

Critique of Creative Industries

Helsinki 31.8.-2.9.2006

Frame - Finnish Fund for Art Exchange

eipcp - European Institute for Progressive Cultural Policies

Abstracts of presentations (to be completed)

Branka Ćurčić

Desire to Own

Property Issue around Creative Industries

Today, one of the things that creative industries are based on is "exploitation" of intellectual property (IP), with the clear aim of "achieving full economic potential." It would be interesting to examine bounds created between creative industries and property issue in different contexts - of West and of East- Post-communist Europe. Together with economic and political trans- passes in former communist countries, cultural production also moved "from real socialism to post-modern capitalism", where struggle for distribution, appropriation and property rights is taking part together with production of new "capitalist souls" - nouvelle private owners. According to B. Groys, in communist times, abolition of private property meant a radical break with the (bourgeoise) past, leading towards artistic and political freedom. Re-introduction of private property thus represents a prerequisite for putting an end to the communist experiment. In communist countries, cultural production was instrumentalized by bureaucratic and not by economic interests.

Most of the socialist governments have viewed copyright as a support mechanism for artists, instead of a legal right. Today, "the object of IP law is the regulation of immaterial labour and the control of the production process". IP regulations, together with agenda of creative industries have been exported also to East European countries and well traded. There "the marketplace had long ago been eliminated and the primacy of politics was pervasive. Thus for the east the marketplace represented utopia." That could be the reason why cultural producers placed their faith in a marketplace of a Western character and maybe why this specific cultural production is unquestionably taking over models of market based production from the West. Also, they're applying often employed PPP structure in the EU, where new cultural institutions are created through partnership between public and private spheres, like in the case of recent urban development in Budapest - cultural complex of Ludwig Museum, National Theatre and Philharmonics.

Moving from IP regulations as "occasional reward" in the past, to current situation of "moving them at a side", it seems that period of piracy has brought more significant economic benefit to those countries than IP regulations do today. There have been many initiatives for Creative Commons (CC) license localization in Eastern Europe and its accommodation to a local legal system. What happens if the law which CC is accommodating to is not being frequently practiced? What stands for, perhaps, is desire to attain the system which would enable them to finally Own their work, outside of intellectual property regulations, piracy itself and beaurocratised/economised market, even if category of ownership here could present opportunity to accumulate her-/his own private symbolic capital, if not real one.

Esther Leslie

Add Value to Contents: the Valorisation of Culture Today

In the private and the state sectors art has been affirmatively re-moulded as "cultural and creative industries". Culture is universally posited as a form of value-production in a number of ways: for example, its economy-boosting and wealth-generating effects, its talent for gentrification and regeneration, its benefits as a type of moral rearmament or emotional trainer. Culture is instrumentalized for its "value" generating spin-offs. The "culture industry", about which Adorno wrote so scathingly, has become with redoubled force "cultural and creative industries", positively affirmed as such by various bodies, from governments to supra-governmental forms, quangos, NGOs and private initiatives. These forces conceive culture in commodity or reified terms, as something measurable as testified in the graphs on the UNESCO site of world imports and exports of cultural goods rather than as an experience or a dialogical exchange. While there is much talk of "cultural value" (along the lines of re-distributing "cultural capital"), this is a term so debased in terms of experience (quantifiable, mechanistic), that it is subsumed easily into economic value. Culture's marketability must be justified; culture becomes valuable only because in the guise of "cultural industries" it contributes to "the economy".

The cultural and creative industries produce value or as UNESCO puts it "add value to contents and generate values for individuals and societies". This industrially conceived model of culture has made possible the introduction of neo-liberal policies in the public and private art sectors. Strategies for cultural valorisation in the public and private sector alike enthuse about cultural "branding". The prime threat to the brand is the unlicensed "pirate", the copy, which was for Walter Benjamin the fulcrum of a democratization of cultural forms and contents. It is the pirated copy that exercises UNESCO, which impotently proposes "control of piracy" as antidote to the loss of local cultures.

In a paradox typical of neo-liberalism, the rise of privatization and the inclusion of private industry as sponsors in the art sector have been accompanied by the subjection of culture to government and state intervention, under the name of cultural policy. Cultural policy bears the same relationship to cultural criticism that the culture industry bears to culture. It is its commodification without counter-measure.

What is remarkable though is that cultural policy has been pushed by the very same forces –academics predominantly– which once engaged in cultural criticism, in the guise of cultural studies and cultural theory. Adorno speaks of the way in which "no theory today escapes the marketplace". If the ideology of privatization needed to promote the industrialization of culture, and its annexing to the production of value in whatever guise - cultural studies proponents were willing ideologues for this refunctioning. Adorno's "Culture Industry" concept a yoking together of the unyokeable - assumed that industry was anathema to culture. Industry signifies business, activity, endless production. Utopias often moulded themselves according to this image. For Adorno, art is a placeholder for utopia. It does not emulate the busy productions of technological industriousness, rather it reflects on the woundings such industry produces and on its potentials, but under different conditions of ownership. Art of that conviction may be too rare to find (or not even appear as art) but it is no less needed today.

Maurizio Lazarato

The Conflict (Semiotic) in Creative Industry: The Case of Contract Workers in Show Business

The struggle of contract workers in show business has concerned the signification and the contents of categories and at the same time the modalities of fabricating this knowledge. There has been a struggle around the signification of the categories of « unemployment » , of

« work » and of « employment » equally important than the one that concerned the conditions of indemnification, because the ways of doing and the ways of telling are not in a rapport between structure and superstructure, between signified and signifier, but in a rapport of mutual presupposition.

During these three years of a continuous conflict we have been able to verify that the signification of « unemployment » and of « unemployed », of « work » and of « employment » are results of an encounter between different semiotics and of heterogeneous dispositions of enunciation. They are built up in the junction between semiotic systems referring to the heterogeneous knowledge and practices, of which this struggle has unravelled the cartography and the articulation.

Alongside with the societies of security there is, in comparison to the disciplinary societies, a new distribution of knowledge and semiotics arising. Despite the fact that linguistics were the paradigm of social sciences in the 60s and the 70s, only a few authors have analysed this new configuration that has a fundamental role in contemporary conflicts.

We borrow from Deleuze and Guattari the distinction between semiotics « non- signifiers » and semiotic « signifier » in order to grasp the different functions of signs, of discourses and of knowledge that we have seen at work in this conflict. From Michel de Certeau we take the diagnostics of the language as the great « ill » of the societies of security, for the language divides in the « language action » of « artificial languages » that articulate the procedure of a specialised knowledge, and in the « fiction language » of the natural languages that organise the significant collaborative activity.

This new distribution of languages and signs refers to a new distribution of dispositions of power that enables us to understand how, in reality, the heterogeneous character of disciplinary dispositions and of dispositions of security runs into a new government of conduct.

The ideal distinction between sovereignty, discipline and security, the different functioning of norms (immanence and exterior) and the multiplicity of modalities of subjection actualise in this conflict, extending and taking in depth Foucault's analyse.

Raimund Minichbauer

"In trade terms, content is a service"
EU-Policy on 'Creative Industries'

The concept of 'Creative Industries' has been high on the EU's cultural political agenda in recent years. During the past EU-Presidencies (UK and Austria) and now in Finland it has been ascribed a prominent role in the cultural policy program, with a series of conferences on different aspects of the subject.

These interventions take place in a very heterogeneous policy field. Policy strategies that relate explicitly to 'Creative Industries' or 'Cultural Industries' as a global concept have been developed on EU-level since the second half of the 1990s - triggered mainly by interest of the Directorate-General (DG) Employment in the subject. The further development did not lead to a common definition and consistent EU Policy, but to a highly heterogeneous form of a network policy (which is not a 'failure' but a component of the neoliberal political development). The different DGs and other political actors analyse the sector and shape their strategies in their very own logics.

The main tendency in this setting of a network policy lies on the one hand in a growing complexity of dynamics which incorporate the arts and culture sector into neoliberal economic policies: the growing importance of competition policy; an employment policy that stresses the high job potential of the sector and at the same time the precariousness and low quality of a big part of the jobs;

developments in copyright policy; the role assigned to culture in the context of the 'competition region' etc. At the same time, instruments that could support the political/social functions of culture, are comparably weak: f.e. the program "culture 2007", which is apparently less ambitious than its predecessor "culture 2000", or the outdated concept of national cultural identities which is assigned a main role in counter-balancing transnational free market tendencies.

In my contribution I will discuss these interrelations using examples from recent political strategies ("i2010",...) as well as more historical developments, like in audiovisual policy during the 1980ies.

Monika Mokre

GovernCreativity, or: Creative Industries Austrian Style

When, in the year 2000, the newly appointed Austrian State Secretary for the Arts started to praise the Creative Industries (CI) as the most promising concept for future cultural and economic policies, nobody in Austria really knew what he was talking about – in fact, it seems plausible that this general confusion included the State Secretary himself.

After six years of a government coalition of the conservatives and the new right the CI and their development have become the central issue in debates on Austrian cultural policy. This, however, does not imply that it has become much clearer what exactly the CI are and to which cultural, artistic, or economic aims they contribute.

The paper aims at showing for the case of Austria how the international hype of the CI combined with the specific history of Austrian cultural policies has led to a situation that can, at the same time, be described as part of a global development and the unique result of decades of national cultural policies characterised by a lack of political ambition.

The international hype of the creative industries can be described in a few keywords, namely

- The trivial assumption that creativity is an important economic factor,
- Definitions of the CI that, in fact, are too broad to really classify as definitions,
- Statistical data that prove – starting from these definitions – that the CI are (1) a crucial economic sector with (2) virtually limitless future possibilities,
- The assumption shared by more or less all countries and cities focussing their attention on the CI that the respective own country/city has especially favourable conditions for this sector,
- Consequential positive prospects for employment, economic growth, success in international competition and, last but in no way least, profits and work satisfaction for those working in the creative industries.

This international development meets the specific Austrian conditions of

- A mostly traditional cultural policy focussing on the cultural heritage;
- A welfare state model that has worked both better and for a longer time than in many other countries.

The concept of the CI goes against the grain of both of these features and can be read as neo-liberal change of paradigms of Austrian cultural policies. Its clash with the historically grown features of Austrian cultural policy makes it, on the one hand, difficult to develop adequate structures for those working in the CI, especially with regard to social security. On the other hand, long standing deficits of Austrian cultural policy become more obvious in this situation.

Matteo Pasquinelli

Immaterial Civil War: Prototypes of Conflict within Cognitive Capitalism

The paper traces a theoretical investigation of the concept of creativity between institutional hype and radical political thought. 'Creativity' is an umbrella term to cover also – in a cheaper way – related notions such as knowledge work or immaterial labour. However, we prefer to focus on the term creative work as distinct from that of creativity (that we consider as its spectacular reflex). As a testimonial of the mainstream ideology around creativity we take Richard Florida, author of the bestseller *The Rise of Creative Class*, comparing his lib-lab agenda with the theoretical tools developed by the French post-Structuralism and the Italian post-Operaism around concepts like semiotic capitalism, mass intellectuality, biopolitical production.

It is a theoretical clash between culturally distant worlds, but a necessary one as they cover the same territories and Florida's vision is getting (dangerously!) popular in many circles. In the recent years Florida got an incredible success popularising his "concepts" of creative class and creative economy that became a trendy mantra for a lot of journalists, managers, consultants and politicians. Florida had several show tours across US and Europe to present (and to market) his ideas to city councils and urban planners. At the same time the "hegemony of immaterial labour" driven by Italian philosophers is conquering those Anglo-American universities looking for fresh radical ideas and is inspiring prototypes of conflict among cognitive workers in Europe. Sometimes Richard Florida happens to be superficially quoted and used even by "radical" activists and grassroots cultural producers. A disambiguation is needed.

We consider the semiotic biosphere not as a violent break but simply as another layer to add to the biological world and traditional economy. However the critical density reached by the noosphere produces a paradigm shift and a modification of several political coordinates (the "linguistic turn" of post-Fordism). Our attempt is to find the new forms of conflict in the age of mass inflation of creativity or distributed creative work. Even if deeply inspired by the Italian post-Operaism, we still lack an acknowledgement of the dark side of mass intellectuality (or general intellect), whereas creativity becomes a device for biopolitical control, an new alibi for social-democrats nostalgic of the dot-com crash or, even worst, a new regime of boredom and alienation. If capitalism goes "cognitive" and "biopolitical", the psychological conditions of creative workers must be central in our investigation: so far we have very few maps of the psychosphere of cognitive labour.

Gerald Raunig

Creative Industries as Mass Deception

„Immerwährend betrügt die Kulturindustrie ihre Konsumenten um das, was sie immerwährend verspricht.“

(Max Horkheimer /Theodor W. Adorno, *Kulturindustrie: Massenbetrug als Aufklärung*: "The culture industry perpetually cheats its consumers of what it perpetually promises.")

When Horkheimer and Adorno wrote „Dialektik der Aufklärung“ and the famous chapter about „The Culture Industry – Enlightenment as Mass Deception“, it was mainly about the growing film and media industries, in the 1940s meaning Hollywood cinema and public radio in the USA. In their interpretation, this kind of culture industry was the institutional structure for a mode of subjectivation that subjugates the individual under the power and the totality of capital. Of course, what is now coined by neoliberal cultural politics and urban development as creative industries is something totally different than huge media corporations.

But there are two interesting aspects in adapting Critical Theory of more than 60 years ago to actual cultural production: How could it happen that in the cultural field with its still prevailing myths of geniality, originality and autonomy where the term "industry" means something completely disgusting and when Horkheimer and Adorno's polemics were once again reaffirmed by the media critique of the 1970s, how could it happen that in the same field this small shift from singular to plural, from culture industry to creative and cultural industries became something like the universal salvation not only for politicians, but for many actors in the field? And secondly, and that is what I want to focus in my talk: When culture industry is the institutional structure for subjugating the individual under the control of capital, what modes of subjectivation are developed in the new institutional forms of creative industries? I will revolve around this question with the help of Paolo Virno's "Grammar of the Multitude" and Isabell Lorey's essay on "Governmentality and Self-Precarization".

Tere Vadén

Open Collaboration and Digital Media – Threats and Potentials

The golden age of the Internet is fading, the time of fragmentation arriving. User cultures, modes of production, dissemination and collaboration are reforming. The main tension exists between gated communities of protected and proprietary content, on one hand, and open communities of free and collective content, on the other. When we think about the issue of what role any kind of information, whether cultural or not, is to play in the information societies to come, two crucial issues present themselves. First, the nature of digital technology has produced a change so profound that the "digital" is often spoken of as a realm or kind of being of its own. Consequently, it is essential for any analysis of contemporary culture to understand the nature of the "digital", its conditions and limitations, as well as new and unique possibilities. Second, due to its digital nature, information distributed in computer networks and other media is different from any other resource in that it is not scarce: it can be copied and redistributed at will with close to zero marginal cost.

The overcoming of scarcity together with the growing importance of information as a resource of production and social interaction has been perceived to result in a major shift both on the economic and the cultural levels (see, e.g. Castells 1996, Hardt & Negri 2000, 2004, Lash 2002, Žižek 2004). From this perspective, it is noteworthy that the excess of information resources that digital technology promises is a threat to many old structures and modes of operation.

In the following, we will present a model for understanding the nature of the digital; a model which, hopefully, will bring into sharper focus the tension between the potential excess of digital information and the need for scarcity that is an inherent property of many social structures, be they economical (certain capitalist modes of production), political (authoritarian systems) or military (need for secure information).

Ulf Wuggenig

The Dealer as Genius. Creative Industry Approaches to Art History

The creative industry approach, which emerged in the 1990s, seeks to introduce a new language for dealing with familiar phenomena in art and culture. One of its main proponents, Richard Caves, for example, relabelled works of art as "creative products", "creative services", or "creative goods", thereby distinguishing between "simple" ones, like paintings, and "complex" ones, like Hollywood films. Art Galleries are depicted as "industries" that mediate

between artists and consumers. The creative industry perspective not only redefines central notions of cultural theory, but seeks to enforce new visions and divisions of the world.

The presentation deals with one of such attempts of the new creativity literature, encompassing contributions of economics, sociology, geography and cultural studies, to transform our view of the world. It particularly focuses on the relationship between "artists and industries" in the realm of visual arts. According to many social historians, the modern social system of art, which is still prevalent in the Western world today, was initiated by the revolution of the impressionist movement against the dominance of the state, the academy and the salon in the second half of the 19th century in Paris. Yet while some interpretations hold that this revolution was mainly driven by artists, others argue that dealers played a paramount role for this radical change of the institutional frame of visual art.

The new creative industries literature has also discussed the emergence of the modern system of art as well as the relations between artists and dealers. The lecture will especially discuss the position of Harrison C. White. Together with Cynthia White, he conducted the influential study "Canvases and Carriers" which has been known for introducing the notion of the "dealer-critic system" into the art world. Meanwhile, White has gained reputation as a major figure of network analysis in the social sciences and as one of the leading contemporary economic sociologists. In a more recent book on "Careers and Creativity: Social Forces in the Arts", which is part of the new creativity literature, he went so far as to call the dealer Durand-Ruel "as predominant a genius in one way as was Cezanne in the painterly dimension among the impressionists-to-be." Apart from this apotheosis of economic actors in the world of art, other assumptions referring to the visual arts that are characteristic for the cultural industries literature will be reconstructed and critically discussed.