organisations which many people regard as a necessity: longer hours, more targets, rules and stress.

As these communities have very low costs of entry – it is very easy to take part – they also attract a much larger range of contributions than traditional organisations. Even if your contribution is very limited – spotting a bug, correcting a Wikipedia entry – you can still add to the larger project. Most open source and file sharing communities depend on perhaps 20% of the contributors – or less – making most of the big contributions. The Linux kernel is supported by a relatively small team. But the other 80% make a long tail of smaller contributions. Innovations in Linux start with users reporting bugs that then get fixed by other programmers and in turn might provoke a significant innovation. Large organisations, by and large, like to employ people who come to work on a regular basis and devote most of their working time to the company. That is what employment contracts achieve. The need to accommodate people who make smaller, less regular contributions, is reflected in the growth of part-time and short-term contract working. But setting up an organisation to cope with lots of people who want to make lots of small contributions is very costly for a traditional organisation with its management hierarchies and brand strategies. One of the distinct advantages of open communities is they allow people to make contributions of just the scale that suits them, large, medium, small, miniscule, episodic, intense. This flexibility allows them to mobilise a much larger range of players from fanatics to occasional dabblers.

The second challenge is how this myriad of contributions is brought together to form a coherent whole. The traditional organisation is based on a division of labour: people are allocated to tasks, divided up from above, according to a strategic plan set out from the centre. That works only on the assumption that the centre – the people who design the work system – know what needs to be done. But these open source communities are designed for innovation and growth. People at the centre cannot say for certain in advance what will need to be done. Open source communities coordinate their work through a distribution of labour: people distribute themselves to tasks they think need doing and they believe they have the skills to undertake. A self-distribution of labour – if it works – is far cheaper and more innovative than a centrally planned division of labour. An organisation does not need a layer of management supervisors to check what people are doing. That decision is left in the hands of the people doing the work, facing the problems, seeking solutions.

Ronald Coase, the organisational economist, famously argued that firms emerge to coordinate work – through management instruction and planning – when it is too costly to achieve the same result through the market. Coordinating complex activities at the right time, in the right place, is a difficult task. Relying on contractors in the open market is a risky business. That is why it makes sense for firms to control the process. But as Yochai Benkler, a law professor at Yale Law School points out, people do not generally get involved in open source projects because their boss tells them to do so, nor because they stand to make money. In open source work gets completed and coordinated, people build complex goods like encyclopaedias, without anyone appearing to be in charge or anyone offering to pay for the service.

Benkler's explanation for how open source communities coordinate themselves runs something like this. The raw material of these collaborations is creative talent. But creative talent is highly variable. People are good at different things and in different ways. It is very difficult to tell from the outside, for example by time and motions studies, who is the more effective creative worker. It is very difficult to write detailed job descriptions and contracts for creativity, specifying what new ideas need to be created when. Creativity cannot be delivered just-in-time. Open source communities resolve the difficulties of assessing creativity and quality by decentralising decision making down to individuals and small groups. They decide what to work on, depending on what needs to be done and what their skills are. There is little sense in working on a project that is already well staffed and where your contribution will add very little. It is very difficult to pull the wool over the eyes of your peers: they will soon spot if the contributions that you make do not really come up to scratch. That allows people to work on just their bit of the

puzzle. Good central design rules allow the whole thing to add together. Work in open source communities gets done when creative people self-distribute themselves to different tasks, they submit their work to open peer review to maintain quality and the product has a modular design so that individual contributions can be clicked together easily.

Open source communities are a challenge to the established order because they answer the three critical questions about work – how to motivate, coordinate and innovate at the same time – highly effectively while requiring little in the way of top down bureaucracy or financial incentives. They motivate a mass of contributors by providing interesting work, posing interesting questions to answer and attracting interesting people to work with. The work is coordinated because the products clip together with modular architectures, performance is judged openly by common yardsticks and the community shares an overarching goal. Open source communities have to be efficient and low cost: they cannot afford overheads so they seek out the lowest cost solutions. Yet these communities also encourage constant exploration, driven by curiosity. Authority is exercised mainly by peer review and with a light touch. It is worth reminding ourselves what open source communities do not need to succeed: restructuring, re-engineering, knowledge management, career reviews, brand strategies, vision statements, corporate bonding sessions in the jungle, embarrassing lunches with the boss.

The See Through Workplace
Open source provides an inspirational new model for how we can work together, collaboratively and creatively. But it will not work in all settings. It depends on people feeling motivated. There are plenty of tasks – collecting the community's rubbish – which most people will not willingly do out of a sense of curiosity. Some products cannot be broken down into modules. Many do not have the equivalent of a source code to be shared. Collaborative and cooperative forms of work have a long, romantic and often disastrous history. Collaborative, peer-based working will not completely supplant market incentives and firms. Yet collaborative working models like Evolt, Wikipedia and Linux cast a long shadow over traditional hierarchical organisations. The biggest impact of these open models may come from how they force established, traditional and top-down organisations to adapt by becoming more open and participative.

Large organisations will have to start learning from open communities of innovation. Employees increasingly need to be flexible, self-motivated problem solvers, not rigid rule followers. More jobs will involve the investment of imagination, creativity and empathy, factors of production that are difficult to measure. The more that people are expected to multi-task – to deliver and execute effectively, but also to innovate and learn – the more difficult it is to set clear incentives and reward them. A performance based pay system that rewards individual efforts and output will do little to encourage new ideas and collaboration. Traditional firms will have to become more democratic, open and egalitarian – if they are to match the innovation capacity of open source. Traditional, top-down companies – with power invested in an unelected executive – are an anachronism in a democratic age. It should be no surprise that young and entrepreneurial companies, founded by people who share these more democratic values, look and feel quite different from traditional organisations.

A fashionable example is the British drinks firm Innocent Drinks where the work culture is defined by informality. The company's three young founders have slightly grating titles such as "Chief Squeezer" and "Top Banana." The Innocent offices abound with the paraphernalia of trendy modern business: table football and photos of staff when they were babies. Everyone is on first name terms. New parents get a £2,000 baby bonus and newly weds an extra week's holiday to have a decent honeymoon. A high proportion of profits are donated to development charities. Over one door of their offices in a non-descript industrial park in Hammersmith, West London a sign hangs: "Burglars' Entrance." The open, entrepreneurial work culture, which encourages people to speak their minds and link their work to their lives, has helped to propel Innocent to become one of the most exciting and widely emulated new entrants into the British food and drinks markets.

Approaches like this are not confined to companies that are small, young and trendy. WL Gore, the maker of Gore Tex and a range of other products has sales of close on $1.4bn – but claims to have no managers, secretaries or even employees. It has a global network of 6,000 associates, who jointly own the company. Salaries are decided collaboratively. Every new associate has three peer mentors who help to navigate their career. Bill Gore, the company's founder, argues that in most companies, the work gets done through informal networks that bear little relation to formal organisation charts. He set out to design an organisation based on those informal networks. As one Gore employee put it: "Why go to someone with a title when you can go to someone with the answer." Large companies are attempting to cherry pick elements of choice and self-management they want to introduce. In 1998 BT, the British telecoms incumbent, created a Freedom to Choose scheme for field engineers, after an experiment with a particularly recalcitrant group of software engineers in Cardiff. Almost in desperation the managers gave them the right to self-schedule their work. The pay system for engineers had encouraged them to work at weekends and to clock overtime. As a result engineers failed to complete jobs so they would be able to earn overtime. The Freedom to Choose programme allowed small teams of engineers to choose which work should be done, in which order and by which team members. Many of these decisions were made in chat rooms on the Internet with the help of scheduling software. Engineers earn points by completing work, mentoring peers and leading groups. The points can be redeemed for pay. In March 2002, the original pilot was extended to 20,000 engineers who self-schedule their work. The BT scheme is a limited form of the self-distribution of labour that is a central feature of open source communities. After three years the average engineer was earning more money and working two hours less per week. Productivity was up by 5% and quality up by 8%. BT's will never become a community. Yet it is adapting elements of the open approach to work because that is how best to motivate and coordinate staff who want to be self-motivated innovators.

In the right conditions these open and participative forms of work can provide better answers to the basic questions that all large organisations face: how to motivate staff to come up with new ideas, and coordinate what they do with as little hierarchy as possible. One can see more elements of this open thinking in the way some large corporations are changing their physical surroundings: their offices.

Organisations revolve around offices. Usually they are designed to help managers coordinate work but as a result they also usually fail to motivate people and can stand in the way of innovation. Offices, in my experience, are good for power politics, flirting and gossip. They are dreadful places for intellectual curiosity. Creativity comes from being immersed in ideas, getting lost in your thoughts. Yet offices provide a constant round of distractions and trivia, the urgent chasing out the interesting. Creativity comes from diversity: exposure to different points of view and experiences. Office cultures tend to make everyone conform to the corporate code, making them seem alike even when they are not. In most offices people rarely move outside their own departments, let alone outside the organisation as a whole. Innovation often comes from creative interaction with customers, yet offices are a good place to hide from the outside world and from consumers in particular. Offices encourage territorialism – different departments on different floors – so it is difficult for people to cross boundaries to borrow and share ideas. Office bureaucracies make people dysfunctional and irrational: most of the conversations I overhear in the lifts of large organisations are either about internal turf wars people are fighting or what they did when they escaped from work. Lateral and sideways thinking is virtually impossible in the standard office environment. People often have their best ideas in idle, marginal moments: after exercise, while walking, on the way from taking the children to school, in the shower. Long work schedules drive out those marginal moments. Innovation thrives on conversation. Days that are scheduled down to the last minute drive out conversation, managers frown on conversation as no more than idle chatter. Yet as we will see conversation is at the root of innovation.

The most open and creative office I have worked in belongs to Ideo, the design and innovation firm. For several months I squatted at a desk in Ideo's London office, joining project meetings and discussions, while my own home office was being built. There was a constant flow of people, especially customers, into the building. They came straight into the workspace. Everyone could see them. Ideas, materials and images were constantly posted on the walls so that people could see work in progress. People felt at home. The décor was unflashy. There was nothing

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft — We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

self-conscious about it. It was designed to feel comfortable and efficient. Unlike many advertising companies and large corporations Ideo did not have to display modern art to show everyone it was creative. People moved around the whole time, bumping into one another, colliding and conversing. There were simple spaces where people could congregate: a large table around which people ate lunch. In some areas the atmosphere was as studious as a library. But it was also highly gregarious and at times raucous and playful. People were allowed to be idle: someone taking a nap on a sofa was assumed to be resting, not skiving off. The underlying ethos was of self-organisation and self-discipline. Idea's office encourages people to generate ideas by mixing and melding. Ideo is much vaunted in academic studies of innovation and design but it too has its problems: a culture that can become inward looking; people who have become tired and conservative; ways of thinking that have turned into routines. But at its core Ideo's places of work allow people to be creative together, in a highly self-disciplined environment.

Of course it is ridiculous to imagine most places of work will be like this in future, even in the developed world. Call centres and retail outlets will be experience and service factories: highly regimented, delivering a commodity service, fast and to high standards of quality. Yet as more organisations come to recognise they need to innovate and motivate staff, as well as coordinate their work, so more of the will have to explore recipes like those of Ideo and Linux. Not all these experiments will be an outstanding success. Big companies tend to think that if they bring in modern art, paint walls bright colours, put out some bean bags and most crucial of all — put in a table football table — they will become buzzy, creative places to work.

But even these clumsy attempts at reform confirm the general drift: offices will have to become spaces for creative conversation. The task of the modern office, as Malcolm Gladwell put it in a New Yorker article, is to invite social interaction that makes it easy for strangers to talk to one another. Offices need a social milieu like that in a bustling city neighbourhood, where much of the life takes place on sidewalks and in cafes. Those spaces need to be at the heart of modern offices not in the margins. Do not design the office around the executive offices but around places where people congregate, mingle and talk: cafes, open workspaces, libraries. Workspaces should be designed to promote collaboration, self-organisation and interaction: think barefoot and beach.

More and more large organisations will feel the gravitational pull of these open and participative ways of working. Many will cherry pick elements of the recipe: self-organisation, self-scheduling, peer review of performance, open plan, café style places of work. Some large organisations, as a result, will be more humane, productive and profitable. But it will prove difficult to take the cherry picking too far: open source styles of work depend on similarly open approaches to leadership and ownership. Open source communities encourage freedom of speech and association; decision making is transparent; ideas are held in shared ownership. Not many large companies are prepared for all that this entails.

This call for more open and participative forms of work may all sound utopian and I might have been inclined to agree until I met Chris Sacca over dinner in late 2005. Sacca is a principal at Google, the information search company and one of the first handful of employees. I asked him how Google managed to come up with its flow of ideas. His reply went something like this. Every Friday everyone in Google gathers for an all company meeting, 7,000 people, face-to-face or connected by video. Anyone can ask the senior management any question about the company's policy, strategy or performance. People who ask more direct and difficult questions tend to get a round of applause. Every Friday, every person working in one of Sacca's teams files him five bullets explaining what he or she has achieved that week and five more on what they plan to achieve in the week to come. That is the only reporting system. He does some work making sure everyone is on track but most of the time it is up to people to sort out what they are doing, adjust to one another without calling in a manager: the beach ethic at work. Anyone in the company can search through the bullets submitted by anyone else, including those from the chief executive. Anyone in Google can launch a development project to create a new service, so long as they post the details on a central site, so everyone else can see what is going on. They can continue with their project until they want to recruit more than two people or start to use some significant server capacity. Once they have reached that stage they have to take the idea to a company council — a bit like a committee in an open source community — which will

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

make a decision about whether it should go ahead. If it does get the go ahead then the project gets given very few resources to begin with. Sacca explained : "You have to keep resources tight. If they can only recruit one extra person to the project, you know they are going to go out and get the best person they can find."

All of this has to be taken with a pinch of salt. Work cultures are rarely as open and democratic as people at the top of an organisation claim, even at a company as funky as Google. Yet if only half of what Sacca describes is true then it poses a huge challenge for traditional, top down, slow moving organisations, both public and private. If an organisation wants to match Google's rate of innovation, then technology is only a small part of the story. Google's most valuable asset is this self-organising work culture which motivates, coordinates and innovates all at the same time and at very low cost. Google is perhaps the most striking example of how a company has taken elements of open source work into the corporate world and in the process created an extremely potent mutant.

Work and consumption are being changed by the emergence of more open ways to organising ourselves at scale. Consumers, especially the Pro-Ams, increasingly want to be participants and contributors not just recipients of services and solutions. Workers aspire to the democratic and participative values that run through open source collaboratives and much of the rest of life. They want to be able to self-organise more. The interaction of new self organising forms of work and new m ore participative forms of consumption will generate new approaches to innovation. New ideas increasingly will emerge from the interaction between users and producers, amateurs and professionals, rather than coming down a pipeline from the boffins and professionals, to the waiting, open mouthed consumers. This more interactive and participative approach to innovation will challenge many deeply held assumptions about what creativity is, where is comes from, how it should be rewarded and organised.

Of course it is ridiculous to imagine most places of work will be like this in future, even in the developed world. Call centres and retail outlets will be experience and service factories: highly regimented, delivering a commodity service, fast and to high standards of quality. Yet as more organisations come to recognise they need to innovate and motivate staff, as well as coordinate their work, so more of the will have to explore recipes like those of Ideo and Linux. Not all these experiments will be an outstanding success. Big companies tend to think that if they bring in modern art, paint walls bright colours, put out some bean bags and most crucial of all – put in a table football table – they will become buzzy, creative places to work.

But even these clumsy attempts at reform confirm the general drift: offices will have to become spaces for creative conversation. The task of the modern office, as Malcolm Gladwell put it in a New Yorker article, is to invite social interaction that makes it easy for strangers to talk to one another. Offices need a social milieu like that in a bustling city neighbourhood, where much of the life takes place on sidewalks and in cafes. Those spaces need to be at the heart of modern offices not in the margins. Do not design the office around the executive offices but around places where people congregate, mingle and talk: cafes, open workspaces, libraries. Workspaces should be designed to promote collaboration, self-organisation and interaction.

More and more large organisations will feel the gravitational pull of these open and participative ways of working. Many will cherry pick elements of the recipe: self-organisation, self-scheduling, peer review of performance, open plan, café style places of work. Some large organisations, as a result, will be more humane, productive and profitable. But it will prove difficult to take the cherry picking too far: open source styles of work depend on similarly open approaches to leadership and ownership. Open source communities encourage freedom of speech and association; decision making is transparent; ideas are held in shared ownership. Not many large companies are prepared for all that this entails.

This call for more open and participative forms of work may all sound utopian and I might have been inclined to agree until I met Chris Sacca over dinner in late 2005. Sacca is a principal at Google, the information search company and one of the first handful of employees. I asked him how Google managed to come up with its flow of ideas. His reply went something like this. Every Friday everyone in Google gathers for an all company meeting, 7,000

people, face-to-face or connected by video. Anyone can ask the senior management any question about the company's policy, strategy or performance. People who ask more direct and difficult questions tend to get a round of applause. Every Friday, every person working in one of Sacca's teams files him five bullets explaining what he or she has achieved that week and five more on what they plan to achieve in the week to come. That is the only reporting system. He does some work making sure everyone is on track but most of the time it is up to people to sort out what they are doing, adjust to one another without calling in a manager: the beach ethic at work. Anyone in the company can search through the bullets submitted by anyone else, including those from the chief executive. Anyone in Google can launch a development project to create a new service, so long as they post the details on a central site, so everyone else can see what is going on. They can continue with their project until they want to recruit more than two people or start to use some significant server capacity. Once they have reached that stage they have to take the idea to a company council – a bit like a committee in an open source community – which will make a decision about whether it should go ahead. If it does get the go ahead then the project gets given very few resources to begin with. Sacca explained : "You have to keep resources tight. If they can only recruit one extra person to the project, you know they are going to go out and get the best person they can find."

All of this has to be taken with a pinch of salt. Work cultures are rarely as open and democratic as people at the top of an organisation claim, even at a company as funky as Google. Yet if only half of what Sacca describes is true then it poses a huge challenge for traditional, top down, slow moving organisations, both public and private. If an organisation wants to match Google's rate of innovation, then technology is only a small part of the story. Google's most valuable asset is this self-organising work culture which motivates, coordinates and innovates all at the same time and at very low cost. Google is perhaps the most striking example of how a company has taken elements of open source work into the corporate world and in the process created an extremely potent mutant.

Work and consumption are being changed by the emergence of more open ways to organising ourselves at scale. Consumers, especially the Pro-Ams, increasingly want to be participants and contributors not just recipients of services and solutions. Workers aspire to the democratic and participative values that run through open source collaboratives and much of the rest of life. They want to be able to self-organise more. The interaction of new self organising forms of work and new m ore participative forms of consumption will generate new approaches to innovation. New ideas increasingly will emerge from the interaction between users and producers, amateurs and professionals, rather than coming down a pipeline from the boffins and professionals, to the waiting, open mouthed consumers. This more interactive and participative approach to innovation will challenge many deeply held assumptions about what creativity is, where is comes from, how it should be rewarded and organised.

Chapter 9 – Innovation is Conversation

Ideas have many authors
The worm c elegans is as simple as an organism gets. It has a front end, where the food comes in, a rear where the waste exits, a bottom and a top, a left and right. On the face of it, that is pretty much it. Except even the simplest worm achieves a mind-bogglingly complex task: it generates itself from a tiny set of genetic instructions. The worm is like a self-organising chemical factory, orchestrating millions of miniscule reactions, which seemingly adjust to one another, without any central programmer being in charge. The collaborative effort to understand how the worm achieves this task, which started in the 1960s, created the basis for the subsequent global, public initiative to map the human genome three decades later. Our understanding of both is the outcome of an elaborate work of shared authorship. Scientific research is a vital source for the peer-to-peer methods being deployed by open source projects, file sharing systems and community based companies. In these communities innovation and creativity is also invariably a cumulative, cooperative and shared activity. It is rarely the work of a lone genius who comes up with an idea in a flash of insight, a eureka moment. Most innovations are jointly authored. That is why these emerging collaborative ways of working are so powerful: they promote the kind of collaboration that makes creating new ideas easy.

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

When Sydney Brenner set out to unravel the worm's genome in 1965 just eight years after Frances Crick and James Watson had uncovered the double-helix structure of DNA, little was known about how genes worked. Brenner set out to find out how the worm's genes directed the growth of the organism as a whole, with a small team of fledgling researchers and crude tools: at the start they lifted worms into Petri dishes with sharpened tooth picks. It was as if someone had seen the Wright brothers' first flight and decided to start work on a rocket to the moon. Had Brenner decided to confine his efforts to his laboratory at Cambridge University, he would be still at work. The worm project succeeded only because from the outset its leaders adopted an open, highly collaborative, model of organisation. Brenner's Laboratory of Molecular Biology at Cambridge University provided the kernel: he attracted collaborators. Brenner announced he was going to explore a question that intrigued many others. He had just enough resources to get going and just enough momentum to attract other laboratories as collaborators. The way Brenner's lab worked set the tone for what would eventually become a global project involving thousands of researchers. The atmosphere at the Laboratory of Molecular Biology was hard working, meritocratic, egalitarian and conversational. The coffee room quickly became the place where people discussed ideas. They were making it up as they went along, so there were no established territories or reputations to defend. Sharing ideas quickly became the norm. Brenner also insisted people test out their ideas as early as possible: he would call symposia at two-minute's notice so that people would have to talk about ideas without being prepared. That ensured a more open, creative discussion. The atmosphere Brenner created in Cambridge set the tone for the project as a whole, as it expanded to encompass thousands of researchers around the world: collaborative work as the basis for shared innovation. One of the key institutions for this sprawling global community of knowledge was the relentlessly practical Worm Breeder's Gazette, which became the place where researchers shared their discoveries but also their methods, tips and tools (not unlike Graigslist but for worm geneticists.)

Brenner's open approach set in motion a virtuous cycle of knowledge sharing. That was not just because Brenner, and other project leaders such as John Sulston believed in open science. There was no other way to get the work done. Brenner had identified a task too complex for any one lab to complete. If a researcher found out what a particular gene did, that knowledge was virtually worthless unless it could be combined with information about other genes. The puzzle would be completed only through collaboration and that collaboration had to take place on a mass scale: there were too many pieces to find and fit together. The research community could only be sustained on the basis of common ownership of the basic knowledge. Brenner and his colleagues established a commons on which worm breeders could work together. As Bob Waterston, one of the US leaders of the project put it: "The more we put out there the less of a problem it was to get other people to contribute. The more we restricted the flow of knowledge, the more people felt they had to bargain with us before they would release their results. If you just put the data out there then everyone was on the same footing and they were all free to talk about it."

The commons grew with the community that contributed to it. In 1975, ten years after Brenner launched the project, the first international meeting of worm genome researchers attracted 24 participants. A decade later there was enough information to fit into a sizeable textbook. When the complete gene sequence was announced in 1998 the then US vice-president Al Gore greeted it as the equivalent of the moon landings. By 2002 the worm researchers' meeting attracted 1,600 participants. One thesis listed all 5,000 connections between neurons in the worm's brain. The project had traced the history of every cell in the worm's body. It was the most completely understood organism on earth.

Technology was critical to the project's success. Researchers who started out using toothpicks ended up using automated gene sequencing machines. But the worm project – and the human genome project that followed it - were a triumph of open, collaborative, social organisation. Not only did Brenner mobilise a vast community of researchers but he found a way to combine their very different skills and interests with very little hierarchy or bureaucracy. The genetic map was an intricate work of joint-authorship, woven together by an unfolding creative conversation among a global community of researchers.

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Eric Raymond, the open software guru, says mass collaborative innovation is like a bazaar – open, cacophonous, with no one in control – rather than a cathedral, where craftsmen implement a master plan. The worm project could never have been a cathedral. There could be no master plan. The researchers were moving into unknown territory. No one knew what they would find next and how it would fit together. Brenner could not look at a plan and allocate people to tasks, because he had no idea what would need to be done next. The researchers had to fan out and find out for themselves. They had to allocate themselves to interesting tasks that they felt able to take on, rather than ask for direction from the centre, and they had to share their ideas with one another, to build upon one another's work. Brenner's leadership also provided a way for this mass of decentralised activity to be brought together. He set out the cause that animated the community: doing something never attempted before, mapping the genome of an entire organism. He set the style of working by the way he ran his own lab: egalitarian, open and challenging. He set the norms others followed by releasing information early to encourage other to do likewise.
It is said that big breakthroughs only come from small teams or even individuals who can focus their energies. The worm project is just one example among many – a more recent one is the way international collaboration among scientists decoded the Sars virus – of how mass collaboration can spur huge strides in scientific knowledge. The ethics of open science are now feeding a much wider range of organisations, working in many different fields. Free form organisations like Wikipedia and Linux have taken practices common in science – open early publication of results, peer-to-peer review – and turned them into a mass, everyday working practices, for people writing software, playing games or creating an encyclopedia. An elite and esoteric way of working, usually confined to men in white coats, has been turned into a mass way of working, ideally suited to large scale innovation and complex tasks. Their success demands we think in an entirely different way about where ideas come from.

We think therefore.

The phrase cogito ergo sum, "I think, therefore I am" was inscribed onto our culture in 1637 by the French soldier cum philosopher Rene Descartes, announcing a dramatic inward turn in the way we think about ourselves. In search of certainty about his own existence, Descartes declared that the act of doubting was itself proof that we exist. To doubt is to think and to think is to be. From Descartes on certainty in our existence was rooted in our ability to think, on our own and for ourselves. Thinking for Descartes was a creative act, an inner construction of order, collecting and bringing together ideas, which was not just proof of our existence but a source of self-esteem and dignity.

The spreading net of vastly cheaper communications and computing, combined with new highly social and collaborative forms of organisations means that we are moving from "I think, therefore I am" into an era in which "we think, therefore we are."

Creativity is invariably not an individualistic activity but a collaborative one that thrives when people share and mix their ideas. Creativity emerges from how we think together. The manner in which we organise ourselves to think together - how we publish, debate, test, refine and reject ideas – is critical. Creative thought is not just the product of Descartes' inner journey, a flash of insight inside the head of a gifted person. It usually comes from creative interaction between people. The mass collaborations profiled in this book are experiments in we-think: finding new ways for people to combine their ideas together. Wikipaedia is the shared creation of thousands of contributors. The mountain bike came into being through shared innovation among hundreds of riders before the big bike manufacturers came on the scene. Linux has grown by orchestrating contributions from thousands of bug reporters and programmers. Computer games thrive on the mass innovation of the players. Most of eBay's best business ideas came from its community of users. Most large scientific projects depend on international collaboration among independent teams. This generation's motto will be: we think, therefore we are.

That is a huge challenge to the way we assume new ideas are created. We are used to thinking that innovation and new ideas come from special people, often working in special places, wearing special clothes: the boffin, in his white coat in the lab; the artist, in his smock, in the studio; the zany inventor, barely clean, in his garage; the loft living bohemian wandering the cultural quarter. The implication of these caricatures of the creative class is clear: if you

want more creativity in your city, society or company, you need more people and places like this. Creativity thrives when special people work in special places: bring on the creative class.

Yet innovation and creativity are becoming increasingly distributed, emerging from many, often unexpected, sources thanks to rising educational attainments, spreading communications and cheaper technology. As more people acquire the capacity to express and share their creativity so they will find new ways to be creative together. Creativity will emerge not just from specially gifted individuals, but from creative collaborations bringing together different ideas and points of view. We are schooled to think that new ideas come freshly minted out of the heads of specially gifted individuals, lone inventors. We are moving into an era when new ideas more often will emerge through collaboration. They will be the products of shared authorship.

Mass Innovation

Innovation is one of the defining features of modern capitalism: the ability to come up with a stream of new products, services, organisational models, experiences. Innovation is critical not just to companies but to regions and countries, if they are to make better use of their resources by combining them more effectively. We-think organisations matter because they have devised a new way to orchestrate innovation, as a rolling, mass process, involving thousands of participants.

Innovation comes from interaction. New ideas invariably emerge through an interaction with the past: the germ for them comes from somewhere. Inventors have to work out which ideas from the past they draw upon, which they discard and which they challenge. Scientists and artists work within and challenge the traditions they come from. Innovators do not just borrow from the past, but from other domains of knowledge around them. They excel at spotting what to borrow and how to blend it with ideas they already have. Cirque du Soleil, the fantastically successful Canadian-Belgian based circus troupe, plays to millions of people each year. It is a unique cultural experience. Yet none of the ingredients in Cirque du Soleil is original. What is original is the way it has blended traditional circus techniques with fable and rock opera.

Innovators build bridges between different ideas. They welcome the clash and collision of ideas that are often uncomfortable with one another. Psychologists call this cognitive dissonance: when ideas do not add up. The natural tendency for most people and most companies is to seek to eliminate this clash, to get everyone singing from the same hymn sheet. The entire knowledge management industry is based on eliminating cognitive dissonance. That is why knowledge management is often the enemy of creativity. If there is too much cognitive dissonance because ideas are too different, it leads to chaos and confusion. If there is too little cognitive dissonance because ideas in an organisation are too similar, it can lead to predictability and boredom. Creativity emerges when different points of view are held in reciprocal tension, so they play off one another, eventually evolving into a different idea. This tends to be an evolutionary and cumulative process, usually punctuated by key moments of insight and invention. Those moments often tend to be architectural: creative people spot how to build a bridge between two ideas to combine them in a new way. The rise of highly collaborative open approaches to innovation should make us rethink how innovation happens in other walks of life. Take architecture as an example.

Nowhere is the connection between individuals and their creations stronger than in architecture. We identify buildings by their architects: Richard Rodgers and the Pompidou Centre; Christopher Wren and St Paul's Cathedral; Norman Foster and the London Gherkin; Frank Ghery and the Guggenheim in Bilbao. The truth is that all buildings are the product of intense collaboration, (after they have been occupied as much as before, as Stewart Brand points out in his brilliant account of How Buildings Learn.)

One of the most striking buildings of the first decade of the 21st century will be the swimming pool for the 2008 Beijing Olympics. Imagine taking a sharp knife to a mountain of foaming bubbles in a bath, cutting out a rectangle and hollowing it out to form walls and a roof. The bubbles would fit together, because by some miracle that is what bubbles do: they curve and fit together, apparently irregularly. Yet the structure would be built around right angles

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

and it would support itself. That is what the Beijing pool will look like: a see-thru structure made entirely of irregular bubbles that nevertheless fit together around right angles. It is a perfect example of how cognitive dissonance – two ideas that should not fit together, rectangular building and irregular bubbles – create an innovation.

No building has ever been made that way before. The idea for the pool's structure seems to have come from a single individual: Tristram Carfrae, a talented engineer working in the Sydney offices of Ove Arup, the engineering firm appointed to the project. Arup has engineered many of the most difficult and ambitious buildings of the last 50 years, including the Sydney Opera House. Arup engineers set out to break rules. This was the third Olympic pool Carfrae had worked on. He wanted to do something different. That meant initially searching for cognitive dissonance: something that seemed impossible to make work, a rectangular pool made of bubbles. Carfrae had already seen a material he wanted to use for this greenhouse-come-swimming pool: the Eden project in Cornwall is made from a Teflon coated film. A member of the design team pointed out that when two sheets of the film were bonded together they could be inflated to form a cushion. The film would let light through but the air would provide insulation and keep heat in. The challenge was to get the cushions to fit together. (As all children know structures built from cushions do not last long.) Carfrae went to work on his computer trying to replicate cells that looked organic but would fit together to make a building with straight edges. Two days later he was ready to admit defeat and almost as a last gasp turned to Google, the Internet search engine which is a distillation of the intelligence and views of millions of web users. After asking a few simple questions about geometry and irregular shapes Carfrae found himself deep in the arcane world of foam theory, which predicts the shapes bubbles take to fit together. With a few more clicks he was reading a paper by two Irish academics in a journal published by a university in Pennsylvania. Their theory depended on software they had got from a US foam theorist, Ken Brakke. Carfrae tracked Brakke down through Google and found the software – Surface Evolver – was available, open source, from Brakke's website.

Within a few of hours of posing his original Google inquiry Carfrae had installed Surface Evolver and was busily generating bubbles. Within a few days he had learned enough to cut the bubbles into shapes. A building with hard edges and right angles could be built from irregular shapes, in this case 7m wide Teflon bubbles. Carfrae does not claim the Beijing pool is his creation. He managed to build a bridged between the dissonant ideas in play: a rectangular building made of irregular building blocks. Like most buildings the Beijing pool is actually the product of a long process of joint authorship, starting with the way Carfrae drew upon the ideas of foam theorists, passing onto the architects, engineers and contractors who would build it and then the people who used it and adapted it to their ends. Creativity and innovation come from promoting this open clash of different ideas. That is why open source communities are so potent. They do that the whole time.

They bring together people with different ideas around a shared task and a way of working. Innovations succeed only through exposure, as early as possible, to comments and criticism, which allow ideas to be refined, adjusted and reinterpreted. That is best done through dialogue and discussion – Brenner's short notice symposia in Cambridge, for example. Open source communities provide a ready setting for that kind of conversation. The discussions groups around Linux projects, for example, a lively, raucous and sometimes brutal. No one from head office is listening in to check you are toeing the corporate line. There is no boss to kow-tow to. Creativity comes from speaking your mind, with other people, in an attempt to come to a new and shared understanding or idea. Most corporations live in sullen silence or speak the mumbo-jumbo of mission statements. Long after the fall of Communism large corporations are the last place where free association and open debate are not tolerated.

Creative Conversation

To put it another way, creativity thrives on conversation. Open source communities encourage a constant babble. People talk to one another the whole time. They are never silent. Talk about work gets mixed up with gossip and jokes. Organisations that want to be good at innovation have to be good at conversation. Think about some of the most powerful conversations you have had in your life. A good conversation is never fully under control. You learn

things you did not expect to and often find yourself saying things you did not plan to: admitting a confidence, revealing a weakness, declaring views you did not realise you held so passionately. Good conversations feel open ended: you cannot say in advance where they will lead. The most important conversations you have in your life will change you and the way you think about the world. Creative conversations are like a shared exploration the results of which cannot be guaranteed in advance. Good conversations are not lectures, diatribes, sermons, cross examinations or proclamations. They depend on people listening as intently as they talk.

Two of the biggest advances in 20th century science came from conversation. Werner Heisenberg, the German nuclear physicist and author of the uncertainty principle said in his autobiography that all science is rooted in conversation. His conversations with Neils Bohr and other physicists in Copenhagen in the 1920s paved the way for quantum mechanics and other theories that in time led not just to the nuclear bomb but many advances in modern electronics. Bohr liked to work out theories through constant, often meandering, intense conversations, which spilled out from his laboratory to his villa or summer house. Conversation was also central to Watson and Crick's unravelling of DNA. They spurred each other on, offering new ideas and insights. One a chemist, the other a biologist, they would often clash but combined to create a new shared insight. It was their ability to hold creative conversations that allowed them to succeed where others failed.

Even the most famous inventor of all, Thomas Edison, was a great collaborator. March 25th, 1876, is one of the most important dates in the history of modern capitalism: Edison opened his legendary laboratory in Menlo Park, to create a factory for invention. It was in Menlo Park that Edison produced the phonograph and the light bulb. Edison seemed to have found a way to systematically organise invention. At the time Menlo Park, in New Jersey, was little more than a hamlet with a dozen houses where an inventor could cut himself off, concentrate, without distraction, rapidly building, testing and refining prototypes, often working an 80 hour week. The truth is that most of Edison's achievements came about through collaboration. Far from being a tortured lone inventor Edison was highly social. He was constantly seeking new partnerships with people with money and ideas. He was restless and rarely stayed in one place. Edison had started his working life as an itinerant telegraph operator. Moving from place to place he struck up conversations with strangers, picking up an idea in one place and taking it to another. That was the method he employed throughout his life. Edison worked at Menlo Park for only four years. The Menlo Park lab was closed just six years after it opened and Edison had move back to New York City.

As Edison took on more complex tasks so his methods became more collaborative. Those collaborators are not household names – Charles Batchelor, James Adam, John Kuresi, Charles Wurth – but as Edison admitted, without them, he would not have come up with many of the inventions which made him famous. We think of Edison as a lone inventor in part thanks to the patent system which routinely named employers as the owners and originators of any invention made by an employee. The patent system disguises the collaborative nature of innovation. Edison had a genius for rapidly developing his ideas by drawing on the talents and skills of others. His laboratories were small communities of creativity. As Edison's career progressed it became harder and harder to see him as "the" inventor. He was the focal point for a mass of intense creative collaboration and joint authorship.

Creative conversations of the kind that Watson and Crick, Bohr and Heisenberg engaged in are not usually helped by strict time limits on when they can end because the parties for the next meeting are banging at the door. Powerpoint is not good for conversation. Nor is sitting quivering on the sofa in the boss's office. Big corporations are designed to be conversation killers. That is why they often find innovation so hard.

A creative conversation is not just a good chat though. The word dialogue comes from the Greek dia-logos: a flow of shared meanings. Each participant must give something of themselves in a way that encourages the other to reciprocate. A good conversation requires people to listen intently not just to speak their mind. Listening attentively and thoughtfully to other people, trying to help them make sense of what they are saying is more tiring than speaking. You have to be prepared to adjust, not simply to defend the views you came into the conversation with. When you are in a good conversation you loose a sense of time, the conversation takes on a flow. What to say

next seems obvious without being planned. But a good conversation also needs pauses, spaces for thought and reflection. How many managers in large companies have the time to really listen to people or show a willingness to adjust their views? Being a manager is about being in charge, showing no doubt. That is why managers don't often have good conversations with the people they work with. Good conversations are self-moderating. People do not hog the limelight. How often in large companies do senior managers ever get involved in conversations moderated by other people? The manager is always the moderator. Good conversations start and keep going when they are about questions that interest people but to which there is no set answer. Linus Torvalds got Linux going by leaving his programme open ended: it started an interesting conversation. Most managers do not ask interesting, open ended questions because they already know the answers: this is the direction we should go in, this is how we get there, I am in charge. Being a manager is not about asking open ended, often apparently stupid questions that will excite the right kind of conversation. Most of the time management is about doing things to people; dialogue is about doing things with people.

Good conversations often take place in shared, neutral spaces. That does not mean a barren meeting room. Most of the best conversations about work do not take place at work. They happen over food or drink. I suspect one reason the Finnish mobile phone company Nokia has been so innovative over such a long period is that everyone stops for lunch and everyone eats in the same canteen. They do not go out to get a sandwich that they wolf down in their work pod while sending a few emails. There is no separate dining room for executives. Everyone eats together and so talks together. These days most work it seems involves talking, which is why so much work now gets done in coffee shops and so many offices seek to model themselves on cafes. Creative conversations have to encourage people to let go of fixed positions that make people want to reject ideas that strike them as unfamiliar and threatening. Innovation only happens if people are prepared to suspend judgements, entertain wild ideas and build upon them. If you want to lead a creative organisation, city or region, you have to lead a creative conversation. That means promoting interesting questions, creating spaces where people can talk, bringing in different view points, ensuring the discussion is moderated but not by you, making sure it does not split, meander or lose its way and knowing when to bring it to a close, to stop talking and start acting. Open source communities are just these kinds of conversations. That is why they excel at highly social, collaborative forms of innovation.

Consensus and conformity, can inhibit the very free-thinking and debate on which innovation thrives. To be innovative you have to be gregarious, promiscuous even, in search of promising ideas. As well as peering into the future you have to be prepared to look for ideas in marginal and non-mainstream places. And you have to be good at attracting people with these deviant ideas to take part in the conversation you are hosting. Above all, do not eat lunch at your desk or in an executive dining room: stop, sit down, do it properly and talk to other people, across a neutral space. The best ideas come about through conversations and the best conversations do not happen in the office, they take place over food. The challenge of open source communities will mean large organisations will have to remodel themselves as open innovators. Leading innovation and creativity is often like leading a creative conversation. That is why open and collaborative ways of working demand new open and collaborative approaches to leadership.

Chapter 10 – Open Leadership

Leading a flock
Imagine you are organising your ten-year old son's birthday party, the kind of boy for whom parents have started to become an embarrassment. How would you manage that task? Well if you brought in the people from McKinsey you would probably first do an exhaustive trawl to benchmark global best-practices in tenth birthday parties. You would get together all of the parents of the children attending the party for an away-day at which with a facilitator you would agree a vision statement and some learning goals for the party, which would be set out on a small card, given to every child on their arrival. It would be made clear that their performance against these goals would determine what kind of party bag they would leave with and how much food they get. The top performers would get bonus presents. Half way through the party everything would grind to a halt so that all the children and adults

could engage in 360 degree discussions to recalibrate their goals for the remainder of the party. The party would not conclude without a knowledge management team coming in to debrief everyone and make sure lessons learned were downloaded.

There is a reason McKinsey restructures corporations and does not throw children's parties. As Dave Snowden, the knowledge management advising puts it: children's parties are complex, self-organising affairs. They are at their best when they are boisterous, slightly unruly and on the edge of being out of control. A child's party that is under control is dull. One that spins out of control will end in tears. Parties work best when they take on a life of their own, without ever becoming chaotic. The rules for throwing a good child's party are quite simple. To start with you have to set the tone, by establishing a clear and simple purpose: we are here to celebrate a birthday. That says everything people need to know about how they should behave and what is about to happen: bring a present, dress up, be prepared to have a good time. Setting the tone gives people a huge amount of information not just about what they should be ready to do, but how: it motivates as well as informs. Then you have to provide some attractors, to attract the flock of children towards activities that will engage them: an entertainer or a game, something they can all get involved with. You also have to set some boundaries so people also know where not to go and what not to do: do not go into the parent's bedroom, do not push your sister in the pond. Those boundaries need to set with care. If they are drawn too close then the children will cross them too often and so call on your authority too much, eventually overstretching it. As all parents know, the more you intervene the more demand for intervention you create. Once you have sorted out one argument, another hand shoots up asking for assistance. Intervene rarely; encourage people to sort out their disputes among themselves and make up; withdraw fast. The more parents there are trying to keep order the more chaos there will be. Timing is also critical. A party that goes on too long is exhausting. Too short and it is frustrating. Being realistic about how long it will take is vital. If you can keep to those simple rules then you have a chance to enjoy the final one: stand back an enjoy. Children's parties are at their best when the children self-organise and play among themselves. What children enjoy most about parties is playing with one another: there are no consumers in a good party and no value chain delivering pleasure to them. The children are participants. They are what make the party enjoyable.

Parties examples of our everyday capacity for self-organisation, where the parents provide the platform, some rules and some tools, to encourage mass participation. No two parties are ever the same. They run best with a few simple rules. The same is true for all efforts at mass innovation that combine a large number of participants in a complex project. In future we should try to run organisations more in the way that we throw parties. But that will require some very significant changes to the way organisations are lead. Good managers are often the enemies of innovation. They stifle it, control it or seek to dominate it. They are often bad at providing a simple, compelling sense of purpose that people need to engage their imaginations. Traditional organisations are often poor at creating attractors: they hope to encourage people to innovate by putting too much emphasis on money at the expense of recognition and quality of working life. Many large organisations, especially in the public sector, are bad at confining themselves to setting only a few simple rules, preferring instead complex and detailed rules that ensnare potential innovators. Often impatient leaders overestimate what can be done in the short-run when they seek to drive change but underestimate how much can be changed in the long run, once the momentum for change builds up. As we move from closed to more open and interactive models of innovation, so we will need a parallel shift in management and leadership. It will not happen without an enormous, often uncomfortable struggle. The people with the most to lose from new, looser forms of self-organising are the people at the top of traditional organisations: professionals, leaders and managers. They will not change without a fight.

Attraction not Propulsion
Innovators are pulled towards interesting challenges, they gather around intriguing questions and opportunities. That is what leaders of open source communities – the likes of Linus Torvalds, Sydney Brenner, and Jimmy Wales – do so well. They attract collaborators to interesting questions, orchestrate creative conversations around those questions, help set the framework in which people make decisions themselves about which ideas are best. Open leaders tend to come from the communities they lead. Their position is established through merit. They embody

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

the values of the organisation in what they have done and how they behave. They do not make too many decisions, nor set the direction in detail but they do propagate the values that guide the community forward.

It is like the difference between propulsion and attraction. Most traditional senior managers think they are in the propulsion business: it is their job to propel their organisation on, drive it forward. Senior managers arrive at their offices early in the morning, ready to pick up the organisation as if it were a rock and throw it forward, to get it from A to B. But instead imagine your task is to get a bird from point A to point B. If you have spent too much time with McKinsey & Co you will know the solution is to strap up the bird's wings, attach a rock to the bottom and throw it. The bird is likely to die in the process and has been robbed of all birdlike properties but at least it gets to its destination. Now imagine your task is to get a flock of birds from point A to point B. That flock includes you staff, customers, suppliers, shareholders, partners, even some of your competitors. You do not have enough hands and rocks to propel them all. The only way to get them to point B is to attract them by putting out bird-seed and water at point B. Standard approaches to management rely on shock and propulsion. Innovation thrives when flocks of creative people – inside and outside and organisations – are attracted to an exciting goal or opportunity. That is how Linux, eBay, Wikipedia and Brenner's worm project got going: a swarm of innovators was attracted to an interesting question posed by people who in time became leaders of a community. Closed leaders mainly propel. Open leaders mainly attract: they create the conditions for creative self-organisation by articulating compelling goals and unlock the capacity of others to reach those goals. As Jimmy Wales explains leadership of Wikipedia is not just invested in him, although he plays a role as quasi-monarch. Leadership, accountability and power are distributed throughout the community through a mixture of different ways for people to take decisions and justify them: anarchy, democracy, meritocracy and aristocracy. We-think organisations would not succeed without leadership, but it is leadership of a completely different style from the stereotypical, charismatic ceo. Or put it another way if it's a choice between Jack Welch and Jimmy Wales, give me Jimmy Wales everytime.

Traditional closed organisations bred generations of closed leaders. Leadership was a job for special people, who worked in special places: the executive offices, with their attached dining rooms, restrooms and lounges. Leadership was something people did at the top of an organisation, because they had special qualities, skills and information. Leaders made the decisions that counted: they gave permission and approval. They made sure resources were "aligned" behind corporate priorities, by creating the right incentives or issuing instructions. If you did not know what to do next in a traditional organisation the best idea was to ask someone in authority for guidance. That is what leaders did: decisions went up for approval, instructions and permissions filtered down.

The organisational upheavals of the last twenty years have put enormous pressure on this closed model of leadership. Organisations and leaders need to be more alert, agile and nimble. Networked organisations cannot be self-contained. They can be affected by events in far-flung financial markets and economies. Developed societies are becoming more democratic, with a growing stress on individual rights and choice. People increasingly see their careers as an expression of their identity, something they want to control rather than something the company defines. Traditional sources of authority are more likely to be questioned, less-likely to be followed meekly. Leaders in all walks of life operate in a far more open environment, with constant scrutiny from the media, regulators and their own employees. Leaders cannot control the conversations that take place about their organisations and their own performance. Followers are not voiceless. Their support cannot be taken for granted, it needs to be renewed, time and again.

Closed leadership is too slow because too many decisions have to be passed upwards for approval to an often homogenous elite. Command and control may impart drive to an organisation for a while, perhaps during a crisis, but over the long run it undermines motivation and initiative. It is increasingly difficult for organisations to maintain a sense of order and stability through a hierarchy drawn on an organisational chart. The closed model of leadership, like the closed model of pipeline innovation, is increasingly outmoded in a era of mass creativity and participation. Traditional managerial leadership is often at odds with innovation. Good managers often say they want innovation but actually they hate it.

Charles Leadbeater
Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Innovation invariably starts with ignorance, someone asking a stupid question. Michael Dell asked as stupid question about the computer industry: "Why do we have to sell computers through shops? Why not sell them over the phone, or online, make them just-in-time and ship them direct." Yet asking stupid questions makes you look naïve and being a manager means being in control, having the answers. Admitting ignorance looks like weakness. But unless you are prepared to admit to ignorance – you do not know the answer to an interesting question - it is very difficult to get innovation going. Innovation often requires unlearning: a critical reassessment of the past. It is very difficult to create the space to do new things, unless you can clear away the undergrowth of old habits, and ways of thinking. That means looking hard at the past and working out what needs to be retained and what can be consigned to the dustbin. Senior managers have more invested in the past than anyone else in an organisation: the past is what got them promoted to where they are today. Asking senior managers to unlearn old habits is like asking them to recant what made them successful.

Innovation comes from diversity and dissonance: interacting with people who not only think differently from you but may well contest your view of the world. How many managers appoint people who are going to disagree with them and make life uncomfortable by constantly questioning assumptions? It is much more likely that senior managers will appoint people who share their vision, think like them, reinforce the way they see the world. Criticism and failure has to become routine, not something that people feel blamed for or afraid of. Yet few senior managers talk openly about their failures. If it is impossible to talk about failure then it's impossible to learn and so impossible to innovate, and if senior managers are not prepared to set the tone, by talking about their failures, then how can other people in the rest of the organisation summon up the courage to do so? Closed leadership encouraged conformity; innovation requires diversity. It is very difficult to have ideas unless you see the world from different vantage points. Yet most managers spend their days at their desk, in their office, at the seat of power. Innovation is impossible without spare capacity. If all parts of a corporate machine are finely honed to do their job, to fit perfectly with the other parts of the organisation and no more, then there will be no room for innovation. Innovation requires some spare time, in which people can fiddle, imagine, try out new things. Good managers abhor spare capacity. Driven by performance targets they like organisations to be lean and focussed.

Many innovations start in the margins of a business, yet most managers are not interested in embryonic markets because they are too small and too risky. They want sure-fire investments in large, mainstream markets, where incremental innovations targeted at consumers the company already knows, have a high probability of paying off. Senior managers sitting atop large companies think big. But that is a real problem if innovation starts small. Most of all creativity needs inspiration: leaders who set the tone. Yet senior managers are mainly concerned with market share, margins, costs and profits. They talk the language of numbers when people want values and goals embedded in simple stories which sum up what they are trying to achieve.

Open Leadership
Effective leaders, these days, have to be open in several respects. Organisations have to be more open to the world beyond them, their suppliers and partners, but also to ideas that comes from beyond their walls. They will have to be more open in the way they work, providing greater transparency for shareholders, regulators, stakeholders and the public. Routes to leadership will have to become open to a wider range of people. In the past leadership positions have largely been closed to women and ethnic minorities. Most important for innovation, leaders will have to be open to challenge and question: they will have to be curious and inquisitive. They cannot afford to be intellectually closed. They will have to be accessible to the people they lead, visible and part of the conversation at work, rather than cut off in the executive suite. Leadership will not longer be the preserve of the people at the top of the organisation: it needs to be exercised in large and small way by many people at all levels. If innovation is going to come from all over the organisation, then so too will leadership.

This desire for more open styles leadership is not confined to a handful of trendy, Californian companies, employing creative types. In 2003 I was asked by a leading consulting firm to write a report on the views of emerging young corporate leaders in Korean, Brazil, Germany, the UK and the US. Their message was remarkably consistent. Heroic

top down leadership did not work anymore: it was too clumsy and too slow; people were no longer willing to be told what to do and potential leaders were no longer willing to sacrifice everything else in their life, including their families, for their jobs. As one young Brazilian executive in her early thirties put it: "There used to be big delays in decision making in big companies, with the hierarchy. Nowadays you have to follow the market, so you have to change much faster." Her German counterpart described the shift in these terms: "Once upon a time those above were nodded to and up there someone sat all alone and decided and left their mark. Now the competencies are distributed on all level, not equally, but at least so that one can more quickly decide. The trend is away from the authoritative style of management in which one person decided and others carried out. The emphasis now is more on team work."

The shift from more closed to more open and democratic forms of leadership will not happen without a struggle, however. That struggle is going on from politics to business as new generations of leaders, with new values and styles, attempt to fashion more open approaches to leadership in fields used to older, closed models.

Effective leaders, these days, have to be open in several respects. Organisations have to be more open to the world beyond them, their suppliers and partners, but also to ideas that comes from beyond their walls. They will have to be more open in the way they work, providing greater transparency for shareholders, regulators, stakeholders and the public. Routes to leadership will have to become open to a wider range of people. In the past leadership positions have largely been closed to women and ethnic minorities. Most important for innovation, leaders will have to be open to challenge and question: they will have to be curious and inquisitive. They cannot afford to be intellectually closed. They will have to be accessible to the people they lead, visible and part of the conversation at work, rather than cut off in the executive suite. Leadership will not longer be the preserve of the people at the top of the organisation: it needs to be exercised in large and small way by many people at all levels. If innovation is going to come from all over the organisation, then so too will leadership.

This desire for more open styles leadership is not confined to a handful of trendy, Californian companies, employing creative types. In 2003 I was asked by a leading consulting firm to write a report on the views of emerging young corporate leaders in Korean, Brazil, Germany, the UK and the US. Their message was remarkably consistent. Heroic top down leadership did not work anymore: it was too clumsy and too slow; people were no longer willing to be told what to do and potential leaders were no longer willing to sacrifice everything else in their life, including their families, for their jobs. As one young Brazilian executive in her early thirties put it: "There used to be big delays in decision making in big companies, with the hierarchy. Nowadays you have to follow the market, so you have to change much faster." Her German counterpart described the shift in these terms: "Once upon a time those above were nodded to and up there someone sat all alone and decided and left their mark. Now the competencies are distributed on all level, not equally, but at least so that one can more quickly decide. The trend is away from the authoritative style of management in which one person decided and others carried out. The emphasis now is more on team work."

The shift from more closed to more open and democratic forms of leadership will not happen without a struggle, however. That struggle is going on from politics to business as new generations of leaders, with new values and styles, attempt to fashion more open approaches to leadership in fields used to older, closed models.

Jorma Ollila is quietly confident without being the slightest overbearing. A well cut blue suit hangs off his lean, steely frame, as he slips into his seat, his eyes studious and alert. Ollila, the long time chairman and chief executive of Nokia, is probably as close as you get to an open leader within a multinational company. Nokia made itself a leading force in mobile communications only thanks to the vision and entrepreneurship of a small group in its senior leadership who charted it away from Wellington boots and cycle tyres into high technology when the market for mobile phones was still unproven. Yet Nokia is also a highly egalitarian bottom-up company, which earned its position only by learning rapidly as the market developed around it. One reason Nokia adapted so fast was that its staff all feel it is their job to learn and innovate. Creating a culture in which innovation thrives is one of Ollila's main

tasks: "Innovation and creativity are not individualistic. It's really about interaction. Getting people to interact with one another in the right way. That is about creating an atmosphere in which people get a kick from working with one another."

Ollila explained the kind of culture he is trying to create in a company in which almost half the 55,000 employees work in some for of R & D: "You have to forget the pipeline model of innovation. It does not work anymore. In the past when phones were simpler analogue devices research and development had an engineering culture. You set out of solve difficult but manageable problems. You could draw a timeline for that. But now products are much more complex. It's about hardware and software, infrastructure and services. People are trying to solve complex problems that are always shifting, as the market, competition and the consumer shift. The atmosphere in R & D is much closer to working with artists. We have to create an atmosphere in which people can express themselves." In these conditions the costs of bad leadership go up, according to Ollila. "In the past if you managed people in the wrong way you might lose a bit of output but you could make that up later. Now bad management could mean you lose a great idea with lots of potential. In the past you could quantify the costs of bad management. Now it is much more difficult to do that."

Increasingly Ollila is leading not just his staff but a flocks of suppliers and partners, developing games, software, components, base station, as well as regulators and consumers. Nokia is trying to lead this flock not just to innovate a new physical product – a handset – not just new software or systems but the way they all come together. Erkki Ormala, head of technology policy at Nokia calls it new value domain innovation: "The mobile phone is not just a handset or a product. That is what we might have thought of it when it first started. Now we are creating a whole range of mobile services that come to people via this handset, which they can use to do a whole range of things in their lives, not just make telephone calls. That is why we talk about life going mobile not just about people making telephone calls on mobile phones. Mobile services are a new domain of value, a new kind of economic space. We have created a new way of doing things but that has meant bringing together telephone companies, regulators, infrastructure, software, all these players have been involved in creating this new platform. We might have started as a mobile telephone maker but increasingly our job is to try to orchestrate all these people to continue to develop the space in which we all operate."

Innovation does not come down a pipeline but from the interaction of all these players together. That kind of orchestration requires open leadership. As products and services become more complex, created by networks of suppliers and partners, so open leadership of the kind practised by Ollila and other Nokians will be vital.
The more that organisations depend on complex networks of suppliers and partners, employ people who see themselves as the authors of their own careers and interact with demanding consumers who want to be contributors and participants, at least some of the time, the more these open styles of leadership will be required. An unlikely example of where this kind of leadership has been applied is Heathrow airport. Heathrow is many people's least favourite airport, a rag bag of different buildings, long walks, confusing signage. Some people call it Theifrow because of its reputation for bags going missing. And it has been the repeated scene of chaos brought on either by industrial disputes at catering companies or threats of terrorist action. In the summer of 2006 the company that runs the airport – BAA – came under fierce attack for failing to employ enough new security staff to deal with tightened security regulations following a threatened terrorist attack.

But for a moment imagine what it is like trying to run Heathrow airport. Each day about 80,000 passengers arrive, the same number leave and 40,000 transfer from one flight to another, often moving between terminals. The population of a reasonable sized town moves through 224 gates, served by about 100 airlines, spread over four terminals, built in different eras, to quite different designs. A fifth terminal, which has to fit into the way the whole airport works is under construction. A plane takes off and lands every 45 seconds. Heathrow can be a nightmare, a byword for delays and lost baggage, but in a way it is a triumph of innovation. When the airport opened in the 1950s, it was expected to handle 180,000 passengers a year. Now it handles almost that many in a day. Not quite Moore's law perhaps – which predicts a doubling of semi-conductor processing power every year – but something

close to it. More and more output has been generated from a tiny strip of land to the West of London. Heathrow serves about 60m passengers a year and they bring with them about 90m bags. About 15,000 bags a day travel through a tunnel connecting Terminal 4 to its three sister terminals. Those bags are usually time critical for passengers transferring from long haul flights onto European services. If something goes wrong with the automatic trains that carry bags through the tunnel staff have five minutes to decide what should be done. If they wait any longer then chaos spreads like a plague through the terminals. Bags get stacked up and so they miss connecting flights. People get very upset.

Heathrow is a highly complex system: there are many players, everything it intimately connected and constantly in motion. Just to add to the complexity, the company that runs the airport – the British Airports Authority - does not control key aspects of Heathrow's operations: air traffic control, the airlines, aspects of security, transport to and from the airport.

I spent a day with Nick Temple the man charged with running Heathrow and I asked him how he managed to stay in control. Temple explained: "Every day there must be ten million, little interconnected decisions taken by the people working at Heathrow and the people using it. I cannot take those decisions or even know about more than a tiny handful of them. The only way I can do my job is to set the context so that people – my staff, airline staff, transport staff – are more likely to make decisions in a way that adds up and helps people." In complex and very open systems like an airport the job of leadership is mainly to help other people to take decisions in the right way, not to take decisions yourself.

Temple shapes the context for those decisions by setting a few simple goals: "We have a slogan – clean, safe, friendly – those are our priorities for serving people. They apply to someone cleaning the toilets, checking bags or running the security system. People need a sense of how their jobs fit into the bigger picture of how the place works without that being vague." The more complex the system the simpler the rules of thumb needed to run it. Temple reckons that those goals – clean, safe, friendly – help guide people to work out how to handle 85% of decisions they make. If a complex system like Heathrow was ruled by complex and bureaucratic rules then an already complex system would just be made more complex, and unmanageable, by the rules designed to control it. As well as some simple goals the system also needs boundaries: "We want people to take responsibility for decisions within their roles but also to recognise their responsibilities to others in the system. There have to be parameters. When something starts to get out of hand, something that might affect safety and the rest of the system, for example, then it is critical that people do not try to solve it themselves but they ask for help." Once an issue like that emerges – something like a breakdown on that railway between the terminals – then executives at the centre need to get involved to sort it out. Central leadership has to focus on challenges and opportunities that affect the system as a whole.

Temple has to lead more than his own staff. He has his flock to think of, all the other people who use the airport – airlines, passengers, retailers – as well as people whose cooperation he needs to make it all work – air traffic control. So he works assiduously trying to get people to collaborate even when they are fierce competitors. "They have to recognise they share the same stadium and play by the same rules even if they are competing like hell," he says.

Temple's approach has more in common with Wales, Torvalds and Trippi and other open innovators than might first be apparent: set a few simple goals; establish some critical boundaries; know when the centre has to intervene and lead; provide good information and clear yardsticks so decisions can be distributed; create a sense of shared purpose among all the people collaborating so they are motivated by a shared goal. The job of leadership is not to take decisions but to create the context in which thousands of others can make the right decisions.

Seen from Temple's office Heathrow is not a value chain but a platform on which tens of thousands of people a day come together, collaborate and combine, making millions of interconnected decisions. The value of the platform

goes up the more that people can use it easily, connect to it, exchange with others and then leave. The Sims is a platform for computer game playing and content creation. Wikipedia is a platform for knowledge sharing created by a community. EBay is a platform for people wanting to buy and sell with one another, often within communities of interest. The Linux community has created a platform for software development. All these platforms and communities have leaders. They are not rudderless. But the kind of leadership they exercise is quite different from the closed leaders of traditional and closed organisations. The more networked companies become the more they will need open styles of leadership practised by the likes of Ollila and Temple. Open leadership does not mean distributing all decisions to the community. It requires a mix: a strong, entrepreneurial and inspirational centre, to set big challenges and goals, combined with high levels of devolution to allow people much greater scope over most day-to-day decisions. Open and distributed leadership allows most decisions to be taken away from the centre, thus creating more scope for the centre to do what it should do best: the strategic and system-wide issues that only it can deal with. Often strategic challenges are not evident at the periphery where people can only see that part of the picture closest to them. Yet open, devolved and distributed are not bywords for vague, relaxed or creative. Open organisations require common yardsticks of performance and contribution. A highly devolved organisation needs a confident, strong leadership at its core. Truly open organisations measure performance rigorously and openly: no code gets adopted in Linux without being checked out by several people; a Wikipedia contribution has to pass the test of peer-review. The task of modern leaders is to create the conditions for effective self-organisation. Nowhere is that more evident than in the way we organise ourselves in cities.

Chapter 11 – Open City

Curitiba
Curitiba in central Brazil faces a challenge common to all fast growing cities in the developing world: to encourage order to emerge from the ever present threat of chaos. Between 1970 and 2004, Curitiba's population grew from 300k to more than 2m. Each year between 20,000 and 30,000 people come to the city from the countryside looking for a better life. Often they have no education, trade, skills, place to live and no sense of what it means to be a citizen of a city. All over Curitiba but particularly along riverbanks and under power lines, migrants throw up shanty-towns which spread like a forest fire as word spreads that a new area of land has been invaded. It takes just a few weeks for a field to become a shanty town housing thousands of people. These shanties are pure self-organising solutions, but they are also breeding grounds for poor education and bad health, protection rackets and exploitation.

Curitiba's solution is structured self-organisation. The most striking example of this philosophy in action is Cujaru, a former squatter encampment, on the city's edge which houses 120,000 people on land that was pasture in 1990. When the Cujaru settlement started growing the city got a loan from the Inter American Development Bank to replace the shacks with permanent houses. The bank stipulated that the council had get a registered builder to build the new homes. Pretty soon the builders were throwing up standardised, low-rise housing units that looked like army barracks. The council called a halt and went back to the bank with a different solution.

The contractor's houses cost $10,000 per unit. The council argued that if people were allowed to build their own houses, employing their own labour – often family and friends – the cost would be about $3,000. Instead of the area being blanketed by barracks, Cujaru would have a variety of architectural styles. People who build their own homes would look after them and their neighbourhood, the council pointed out. If something went wrong with the plumbing the householder would fix it themselves rather than calling the council to provide a solution. The council would have had to employ a large and no doubt bureaucratic housing maintenance department to carry out the work. Eventually the council persuaded the bank that its mass self-build approach, turning people into participants rather than recipients, would be more cost effective. In the first four months of the revised scheme 10,000 homes were self-built. Cujaru is a thriving, stable community of more than 120,000 homeowners, perhaps the largest self-build community in the world. Structured self-organisation - a well-designed, mass, self-organised solution trumped both our bottom up and top down solutions.

Charles Leadbeater
Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Curitiba is one of the most creative cities in the world. But it has not followed in the footsteps of Richard Florida's disciples and created a cultural quarter, for specially creative people, members of the creative class, to do special work. Instead Curitiba has applied creativity to the most important aspects of city life: how people live together, housing themselves, moving to and from work, educating themselves, looking after the sick and poor, and most tellingly in collective rubbish. Which is where Rodrigo Muscolevy comes in.

Rodrigo is tired. For eight hours he has been tramping the streets pulling Interprise II his makeshift, light green, hand made, cart, collecting rubbish to be recycled. A recent arrival in the city, Rodrigo is jobless. Collecting rubbish is his way to make a living. On a good day, after two or three outings Rodrigo collects enough to earn £5 when he delivers his load to the recycling centre. Today his cart is full with 80kg of plastic, glass and metal: he should earn about £2.50. Rodrigo is a one of a small army of recycling entrepreneurs created by a remarkable example of mass social innovation orchestrated by the council.

Rodrigo does not collect litter from the side of the street but from plastic shopping bags placed on platforms that stand outside most houses in the city. People started to leave out items for recycling – plastic, paper, metal, rubbish that is not rubbish as it's known in the city - twice a week when the city's big green recycling trucks were due to come by. But the council organised for its large trucks to collect recycling late in the afternoon, giving entrepreneurs like Rodrigo eight hours to collect the rubbish first. As a result Curitiba is crawling with thousands of men and boys pulling hand made carts collecting rubbish that is not rubbish. The city gets its rubbish collected at much lower cost to the taxpayer because the council needs far fewer big green trucks. The city population gets a cleaner environment: Curitiba recycles more than thirty per cent of its rubbish far more than comparable cities in Europe and the US. Young men recently arrived from the countryside can find a way to make a living as recyclers with little more than a bike. As the city grows and generates more rubbish, so the population of rubbish collectors grows as well. Demand produces its own supply far more flexibly than if the council was in charge of planning a centrally organised service. The micro-entrepreneurs who collect most of the rubbish and the householders have created a self-organising solution within a framework provided by the council.

One of the chief architects of this structured self organisation is Cassio Taniguchi, who was the council's chief engineer and then mayor: "No matter how well run we are we still would not have all the resources we need as a council. We can only get those resources by mobilising more people to participate and take co-responsibility for devising solutions. We cannot organise ourselves in linear ways because people do not live their lives in straight lines." The results of this participative approach have been impressive. In 1995 Curitiba's income per head was already 40% above the Brazilian average; by 2004 it was twice as high. Thanks to the creation of more than 30 large parks there is 51.5 sq metres of green space per resident, compared with 0.5 sq metres in 1970. The unemployment and infant mortality rates are among the lowest in Brazil and literacy rates are higher than in many cities in the US and the UK.

Curitiba has had a stable leadership formed around Jaime Lerner, several times Curitiba's mayor and original architect of the city plan. Many of the specific strategies have been devised by Curitiba's Institute of Public Policy where 300 people work in multi disciplinary teams of architects, engineers, planners, designers and economists. They are the city's systems designers, responsible for the framework of rules, incentives, interfaces and tools that make it fit together. They are the equivalents of lead programmers in the Linux community or the original 200 contributors who got Wikipedia going. Since the 1970s Curitiba's political leaders have mainly been non-politicians. Jaime Lerner trained as an architect; Cassio Taniguchi was one of Brazil's top engineers. Both brought to their office a pragmatic, technocratic, problem solving style. Their charisma comes from being quiet and thoughtful. As Taniguchi put it: "Everytime the public sector tries to do something on its own it tends to be a failure. The public sector works best when it encourages contributions from many other people – the private sector and citizens – to solve problems."

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft — We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

Self-organisation in Curitiba works because it is not a free-for-all. It is structured by simple rules. No one can cut down a tree without council permission and if permission is granted two trees have to be planted somewhere else in the city. Since 1970, about 1.7m trees have been planted. No buildings are allowed within 200m of public parks. The historic core of the city, founded by European immigrants in the 18th century, has been preserved by strict planning guidelines. Curitiba has grown six fold in less than three decades and yet it feels ordered, calm and at ease with itself, in contrast to other fast developing cities which seem chaotic, frenetic and on the verge of break down. Curitiba has also invested in its own "commons", chiefly public transport. The city literally flows: Curitiba has the highest rate of car ownership of any city in Brazil - but even in rush hour there are no traffic jams. That is because 2,530 buses make 21,000 journeys a day to carry 2m passengers, along 71km of bus lanes within the city and more than 270km of feeder routes. More people travel by bus in Curitiba than in New York City which is several times larger. The busiest interchanges at the edge of the city handle 35,000 passengers an hour, more than Heathrow airport, with a revolutionary roll-on-roll-off system for boarding buses designed by IPPUC engineers. Most of the population live within a short walk of an express bus stop. Curitiba does not have sprawling suburbs in which people have to use cars to get to work. Poor people can use the buses for free as can pensioners and people making a payment to the council. People living on the fringes of the city, where the poorer communities lie, can make it to the jobs in the centre.

As resources are scarce in Curitiba many innovations have to serve more than one purpose. Curitiba is built on a flood plain, criss-crossed by five rivers. Flooding was a major problem when the city began to grow rapidly in the 1970s. The solution has been to create a string of lakes within the 30 parks the city has created. The parks give the city its green feel and act as flood defences. Squatters tend not to invade public parks. The 48 Lighthouses of Knowledge: local libraries and Internet centres, located next to schools or health centres, which tend to be close to bus interchanges, are all built with a lighthouse tower that makes them easy to find but which also serves as a look out post for the local policeman.

Across Curitiba there are small pockets of resources rather than large, central departments and institutions. In addition to the 48 libraries, there are 106 municipal day care centres, four of which are open 24-hours and hundreds of vocational training centres, which cater for more than 33,000 people a year doing short courses to prepare them for work or to start their own courses. There are 165 health centres, and 1m Curitibans have an electronic health card that allows them to book an appointment at any centre, regardless of where they live. Most of the 163 schools have Internet connections and many are open beyond school hours for use by the community. Over the past few years all education budgets, for capital, maintenance and teaching, have been devolved directly to schools. Elisangel Cabral, the coordinator of the council's business incubator programme explained how they planned to take their service door-to-door in future: "Far more people will create jobs and businesses at home in the garage or kitchen than will come to a council incubator. We have to take our service to them rather than expecting them to come to us." It is almost as if public services have to be organised like a guerrilla campaign, operating in the community not on it.

City planners have drawn up a detailed social map of the city, highlighting communities blighted by multiple social problems: crime, unemployment and family breakdown. Council staff compiled the map by going door-to-door collecting detailed information on educational attainments, household income, employment and health. They now have a detailed picture of the lifestyles of 10,000 of the poorest families in the city who live in 50 of its poorest neighbourhoods where they have launched collaborative community planning initiatives. The city's aim is to provoke a creative conversation within these communities to generate momentum for change from within. Ana Jayme, the project's leader explained: "Getting people engaged in this collaborative model has been really hard and we've had a lot of false starts. We have had to equip people to do it, to give them the support and tools they need. We have to find the real leaders in a community. If we can get them involved, the first twenty people then the initiative spreads by word of mouth and we get many more people involved. We have to find something positive in the community, whatever it might be that they can start building upon. Self-esteem is very low in these neighbourhoods. We want to get people to feel involved because unless they do they will not feel like real citizens, people who feel a sense of belonging in the city."

Self-organisation without leadership all too easily leads to a dead end: the shanty. Top down leadership that stifles self-organisation fails to mobilise a wide range of people and resources. The trick is to provide leadership for a process through which people, together, find structured collaborative solutions. Cities like Curitiba are among the best examples we have of innovation as a mass, self-organising collaborative activity. That is why cities have been such vital sources of innovation in all fields – government, art, science, business. The lessons of cities like Curitiba should be applied to innovation in other walks of life. Yet all too often in the 20th century, at least, cities themselves turned their backs on these ideas in favour of their own version of closed innovation.

Creating platforms for public innovation
Cities will be vital to the future of creativity. In 1800 only 3% of the world's population lived in cities, even though cities had been around since about 6,000 BC. By 1900 it was 14%. But now half the world's population lives in cities and by 2050 it will be 75%. Cities will be our future. Cities are cradles for innovation because they are cradles for knowledge, culture and self-governance. It is in cities that we learn how to live together creatively. Cities encourage mass innovation as people learn new habits from one another just by walking down the street or observing what their fellow citizens are doing. Everything propagates faster in cities, diseases, fashions, ideas. Cities are neither pipelines nor value chains: they are the original communities of co-creation, the first places where we got all mixed up. Cities provide the social mix that propels creativity But getting mixed up in creative ways depends on how cities are governed. Cities can be diverse and dense without propelling creativity. Everything depends on the mix. What are the design principles for open, creative cities?

Cities nurture a particular kind of freedom, one which comes with its own constraints. Consumers cities give us many more options and choices, to be the person we want to be, to enjoy a wider range of goods, services, food and entertainment, opportunities for work. As centres for cultural creativity cities provide more opportunities for self-expression. But the presence of many other people, in close proximity, also limits what we can do. We cannot roam about regardless. We depend upon other people to provide us with the diverse experiences that makes city life so valuable. Yet the presence of all those people also constraints our freedom for action. That is why cities have always been centres of innovation for new kinds of government and shared infrastructure: to manage the tensions generated by the highly social form of freedom they create. Cities are exercises in continual collaborative innovation.

The postal system is a prime example. Before the invention of the Penny Post in 1837 letter delivery was mainly carried out by messengers finding their way around by word of mouth. Letter delivery was a risky trade: a letter was paid for by the recipient, there were no fixed charges. The creation of a cheap and reliable postal system required overlapping social innovations: a system to link names to addresses, which required streets to be named and houses to be numbered. These names, and addresses were gathered into large directories, which for the first time provided an index of who lived where. The stamp was a cheap and ingenious way for senders to pay up front for the delivery, allowing many more people to send letters. The postal system depended on public innovation, the creation of a new public system with its own rules. But it also enabled a massive growth in private communication – peer-to-peer. Private letter writing had been confined to those who could write and afford to send letters. It was an elite activity. The postal system encouraged writing to become a mass form of self-expression. One beneficiary, for example, was Florence Nightingale, who wrote 12,000 letters in her campaign for nursing to be recognised as a professional calling. Public and private grew together: the shared, public infrastructure of the postal system, with its numbered houses and street names, posting boxes and sorting centres, allowed an even larger flowering of private creativity and self-expression.

Much the same was true of city maps, which for the first time allowed the city to be seen from above. Before the city map was developed people navigated their way by tacit knowledge and local landmarks. Maps created a universal, standardised and artificial language for describing the shared spaces we live in. Yet maps are also a tool people use in their everyday life, navigating the city for their own purposes. Private purposes – finding your way to a restaurant, theatre or club – become easier thanks to a public innovation – a city map – which created a shared

platform. In cities private and public do not operate in separate domains, they interact, intensely: that is fundamental to what makes a city creative. Shared public platforms – like maps, postal systems and public spaces – should allow private purposes to multiply and grow.

Spaces only become truly public when they are colonised by their users, who adapt them to their own, often unexpected ends, which they discover for themselves rather than being prescribed to them. Cities are too large, open and unruly to be regulated in detail, top down by an all seeing state or a feudal lord. So they have to encourage collective, voluntary, self control. People have to learn how to adjust to one another and collaborate. Cities become creative when people start learning from one another about how to use their shared resources more effectively. Successful cities allow a lot of room for adaptive mutation, encouraging their citizens to invest their ideas in the spaces they inhabit. Top down city planning, in the authoritarian tradition inspired by the Swiss French architect Le Corbusier, was such a disaster because it sought to extinguish this kind of incremental, vernacular innovation. People were meant to live inside the creation of the designer. In Curitiba the role of the designers at IPPUC is to draw out the intelligence of citizens as participants in the city, the way it moves, works and clears itself up.

It is commonplace to argue that creative cities must tolerate, even encourage diversity, of cultures, outlooks and ideas. Diversity generated by mutation and immigration is not enough on its own to generate creativity. Diversity must be matched by integration and exchange, to draw together people with different ideas. Creativity comes from mixing and mingling people and ideas. London, for example, is a marvellously open and diverse city. Yet its neighbourhoods and tribes, no more than five minutes on a bus apart, exist in separate worlds. Diverse communities that never connect will never produce creativity. We need to invest in what connects communities, their edges and interfaces. The sociologist Richard Sennett tells a story about the debate in New York over the placement of a new market for an Hispanic district. The planners, quite sensibly and listening to the community, decided to put the market in the heart of the community where most Hispanic people would use it. But the only people to use the market were Hispanic, living close by. Had the market been placed at the edge of the community, it would have also drawn to it people from outside the Hispanic neighbourhood. It would have bridged several communities, become points of interaction and integration. Diversity can just lead to hopeless fragmentation if all the pieces of the mosaic do not join up. Cities – like the Internet – are made up of lots of small pieces, loosely joined together. Unless cities integrate their citizens into a shared cultural and social life they run the risk of not just fragmentation but rising social tension.

Dutch dilemma

Sitting in Amsterdam's Debalie art's centre Jeroen de Lange has a headache. The strategy adviser to the chief of staff of Amsterdam's city government is devising a "vision" for the city's future. What is creating de Lange's headache is the very openness to diversity that should make Amsterdam so creative. About 43% of the Amsterdam population is of ethnic minority descent – from Indonesia and Morocco, Ghana and Nigeria. More than 60% of people under the age of 21 are from ethnic minority backgrounds. Within ten years they will make up a majority of Amsterdam's population of about 700,000. Many of these young people from migrant backgrounds feel disconnected from the place where they live, its institutions and traditions. De Lange estimates that within five years about 10,000 late adolescents, mainly boys, will have dropped out of school and will be supported by welfare. Mostly they live in large housing estates on the periphery of the city centre, where life obeys different rules and rituals. On "African" estates, in one of Europe's most mature democracies', leadership is exercised by tribal chieftains. In one block De Lange found forty illegal nurseries, run from apartments, catering for the children of parents who had risen at 4am to travel in buses to chicken processing plants 60 miles away.

The sense of dispossession on estates like these in cities across Europe feeds tension, especially among young men. Tales of violence, sexual harassment, robbery and rape swirl around feeding the possibility of a white backlash to reclaim Dutch society for the white Dutch. De Lange spent eight years as a diplomat in Rwanda. He returned to Holland to put something back into his country, only to find he was dealing with many of the issues he confronted

Charles Leadbeater

Full Draft – We Think: why mass creativity is the next big thing.

in Africa: "I've thought about the sources of mass violence a lot. The Hutu and Tutsi in Rwanda lived with one another for 800 years before 1.5m were slaughtered in a few days. I am not saying there will be racial violence in Amsterdam but all the elements which promote violence – lack of a sense of justice, dehumanising images of minority groups, lack of emotional connections between social groups – all these are present in this city."

Most cities, like Amsterdam, thrive on their openness, their ability to attract people from diverse backgrounds. Yet how do they hold together, retain a sense of coherence, if many of the new people don't believe in the institutions and symbols of the old? If order was imposed in a heavy-handed way it would provoke a backlash. If the city were closed off to incomers – even assuming this could be done – it would lose its vitality. De Lange scratches his curly locks: "We have to find some common symbols, visions, goals, around which such a diverse population can come together, to see their common interests." Open, complex, mass system of innovation – in this case a city – will only cohere around simple shared goals and values. That requires inspiring, authentic local leadership, which connects with people. It also means investing to give new entrants hope: social mobility is essential to social stability and creativity.

Creative cities have to flow, not just physically and but socially as well. Curitiba is so successful largely because its cheap public transport system keeps the city moving. It also means that recently arrived migrants, living in new settlements on the city's edge, can easily get to jobs in the city's centre. That helps social mobility, which is critical to creativity. As Peter Hall's sweeping history Cities and Civilisation makes clear creativity is often driven by recently arrived immigrants who have to find new routes of advancement by challenging the status quo. The social mix of cities propels creativity only when emerging social groups – traders, artists, politicians, entrepreneurs, students, yuppies – can try out different lifestyles and ways of working. Cities dominated by an establishment will not be creative for long if they lock other people out of power and opportunity. A city that has a lot of people in it from different backgrounds and cultures will not be creative unless it is socially open in the more fundamental sense of offering opportunities for mobility.

Cities are centres for mass, participatory innovation. They provide a potent mixture of density and diversity: lots of people with different backgrounds and cultures in close proximity, their ideas jostling, mingling and competing with one another. Cities provide markets for the adoption of new products. They tend to attract experimenters. Creative cities work with the grain of mass innovation.