The Creative Industries and Cultural value

LUKE STRONGMAN

The Open Polytechnic of New Zealand

Abstract

The Creative Industries are essentially pluralist and transformative in the manner in which they generate knowledge and the way in which creation and attribution of value is conceived of among them. Value in the Creative Industries exists at all levels of the production chain, from imagination to post-consumption. Situated in the apex or fulcrum of the public and private knowledge economy they have a capacity to educate, entertain and inform. If the creative industries are concerned with encapsulating kinds of value in society which encompass educational, cultural wealth or social wealth (including intellectual property) a central problematic that needs to be addressed is how do the Creative Industries resist instantiating Horkheimer and Adorno's vision of a culture as "[wholly] a commodity disseminated as information without permeating the individuals who acquired it"? Given the need to describe cultural capacity for creativity how do we account for values of potentiality and transformation within instantiations of cultural learning? How might we devise an ontological assessment of qualities which differentiate the term Creative Industries from a process of enlightenment reification? How is industry to be understood as co-contributing of humanist values? This paper intends to explore the apparent antimony in the term 'Creative Industries', to signal intrinsic areas of conceptual relevance for the term and to points to ways in which the conceptual division contained within the term Creative Industries may be reconciled.

What are the Creative Industries and Cultural Industries?

The Creative Industries are defined as a set of interconnected industry sectors, which include: Design, Architectural design, Communication design, Designer Fashion, Journalism, the Film and Video industry, Fine art illustration, Game development, Antiques restoration market, Music industry, Performing arts, Publishing, Software development. The largest sub sectors of the Creative Industries are Design, Publishing & Television/Radio that create 75% of revenues and 50% of the employment. The Creative Industries are also involved in urban regeneration and the opening up of cultural heritage and tourism. The UK government department for Culture, Media & Sport defines Creative Industries as "those goods and services in the creative sector . . . which feature original creativity and generate intellectual property with a potential for wealth and job creation."[1] The Cultural Industries by comparison are an adjunct sector of the Creative Industries and include such activities such as Cultural Tourism and the maintenance and development of Heritage, Museums and Libraries; Sports and Outdoor activities as well as the study, usage and practice of public and private corporates and institutions, the media and analysis of the social milieu employing social scientific techniques. The key ingredient in the Creative and Cultural Industries is the application of imagination to both commercial and non-commercial scenarios. As American anthropologist, Arjun Appadurai puts it, "...culture is the dimension of social life and of collective identity in which the material conditions of actors, of subjects and agents, are constantly transformed by the work of the imagination."[2]

Creative Industries involve the conceptual and practical convergence of the creative arts (individual talent) with Cultural Industries (mass scale) in the context of New Media technologies and the transfer of symbolic capital with the new knowledge economy for the interactive citizen-consumers. Worldwide, the Creative Industries sector has been among the fastest growing sectors of the global economy, with growth rates better than twice those within advanced economies as a whole in the early twenty-first century. If the Creative and Cultural Industries involve the interaction of commercial, public, social, and artistic spheres, as

John Holden puts it: "Greater numbers of people are engaging with the *content* and *spaces* of publically funded culture, while the working lives of greater numbers of people are taking on the characteristics and processes of cultural practitioners."[3]

Creative Industries are often micro-businesses or small-medium-enterprises, SME's, which are organized around specific projects rather than the warehouse or factory plant. They are consumer led, businesses based on individual artists such as musicians, producers, directors, authors who create value by manipulating forms of symbolic capital. Historically, creatives may provide, critical, analytic, contextual, archival, artistic, economic and publicity value which recognises forms of professionalism that became separated from industry by mid-twentieth century modernist critique and the annexation of forms leisure by the bourgeoisie 'factory' class who controlled access to capital.

However, in contemporary society, the Creative Industries are recognised as vital by governments as the enablers of industry and as the generators of cultural knowledge. The generic knowledge skills of the Creative Industries may be increasingly dispersed into other large service sectors, finance, health, education, and government. Creative industrial projects vary in scale and organization. Creative industry workers are seen as implementers of transferable, transportable knowledge skills. Creative Industries may involve start-up businesses, which are established to achieve certain projects. The composition of the Creative Industries must therefore attempt to encompass the values of the arts. As Justin Lewis points out generic values of the arts include**:** diversity, innovation, social-pleasure, participation, considerations of environment, economic generation, development of character and an emphasis on style and design.[4]

Closing the antimony: Creative Industries definitions and problematics:

The voice of industry has not been unanimously clear where the Creative Industries might be slotted into chain of primary, secondary (manufacturing) or tertiary (services) industries. Creativity is frequently involved in the planning, conception and commoditisation of many of these productive categories. Creativity is not confined to one industry and what it means in each industry might be different. Nor can creativity be easily defined at the surface of organizational level.

The World Intellectual Property Organisation (WIPO) currently defines the Creative Industries as the commercial exploitation of Intellectual Property based goods and services with symbolic content. However, WIPO recognises that the Creative Industries are complex networks of content driven sectors which 'drive and sustain' diverse cultural and customary rights, enhancing social value as well as generating wealth, employment and trade.[5] However, the boundaries of Intellectual Property have diffused with Creative Commons. Others have questioned whether the divide should exist so exclusively from mass production and distribution (film & video, videogames, broadcasting, publishing) or craft based enterprises in visual arts, performing arts and performing arts, which encompass the chain of production as pre- and post commoditised event or utility.

Nevertheless the inclusiveness of the Creative Industries concepts raises the question of whether the divide between lifestyle and business, non-profit organisations and larger corporates is fixed and absolute. An example here is the difference between state subsidies for (film) and the privatised computer games industry. There is no unitary definition within the field and yet the creative industries span these complexities. Knowledge transfer is not a simple linear process but rather involves the selective confluence of social production, funded culture and commercial and market culture.[6]

What is at stake in such definitional procedure is the way in which creativity, creative and symbolic capital, productivity and social interaction is understood, managed quantified and qualified. The Creative Industries not only aim to quantify the ambiguous social and educational qualities of the transfer of knowledge but also insist that creativity and the production of social wealth be seen in social as well as

economic terms. If the economic imperative of materialism is totalising then this must be countered by policies of information dissemination and the recognition that in many instances in the contemporary economy the person and the commodity (e.g. commercial service) cannot wholly be separated. The Creative Industries aim to exploit this difference positively; they have a material and a nonmaterial component in so far as they encompass the transformation of creative potentiality into actuality, (the ability to design with designing, for example).

Creative Industries are concerned with the transition from non-commercial activities to commercial states through the transfer and application of knowledge. This is one key link between creativity and industry. However, this is not a simple linear process but rather instantiates the tripartite intersection of commercial, social, and cultural forms and procedure. Therefore the question arises of whether we need to attempt to reformulate a definitional compass of the Creative Industries such that the notion of disjuncture between creation and industry is rendered seamless, dissolving the apparent antimony of the term. This is to signal the inherent complexity and apparent contradictoriness of the term. 'Creative Industries' conceptually amalgamates two terms that from a twentieth century modernist perspective were frequently seen as noncoincidental. However, if we retrace this history to the eighteenth century the divide is once again rendered seamless. From the moment of governmental interest, the arts were always seen as related to industry.[7]

It is possible to conceive of a society in which social capital is implied in the creation of all material wealth, in all materialist forms of creativity? What about those whose job involves planning for preventions, for the non-event, for example? This is to extend the argument from the idea that most of what one encounters in society is not exclusively one's own, throughout the private property market there are levels and stages of ownership which bear differing responsibilities and options for adding value. Much of the task of archivists as with, to take an example at the opposite end of the spectrum, military planners, lies in planning for stability amongst contingencies. As such, the creativity involved in these apparently disparate vocations lies precisely in what doesn't happen as much as what does. How is value measured in the latter, the planning of the non-event? To take another example from a different inter-cultural perspective, value is further complicated by the social beliefs of among indigenous communities and developing nations.

Indigenous communities may exhibit a difference between the familiar individuated authorial responsibility and the concept of authorship or ownership in which the author takes part in a collective enterprise. There is no necessary 'author' function in such communities as Michael Foucault has termed it.[8] As such, to extend the metaphor to the creative industries, the artist is not necessarily seen as the determining factor in the artwork, Mark Rothko's 'Seagram Murals' for example, but rather its context or in the way it is received. Furthermore the relationship between the artist, the artwork, the context and the audience is seen as integral to the content of the artwork. The experience, which renders something unique, is individual. Similarly, how does one copyright a relationship? This is not to say that copyright for authorship or some part of a work should not be protected by law but rather in focussing only on the rule as it resides in the display of the artwork we may ignore a cultural effect that is beyond law.

Creative commons which seeks to establish different levels of copyright situated at various transitional points between commercial and non-commercial information may recognise the wider significance of the relationship of the copyrighted material to the cultural and intellectual community. Categories of some licenses vary from the restrictive (Attribution Non-commercial No Derivatives) to credit only licenses (Attribution Share Alike).[9] Indigenous beliefs about property may have more in common with notions of public rather than private property. What if private companies were to extend employees contracts to reflect a share in the creative commons of the products and services, which they create transfer and transform? What social change might be derived from extending the notion of value to the notion of ownership in the

workplace to include a communal clause that recognises a margin of commons in the transfer of property be this ownership or symbolic capital?

Related to the complex division between property and its creation is the idea of as Sebastian Olma has suggested that: "the interface between economies of difference and economies of repetition (the latter of which includes intensified industrial production) will require a good deal of research."[10] That Creativity is frequently serviced by repetition is part of the definitional compass of the Creative Industries term. The need to bring together economies of difference and of repetition under the rubric of creativity raises questions about process and procedure. Should the Creative Industries delineate a cross-section of existing industry sectors, or describe new commercial entities, which transfer creative capital, or should the term be used to describe existing processes and procedures in other industries? Is there a consistency and application of the term across all facets of the concept or working model of creative industries? Further questions relevant to humanist ideas of creativity are what is the place of the subject within this creative economy? In what ways are human agency subjectivity and imagination delimited or enabled by the process of creative production? There is a new dynamic and cross-transfer in what was formally regarded as a gulf between industry and the arts by a mutual acceptance of the creative metaphor as central to evolution of industry in the context of globalisation. The creative subject of the Creative Industries is never static and always in a process of producing, transforming and transferring symbolic capital or being so transformed.

Whilst the material processes, accumulations and materiality (but not the production) of creative capital may be described in abiological terms the capacity to create is intrinsically related to human and natural processes. People may be industrious but not in themselves industrial. In fact much of the arts created in the newly industrialised society of the twentieth century may now historically reflect the anxiety of a society losing touch with its anima and the roots of the self. Therefore the creative industries may be understood as providing logos for the creativity inherent in human activity supported by the capacity to reproduce and sustain commoditised humanistic value in the context of evolving environments.

Hardt and Negri in their book *Empire* have also discerned the propensity for the capture of creativity as elusive "[R]ecent transformations of productive labour have shown a tendency to become increasingly immaterial. The central role previously occupied by the labour power of mass factory workers in the production of surplus value is today increasingly filled by intellectual, immaterial, and communicative labour power."[11] Thus Hardt and Negri identify the necessity to develop a political theory of value that can reformulate the complexities of this new capitalist accumulation of symbolic or iconic wealth. This political theory of value may involve a negative value of social utility emphasising new conceptions of creative commons or the share of workers in the creation and transfer of creative capital.

Hardt and Negri see the necessity to develop a new political theory of value that can reconcile the problematic status of this ontological transcendence inherent in the field. As they suggest there are three primary features of which they describe as 'immaterial labour' in the contemporary economy: 1.) The communicative labour of industrial production, which is linked in informational networks, 2.) The interactive labour of symbolic analysis and problem solving, and 3.) The labour of the production of the manipulation of affects.[12] At the basis of these labour types is language and symbolic manipulation and transfer; the capacity to communicate and share it with the constituent parts of the knowledge economy. The value of this capacity and interchange is not just a feature of the product but of the process and activity that goes into making the product or service. Human agency is the central feature of this knowledge capital and the creation of products based on symbolic manipulation, the creation of iconic simulacra and knowledge transfer may involve activities of creation, planning, design and communication.

The Political theory of value in the Creative Industries:

The Creative Industries seek to revise the view of a purely economic take on value which requires only a single response to observed phenomena. Such a view does not account for contingency or individuality which are both core concepts in creativity. It is questionable whether there in fact is an objective or truth value, individuals value the same things differently value different things. Thus value is contingent on a limited set of conditions determined by environmental, social and cultural factors. Analyses of both contingent and derived forms of value highlights that the value of possession, acquisition, exchange and transaction value are only four among thirty-seven differing forms of value which can be distinguished from the market value to the customer. Other forms of value include: Aesthetic value, image value, ethical value, and social value.[13]

Historical and geographical variability of the Creative and Cultural industries:

Alongside considerations of the various kinds of value in the Creative Industries are those of historical and geographical variability. The historical origins of the Creative Industries have, evolved from previous conceptualizations of 'creative arts' and Cultural Industries going back to the eighteenth century ideas of consumer and citizen. The U.K, Singapore, Australia and New Zealand and other Commonwealth countries are early users of the term. In the U.S. creativity is seen as consumer and market driven whilst in Europe it is indexed to traditional cultures, nationalism and civic identity. Combining the creative arts with the Cultural Industries is also brings local and individualised art and culture into direct contact with large scale industries such as media and entertainment. The democratic levelling tendencies of the term suggests possibility of moving beyond elite/mass art/entertainment, commercial, high/trivial divisions. Yet this may present problems in the politics of creative policy and in the categorisation of such amalgams.

Politically, the creative arts are associated with subsidized or sponsored 'public arts' derived from the ideal of civic humanism. The creative arts blur the classical distinction between 'liberal' arts and 'mechanical' citizenship. This tension is traditionally expressed as a conflict between the powers of immanent creation and the industrial footprint; however, the Creative and Cultural Industries suggest a way in which these two apparently different economies may find symbiotic alliance.

Historically, creative culture is seen as a bastion against the reifying tendencies of civilisation which according to F. R Leavis and T. S Eliot throughout modernity have been synonymous with mechanization, standardization and the cheapening of aesthetic and human experience. Both Leavis and Eliot are thus similar to Adorno and Horkheimer in their suspicion of the reifying tendencies of a mechanised industrialised society. The dissonance and apparent antimony between human labour capacities, experience and subjectivities is well problematised in sociological studies of modernity but it is a view which the Creative and Cultural Industries among a wider postliberalism seeks to reconcile. The political imperative is more closely aligned with the commercial imperative expressed in the belief that creativity in symbolic labour be brought closer together to the material realities of neo-liberalist democracies. However, contemporary art institutions, for example, are not opposed to productive capacities of contemporary global, mediated, technologically supported economy and frequently may lead the way in public utilisation of technologies. Where T. S. Elliot sought to describe the notion of democracies as culturally subordinated by mechanization (whose terms describe the process of reification) the opposite tendency might be observed in the writings of Donna Harroway, for example, who defines the human experience is defined as the capacity to transcend and transform the baseness of the material world by a form of integration with technologies.[14] Such a world might be sympathetic to the possibilities of genetic modification without being slave to the horror and melancholy of the view of science unbounded by ethics, expressed in Mary Shelley's *Frankenstein*, for example.

The distrust of concepts of totalitarianism and mechanical reproduction were formed partly in response to the fascism of Nazi Germany and the industrialisations of the endless conflicts of the twentieth century. However, critics of mass entertainment had been voiced by the Frankfurt school in the 1930s and 1940s, themselves articulating a form of alienation with the spectacle derived from WW1. These figures included Adorno & Horkheimer on the demise of the natural world, Hannah Arendt on the notion of compromised human spontaneity and Marcuse and Enzensberger who signalled a deep divide between the human and the mechanical.

Art offers metaphors which transcend divisions however. The Creative Industries seek to combine market place notions of subjectivity and cultural notions of identity. For example, consumer comfort, citizen's freedom, truth, and justice come at legal and social cost whereas non-transmutable normative categories such as issues of identity, gender, ethnicity, sexuality, nationality, age remain subject to a value system which is largely beyond the commercial market place but not beyond the public sphere. Thus as well as the quantitative descriptions of industry the Creative Industries must recognise the permeation of normative descriptions throughout culture as well as in the technologisation of personal identity in both public and private spheres.

The Creative Industries, demarcate the fuzziness of boundaries between 'creative arts' education, identity and 'Cultural Industries'. Whilst the market place of Creative Industries may be involved in the democratizing culture in the context of commerce, the core of culture is still creativity. Creativity may be imagined transferred, produced, deployed, consumed and is predicated on human individual and collective diversity.

Public and private contexts of Creative Industries:

Related to the individual and communal diversity of the Creative Industries are the notions of public and private context. Ever since the eighteenth century notions of consumer and citizen have become increasingly entwined. The desire for freedom and the experience of enlightened principles is expressed in citizenship whereas consumerism involves the notion of the desire for comfort and freedom from scarcity. The public sphere is divided between concrete and abstract notions of civic good. The concrete public sphere involves government, politics, security, justice, debate, democracy, public service and the negotiable notions of public interest, human and civil rights and public rights to forms of welfare, education, social security, and cultural identity.

Existing co-jointly with the public sphere is the private sphere where abstract notions of civic goods are materially and socially conceptualised, located and produced. Values are formed in both private enterprise and public life and the two are sometimes seen as converging. Within the conception of the economy and Creative Industries not only is there a new epoch in making the shift from manufacturing industry to consumer services but also involving knowledge transfer from the structured imagination to intellectual property. Value comes not only from processing things but increasingly from information (copyright) education is transformed into portable knowledge and pathways to knowledge access. Creativity is seen as producing content which highlights connectivity which increases capacity for mobility or infrastructure.

Creative Industries: The descriptive and analytic qualities of the term.

The dichotomy of the apparent antimony of Creative Industries is further evidenced in the adjectival nature of the concept. Stuart Cunningham suggests that the policy evolution of the Creative Industries take both a descriptive and analytic approach, dividing the intellectual and industry development into 'culture', 'services' and knowledge emphasizing globalization, convergence, and digitalization.[15] Cunningham then

takes a step back and asks why is the term Creative Industries useful? He responds that the Creative Industries mainstreams the economic value of arts, design, the articulation of symbolic capital and media. Concomitant with this is a wider policy commitment which recognises that creativity is a critical input into newly developing sections of the economy. Cunningham suggests that the term brings together the provisional convergence range of sectors not typically linked with one another. Within these sectors the Creative Industries articulate the transition from non-commercial activities to the high-tech and commercial spheres, connecting research and development, new computer technologies and symbolic capital creation and knowledge transfer.

Through such practices as the creative commons, the Creative Industries may also be involved in the transition between the commercial and non-commercial spheres recognising that this continuum has a variety of in-between positions. Within both directions of this newly defining distributive pattern the production of the immaterial labour economy also represents an ontology of producer and consumer experience, emphasising the production of positive subjectivities by enhancement of cultural identity and social empowerment. To this extent the Creative Industries place emphasis on the use of internal imaginables to produce external solutions which set new templates which industries follow. However, the praxis of the term must also have social and political effects.

The social and political effects of the accumulation of immaterial labour:

Sebastian Olma (2007) points out that Creative Industries policy aims at a transformation of the structural conditions of production in such a way that 'creativity' (the reference here is to 'individual creativity, skill and talent') can be channelled into regimes of property. This acknowledges a political component of the creative industries in which a structural determination involves knowledge of the conditions and experience of creative labour as it relates to regimes of intellectual property.[16] Olma ironically refers to the potential for 'collective hallucination' of a creative city based on an ungovernable accumulation of symbolic capital.[17] However, this perhaps to see a pathology before a symptom, accumulation of creative capital may produce collective 'illusion' as in some forms of advertising (when people are urged to by products they don't need) but not necessarily 'hallucination'.

Despite this vision of an unpoliced civic sphere, Olma suggests that in contemporary patterns of consumption social bios is held in state of 'permanent virtual mobilisation' by what he calls novel dispositifs of capital such as intellectual property which capture the immaterial labour of informational economy. Here the medium is subject to more regulation than the message. Relatedly the frontiers of immaterial labour in its info-industrial, symbolic, analytic and affective aspects are seen by Hardt and Negri as a more authentic, autonomous expression of 'social bios' than, say, industrial labour, since social interaction and cooperation are part of immaterial labour rather then being the direct result of capital's imposition.

For Hardt and Negri, this signals a possible site of exploitation, however: the poetic potential of 'social bios' is rendered effective in immaterial labour while the passage toward a creative praxis (in the Marxist sense of human beings capacity to constitute their genus in praxis) is perpetually blocked. In a similar manner to Horkheimer and Adorno, Olma conceives of social life as being in a state of permanent mobilisation but without the possibility of adequate actualisation. For Hardt and Negri, the immanent creative expression of the multitude is encouraged by the dispositifs of neoliberal capitalism as long as it remains outside the sphere of the political.

Olma claims that what initially appears to be real creativity (praxis) on closer inspection turns out to be its perpetual postponement for the sake of capitalist poiesis.[18] It seems poststructuralism has found its material location. Socially, as Olma's reading of Virno, suggests, the current twentieth century version of capitalism has transformed the contemporary multitude into a *bios xenikos*, i.e., a living multiplicity of

strangers. He refers to the condition of 'not feeling at home' as the permanent and irreversible situation of the contemporary multitude which has been permeated by the collective hallucination of apparently ungovernable symbolic capital. [19] The desire for the new has been displaced from living and natural forms of creation to synthetic and anthropomorphised entities. However neoliberal capitalism's division and intensification of economies of difference of repetition points to ways in which this bias may be overcome.

The Nature of Creativity:

If the apparent antimony creativity and industry is to be reconciled, the concept of creativity needs to be examined further. Personal creativity can be found just about anywhere that people do or make or think things. Everyone is creative to some extent. Only some creativity functions socially by means of employment, vocation or calling to create economic or cultural value, however, creativity in one sphere is likely to transpose to creativity in another. The Creative Industries seek to enhance the net visibility and productivity of the creative sectors. Creativity may involve access to capital, infrastructure, property rights and other large scale processes which effect individual artists, designers, writers, beneficiaries of social organizations. Creative workers comprise a vast multi-national workforce of talented people applying individual creativity in design, writing, the arts, technology, and many other forms of production and performance. Notions of creativity are inherently linked to notions of value - they are combined. Creativity is in part informed by perspective. This works in both economies of difference and economies of repetition. In eye of the consumerist beholder, innovation, novelty, are about changing their minds about what they think.

The value of creativity is difficult to determine because it is in itself a transformative process. As Richard Campbell points out "[T]o be human is to be engaged in a constant struggle, a struggle between finitude, naturally and historically given, and the potentially infinite possibilities which can be entertained in thought".[20] Campbell describes this concept of the human condition as being engaged in a dialectic between "situation and situated selfmaking."[21] Creative Industries are defined from the position of there being 'no-outside'. Due to the rapid advances in technology and the closing of the gap between knowledge acquisition and symbol manipulation there is an increase in the impact of knowledge and creativity in the economy. A creative workforce is a key longer-term investment and sustainability in a creative economy and society. Such a workforce need be both flexible and specialised.

Flexibility and specialisation

In the research and development area of the Creative Industries there is a large concentration of people who are trend conscious, early adapters, and curious about the new. To this extent the Creative Industries policies signal and advocate flexibility and relevance to the market place. The standard model of education involves the teaching of large classes based on the dissemination of standardized knowledge. This form of education has its origins in the enlightenment in the organisational models of Bentham and Owen and is modelled on industrial production and labour. However, more recent models emphasises the role of teaching specialists who may have a portfolio career. In an international environment with changing cultural, technical and business imperatives, continuing education is necessary, project management or core skills and life design are increasing priority.

The safe distinctions between consumption and production, labour and citizenship have transformed into culturescapes in which the global digitalisation and conceptions of the cartographic totalisation of space through systems such as GPS and GRI create views of people and society in which immaterial labour make image and digital presence a part of the fabric of the living economy. This economy is defined less by new commercial and public opportunities - user led and professional-amateur innovation - than by the dissolving of roles of demand and supply in the digital economy of symbolic analysis and immaterial labour in which

communication is rendered flexible and transparent. Specialisation is increasingly demanded of the generalist sphere. Immaterial labour and symbolic capital is currently locked up in legacy formats, content management systems, or sequestered by copyright regimes, which are skewed towards powerful accumulations in data-silos rather than towards a democratic commons of creatorships and creative clusters. Communicative interoperability describes synchronic performance while memory solos encode diachronic contents. However, open source, broad-based consumer creativity results in relatively low-cost generation of symbolic capital - ways of improving the formation and sustainability of creative enterprises are crucial to an innovative system which produces and enhances people's cultural and subjective experiences.

The production of 'subjectivities': The social and public context of Creative Industries

Most of the creative industries are involved in the production of subjectivities and a transvaluation which acknowledges that creativity of immaterial labour in symbolic capital involves aflexibility. The informization of production and the significance of all forms of symbolic analysis to the workplace are redefining the relationship between capitalism and culture. Cyberspace is 'a public sphere without a democracy' as Jodi Dean defines it, or a zero institution and empty signifier that in itself has no meaning but which signifies the presence of meaning.[22] Cyberspace may represent a structural transformation at least as significant as that identified by Habermas pertaining to the enlightenment.

However, although democracy requires contestation as the political instantiation of the public sphere it is not without values. The values of the public sphere include open access, participatory parity and social equality. In "Rethinking the Public Sphere" Nancy Fraser defines it thus: "The public sphere is . . . not the state; it is rather the informally mobilised body of non-governmental discursive opinion that can serve as a counterweight to the state."[23]

'Weak publics' involve opinion formation but not decision making. In comparison 'strong publics' involves opinion formation and decision making. The key example is that of sovereign parliament which functions as public sphere within the state. Thus the reorientation of the Creative Industries with the symbolic capital of industrialisation works so as to redefine the relationship between capitalism and culture. Creative symbolic analysis has a hierarchy, with menial and repetitious symbolic analysis at one end and high grade symbolic analysis at another. For the most part creative workers cannot capture the excess capital that their productivity helps create, in order to do so the capitalist market needs to continue to expand. If production is contained within a margin for creative commons in each intellectual product - productivity must be captured as a part of the product as well as the process of symbolic information exchanges workers engage in. A fraction of all value workers produce may go into training and development whereby that part of private good deemed public is captured and transformed at source, giving people a chance to upgrade the levels of value they impart. Creativity too has a politics that is aligned with growth, bio-polity and complexity. Such a politics is informed by co-operation as much as by competition.

Immaterial labour and co-operation:

Symbolic analysis is a part of immaterial labour with service provision at the fulcrum of the information economy. Industrial production is informationalised and incorporates communication technologies which are transforming the production process itself. Hardt and Negri identify three kinds of immaterial labour.

1. Manufacturing service/material labour involved in the production of desirable goods carries symbolic content which tends towards the immaterial.

2. The immaterial labour of analytic and symbolic tasks divides into two kinds, the creative and intelligent and the routine.

3. The third type of immaterial labour involves the production and manipulation of affect and requires virtual or actual human contact, labour in the bodily mode.[24]

Immaterial labour involves social interaction and cooperation. However concomitant with this is the notion that brains and bodies need others to produce value. Value is derived from productivity which produces wealth and creation of social surpluses informed by cooperative interactivity through, linguistic sharing, communication and other affective language based interactions. This immaterial labour is defined by the abstract symbolic labour of computers and the service-led somatic and affective labour of human contact and interaction.[25]

Creative workers frequently inhabit virtual spaces of the imagination which allow them multiple localities or a single and complex sense of locality, in which many different empirical spaces coexist. However, more than this, in 'The Poetics of the Open Work' Umberto Eco describes how the artist, audience and artwork interact to produce the work of art: "[E]very reception of a work of art is both an interpretation and a performance of it, because in every reception the work takes on a fresh perspective for itself."[26] The artist or creative industry personnel expose the work to the maximum possible audience which reinvents it in psychological collaboration. With such knowledge transfer comes the transfer of values also.

Knowledge transfer of the Creative Industries from Intellectual property to research and Development:

As human capital is a key component of the Cultural Industries, they are therefore concerned not only in the transition and application of intellectual property but in developing other kinds of value in society than simply monetary value. Creative Industries are concerned with cultural wealth or social wealth including such factors as health. Thus for example the biopower of the somatic industries may be employed in therapeutic health delivery. Thus we may wish to reconceive of how this wealth in society is seen and experienced. Instead of the sharp division between people and property we might we think if the creative milieu as extending the personal into the environment to include a creative commons which recognises the communal value and utility of creative resources. The idea of a creative commons is to some extent supported by the example of the internet, accessible to a large number with a basic level of resourcing.

Knowledge workers comprise the creative class whilst the knowledge economy is concerned largely with intellectual property. Contemporary society has increasingly been regarded as an information and knowledge society which Richard Florida has claimed gives rise to the '*Creative Class*'.[27] Society has a demand for information but more than this creative workers need to be pro-active in challenging the information that is received and retrieved - where to apply it and what to do with it. Sometimes knowing where to find information may be as valuable as the information itself.

Society increasingly recognises that wealth creation and the pattern of socialization in society are driven by knowledge and ideas in a context whereby the influences of new technologies and the forces of globalisation comprise everyday experience. It is only by examining these experiences that may be able to do something else with them, to transform our knowledge acquisitions and our society in doing so. The idea of creativity involves a variety of traits: originality, serious mindedness, being sceptical and analytic, being argumentative and prepared to test hypotheses, being prepared to be adaptive, sometimes being negative and at others adding value to information.[28]

To provide a scenario which is deeply implicated in the apparent antimony of the Creative Industries term: Creativity in research and development is controversially encapsulated by the notion of using embryos

in stem cell research. Are we to regard such embryos are tiny human beings or clusters of cells? Are such entities already members of the community or should they be distinguished from adult human beings due to their lack of sentience and personal identity? Here we have a tangible medical and research dilemma which articulates the ethical urgency to examine the distinction between economies of creativity and economies of repetition. As a sector the Creative Industries are drivers of the knowledge economy, they are seen as facilitators and 'enablers' for other industries and services. While the 'creative class' is not as large as the service class it is seen as a source of change and growth for the economy as a whole, as well as expressing the cultural zeitgeist or 'spirit of the times'. The work patterns of the creative class are characterised by 'soft control', which replaces the traditional rigid hierarchies of control with new forms of self-management, peer recognition and motivation.

Cultural creatives largely shape the content of their own work, they assume responsibility for their own ability to learn and to grow and in this sense the creative class is never 'not at work'. The cultural creatives class includes: artists, musicians, professors, scientists who operate in a broader base of enterprise culture, micro-businesses, in small and medium enterprises and with large corporate brands. Examples of successful cultural creatives include the Creative Industries in London and Silicon Valley in California neither of which could function without the substantial involvement of Universities and government agencies who provide input in terms of research and development time. Cultural creatives may operate in the pre-competitive research and development area and provide stability and leadership to the creative milieu.

As society changes with innovations in science, technology and social thought, different societal and workplace demands will necessitate different styles of education and education priorities. Service industries and primary sectors are no-longer monolithic life-long employers. Changes in working patterns in response to the more complex demands of contemporary society employ the skills of adaptable life-long learners who navigate careers made up of portfolios of ideas. Education today inspires 'yearning for learning', the acquisition of flexible knowledge bases that develop capabilities of literacy, numeracy, project responsibility. In the creative economy learning will become a distributed system - creativity, innovation, customized needs will be networked across sites of the workplace.

There is also increasingly the recognition that creativity as well as economic development has decisive social and economic benefits, which arise when humans make things and do things. Creative Industries seek to emphasize and link human attributes with large scale organized enterprise. By focussing on human creativity, the Creative Industries seek to create wealth on sites of universal human attributes. They begin from the human rather than industrial perspective. There is also the acknowledgement of a counter cultural political element in the Creative Industries; a vociferous refusal of some among the democratic audience of its dispotif to engage with corporate creativity on its own terms. This is evidenced by the culture jamming movement, anti-globalization, and some environmental groups. Analysis of the socio-politics of this arena is needed. If the Creative Industries have a politics, the mobility of their operation seem to imply a potential for collaboration and autopoeisis that eludes international politics however they constitute certainly a less threatening form of national and transnational engagement since they are not determined by essentialistic identity policies such as nationalism but rather concerned with hubs of knowledge-creation flow.

The Civic Context: cities as creative spaces:

According to Jinna Tay, creative cities are concerned with how local urban spaces can be reimagined, rejuvenated and re-purposed within a competitive global framework.[29] Creative city policies are governed through national (or sub-national) directives and policies which contain social, political, and economic objectives. Creative cities may involve the formation of cluster enterprises comprising a creative milieu in which networks, enterprises and entrepreneurs are identified as producers of development outcomes. Michael Porter of the Harvard Business School defines clusters as 'geographic concentrations of interconnected

companies, specialized suppliers, service providers, firms in related industries.'[30] These organisations increase productivity, promote innovation, promote new business formation.

There is a dynamic interplay between local and global forces which determine how international trade in goods, information, and culture are impact upon local spaces (private and public). As Tay points out, the first recognition of the role of cities in Creative Industries is to see cities as sites where shifts in social and economic processes (such as reflexive consumption), developmental strategies (clusters and networks), and emerging spaces (in cities and urban sectors) interact.[31] Cities can be seen as anchors for creative capital. Economic development involves organisations, sites and mediums for creativity in which patterns of consumption and innovation become strategies for social, economic and political revitalization. Tay further observes that creative synergies may be produced in networks of face to face interaction and socialisation.

In the creative economy clusters and networks gain competitive success as business inputs (resources, capital and technology) can be provided by both local and global markets. Remote capacity knowledge transfer gives creative clusters opportunities to bypass local economies. Symbolic capital offers the potential to re-create old industrial quarter's cities such as Dunedin, Dublin, Sheffield, Newcastle Austin, Tijuana, Mexico Helsinki, and Antwerp, as well as to transform the medium term semi-industrial infrastructure of developing cities. The creative milieu involve formation of social and informal networks that enable knowledge transfer a relationship reciprocity and facilitation.[32]

As Denise Pumain points out, the energy flows that sustain cities, comprising: materials, energy, goods and services, people and information, may result in patterns of growth which deviate from anything known in biology. Some creative urban activities grow faster than city size, implying the proportion of these activities increases with city size. As Pumain maintains this is true of employment in research and development, the distribution of highly skilled professions, income per capita, price of land and housing per square metre, and patents and inventors.[33] Urban development involves the creative capacity for invention, symbolic production and articulation and use of new technologies and formulas for sustainability which are abiological. As Pumain points out, cities use what economists call 'human capital' as well as financial and knowledge resources for sustaining growth.[34] These creative clusters consume more informational energy per capita in terms of resources, capital and technology. These clusters within creative cities are regarded as networks of knowledge transfer as a network of nodes of local cities within global spaces with the potential to direct the flow of international and local traffic in commodities, ideas, and services.

As Terry Flew suggests, Charles Landry (2000) has drawn attention to the significance of a creative milieu to the development of creativity in modern cities and regions, which he defined as a combination of hard infrastructure, or the network of building and institutions that constitute a city or a region, and soft infrastructure, defines as "the system of associative structures and social networks, connections and human interactions, that underpins and encourages flow of ideas between individuals and institutions".[35] Landry's concept of the 'soft infrastructure' is not just conceived in technological terms in which clusters are simply economic but rather sees them as contextualised as nodes of interaction in communities, linked in interpersonal as well as virtual terms.[36] Thus the functioning of the soft infrastructure of such nodes is acknowledged in this way prescriptions of value should not be divorced from their context which be understood in terms of cooperation and bio-sympathetic processes producing two main kinds of knowledge.

Knowledge creation as generative process:

There are two kinds of knowledge which encapsulate the apparent antimony of the Creative Industries - tacit and explicit knowledge, which entail the separation of the implied and the direct forms of information. However, implied or tacit knowledge contains within it the possibility of the explicit and direct depending on audience and environment and therefore must be taken into account in knowledge generation or creation, just

as metaphors in art may speak multivalently in many ways at the same time. Relatedly the concept of creative freedom has utility suggesting as it does the imaginative reconstruction of forms and symbols. However, tacit knowledge (how to write, for example) has to be made explicit (as a written product) before it can be commercialized. Similarly, unconstructed knowledge has to be commoditised.

In the knowledge economy, creativity is also dramaturgical. The act of creative consumption involves a relationship with the market place and involves the notion of reproduction. With the conception of creative identities (and knowledge generation as a zone of transformation) the consumer is sometimes seen as the last worker on a production line of learning which is a 'distributed system'. As a consequence generation of knowledge can be seen as a biological process reinforced by strategic repetition. John Hartley implies that creativity involves a kind of redaction,[37] "in order to create and synthesize, people need stimuli-put together in unfamiliar ways".[38] However, at the cognitive and imaginative levels, as Peter Hempenstall points out, creativity and imagination are also somatic functions intimately related to biopower. By articulating identities, people may proceed from notion of unfixed, dynamic human nature which act out attempts of 'radical transcendence' in dialogue with historically situated cultural context. This involves engagement not only with historical finitude of the human lifespan but also with the infinite creative possibilities entertained in thought.[39]

Creative Practices:

An examination of creative practices must involve an assessment of the impact which cultural, economic and technological change has on the creative practices of individuals and groups. Widely held formulations of art and aesthetics are changing with the creative industries to give rise to new cultural ecology. Creativity is instantiated by playful contingency, and openness to various combinations of forms. [40]

As part of a revised civic humanism, it has been suggested that the arts be re-purposed within Creative Industries to acknowledge a civilizing agenda within a 'hierarchy of taste' involving both social enlightenment and personal fulfilment. The Creative Industries may use experience in one sector to challenge and enrich another. Forms of knowledge transfer and creative processes are fleeting, extend across disciplines, and may have different life spans and life cycles.

Umberto Eco proposes that 'openness' is fundamental to the working potential of the contemporary artist or consumer. He suggests that art works and practices are organised to multiply possibilities. Often an artwork will occupy a status of 'becoming' in which it may be unfinished although complete. The internal mobility of the artwork sets up the possibility of dialogic interaction between author, performer, and audience. In 'The Open Work', first published in 1962, Eco explains how in classical compositions, conventional symbols oblige the performer to reproduce the format devised by composer. This can be compared with the rhizomal recombinations of jazz improvisation which involve forms of creation which are collective, simultaneous, extemporaneous, organic and fluid.[41] In the former we have replication, in the latter imagination. Eco's analysis raises a different order of aesthetic questions to do with 'productive processes and the personality of author', in which there is a distinction between process and result, the relationship between the finished work and its antecedents which describe a poetics of interdisciplinary performance. Eco's conception of openwork is thus inherently democratic and participatory; it also imagines that each artwork has an ideal audience.

John Hartley's concept of creative redaction, in the context of Eco's 'openwork' suggests that creativity expands the possibilities for meaning through fragmentation, appropriation, intertextuality, editing and preparation for publication or production. Hartley suggests that redactive creative producers revise, prepare, adapt, remotivate, recontextualize, abridge, reduce materials to their desired shape into form. According to Hartley creative practices involve six main features: 1.) They involve interactivity (to enhance and extend the way people work), 2.) They are intrinsically hybrid involving eclectic constructions, 3.) They embrace new

sites and forms of cultural production such as the critical capacity of digital media to receive or transmit content and 'flash mobbing' by email or sms in which large groups of people gather and disappear in short spaces of time. 4.) Creative practices are orientated toward multiform, cross-promotional means of distribution involving multiplatform delivery. 5.) They should not be approached *as if* commercially irrelevant 6.) Creative practices sets new relationship between aesthetics and industry.[42]

Hartley's views thus acknowledge the importance of culturalization of everyday life by identifying the experience of an economy which creates income and shared value by engaging creators and consumers in interconnected and personable and memorable ways.

The creative economy:

Bilton and Leary agree that the creative industries produce 'symbolic goods' (ideas, experiences, images) the value in which is primarily dependent on play of symbolic meanings in the creative economy. Such notions are subjective and dependent on the end-user (viewer, audience, reader, consumer) decoding and finding value in meanings. These 'symbolic goods' which are dependent as much on the user's perception as the original content, may or may not translate to a financial return.[43] Such a weightless economy is based on dematerialized output, computer code, media content, design, information, and services.

The politics of creativity is democratic as well as pluralist. Everyone is creative, and may experience creativity as a personal phenomenon as well as a notion of workplace productivity. Lash and Urry have observed how in the culturalization of everyday life contemporary capitalism is marked by a growing degree of reflexive accumulation in immaterial labour, this aesthetic reflexivity is reflected in spheres of production and consumption in which capitalism becomes design-intensive, orientated towards niche consumer markets.[44] The Creative Industries offer new descriptors for cultural management in which economic processes and transactions often related to interpersonal relations inevitably possess a cultural dimension as well as emphasising economic employment. However, it is undesirable to produce terms which reify people or that iterate and replicate the politics purely economical, industrial or material interaction. The apparent antimony of the creative industries does not entail a bifurcation but rather a polysemy in which they are recognised as capable of sustaining both creativity and repetition.

The Creative Industries counter to the language of industrial reification – reconciling the antimony.

John Hartley points out that term had first invocation of Creative Industries was made in ironic terms by German Marxists Theodor Adorno and Max Horkheimer (1977) in their critique of industrialization of culture in advanced capitalist societies.[45] For Adorno and Horkheimer, the industrialization of culture, and its absorption within capitalist industry and commodity aesthetics, meant the negation of 'true' art and culture, and the artificial differentiation of cultural commodities in the context of overall standardization and mass production. However, the Creative and Cultural Industries potentially revise Horkheimer and Adorno's critique of the reifying tendencies of the language of industrialisation by the recognition of a broader and deeper spectrum of values in the creative production, consumption and modification of materiality.

Horkheimer and Adorno claim that, "Technical rationality today is the rationality of domination. It is the compulsive character of a society alienated from itself."[46] However, the reduction of alienation by incorporation of symbolic analysis and immaterial labour into the production process reaffirms human agency. The viewpoint of the Creative Industries would revise Horkheimer and Adorno's assertion that for the consumer there is nothing to classify since the classification has already been pre-empted by the schematism of production. The vocations of curators and archivists are simple counter to this as well as designers who reassemble existing concepts into new creations whilst symbolic analysis and immaterial

labour promises to redefine the concept of production. While it may simplistically true that reproduction of mind does not lead to expansion of mind, mind itself is not what is being produced but rather the causal consequences of the application of kinds of thinking. However, there is a further liberationary quality involved in the operation of the Culture Industry which like the immaterial labour of the Creative Industries foregrounds the tangible performance, the technical detail over the work, as Umberto Eco has claimed, in which part of the *work* of the artwork is created in the act of perceiving, experiencing and categorising it.

If Horkheimer and Adorno confuse *process* for creation, mechanism from experience, they refute the potentially a gestalt effect by the prioritisation of figure over ground, denying the whole in the perception of the parts. If, as they claim, this is a particular symptom of the present in industrial culture, in which, for example: "In music, the individual harmonic effect had obliterated awareness of the form of the whole; in painting the particular detail had obscured the overall composition; in the novel psychological penetration had blurred the architecture,"[47] the Creative and Cultural Industries offer a paradigm in which the contact functions of the individual may be regained by a system of values located in more than the material present.

Horkheimer and Adorno observe that a withering of imagination and spontaneity in the consumer culture of today need not be traced back to psychological mechanisms. This they attribute to the emphasis on the objective makeup of products which demand fleeting observation rather than spectoral thinking; the powers of the imagination are suppressed by the reifying imprint of industrialisation which requires alertness and consumption but which produces distraction. Thus the economic machinery of repetition they claim informs the very material of creation.[48] Only a redistribution of value across the process of production involving a responsibility of consumption in the end product which acknowledges the social capital and immaterial labour that has gone to produce it, as well as a sustainable distribution of materials will allow the creative experience of the product - there is no endpoint to the cycle of production and consumption between commercial, social and cultural spheres. If we do not regard industries as creative and expanding of our notions of social utility then we participate in what Horkheimer and Adorno call, "the secret of aesthetic sublimation: to present fulfilment in its brokenness".[49]

If nature 'the most valuable creative industry of all' and frequently regarded as the healing antithesis of society is merely absorbed and partitioned off due to a simplistic privileging of the symbolic end point of consumption, the Creative Industries offers a paradigm in which the inherent complexities and currently unreplicable patterns of nature are desired and respected as the pre-eminent model of creation as well as fundamental sources of diversity. If the power of industry is regarded as totalising, the Creative Industries are seen as offering a paradigm which enables human agency to rest some control back from the system that reduces the value of human labour, by privileging a domain of non-mechanistic labour, seeking to realign the arts to their applied focus. Constant recreation will reverse the opacities of industry: For the more completely language coincides with communication, the more words change from substantial carriers of meaning to signs devoid of qualities; the more purely and transparently they communicate what they designate, the more impenetrable they become.

The demythologizing of language, as an element of the total process of reification leads not to wholeness and creativity but enacts the denaturalisation of knowledge. If we want to preserve the possibilities for a workplace world of meaning in which concepts such as emotion, nature and life can be apprehended in the word and the world which sets them apart and preserves them, the Creative Industries paradigm seeks to be aware of the way we assess and experience qualities and values and seeks a redefinition of the arena and way in which such concepts can be recognised.

Rather than privileging a system which reproduces a mentality signifying a zero space of no value we must look for working models creativity and learning which redefine forms and mediums in which value can be created and recognised as in relationship between people, word and world, sign and substance. Nothing is

value free. It is in the potentialities of revising forms of Creative industries that the possibilities for a sustainable collective imaginary may find a co-creative alliance with the semantics of industrial production.

Summary:

In summary this paper looks at ways in which industry and creativity can be combined and the philosophical consequences of this. It offer a definition of the Creative and Cultural Industries, it identifies problematics with the term, it develops a theory of value relative to the politics of the Creative Industries, it indicates their historical and geographical variability, the public and private contexts of creative industries, maps out the social effects of the accumulation of immaterial labour, examines the nature of creativity, the formal and informal paradigms of education within the creative economy, examines the role of the Creative Industries in the 'production of subjectivities', the knowledge transfer of IP, creative practices and the creative economy. The argument is made that the Creative Industries paradigm offers an opportunity for the post-industrial society to avoid the sharp distinction between people and product which lead to socially uneven and outdated systems of value within the creative economy and wider society.

Notes

1   UK Government, Department of Culture, Media and Sport. *Creative Industries*. Retrieved April 27th from http://www.culture.gov.uk/www.culture.gov.uk/

2   Appadurai, A. *The Right to Participate in the Work of the Imagination*. Interview by Arjen Mulder. Retrieved 5th June 2007 from http://www.appadurai.com/interviews.htm

3   Holden, J. *Publically-funded culture and the Creative industries.* Retrieved 28 August from: http://www.demos.co.uk/files/Publicly_Funded_Culture_and_the_Creative_Industries.pdf. P. 10

4   Lewis, J. Public Arts Funding: Who Benefits?, in: Simon During (ed.) *The Cultural Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge) p.45.

5   IP for Development: Creative Industries. Retrieved 29 August, 2007 from http://www.wipo.int/ipdevelopment/ en/creative industry/

6   http://www.demos.co.uk/files/Publicly_Funded_Culture_and_the_Creative_Industries.pdf

7   In Britain what is now the Royal Society of Arts was established in 1754 as the Royal Society for the Encouragement of the Arts, Manufactures and Commerce.

8   Foucault, M. (1991) What is an Author?, in: Paul Rabinow, *The Foucault Reader* (London: Penguin) pp. 101-120.

9   Licenses explained. *Creative Commons Aotearoa New Zealand*. Retrieved 28 August, 2007 from: http://www.creativecommons.org.nz/

10 Olma, S. On the Creativity of the Creative Industries: Some Reflections. Retrieved 5th June 2007 from http://www.metamute.org/en/node/10493

11 Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2001) *Empire* (Harvard University Press: Harvard) p.29.

12 Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2001). *Empire* (Harvard: Harvard University Press) p.30.

13 Woodall, T. (2003). Conceptualising Value for Customer: An Attributional, Structural and Dispositional Analysis. *Academy of Marketing Science review*. Retrieved August 10, 2007 from: http://www.amsreview.org/articles/woodall12-2003.pdf The remaining twenty-nine forms of value include: Basic value, delivered value, desired value, dual-stimulous value, exclusive value, expected value, general value, postpurchase/performance value, private meaning value, received value, redemption value, relative value, single-stimulus value, unanticipated value, use value, conditional value, efficiency value, epistemic value, esteem value, excellence value, functional value, image value, logical value, material value, play value, practical value, spiritual value, status value.

14 Harroway, D. (1991) A Cyborg Manifesto Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York; Routledge) pp.149-181.

15 Cunningham, S. (2005) Creative Enterprises, in: John Hartley (ed.) *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p. 282.

16 Olma, S. On the Creativity of the Creative Industries: Some Reflections. Retrieved 5th June 2007 from http://www.metamute.org/en/node/10493

17 Olma, S. On the Creativity of the Creative Industries: Some Reflections. Retrieved 5th June 2007 from http://www.metamute.org/en/node/10493

18 Olma, S. On the Creativity of the Creative Industries: Some Reflections. Retrieved 5th June 2007 from http://www.metamute.org/en/node/10493

19 Olma, S. On the Creativity of the Creative Industries: Some Reflections. Retrieved 5th June 2007 from http://www.metamute.org/en/node/10493

20 Campbell, R. Persuasive pictures, patterns and perspectives: goals of historical thinking? *Australian Historical Association Bulletin* 74: 8.

21 Campbell, R. Persuasive pictures, patterns and perspectives: goals of historical thinking? *Australian Historical Association Bulletin* 74: 9.

22 Dean, J. (2007) The Net and Multiple Realities, in: Simon During (ed.), *The Cultural Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge) p. 531.

23 Fraser, N. (2007) Rethinking the Public Sphere, in: Simon During (ed.), *The Cultural Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge) p. 504.

24 Appadurai, A. The Right to Participate in the Work of the Imagination. Interview by Arjen Mulder. Retrieved 5th June 2007 from http://www.appadurai.com/interviews.htm

25 Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2001) *Empire* (Harvard: Harvard University Press) p. 292.

26 Eco, U. (1962, 1989) The Poetics of the Open Work, in: John Hartley (ed.) (2005) *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p. 178.

27 Florida, R. (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class, and How it.s Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life* (New York: Basic Books).

28 Howkins, J. (2005) The Mayor's Commission on the Creative Industries, in: John Hartley (ed.) *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p. 118.

29 Tay, J. (2005) Creative cities, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p.220.

30 Porter. M. (2000) Location, Competition, and Economic Development: Local Clusters in a Global Economy. *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14:1, p. 15.

31 Tay, J. (2005) Creative Cities, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p. 221.

32 Tay, J. (2005) Creative Cities, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p. 223.

33 Pumain, D. (2007) The future of cities. Retrieved August 21, 2007 from: http://www.iscom.unimo.it/file.php/1/Brochure_future_of_cities_for_ISCOM.pdf

34 Pumain, D. (2007) The future of cities. Retrieved August 21, 2007 from: http://www.iscom.unimo.it/file.php/1/Brochure_future_of_cities_for_ISCOM.pdf

35 Landry, C. (2000) The Creative City. Earthscan. London. p. 133. Cited in, Terry Flew. .Beyond ad hocery: Defining Creative Industries. (2002) Retrieved 21 August, 2007 from: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00000256/01/Flew_beyond.pdf

36 Flew, T. (2002) Beyond ad hocery: Defining Creative Industries. (2002) Retrieved 21 August, 2007 from: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00000256/01/Flew_beyond.pdf.

37 Hartley, J. (2005) Creative Identities, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p. 115.

38 Florida, R. (2005) The Experiential Life, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p. 143.

39 Hempenstall, P. (2000) Releasing the Voices. Historicising Colonial Encounters in the Pacific, in: Robert Borofsky (ed.), *Remembrance of pacific pasts. An Invitation to Remake History* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press).

40 Haseman, B (2005) Creative Practices, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p. 178.

41 Eco, U. (2005) The Poetics of Open work, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p. 183.

42 Haseman, B. (2005) Creative Practices, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) pp. 167-169.

43 Bilton, C. and Leary, R. (2002) What Can Managers Do for Creativity? Brokering Creativity in the Creative Industries, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8:1, p. 50.

44 Lash, S. and Urry, J. (1994) *Economies of Signs and Space* (London, U.K.: Sage).

45 Hartley, J. (2005) Creative Industries, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell) p. 10.

46 Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T.W. (2002) The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception, in: G. Noerr, T. E. Jephcott (eds.), *Dialectic of Enlightenment. Philosophical Fragments* (Stanford University Press. Stanford: California) p. 95.

47 Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T.W. (2002) The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception, in: G. Noerr, T. E. Jephcott (eds.), *Dialectic of Enlightenment. Philosophical Fragments* (Stanford University Press. Stanford: California) p. 99.

48 Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T.W. (2002) The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception, in: G. Noerr, T. E. Jephcott (eds.), *Dialectic of Enlightenment. Philosophical Fragments* (Stanford University Press. Stanford: California) p. 100.

49 Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T.W. (2002) The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception, in: G. Noerr, T. E. Jephcott (eds.), *Dialectic of Enlightenment. Philosophical Fragments* (Stanford University Press. Stanford: California) p. 111.

References

Appadurai, A. .The Right to Participate in the Work of the Imagination. Interview by Arjen Mulder. Retrieved 5th June 2007 from http://www.appadurai.com/interviews.htm.

Bilton, C. and Leary, R. (2002) What Can Managers Do for Creativity? Brokering Creativity in the Creative Industries, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8:1, p. 50.

Campbell, R. Persuasive pictures, patterns and perspectives: goals of historical thinking?, *Australian Historical Association Bulletin* 74:9.

Cunningham, S. (2005) Creative Enterprises, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell).

Dean, J. (2007) The Net and Multiple Realities, in: Simon During (ed.), *The Cultural Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge).

Eco, U. (2005) The Poetics of Open Work, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell).

Flew, T. (2002) Beyond ad hocery: Defining Creative Industries. Retrieved 21 August, 2007 from: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00000256/01/Flew_beyond.pdf. P.26

Florida, R. (2005) The Experiential Life, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell).

Foucault, M. (1991) What is an Author?, in: Paul Rabinow (ed.), *The Foucault Reader* (London: Penguin).

Fraser, N. (2007) Rethinking the Public Sphere, in: Simon During (ed.), *The Cultural Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge).

Hardt, M. & Negri, A. (2001) *Empire* (Harvard: Harvard University Press).

Hartley, J. (2005) Creative Industries, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell).

Holden, J. .Publically-funded culture and the Creative industries.. Retrieved 28 August from: http://www.demos.co.uk/files/Publicly_Funded_Culture_and_the_Creative_Industries.pdf.

Howkins, J. The Mayor's Commission on the Creative Industries, in: John Hartley (d.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell).

Harroway, D. (1991) A Cyborg Manifesto Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century, *Simians, Cyborgs and Women: The Reinvention of Nature* (New York, Routledge) pp. 149-181.

Hartley, J. (2005) Creative Identities, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell).

Haseman, B. (2005) Creative Practices, in: John Hartley (ed.), *Creative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell).

Hempenstall, P. (2000) Releasing the Voices. Historicising Colonial Encounters in the Pacific, in: Robert Borofsky (ed.), *Remembrance of Pacific Pasts. An Invitation to Remake History* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press).

Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T.W. (2002) The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception, in: Gunzelin Noerr Trans. Edmund Jephcott (ed.), D*ialectic of Enlightenment. Philosophical Fragments* (Stanford University Press. Stanford: California).

Landry, C. (2000) The Creative City. Earthscan. London. p. 133. Cited in, Terry Flew. .Beyond ad hocery: Defining Creative Industries. (2002). Retrieved 21 August, 2007 from: http://eprints.qut.edu.au/archive/00000256/01/Flew_beyond.pdf

Lash, S. and Urry, J. (1994) *Economies of Signs and Space* (London, U.K.: Sage).

Lewis, J. Public Arts Funding: Who Benefits?, in: Simon During (ed.), *The Cultural Studies Reader* (New York: Routledge).

Olma, S. On the Creativity of the Creative Industries: Some Reflections. Retrieved 5th June 2007 from http://www.metamute.org/en/node/10493

Porter, M. (2000) Location, Competition, and Economic Development: Local Clusters in a Global Economy, *Economic Development Quarterly*, 14:1.

Pumain, D. (2007) The future of cities. Retrieved August 21, 2007 from: http://www.iscom.unimo.it/file.php/1/Brochure_future_of_cities_for_ISCOM.pdf

Tay, J. (2005) Creative Cities, in: John Hartley (ed.), C*reative Industries* (Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell).

UK Government, Department of Culture, Media and Sport. Creative Industries. Retrieved April 27th from http://www.culture.gov.uk/www.culture.gov.uk/

Woodall, T. (2003) Conceptualising Value for Customer: An Attributional, Structural and Dispositional Analysis. *Academy of Marketing Science review*. Retrieved August 10, 2007 from: http://www.amsreview.org/articles/woodall12-2003.pdf