architecture institutions and change

Proceedings of the
Society of Architectural Historians
Australia and New Zealand
Vol. 32

Edited by Paul Hogben and Judith O'Callaghan

The bibliographic citation for this paper is:

Macarthur, John. "Architecture, HEAT and the Government of Culture." In *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand: 32, Architecture, Institutions and Change*, edited by Paul Hogben and Judith O'Callaghan, 366-377. Sydney: SAHANZ, 2015.

All efforts have been undertaken to ensure that authors have secured appropriate permissions to reproduce the images illustrating individual contributions. Interested parties may contact the editors.

John Macarthur, University of Melbourne

Architecture, HEAT and the Government of Culture

The HEAT program, in which the Queensland Government's Creative Industry Unit promoted architecture from 2008-12, was perhaps the most elaborate and, in a practical sense, successful example of a Creative Industries program in Australia. Nevertheless, at a conceptual level it exposed developing contradictions in the government of culture, with the consequence that architecture, being so long outside the realm of cultural policy, could be a cipher for quite contradictory positions. HEAT spanned the period between the late twentieth century when Cultural Studies academics put Michel Foucault's concept of governmentality to work in cultural policy, the emergence of the concept of Creative Industries in the early twenty-first century, and the current ferment over Creative Industries as a neo-liberal monetisation of culture and as a useful recalibration cultural policy. These international developments and debates were well advanced and in part initiated in Queensland, but the fact that HEAT chose architecture as the first example of a Creative Industry adds further twists to an already complex story. Here I want to consider, in particular, HEAT's strategy of showing architecture in the exhibition Placemakers: Contemporary Queensland Architects at the Queensland Gallery of Art, Queensland Gallery of Modern Art in 2005. It can be read as both the storming of the citadel of elite culture by the commercial and the everyday; and, as an overdue recognition of architecture as an autonomous art form.

The paper aims to layout this complex and contradictory set of issues in the government of culture by analysing policy documents, categories for the collection of statistics on the creative economy, and an interview with Lindy Johnson who originated and directed the HEAT programme.

The HEAT programme, which promoted the architecture of Queensland from 2008 to 2012, was a fascinating intersection of concepts and categories of culture that are often at odds. The three players in HEAT – the architectural profession, the Creative Industries Unit in the Queensland Government, and the Queensland Art Gallery – each had their own model of how architecture fitted in the cultural sphere, and their own interests in promoting architecture. For the Creative Industries Unit HEAT was perhaps the most explicit attempt thus far in Australia to implement governmental policies to foster creative industries. Having, for largely contingent reasons, chosen architecture as its first vehicle, HEAT can also tell us much about the ways architecture exists in Australia as a lacuna in cultural policy and governance.

Creative Industries theory valorises commercial forms of cultural production as proof that culture does not have to be a 'rent-seeker' on government if seen in the context of the broader creative sector of the economy.[1] The idea of creative industries is a recent part of a wider, longer history of the critique of elite artistic culture that is held to distinguish and naturalise class differences.[2] Creative Industry research into the size and shape of the economy of creativity and culture opens further questions about whether monetary value can or should be put on public goods; whether the public should subsidise particular cultural forms; whether subsidies ought to be extended to other, more commercially-defined cultural forms; and, what is good value for money.

Despite the concepts of art and the creative industries being somewhat at odds in theory, the Creative Industries Unit chose to launch HEAT by sponsoring a large-scale exhibition of contemporary architecture at the Queensland Art Gallery-Gallery of Modern Art, Placemakers in 2008.[3] The show had parallel publications. One was a catalogue representing the exhibits with a discussion by curator Miranda Wallace, and with scholarly essays placing the works in the context of international architecture. Another, HEAT was a lavish trade brochure that pointed out that the same architects were available for hire. Placemakers was the first major exhibition of architecture in any of the official state art galleries of Australia, and it was a tremendous success in its visitor numbers, press, and more importantly, in shifting cultural categories.

Fig. 1 Premier Peter Beattie opening the Gallery of Modern Art, Brisbane, 2006. © John Macarthur.

The three points of view of creative industries, the Art Gallery and the architecture profession form a triangle of contradictions that made architecture the centre of attention in Placemakers. From the Creative Industries point of view the exhibition breached the elite cultural institution of the high arts with commercial design creativity. From the Art Gallery's point of view it did the opposite, broadening the remit of art to include design, as for instance MoMA had done since the 1930s, but which the Sydney and Melbourne galleries had been too conservative to do on the grounds that architecture, with its relations to utility and commerce, was below the 'fine arts' of painting and sculpture. From the point of view of the architectural profession it was, at last, gaining the state financial support that the visual arts had long enjoyed through access to cultural infrastructure and the money that went with being an object of cultural policy.

This paper focuses on one of the three points of view identified, creative industries discourse. Against the typical view in the discipline that policy and administration are largely irrelevant to architecture, or games to be played for passing advantage, the paper attempts to show that administrative categories have real effects on our concept of architecture and its public governance.

The funding for Creative Industries and HEAT was a part of the broader policy of the Labor governments of Wayne Goss, Peter Beattie and Anna Bligh, which from 1986 to 2012 (with the interruption of a one term conservative government) attempted the modernisation of the economy of Queensland and its image as an ignorant, corrupt, and philistine place. From 1998, Beattie's government began a "Smart State" strategy of support for innovative hi-tech industry which also saw a role for culture as an aspect of a wished for knowledge economy.[4] Smart State was a branding exercise that was applied broadly to various Government initiatives, but it also stood for an aspiration for interconnecting various policies.[5] The Smart State involved partnering with the Brisbane universities to lever Commonwealth research monies, and also the building of new facilities to foster urban renewal. Queensland University of Technology had determined to restructure its Arts Faculty into a faculty of Creative Industries. In 2000 the foundation Dean, John Hartley, briefed Vice-Chancellor Dennis Gibson and Premier Beattie on how creative enterprise could add economic value as well as cultural value to the Smart State.[6] Work began on transforming public land around Kelvin Grove High School into a public-private 'urban village' development and a campus for QUT's Creative Industries supported by $15 million from the State.[7] This was opened by Beattie in November 2003. In 2005 QUT was granted an Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation under Stuart Cunningham.[8] CCI has gone on to be an international leader in this field and to have a good deal of influence on cultural policy in Queensland. As Beattie put funds into QUT's capital works, in 2004 he also made an allowance of $4.4 million for creative industries development within the Department of State Development and Innovation. A strategy entitled *Creativity is Big Business*[9] was produced, a Design Council of successful local business leaders was formed, a website providing business basics for creative start-ups was developed, but little of the $4.4 million had been spent or even allocated until 2006 when Lindy Johnson was appointed Director of

a new Creative Industries Unit, and decided to make a big splash through an exhibition of architecture at the Queensland Art Gallery.[10]

Johnson's strategy was in some ways an unlikely one. In *Creativity is Big Business* architecture is only one of eleven creative industries, and is grouped with design and the visual arts to form a cluster; the others being music, film and television, writing and publishing, advertising, graphic design and marketing. "Design", as the cluster is abbreviated, is only the third largest cluster in terms of employment in Queensland. Of the five actions the strategy recommends for the cluster only one, "Create targeted promotional strategies based on identified potential markets" looks anything like HEAT.[11] Equally the decision to mount an exhibition in the Queensland Art Gallery's Galley of Modern Art could be seen to be counter-intuitive as arts policy was under the remit of a different government department – Arts Queensland, and the Gallery, while financially dependent on Government, answers to an independent board.

In *Creativity is Big Business*, the visual arts seems a particularly poor fit with the finance, workforce and marketing strategies supposed, and the example given of a success story in the visual arts is Urban Art Projects, a company that manages manufacture and construction in collaboration with artists. By contrast, Arts Queensland in its policy platform *Creative Queensland* of 2002, trumpeted the works of internationally renowned artist Tracey Moffat and the Gallery's highly successful Asia Pacific Triennial of Visual Arts.

In an interview Johnson explains that her choice to make architecture the first, and most substantial creative industries campaign, was based on her own admiration for contemporary architecture. She also had a sense that it would play well in international marketing and give her the success she needed for the on-going funding of her unit which also had campaigns for industrial design and brand and graphic design. She says:

> The kernel of the story was in the architects themselves and their unique approach, which we thought was a fabulous one. People, incredibly site responsive, incredibly sensitive to their environment, very conscious of life style, very clever at using materials that were cost effective and the result was an architecture that I would argue is quite unique and aesthetically very beautiful, but also very functional, and human centred. We wanted to tell that story and I knew that story would get resonance with the critics and it did.

Architecture was also, as she explained in the language of creative industries, at the head of the supply chain. Creating demand for architecture was a way to create demand for lighting design, signage, furniture and even 'art built-in'.

Johnson did not hesitate to put a substantial proportion of creative industry funding in the hands of the Art Gallery or to give complete curatorial control of the exhibition project to the Gallery's Miranda Wallace, and this raises a different kind of issue of the how the divisions of Government actually operate. Johnson trained as an artist. Prior to her appointment to

Creative Industries she had been arts advisor to Arts Minster Matt Foley and then Premier and Arts Minister Anna Bligh. Johnson felt that architecture "had been neglected, in terms of government policy, from an arts point of view", but in the wider picture of the cultural economy it had responsibilities in the Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation because of its potential to create demand for design.

> … people's understanding of what art and design are is fuzzy, so it's easy for people to put them into crass boxes … art is not commercial and anything that is commercial is then called design, which is just crazy. So, the way I worked in government was demand and supply. In the Creative Industries Unit, I wasn't interested in giving individuals or businesses money to create an artifact, because I felt that that was happening quite nicely by itself and that Arts Queensland … do support the creation of an artifact. … The shortfall in government and in industry was in failing to address the oversupply-under demand and that's why I felt that the Creative Industries Unit, because of its economic focus, that would fit very neatly. So that's how I approached the art/design so-called divide. I don't consider it a divide, but in government….! But, it ended up working well, I thought, because John Stafford, head of Visual Arts, Craft and Design, within Arts Queensland, was such a supporter of the arts and design industry in this state, so between us we covered as much ground as we could. We never got confused about how cultural economy issues sat over the art/design disciplinary divisions, but, certainly my superiors did and I would always have to explain to them what the difference was and why our focus was what it was.

The Placemakers exhibition in the new Gallery of Modern Art, one of the Beattie government's most visible monuments, was a great success. It was opened by Premier Bligh with remarks about how proud she was to live in a 'Queenslander' house and it soon became clear that the choice of architecture had wider implications than creative industries. It matched Tourism Queensland's desire for residents to 'live the brand' that was being created around Queensland's relaxed lifestyle in a place of high economic opportunity. Having the support of the Queensland Chapter of the Australian Institute of Architects, with the marketing collateral in hand (including quite elaborately produced films), Johnson took Queensland to the Venice Biennale of Architecture later in 2006. With a party on the terrace of the Peggy Guggenheim Museum she created something of a perfect storm of publicity. HEAT employed the London marketing consultant Leanne Tritton of INGmedia who placed stories in major northern hemisphere journals and newspapers including *The Guardian*, the *New York Times* and *Monocle*. HEAT then went into its second phase of presenting large scale institutional buildings and presenting at the Shanghai world exposition as part of an official Queensland Government delegation led by the Treasurer Andrew Fraser.

Despite HEAT ticking all the right boxes in terms of traditional governmental uses of culture in forming civic identity, place branding and diplomacy, its claims to economic effectivity were

important aspects to be tested. Johnson told us: "I never wanted Creative Industries to be a soft target, in that, you're just this soft kind of cultural thing, soaking up money, … for every $1 we spend on HEAT we would deliver 20 back to the architecture industry." This leverage was based on two kinds of calculation. ING Media estimated the monetary value of the press received, and Peter Higgs of CCI developed a tool, the Creative Business Benchmarker, which measured growth in revenue of the architecture firms involved in the programme. This was a complex tool that allowed businesses to report their financial performance, have this anonymised and reported back to them as their performance compared to their peers. Johnson and CCI Director Cunningham were in weekly contact and the CCI was funded to produce the kind of economic data that would stand up to the scrutiny of Treasury Department statisticians. Cunningham wrote of HEAT's approach:

> … it should be stressed that the laser-like attention to economic growth embodied in this strategy is itself innovative, given that so much creative industries policy, and commentary around it, seeks to hedge its bets by pragmatically promoting the benefits of a 'triple bottom line' approach (where the creative industries deliver economic, cultural and social benefits), or maintains an in-principle opposition to prioritising the economic over the cultural.[12]

Whatever hope there was for measuring growth in demand for architectural services was destroyed by the global financial crisis, the increasing economic problems of the State and the electoral defeat of the Bligh government in 2012. However, there is no doubt that the programme's emphasis on the economic over the cultural was a major factor in getting government support in the first place and the undoubted benefits that it has had in raising the status of architecture within Queensland. It has been previously argued, that alongside the quality of the architecture, HEAT worked because it drew on an established mythology of exaggerating the autochthonous character of Queensland's architecture, its climatic responsiveness and place specificity.[13] This paper adds another strand to the argument by showing that HEAT also relied on the high profile and relatively long history of cultural studies and cultural policy at the Brisbane universities.

Cunningham was a member of the Griffith University-based and Tony Bennett led Institute for Cultural Policy Studies (ICPS) in the 1980s and 1990s; and then Deputy Director of the ARC Key Centre for Cultural and Media Policy (CMP) from the mid-1990s to early 2000s under the leadership firstly of Tony Bennett and then Tom O'Regan. ICP/CMP, like cultural studies in general, was concerned with the relation of culture and power, but it aimed to go beyond critiquing class interests in culture. Nevertheless, cultural studies has been, in part, defined by an on-going opposition to aesthetics. Particularly to the idea put most strongly by Friedrich Schiller, that the fine arts have an inherent nobility in exercising an aesthetic sensibility that is autonomous from the present conditions of society.[14] In taking up Michel Foucault's concept that government is a matter not only of interests and aims but of techniques, and Pierre Bourdieu's study of the exchange of cultural and real capital,

Bennett proposed that cultural policy could be a science for progressive reform of society.[15] In 1990 the Institute published its Cultural Policy for Brisbane City Council, which is one of the earliest attempts to turn academic cultural studies to the practical task of managing high and popular culture alongside the socio-economic aims of the City.[16] Johnson, in her then role as head of the Queensland Art Workers Alliance, was one of the informants interviewed for the study, and the policy is one of the first to propose that public space design and the distinctive architectural forms of Queensland should be seen in this wider cultural framework.

The Creative Industries is one outcome of this shift of cultural studies into being an instrument of government. The term creative industries arose in the United Kingdom in a creative industries mapping study by the Department of Culture, Media and Sport in 1998.[17] Its prime concern has been to argue for the importance of culture in the terms most recognised by governments, that is, the economic. National measures of creative economic activity and employment can be fitted against UNESCO's Framework for Cultural Statistics to measure the creative economy and to make international comparisons and growth predictions. The creative economy is estimated to be around 4 per cent of the world's economy, while the Australian Bureau of Statistics calculate that in Australia in 2009 it was 6.9 per cent of GDP and employed 970,000 people.[18] The willingness of the Queensland Government to fund HEAT is in part based on these statistics. CCI's census analysis showed that in 2001-6, while national employment growth had been only 1.9 per cent in the creative sector as a whole, in architecture employment had gone up by 3.6 per cent and salaries by 4 per cent. What is more in this period Queensland led growth nationally adding 30 per cent of employment growth, or 10,359 new jobs, in the creative sector.[19]

CCI have been international leaders in their academic field, which is not without controversy. While one claim of creative industries is that culture would be taken more seriously when aggregated with creativity and innovation across the whole of the economy; others have complained that this is a kind of neo-liberalism that would monetise all forms of value, and thus prefer the older term 'cultural industries'.[20] Some are concerned that the two terms creative and cultural are not adequately distinguishable and the categories are misleading. The present paper argues that the case of architecture supports such a view.[21] Yet another complaint is that with a strong focus on economic measures there can be little attention to the particular dynamics and drivers of the 'industries' that are driven by explicitly cultural values.[22]

Architecture is rarely mentioned in any of the academic literature on these issues despite appearing as a category in the various measures. On one hand, this makes the HEAT campaign look even more marginal, but on the other hand, it makes it more obvious and central. Architecture matches the concept of a creative industry in that it is regularly exchanging apparently ineffable cultural values with hard currency. At the same time, it is managing the parallel values of individual aesthetic preferences and regional and national cultural identification. While politicians, policy wonks and the public might have no more idea of how architecture intersects culture and the economy than they would with new industries such as games design – that architecture manages this relation is an historical fact. Johnson

needed the self-evidence of the cultural value and aesthetic appreciation of architecture to be a masthead for a programme that could otherwise have been misunderstood as being only about embedding creativity in a business model.

The inclusion of high employment relatively high wage industries like architecture in the creative economy was also, arguably, necessary for creativity to be large enough to have political significance. Census data for 2008-9 shows that 'Design' at $26.6 billion was 40 per cent of the Gross Added Value of Australia's creative economy.[23] So architecture could serve a double function: it was both evidently aesthetic and embodying cultural values, and evidently an industry employing people and contributing to the creative economy.

Whatever might be thought of the concept, the idea that creativity and/or culture is part of social formation and wealth creation has a further potential of breaking down policy 'silos' and serving aspirations for 'joined-up government'.[24] Although creative industries implies a critique of subsidising the production of culture and putting it in monuments such as Art Galleries, Johnson's pragmatic sharing of the cultural field with Arts Queensland and co-opting the Art Gallery into the HEAT strategy drew a thread from economic development policy, through two mildly contradictory cultural policies, the major capital works achievement of the new Gallery of Modern Art, and took this thread back into Treasury in dollar-speak. The exhibition demonstrated, at least politically, that creative industries could live with the values associated with continuing state investment in high profile cultural infrastructure; and that creative industries policies need not require a redirection of funding from the arts to commercial creativity.[25]

Again, it is hard to imagine whether gaming, film production, music recording, or some other creative industry could have made so many connections. The success of joining up government in this way lies in the facts that: architecture is traditionally seen as an art and an industry; that it is large on relative economic scales; that it is a vehicle of cultural identity formation; and, that it gives form to symbolic gifts of government and emblems of civic pride, such as the Gallery of Modern Art.

Having said something about how architecture and creative industries have been useful to one another, I will turn to what I see as the potential problems these new forms of the government of culture create for architecture. Much of this came to a head in the categorisation of architecture as a sub-section of 'design' in the statistical categories and then in policy. Late in the Bligh Government, in 2010, a new policy arrived – *Queensland Design Strategy 2020.* The strategy grouped architecture, fashion, graphic and product design, and marketing.[26] While the HEAT campaign faded away with the election of the conservative Newman government in 2012 and Johnson's departure, architecture is still promoted through the web portal *Queenslandersign* – the unlovely name of which manages to combine punning with chauvinism. More to the point, the *Design Strategy 2020* commenced an Asia-Pacific Design Triennale to match QAGoMA's Asia Pacific Triennale of Contemporary Visual Arts, further cementing the binary opposition of art and design – aesthetic autonomy and commercial utility. The high culture strategy of HEAT, with its nuanced politics is unlikely to be repeated, as the new silo of 'Design' rises alongside the older edifice of policy for the 'proper' arts.

The rise of design as a meta-category is unlikely to have had any consideration as policy. It is rather the result of mirroring the categories in which economic statistics are collected. Architecture is a subset of the domain of 'Design' in the Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification, and since 1986 this has allowed international comparisons through the "Design and Creative Services" in the UNESCO Framework for Cultural Statistics.[27] These classifications are the outcome of models developed by statistical bureaux for their own accounting purposes, but they, in turn, have remarkable similarities to eighteenth-century attempts to produce systematic divisions of art into departments. While less hierarchical, the divisions in UNESCO's framework are strongly marked by Immanuel Kant's system where rank is based on autonomy from concepts, and the Abbe Batteux's earlier categorisation of architecture among the 'intermediate arts' which compromise the pleasure of the fine arts with utility.[28] Justifications of the modern classifications such as Throsby's concentric circles, has architecture as a 'related industry' a long way out from the cultural core of visual and performing arts, literature and music.[29] The statistical collecting categories thus tend to reproduce and reinforce long-standing hierarchies of value that are implicit but apparently unnoticed in the term "design". The modern systems are, however, unlike their precedents, in that they are not philosophical speculations, but categories for collecting and measuring economic activity. The relatively new power to analyse large data sets and then compare the size of the creative economy in different nations, or the relative growth of different sectors of that economy is the means that allows a detailed and comprehensive government of culture that is historically unprecedented, and which have had the contingent effect of the positioning of architecture within design and in a different box to 'art'.

Creative industries nomenclature and the odd bedfellows it creates often surprises architects who feel professionally superior to interior, graphic, fashion and industrial designers. It also a surprising grouping because of the very different market for architectural services. Architecture is not in a retail market for services but makes *Grands Projet* for governments. It makes bespoke houses for the kind of people who own yachts, invest in contemporary art and listen to Wagner. Deepening the paradox, architecture is by far the largest activity in Design (53 per cent of all employment in Design according to the 2006 Australian census). Beyond these issues of the mode and scale of its industry, architecture is also a defined profession at a higher level, under its own act of parliament.[30]

Few lay people or policy makers understand that architecture is a profession defined in legislation like medicine, and thus constituted differently to engineering, or planning, which are self-accrediting, or the looser definitions of graphic design, advertising or marketing. Just as few architects recall the debates and controversy in the late nineteenth century when registration was fiercely opposed, in the name of art, as mere commercial avarice. Critics then claimed that registration was an attempt to create a cartel and that defining the architect around a set of competencies would estrange her from her sister arts.[31] In most nations, by the 1930s, which is to say well after the foundations of artistic modernism, architecture was no longer considered an art in the same way as it had been for centuries, it had (somewhat equivocally) disavowed its artistic status to become a profession based in building science

with an aim of wholesale reform of the built environment that paralleled universal health care. Unfortunately for architects, the cartel did not hold well. It also did not achieve the high salaries of the medical and legal professions. Despite this, the persona of the professional architect is not that of an ordinary kind of trader in services. Instead, it remains rather like a medical practitioner, where a higher duty defined for the public good in legislation, trumps commercial interests. Whatever one might think about the actualities of, or the future of professional registration, the point is that architecture is not only an uncomfortable fit in a meta category of design because of its historical status as a high art, but also because of the mode of its later professionalisation through the twentieth century.

One of the ways in which architecture is defined as other to art lies in the Australia Council's not including architecture in its remit. It used to do so in the brief existence of its Design Arts Board from 1983-87. Architecture having been grouped with design in this experiment in arts boards, was abandoned with it. This leads to one of the few points where architects have protested over their treatment by cultural policy and cultural agencies. This was the Australia Council's refusal to fund representation at the Venice Biennale of Architecture as other national bodies did for their architects. The nation is instead represented by the Australian Institute of Architects.

In a recent report for the Australia Council on the relation of art and creative industries, it is clear that the design professionals and artists interviewed, and indeed the authors Justin O'Connor, Stuart Cunningham and Luke Jaaniste, think that architecture is not art because it is instructed by commission and undertaken commercially.[32] It thus lacks what is still understood to be constitutive of the aesthetic dimension of art, its freedom from commercial interests and its escape from pre-existing concepts of what it should do, such as function. These definitions of the autonomy of aesthetic feeling go back to Kant, and while it would complicate things to remember that Kant thought architecture was an art, the concepts of the disinterestedness and non-conceptual rationality of the art continue to be used to categorise culture as they did in the eighteenth century. For creative industries discourse the values are somewhat reversed, because aesthetics, particularly the concept of the exceptionality of art, is seen, where it is considered at all, as ideological. Sometimes creative industries practitioners cast the old high arts as 'market failures' with insufficient demand for them and requiring state subsidy, but beyond this the arts can be seen to be prejudiced, to have an interest in a concept of culture that puts them in the centre and makes subsidisation a necessity. Seen from the point of view of policy, architecture, like television and other creative industries that live in the real economy, is purer in having no interest and nothing to gain in culture being defined in one way or another. This is merely a crude cartoon view of how architecture might be misconstrued in creative industries policy. It is nevertheless the kind of paradox that appears if one tries to account for both the specificities of architecture's history as a sometimes-art and its place it ought to have in present policy debates.

The authors of the Australia Council report make a balanced summary when they state that the undoubted rise of a creative economy beyond the traditional arts raises tensions,

but that: "there are long-standing social, cultural and economic understandings, narratives and policy resources whereby these tensions can be managed and made culturally and economically and socially productive."[33] They give an instructive example of the interaction of the art of music with its economic and technological context of the publishing of sheet music from the eighteenth century on. This is precisely the kind of historical understanding that ought to underlie the policy considerations that are yet to be made of architecture. The misfit between administrative categories and the concepts of their art held by practitioners is one such place of tension and political manoeuvre, as is the case with architecture, design and the visual arts. At one level this is a simple misstep caused by the differing historical pace of architectural theory and administrative practice, which is due for correction and offers potential for renewal. At another level we could say that it is useful to recognise that something that has all the attributes of an agile modern creative industry has succeeded historically, and still does, by playing on the prestige of old categories like art and profession.

Acknowledgements

1   Terry Flew and Stuart Cunningham, "Creative Industries after the First Decade of Debate," *The Information Society* 26, no. 2 (2010): 113-23; Terry Flew, *The Creative Industries: Culture and Policy* (Los Angeles: Sage, 2012).

2   Raymond Williams, *Culture and Society, 1780-1950* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1961); Pierre Bourdieu, *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984).

3   Miranda Wallace, Sarah Stutchbury and Queensland Art Gallery, *Place Makers: Contemporary Queensland Architects* (South Brisbane, Qld.: Queensland Art Gallery, 2008).

4   Gillian Maree Mort and Amanda Roan, "Smart State: Queensland in the Knowledge Economy," *Queensland Review* 10 (2003): 11-28.

5   Queensland Government, "Queensland the Smart State: Investing in Science, Research, Education and Innovation" (Brisbane: Queensland Government, 2002).

6   John Hartley and Queensland University of Technology, *The QUT Creative Industries Experience* (Kelvin Grove: Queensland University of Technology, 2010), 7-8.

7   Hartley, *The QUT Creative Industries Experience,* 9.

8   Stuart Cunningham, "The CCI Narrative: Research for a Creative Australia," ARC Centre of Excellence for Creative Industries and Innovation, 2011, www.cci.edu.au/sites/default/files/alawrence/CCI_narrative_2011_public_FINAL.pdf (accessed February 20, 2015).

9   Queensland Government, *Creativity is Big Business, a Framework for the Future: Queensland Creative Industries Strategy* (Brisbane: Queensland Government, State Development and Innovation, 2004).

10 This paper draws on an unpublished interview with Lindy Johnson by John Macarthur and Naomi Stead on 18 July 2012. All the following quotations of Johnson are from this interview. The Creative Industries Unit started in State Development, then it went to Department of Economic Development and Trade and Regional Innovation, which then became the Department of Employment, Economic Development and Innovation.

11 Queensland Government, *Creativity is Big Business*, 39.

12 Stuart Cunningham, *Hidden Innovation: Policy, Industry and the Creative Sector* (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 2013), 191.

13 Naomi Stead, Deborah van der Plaat and John Macarthur, "A Taste for Place: The Cultivation of an Audience for Climate-Responsive Architecture in Queensland," in *Audience: Proceedings of the 28th International Conference of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand*, ed. Antony Moulis and Deborah van der Plaat (Brisbane: SAHANZ, 2010).

14 Ian Hunter, "Aesthetics and Cultural Studies," in *Cultural Studies*, ed. Lawrence Grossberg, Cary Nelson and Paula A Treichler (New York: Routledge, 1992), 347-67; Friedrich Schiller, *On the Aesthetic Education of Man* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1967).

15 Michel Foucault, *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991); Bourdieu, *Distinction*; Tony Bennett, *Culture: A Reformer's Science* (St Leonards: Allen & Unwin, 1998); Tony Bennett, John Frow and Michael Emmison, *Accounting for Tastes: Australian Everyday Cultures* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Tony Bennett and David Carter, *Culture in Australia: Policies, Publics and Programs* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

16 Colin Mercer and Peter Taylor, "A Cultural Development Strategy – Towards a Cultural Policy for Brisbane" (Brisbane: Institute for Cultural Policy Studies, Griffith University, 199-).

17 Department of Culture, Media and Sport, "Creative Industries Mapping Document" (London: UK Government, DCMS, 1998).

18 Australian Bureau of Statistics, "Visual Arts, Crafts and Design," ed. Australian Bureau of Statistics (Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2013).

19 Stuart Cunningham, "Creative Careers: What the Census Tells Us, Presentation to Queensland Academy of Creative Industries," CCI 2008, htts://wiki.cci.edu.au/display/CEMP/Creative+Careers+what+the+census+tells+us (accessed June 21, 2010).

20 Nicholas Garnham, "From Cultural to Creative Industries," *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11, no. 1 (2005): 15-29; David Hesmondhalgh, *The Cultural Industries*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage, 2007); Toby Miller, "From Creative to Cultural Industries," *Cultural Studies* 23, no. 1 (2009): 88-99.

21 Susan Galloway and Stewart Dunlop, "A Critique of Definitions of Cultural and Creative Industries in Public Policy," *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 13, no. 1 (2007): 17-31.

22 Justin O'Connor, *The Cultural and Creative Industries: A Review of the Literature* (London: Creative Partnerships, 2007); Mark Banks and Justin O'Connor, "After the Creative Industries," *International Journal of Cultural Policy* (2009): 365-373; Justin O'Connor, "Surrender to the Void: Life after Creative Industries," *Cultural Studies Review* 18, no. 3 (2012): 388-410.

23 Australia Bureau of Statistics, "2008-9 Australian National Accounts: Cultural and Creative Activity [5271.0]," 2014. I can't interpret what proportion of the economy of design is architecture, but the Census shows that architecture is 53 per cent of employment in design.

24 An insider's account of policy making in Queensland in this period is Stuart Glover, "Revisiting the Cultural Policy Moment: Queensland Cultural Policy from Goss to Bligh," *Queensland Review* 18, no. 2 (2011): 190-206.

25 There was, and continues to be, antipathy to be overcome. This has been encouraged by the history of cultural studies as a class critique of the cultural establishment and by polemical discussions of creative industries as the successor to the concept of art. See, for instance, John Hartley and Stuart Cunningham, "Creative Industries: From Blue Poles to Fat Pipes," in *National Humanities and Social Sciences Summit – 2001: position papers, 2001*, 2001.

26 Queensland Government, *Queensland Design Strategy 2020* (Brisbane: Arts Queensland, Department of Education, Training and the Arts, 2010).

27 Australian Bureau of Statisics, The Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification (ANZSIC) 2006 (cat no. 1292.0). Office of Statistics, UNESCO. "Statistical Commission and Economic Commission for Europe, Conference of European Statisticians: Third Joint Meeting on Cultural Statistics, 17-20th March 1986" (United Nations, 1986). United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation, "Creative Economy Report 2013 Special Edition: Widening Local Development Pathways" (New York: United Nations Development Programme, 2013).

28 See my discussion of these systems in John Macarthur, "Architecture and the System of the Arts," in *Architecture, Disciplinarity, and the Arts*, ed. John Macarthur and Andrew Leach (Ghent: A & S Books, 2009), 27-44.

29 Macarthur, "Architecture and the System of the Arts," 23-4.

30 Queensland Architects Act 2002, a successor to the act of 1928.

31 Richard Norman Shaw and T. G. Jackson, eds., *Architecture, a Profession or an Art. Thirteen Short Essays on the Qualifications and Training of Architects* (London: John Murray, 1892).

32 Justin O'Connor, Stuart D. Cunningham and Luke O. Jaaniste, "Arts and Creative Industries: A Historical Overview; and an Australian Conversation" (Canberra: Australian Council for the Arts, 2011).

33 O'Connor, Cunningham and Jaaniste, "Arts and Creative Industries," 100.