Lisanne Gibson and Tom O'Regan

CULTURE: DEVELOPMENT, INDUSTRY, DISTRIBUTION

There has been a shift in the underlying principles governing contemporary cultural policy. This has manifested itself in a range of structural changes, such as the changing terms under which governments direct funding to the cultural sector, leading in some instances to the withdrawal of government funding (as well as the welfare sector in general); the globalisation of the cultural market and intensification of competition for audience attraction in local cultural markets; and changing audience constitution and practices. In response to these changes, cultural policies have taken a number of new forms such as the adoption of an entrepreneurial focus; an increasing encouragement of partnerships between non-profit, government, business and philanthropic agencies; and the application of industry models to the cultural sector. Of particular importance in this refocusing are the two distinct but related notions of 'cultural development' and the 'creative industries'.

On the one hand, cultural development gives priority to the building and enhancing of cultural capacity for the twin purposes of both social and cultural inclusion *and* industry development. Cultural development frameworks therefore pay considerable attention to planning — to finding the means to generate the appropriate relationships, partnerships, cultural protocols, entrepreneurial activity (including social entrepreneurship), governmental instruments and investment necessary for both sustainable and 'livable' communities and growing cultural industries. With their dual focus upon cultural diversity and economic sustainability, cultural development frameworks are concerned to establish viable and sustainable *cultural ecologies*. Ideally, such productive ecologies would connect diverse peoples and create synergies among sectors and cultural forms — connecting the subsidised and unsubsidised; the professional and the amateur; and producers and audiences.

On the other hand, creative industries policy-making presents a more business-oriented and competitive dimension to cultural planning and development. It is more explicitly concerned with generating capacity, valuing 'creative industries' for their potential to contribute to national and regional economic growth, employment and place competitiveness. While there are different articulations of 'the creative industries' — see the papers by O'Regan, Cunningham and Gibson in this issue — what they have in common is their attempt to regularise, reformulate and cohere a set of diverse creative practices as an industry sector in its own right. Creative industries policy-making therefore develops a palate of activities designed to stimulate connection and synergies among the arts-related industries of design, advertising, multimedia, film, broadcasting, publishing and fashion. Creative industries frameworks strive to stimulate innovation, generate new products and services, unleash commercial entrepreneurial energies, and trigger private investment. They are concerned to engineer creative capacity in an apparently rigorous way to value-added ends.

The knotty set of issues involved in the retheorisation of cultural policy under the rubrics of cultural development and creative industries forms the subject of this issue. In commissioning pieces for this issue, we were concerned to explore the continuities and differences between cultural development and creative industries rationales for government's relations with culture. We see securing a productive conjunction between these models as the central problem facing the contemporary government of culture.

In 'Too Much Culture, Too Little Culture', Tom O'Regan surveys a variety of trends and issues in cultural policy-making, paying particular attention to the form and character of the contemporary 'planning' moment embodied in cultural development and creative industries

rationales. He sees the simultaneous centralisation and marginalisation of cultural policy characteristic of contemporary cultural policy formations as a consequence of cultural policy becoming less its own *sui generis* domain and more part of a variety of other governmental processes, spheres, knowledges and domains. In these circumstances, effective cultural policy-making requires more — not less — differentiated strategies, knowledges, sites and outcomes for it to be effective.

In contemporary constructions of cultural policy constellations, the ‘new enthusiasts’ of the ‘creative industries’ position the economic outcomes of cultural policy as the key rationale for relations between government and culture. This privileging of the economic outputs of culture has tended to set to one side (or indeed, in some instances, actively marginalised) the social welfarist rationales which have informed cultural policy as it has been broadly defined since the later half of the nineteenth century — at least in Anglophone countries. In ‘Creative Industries and Cultural Development — Still a Janus Face?’ Lisanne Gibson critiques this opposition, arguing that we need to maintain a close awareness of the social, cultural and political effects of cultural policy. If we do not do so, cultural policy is likely to ‘replace nineteenth century cultural policy structures based on the dichotomy of excellence and community with an equally limited twenty-first century paradigm which establishes a hierarchy between cultural forms which have a commercial application, and are therefore favoured, and those forms which are useful for social or cultural reasons, and are therefore seen as secondary to those with a higher profit potential’.

Concurrent with this reconceptualisation of the cultural policy object as the ‘creative industries’, there has been a parallel focus on ‘cultural development’ in terms of an increasingly pluralised definition of publics and the forms of cultural consumption and production which should be the object of government. On the one hand, this movement owes itself to the convergence of cultural practices and tastes where distinctions between what is fundable and what is not are increasingly open to question. On the other hand, it owes itself to the substantive recognition of the culturally plural nature of national communities as global populations have become more mobile. In this last context, cultural diversity has emerged as an important policy objective, and frameworks for the assessment of cultural value have been pluralised. In ‘Cultural Diversity, Cultural Networks and Trade: Recent Developments in International Cultural Policy Debate’, Ben Goldsmith discusses the ways in which cultural development — and, more recently, cultural diversity policy frameworks — have been understood as a key area of governance for international organisations and policy instruments. Goldsmith argues that multi-lateral organisations are playing an increasing role in the discussion and construction of global cultural policy instruments and that these instruments will have an increasing bearing on cultural policy, production and consumption at both national and more local levels.

In ‘From Cultural to Creative Industries: Theory, Industry and Policy Implications’, Stuart Cunningham provides a sustained exposition of the creative industries from the standpoint of a researcher and someone involved in ‘a substantial project to grow and diversify a regional economy through the development of its creative industries’. With commercial development in mind, Cunningham draws a sharp distinction between the ‘older’ cultural industries and the ‘newer’ creative industries, seeing an applications-based understanding of the latter as ideally suited to the emerging knowledge-based economy and society. The creative industries concept becomes, for Cunningham, not only a new mechanism for delivering innovation and regional economic development, but also a new domain of pedagogy for the arts and humanities and a means for ‘creativity’ to assume a central place in the knowledge-based society.

For his part, Andrew McNamara evaluates the argument and polemic for the creative industries, arguing that the conception of creative industries proposed by Cunningham and John Hartley is ‘actually reliant upon the creative arts — particularly, the legacy of interdisciplinary modernist practice within the visual arts’. For MacNamara, Cunningham and Hartley’s understanding of the creative industries risks adopting a too narrow approach to the

‘management of creativity’. By ‘calculating’ in advance what will be viable as creativity, such an understanding could exclude ‘other areas by fiat because the new ideological principles have dictated in advance that they will not be “creative” in the right way’.

The next two articles by Ron Callus and Shane Homan represent a distinct change of perspective and orientation. While both are concerned with how to encourage cultural development and maintain diversity in widely varying local cultural, political and economic climates, they do so through an investigation into the micro conditions of cultural practice and consumption. Both investigate the policy contexts of particular forms of cultural practice and consumption. In ‘Live for Art — Just Don’t Expect to Make a Living from It: The Worklife of Australian Visual Artists’, Callus takes a detailed look at the ways in which visual artists subsidise their creative practice. For Callus, there is a distinction not only between artists who are self-supporting from their practice and artists who are not, but also within the latter category between artists who are ‘full-time practising’ and artists who are ‘part-time’. Callus’s micro-engagement with the actual working conditions of Australia’s visual artists suggests that cultural policy needs to be more targeted in the ways it seeks to help different categories of cultural worker.

For Homan, the problem facing Australian pop music is its mixed status as alternatively a ‘cultural industry’ and a ‘social problem’. Discussing the iconographic ‘OzRock’ pub gig, Homan demonstrates how other forms of social policy — like noise regulation and liquor licensing — can actively militate *against* the economic productivity of creative industries. Homan shows how regulation and licensing laws have facilitated the replacement of the ‘OzRock’ pub gig with (the more socially disastrous) poker machine parlours.

This collection of articles demonstrates that effective cultural policy-making needs to be premised on a dual engagement with the global conditions of cultural practice and consumption and the *actual* conditions of local cultural production and consumption. We have developed this issue to encourage such attention to Australian cultural policy and to situate its relation to broader shifts in the logics of cultural policy.