



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Cultural policy

Citation for published version:

O'Brien, D & Oakley, K 2017, Cultural policy: Critical concepts in media and cultural studies. in D O'Brien & K Oakley (eds), Cultural Policy: Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studies. Routledge. DOI: 20.500.11820/de5fd8ca-e607-419f-b228-fad96095efc3

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[20.500.11820/de5fd8ca-e607-419f-b228-fad96095efc3](https://doi.org/20.500.11820/de5fd8ca-e607-419f-b228-fad96095efc3)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Cultural Policy

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Routledge Critical Concepts in Media and Cultural Studies: Cultural Policy

Kate Oakley and Dave O'Brien (eds) 2017

Introduction

Why a collection on cultural policy, and why now? In some ways the rationale is straightforward, as recent years has seen a proliferation of research monographs, textbooks, and book series grappling with the subject, from a host of disciplinary perspectives. Moreover, the last major collection of key papers, Lewis and Miller's *Critical Cultural Policy Studies*, was published in 2003, in an era where the field was still emerging from debates within cultural studies and the applied and vocational elements of arts and cultural management. Moreover, we live in a time where the importance of culture to economy and society has never been clearer. Whether in terms of values driving social cohesion and social division, the importance of the production of signs and symbols to contemporary capitalism, or the rise of new forms of cultural production and consumption, the need to understand cultural policy, in whatever iteration, is a vital and pressing task.

The collection is divided into four volumes, thinking through various elements of cultural policy scholarship. In the first volume – Contexts - we set the scene for what will become the core debates of the field, echoes of which we will see through the later volumes. These include the definitions of culture for the purposes of policymaking; the role of the state; the nature of cultural goods and the links to other areas of public life and public policy.

Volume II - Practices - adopts a dual narrative, outlining cultural policy as a practice of states and governments, as well as a practice of researchers. Here, creative industries come to the fore, alongside the ongoing puzzle of the limits, or otherwise of cultural policy research.

Volume III – Debates – brings together a selection of contrasting pieces which take differing, often conflicting, views on core cultural policy questions such as instrumentalism, commodification, cultural value and measurement. It also helps to remind is of the wider inter-disciplinary field with which any students of cultural policy needs to engage.

The final volume, *Futures*, as befits its title, ruminates on the future of cultural policy. Here the collected contributions are at their most eclectic, drawing from humanities and social science work that is often not considered to be part of the study of cultural policy. In particular, the focus of papers on environmental issues (here from a media studies perspective), ethnic and racial diversity in curricula (from the point of view of education research), and the role of culture in health and wellbeing, open up the vista of cultural policy to new questions, as well as new methods. The continued vitality of the field will depend on cultural policy meeting the challenge of both the social and economic issues, as well as the academic questions, posed by these possible futures.

Volume 1 Contexts

The study of cultural policy as public policy is a relatively recent phenomena, so any sort of decision about foundational texts always has to grapple with the fact that while nothing was written about something called 'cultural policy' until the second half of the twentieth century, the relationship between the state and the production and consumption of symbolic goods is centuries old. Foundational texts therefore could start with Aristotle, as Bennett and Belfiore (2008) do in their study of the social impact of the arts and include swathes of writing on aesthetics, philosophy, economics and theology for example. But we've chosen to focus on what one of us has called, 'the policy of cultural policy,' (Bell & Oakley, 2015), the conscious practice of regulating, supporting, suppressing, measuring and celebrating cultural production and consumption. What we are interested in here is establishing the study of cultural policy as a form of public policy and thus, while we recognise the importance of intellectual histories of culture in determining the assumptions under which policy is made, the process of policymaking is our core concern.

The context for cultural policy that we feature therefore is essentially a modern one (despite Ranciere's argument that this is an incoherent label, we're sticking with it here). How has the state, from approximately the mid twentieth century onwards, sought to regulate something called 'culture?' How has it defined and understood it, what assumptions about culture is it working with, and why do we need a policy for it at all? In the academy, cultural policy studies has become a field of enquiry. Importantly it is one just undertaken by policymakers or the small number of academics in the field, but one that is daily undertaken by artists, by citizens groups and activists, by trade unions and employers, as well as by a growing number of students. Underlying any contemporary publication on cultural policy therefore is the

recognition that the field has grown and morphed way beyond considerations of arts funding to encompass something we awkwardly call 'the creative economy,' and in doing so has become of interest to a wider group of policymakers than at any time in its history. Indeed, as subsequent selections show, a broad, anthropological understanding of culture gives rise to cultural policy encompassing many aspects of economy and society.

What we call 'contexts' brings together writings on the core questions of cultural policy. What counts as culture for the purposes of policymaking (Williams)? Does the state have a role in culture and what is it (Baumol & Bowen)? How are we to understand the particular nature of cultural goods (Becker; Frey) and what are the implications of that understanding for the formation of policy (Yudice; Hesmondhalgh)? How does cultural policy intersect with other public policies (Isar)? And how do cultural policies differ across the globe (Chartrand and McCaughey; Kawashima; Lee)?

Raymond Williams' line about the complexity of culture is one of the most widely quoted in the field, a starting point for any introductory lecture perhaps (and for several of these papers in these volumes). But of course all public policy deals with complex issues - 'the economy,' 'health,' 'defence,' - none of these are exactly simple. What distinguishes cultural policy commentary is the need to establish, define and continuously defend a field for which there is no consensus on the need for public policy at all, where definitional issues (what's in, what's out) and debates over the state's role continue into the present day. This perceived need to defend the existence of cultural policy colours many of the texts here and accounts for the continual search for sources of legitimation that is played out in these pages and elsewhere (HMSO; Adorno).

Defining what we mean by culture takes up an awful lot of time in cultural policy. It's there at the beginning of the post-war debates about cultural policy (HMSO; Upchurch; Williams; Adorno) and continues in the conversation about what 'counts' as a cultural policy (Bennett; McGuigan; Ahearne) or about the global travel of the cultural policy discourse (Isar). In most of the ways we currently use the term, 'culture' emerged in the 19th century through two contrasting approaches: culture as a set of artistic practices or products, and culture as an anthropological signifying system, marking human society off from nature. As a practical matter, as Mulcahy notes, much of what cultural policy has concerned itself with is in the former category: arts, heritage and, inconsistently, with the cultural industries. The argument for this policy,

and above all for the public funding for the arts with which it is generally associated, is often stated simply in terms of the neoclassical economics idea of 'market failure.' In other words, the rationale for state intervention is that without public support societies will either not produce 'enough,' culture, or the right sort of culture or - more commonly - will fail to ensure that citizens beyond elite groups will be able to meaningfully engage with the arts and heritage (it is viewed as axiomatic that they can 'engage' with commercial culture though this if of course, no less complex or riven with hierarchy). Behind this of course are much more important assumptions of what the citizen (or the nation, region or community) potentially has to gain from culture and that constitutes the core policy question for the field.

This second, anthropological, sense of the term which includes ways of eating, dressing or worshipping for example, is generally not part of what is covered by cultural policy. But it has remained influential, both in the discourse of 'development,' particularly as applied in post-colonial societies in the global South, and increasingly elsewhere, as the remit of cultural policy has moved from a narrow focus on the high arts to one which encompasses a broader range of cultural practices (Appadurai).

The drivers of that shift have been in part economic and in part social (Yudice) and as such have at different times been favoured by governments of the Left and of the Right. The discourse of the 'creative economy,' which now dominates global cultural policy, albeit inflected with different associations in different regions is often seen as part of the neoliberalisation of cultural policy and the collapsing of all other goals into economic ones. The Myerscough reading included in this volume dates from the late 1980s, the high point of Thatcherism in the UK and signalled what was to come. But in the post-war period, at least in Europe, the suggestion that cultural policy must move away from the traditional arms-length support for the high arts was driven by largely leftist urban authorities. This was linked to a whole range of post-1968 social movements – feminism, gay and ethnic minority rights – all of whom had associated cultural arguments about the rediscovery of hitherto suppressed arts forms and artists. As Girard argues, this process was reflected at national level in France, particularly under the two Lang ministries in the 1980s and early 1990s, which not only saw a huge increase in cultural funding, but the inclusion of so-called 'minor' art practices such as popular music, fashion and even industrial design. The fact that these huge industrial sectors were described as minor reflects the degree to which traditional cultural policy concerned itself with production outside of the market and the journey it had to travel to engage with those commercial sectors.

The growth of Cultural Studies in the academy was part of this history, as Stuart Hall's piece describes. As Walter Benjamin had pointed out, the industrialisation of cultural production, so distrusted by his Frankfurt school colleagues Adorno and Horkheimer, opened up new possible forms of meaning even while it appeared to close down others. Yet those thinkers who sought to translate the cultural industries idea into public policy - the notion that commercially produced culture could also offer benefits whether social, economic or educational - were not simply content with the culture that markets produced. They were not advocating state withdrawal, but a more complicated form of engagement with a variety of cultural forms, from artisanal crafts to mass media, the pursuit of which involves engagement with a far wider range of cultural actors and policy domains than a simple arts policy would suggest.

The challenge of this - both the range of cultural activities and the range of social objectives to which they are attached - remains significant, as these volumes demonstrate. This is further complicated by the globalisation of cultural policy, particularly in the wake of the creative economy discourse (Lee). While earlier cultural industries policymakers has sought to pursue a variety of social objectives via culture, from the regeneration of de-industrialised towns and cities to the acknowledgement of minority rights and expression, the creative economy discourse was more single-minded. Economic growth and jobs became in the 2000s, if not the only game in town, then the dominant one (Garnham).

To some extent the global financial crisis and the long downturn that had followed it put paid to some of the more optimistic claims for the miraculous economic effects of the creative economy. UNESCO's 2013 Creative Economy Report suggested that more pluralistic approach might be taken to creative economy development in future, one that recognises the importance of local cultural production and consumption and values beyond the economic. Even those who have advocated most strongly for the creative economy approach have recently admitted that there might be important cultural policy concerns outwith those designed to grow the creative industries. Yet the idea of the creative economy remains a global discourse of great significance, despite it many problems. Those advocating for the creative economy and those working within it, and within wider cultural policy, could do worse than consider many of the core questions represented here, as they have not gone away. Whose culture? Whose interests are served? Who gets to produce and consume, and under what conditions, are all issues that remain to be addressed.

Volume 2: Cultural Policy Practices

The development of the field captured in volume one is reflected by a dual narrative in the second volume. This narrates cultural policy both as a practice of researchers, whether academic or otherwise, along with consideration of the practice of public policy, notably in the form of creative industries. The volume clusters around four broad themes to structure this dual narrative, moving from the question of cultural policy research, through the creative industries, to think through global approaches to cultural policy practice. The volume then concludes with a debate over cultural indicators, framed through the problem of the appropriate disciplinary approach to cultural policy, bringing the volume back to its initial theme.

The question of “What *is* cultural policy?” remains an important strand within literature on the subject. It has been approached in several ways since the initial attempts at staking out the field in relation to, in particular, cultural studies. Cunningham’s first piece in this section represents a classic statement on this subject. *Where* cultural policy will be located, as an academic field, a critical orientation, and a set of formal practices, is at the heart of Cunningham’s analysis. Drawing on Australian communications policy of the 1980s, Cunningham laments the missed opportunities for cultural studies to engage with the formal policy process around media practices. Whilst his critique of cultural studies is open to question, the importance of the paper for present purposes is how it demonstrates the centrality of understanding, engaging with, and being critical of, the *practice* of cultural policy by states. In particular Cunningham points towards the role of citizenship in providing a basis for cultural studies and academic cultural policy, an important idea that Staiger takes up in her section towards the end of the volume.

Whilst formal media policy was the subject of Cunningham’s initial intervention, Burke draws our attention to the emergence of cultural forms in the *absence* of cultural policy. This is a settlement that has been very much the norm across various nations and various historical settings. Moreover, the example of the Caribbean shows the practice of cultural policy, even where it is fragmented, piecemeal or implicit, to be bound up with the political projects of the nation gestured towards in many of the readings in Volume 1. It sits alongside the tensions between popular or communal cultural expressions and those sought by governments in more formal cultural policy practices.

Burke's historical narrative of the Anglophone Caribbean is the story of the practice of cultural policy, setting out a common way of thinking through cultural policy research. The question of the practice of cultural policy research, as opposed to the practices of states, organisations, or audiences, is at the heart of the widely cited paper by Scullion and Garcia. This paper, drawing on the experience of engaging with cultural policy-making in the newly formed Scottish executive, from the vantage point of a university department, returns to the tension between critical analysis, policy engagement, and the public good. Whilst their advocacy of interdisciplinarity underpins the quest for a 'challenging, vibrant and living academic discipline' they also confront the on-going discussion of the proper place for the academic study of cultural policy.

One route to interdisciplinary, beyond cultural studies' engagements with cultural policy, is to look further afield. Writing from the perspective of the economist, Throsby details the implicit/explicit divide that has proved influential in thinking through the practice of cultural policy. Throsby shows how the seemingly non-cultural practices of public policy, particularly economic policy, may have important cultural policy impacts and implications. A classic example of this is the idea of creative industries, which have proved to be highly influential as both policy and research practices. Interrogating the explicit cultural policy, creative industries, for its implicit economic policy implications is, for Throsby, a route to expand our understanding of cultural policy away from a potentially narrow focus on the actions and activities of ministries of culture.

The importance of creative industries to cultural policy is indicated by the inclusion of five pieces offering differing, but essential, engagements with this idea. Hesmondhalgh and Pratt historicise the rise of creative industries. This historical narrative allows them to suggest the problems associated with defining, demarcating and demonstrating creative industries in relation to culture and economy, whilst reflecting on their place in academic practice. The lack of attention from mainstream economists, the difficult debates and divisions within cultural studies, alongside work from cultural sociology, media studies and, management has given rise to, but also constricted, analysis of creative industries. This conclusion, although written in 2005, is still a persistent issue within the study of creative industries.

In a related vein, Oakley develops a core question suggested by Hesmondhalgh and Pratt, querying creative industries relationship to aesthetics, even as art and culture

are prominent within creative industries policy discourses. Focusing on the rise of assertions of the value of creative industries in terms of innovation, Oakley excavates the missing 'cultural value' of creative industries practices, alongside the marginalisation of the arts and arts policy. The very policy practice, creative industries, which should have foregrounded cultural policy, offers the prospect of its disappearance into innovation, and thus economic, policy.

The disappearance of arts and culture within creative industries policy is all the more curious given the centrality of new forms of work and labour. This centrality is one way of accounting for the global influence of creative industries as a framework for cultural policy. Whilst Oakley draws attention to the dangers of the marginalisation of arts and cultural practice from creative industries, Banks and Hesmondhalgh query the model of the artistic and cultural worker as an approach to economic and social transformation. As they note, there is an important contrast between the 'utopian' vision of creative work in much creative industries policy, and the reality of a creative labour market which is *'project-based and irregular, contracts tend to be short-term, and there is little job protection; that there is a predominance of self-employed or freelance workers; that career prospects are uncertain and often foreshortened; that earnings are usually slim and unequally distributed, and that insurance, health protection and pension benefits are limited; that creative are younger than other workers, and tend to hold second or multiple jobs; and that women, ethnic and other minorities are under-represented and disadvantaged in creative employment. All in all, there is an oversupply of labour to the creative industries with much of it working for free or on subsistence wages'*. Their conclusion, calling for significant consideration of labour market structures and the limitations of cultural policy as economic policy, provides an important critical dialogue with Throsby's piece, raising questions as to the appropriateness of creative industries as a core framework for cultural policy, and, in turn, to the price of that framework for economy and society.

Critical perspectives on creative labour have become a core, and abundant, theme in the academic practice of cultural policy. This proliferation has been matched by spatial, in particular urban, perspectives on creative industries. On this point O'Connor serves as an introduction to ideas surrounding the 'clustering' of creative industries in cities. In keeping with this volume's dual theme, of cultural policy practice as academic research and as governmental action, O'Connor calls for 'reflexive involvement' in cultural policy to clarify the actual objectives, outcomes and modes of intervention that may deliver the creative city beyond assertions of the

need for creative clusters. Moreover, this piece points towards the relationship between global capital formations and the local structures of feeling underpinning the creative place. The presence of the global perspective is an important element of any understanding of creative industries, and of a further strand in cultural policy practices.

The global perspective is enunciated in Cunningham's famous question as to the meaning of creative industries- Trojan Horse or Rorschach Blot? Cunningham returns to the problem of the distance between policy and research practice, whereby policy has embraced the creative industries as enthusiastically as academic research has questioned and critiqued the idea. The global (and temporal) differences in the reception, development, and application of creative industries are important, with Cunningham's stress on the lack of any single, coherent, core creative industries policy acting as a 'Trojan horse' for the economic to overwhelm the cultural in policy. Cunningham was writing at the tipping point from creative industries to creative economy, a conceptualization of the economic and social activity that acted to draw together issues of definitions, urban settings, labour market structures, and the presence or otherwise of artistic and cultural practice, under a broader single heading. This is partially the reason for Cunningham's specific reading of *Creative Britain* (in comparison to Banks and Hesmondhalgh), but it is also an important moment that is reflected in subsequent selections in the remaining volumes of this collection.

What all of these interventions, whatever their perspective, point to is that creative industries are a central, perhaps dominant, idea within cultural policy. Creative industries have had an extensive global impact, along with a transformative effect on the study of cultural policy, even if only as an approach to be critiqued and resisted. However, even as a dominant set of ideas, creative industries are not the sole lens through which to view cultural policy. In keeping with a core position of the collection, and detailed by O'Connor and by Cunningham, cultural policy needs to be seen as much as a *global* set of practices, as it does a local or national phenomenon.

The clearest indication of this is the importance of United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) to cultural policy. Pyykkönen and Singh's papers are explicitly engaged with the role of UNESCO, both outlining and analyzing its role. Pyykkönen serves to introduce UNESCO, along with The Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions.

Understanding the three discourses, of governmentalisation, commodification, and democratization, underpinning The Convention opens up the debates animating much of global or cross-national cultural policy, along with the familiar problem of specifying and demarcating the boundaries of culture. At the same time, Pyykkönen cautions against the techno-scientific flattening of the world's diverse cultural expressions and practices within The Convention, an issue returned to in volume 4.

Singh adopts a contrasting, but still complimentary, perspective by focusing on trade in cultural products. The regulation of these global flows and the associated need for protection of specific practices has been central to debates in and around UNESCO. Singh uses a broad definition of culture, congruent with the understanding put forward within UNESCO's discourses, to offer a sympathetic vision of cultural trade, particularly for the Global South. His analysis also points to two elements that are important to any global understanding of cultural policy, cross-national comparisons and the role of other international bodies beyond UNESCO.

One such body is the European Union, an institution that offers a fascinating site for considering cultural policy practices. For Staiger culture provides an important arena for the expansion of both the concept and the practices of EU citizenship, moving citizenship beyond simply a legal category and into a more culturally grounded paradigm. Focusing on citizenship within the EU also, in turn, suggests a specific way of viewing culture and cultural policy, as concerned with access to meaning-making in the form of the production and circulation of cultural goods. This latter point is at the centre of much of the discussion of creative industries, whether in terms of geography or work and labour. It is also the underlying concern of Singh's focus on trade, albeit with a more civil society, rather than market, focus.

Access to the means of cultural production continues as a concern in debates and futures of cultural policy. It also provides a longstanding activity for national and local cultural policy, whichever model is used. Rushton gives a comparative example of the USA and Canada's arrangements for national agencies delivering cultural policy, from a cultural economics perspective. This reiterates the importance of differing disciplinary lenses in the practice of cultural policy, as well as comparing and contrasting, in cultural policy terms at least, American *lassiez-faire* with Canadian *dirigisme* in dealing with the problem of the externalities not captured by market prices for arts and culture. Here, political organization and public administration matters, which is to say the context of practices is just as important as the practices themselves in understanding cultural policy.

The volume concludes by juxtaposing a discussion of cultural statistics, from a global perspective, with a consideration of the social impacts of the arts. Partially this is to frame the following volume, *Debates*, but it also serves to bring this volume's consideration of practices full circle to the initial question of what is cultural policy? Belfiore and Bennett offer a critique of the use of arts for social policy outcomes; of the idea of the 'transformative' power of the arts; and of the enmeshment of these ideas with social-technical systems of data gathering and analysis. They argue for the importance of history, as a discipline and set of practices, to cultural policy. This argument is grounded in the insights that history brings to contemporary, governmental, cultural policy practices, such as those associated with social impacts or cultural value.

Madden, in contrast, uses the analysis of the development of cultural indicators as a route to better understanding cultural policy. Focused on the history of indicators, the paper has the aim of outlining the best practice around what makes for a good indicator. This is an issue that is still subject to debate. Indeed, Madden's conclusions are still some quintessential queries that cultural policy practice has not solved, most obviously the question of what, if anything, 'will be the result of having better cultural indicators?'

Volume 3: Debates

Practices closed with a reference to a central dispute, over the academic methods and the governmental purpose of cultural policy. The volume entitled 'debates' develops this line of thought, by bringing together some of the core issues of the field, via a collection of contrasting pieces. It is impossible, even in a collection of this size, to bring together all of the varying viewpoints on these issues, so we have sought to produce representative pieces, acknowledging that behind this lies a larger and ever-growing literature. The debates cover both substantive issues – instrumentalism, the artistic critique and commodification, cultural value - and the approaches to these issues via debates about the best way to capture inequality or the role of the cultural policy researcher, exemplified by the Neilsen piece. It is a measure of how inter-disciplinary the field of cultural policy studies is, that very few of the contributions come from a discipline called 'cultural policy studies' and – Richard Florida is a case in point – understanding the response to them means engaging way beyond the cultural policy sphere.

In the UK at least, the debate on 'instrumentalism' in cultural policy often traces its origins to Francois Matarasso's piece 'Use or Ornament,' published by the consultancy Comedia (also home to Charles Landry and hence influential in the debates about 'creative cities'). Matarasso's piece was published in 1997, the year the UK's New Labour government was elected, and even then it noted that '*over the last ten years it has become increasingly accepted that the arts play an important role in the economic life of the country*'. That role was to be further emphasised during the next 13 years of Labour government (Hesmondhalgh *et al*), under the remit of the newly coined creative industries and later creative economy. Concurrently the social claims for the impact of the arts that Matarasso refers to also multiplied during this time, and increasingly elaborate attempts were made to provide evidence for these impacts. Indeed Matarasso's piece became a touchstone for those uncomfortable with 'instrumentalism' as much for the lack of empirical evidence for the claims- all 50 of them - it makes as it does for the claims themselves. This can be summed up as the advocacy problem, a widespread critique that research in this area, particularly policy-driven research is rarely impartial and is too often confused with advocacy.

Jim McGuigan's celebrated critique of instrumentalism (though he does not use the term itself), was that it translates, '*issues of social policy into questions of cultural policy*,' in the process hollowing out the cultural remit of policy while offering an, "*implausible palliative to exclusion and poverty*'. In this view, not only is it wrong to use culture in this way because it harms culture *qua* culture, but because it will not work – it is a sticking plaster on an increasingly gaping social wound. Such debates have continued from at least the mid 1990s and the claims for impacts have become stronger and the demands for evidence of impacts remained unfilled. But there have also been defences of instrumentalism, of which we feature Lianne Gibson's here.

Gibson is unwilling to concede the gains made by culture – particularly in terms of funding – that an instrumental policy is said to have supported. She challenges the critics to ensure that abandoning instrumental claims for funding does not just pave the way for a return to a policy of funding elite tastes – with no perceived need to justify its decisions. And she also challenges what she, and an increasing chorus of others, see as a false distinction between instrumental and intrinsic claims about culture. That the debate between instrumentalism and the intrinsic value of culture is dead has now become an article of faith, but in fact it lingers on not least because instrumental rationales change as policy regime changes, starting the debate afresh each time.

Indeed it was to bring an end to this alleged impasse that John Holden's pamphlet *Capturing Cultural Value* was published by the think-tank Demos in 2004. Holden's work was inspired by what was seen as growing discontent on the part of the cultural sector itself – not so much at having to address instrumental goals in health, education or urban regeneration - but at having to provide evidence that they were doing so and that it was effective. Politicians were also increasingly sensitive to the claim (itself never demonstrated) that cultural organisations were spending more time filling in forms to show how they usefully they were spending public money than in creating cultural productions in the first place. That the Holden pamphlet has been seen as so influential (Selwood *et al*) is perhaps surprising, given that many of his arguments had been made elsewhere. Dworkin's piece in this volume offers a much richer argument about the basis on which the state might support culture, while Frey's piece offers amore sophisticated account of the notion of 'value' in these debates. But the format of a pamphlet, specifically aimed at policy audiences with the activities of a (at the time) prominent think tank behind it, ensure that it had a kind of saliency that academic articles would generally struggle to achieve.

In addition, Holden's argument in favour of allowing more voices into the debate about what constitutes value and understanding a variety of types of 'value' was unlikely to offend anyone. Unlike McGuigan, Holden did not link instrumentalism to the specific politics of the time in any deeply critical way, ensuring that his argument could be read as an attack on the way policy was being constructed, rather than on the political structuring of that policy. As Hesmondhalgh *et al* argue, Holden's argument neglected both the role of neoliberalism and post-modernism in undermining traditional arguments for cultural spending (problematic though these were). The commodification of culture, the absorption of what had once been seen as space outside of societal norms, the extinction of the counter-culture and its potential to undermine capitalism; all of these issues had been pre-occupying writers both popular and academic. Boltanski's and Chiapello's *New Spirit of Capitalism* (2006) set out to detail the process of absorption of what they call the artist critique by contemporary capitalism. Chiapello's paper, *Evolution and Co-optation*, which we reproduce here, summarises the core of this argument. For her the artist critique is a distillation of many centuries (in the Western world at least) of viewing the arts and artistic practitioners as outside of social and particularly capitalistic norms, motivated by different (and higher) goals and freed from the 'constraint of commodities,' as she puts it. In this way, the artist critique forms a core part of all social critique (even if not all artists hold to such views), because it reveals capitalism as a source of

disenchantment and oppression – constraining rather than liberating us. However, the individualism that also lurked alongside these ideas of freedom and autonomy, means that the artist critique was prey to growing individualism in society at large. As modern capitalism developed outside of bourgeois constraints – away from concerns with traditional family and social norms for example – then the freedom to experiment, to live authentically, to express oneself was not reserved for artists or even intellectuals – but was depicted as a characteristic of the businessperson and the tech entrepreneur, a figure exemplified by Apple founder Steve Jobs. What Chiapello laments as the death of the artist critique is, to writers such as Richard Florida, the birth of the ‘creative’. This argument runs through many contemporary debates, particularly about the social effect of the creative economy discourse. Have artists lost the right to speak for or to society from an outsider position? Wasn’t the creative economy designed to bring them inside – give them a seat at the table as the jargon would have it? And what price is paid for that? Can transitional professional networks root artists in place or community, or are we left with the rather attenuated sense of social responsibility that Florida’s ‘creatives’ have? And if artists can no longer speak from any sort of moral high(er) ground, does art just become another commodity to be funded via the market?

These questions could hardly be more central to cultural policy, yet you will search in vain to see them referred to in cultural policy documents, where assumptions about the social role of the arts are remarkably untroubled, even when the emphasis is on marketization. The assumption that the arts have a social role, because artists have something to tell us about society, or some useful, ameliorative even role within it, is often to be found in policy writing. One of the few issues to trouble this, has been a growing awareness about the impact of inequality, both of cultural consumption and production. Debates about inequality in cultural consumption are of longer standing (Chan and Goldthorpe) but have been given policy saliency of late, at least in the UK, by work on the spatial (mal)distribution of arts and by the high profile Warwick Commission on Cultural Value. There are debates in the academic literature about how to define and measure inequality, largely a technical debate between Weberian sociologists interested in social status such as Chan and Goldthorpe and Bourdieusian sociologists interested in social class. But more important are the ways in which these differences in consumption patterns are linked to notions of value or worth, in other words what is regarded as ‘good’ cultural consumption and moreover the role of public policy in supporting this ‘approved’ consumption (Miles and Sullivan). Links between production, consumption and representation are the

subject of current research interest particularly as it takes places in the context of widening social inequality across much of the world and continuing debates about the role of culture in the reproduction of such inequality.

One of the most fertile areas for this debate has been around the relationship between cultural development, space and place. Richard Florida's original work on the economic geography of talent a sample of which is reproduced here, laid the groundwork for his bestselling book *The Rise of the Creative Class* (2002), as well as his career as policy consultant, largely to cities wishing to turn around their economic fortunes on the basis of attracting the creative class. It also spawned a veritable industry of anti-Florida work and a range of economic, methodological and political critiques. Many of these come from economic geography - Florida's own field - and stand as a reminder for cultural policy students of the need to engage widely outside the topic. Miller's piece in this volume comes instead from a cultural studies perspective but picks up, polemically, many of the objections that people have to both Florida's work and the discourse of the creative economy (here referred to as the 'new' economy, a term which essentially collapsed under its own meaninglessness). This includes the - dubious use of statistics, the polarising economic and social effects of such developments and the blithe ignoring of the darker sides of gentrification and displacement.

It is probably fair to say that the numerous academic critiques of Florida did little to dampen his popularity as a policy advisor and this reminds us of another core debate in cultural policy studies – that of the role of the academic *vis a vis* the policymaker. Pinnock's paper looks at the methodological issues of such a role, the degree to which policy advice in this field can ever be 'evidence-based' and thus have some notion of objectivity, while Karttunen's analysis consider the ways in which these pressures may be felt even by official statisticians. Here we return to the question of the appropriate place for cultural policy. For academics there is a deeper, ideological question, about the degree to which they should engage directly in public policy formation, as some, notably Tony Bennett argued that they should. This is disputed by others (famously McGuigan) who argue for need to maintain critical distance from policymakers. In terms of the creative economy, an important voice in this has been Schlesinger, in this piece arguing that much of the academic community researching or teaching the creative industries, has been part of the 'Hallelujah Chorus' of approval for these notions, rather than acting as critical commentators.

Volume 4 Cultural Policy Futures: Challenges, Speculations, Prospects.

Consideration the future for cultural policy allows this collection to branch out beyond the core concern of cultural policy as policy, towards a more eclectic, and speculative, set of work. This final part of the introduction considers the set of themes structuring possible, but not all, futures for cultural policy. These include questions of (inter)national diversity; measurement and methods; inequalities; and the digital turn. These themes are set alongside developments in health, wellbeing and environmental issues. Given their nature, these themes are difficult to separate. For example, many of the pieces capture the intersection between national policy settings, methodological choices, and potentially unequal outcomes in cultural policy practices. The future challenge for cultural policy scholars is, perhaps, not how to untangle these trends. Rather it is how best to create policy, research, and practice responses that acknowledge the intersecting importance of the questions raised by the work assembled here.

As the initial readings on cultural policy suggested, the roots of both the study and the practice of the policy of cultural policy had a profoundly national character. This has, in subsequent years, been challenged in various ways, not least of which by the global transfer of policy concepts associated with the creative economy agenda, specifically the idea of creative industries. This globalisation of creative economy discourses is one element of the profound challenge to the nation state as the basic unit of cultural policy, a challenge which goes hand in hand with more traditional political economic challenges of globalisation, war, population flows, and economic crisis.

One route into thinking through the future of the nation state in cultural policy is to frame our understanding through discourses of diversity, a topic dealt with in more detail later in this introduction. Another is to attempt to historicise the rise of specific cultural policy discourses, including creative industries, in the broader structures of globalisation, such as British Imperialism, as identified by the chapter from O'Brien. Just as we can see the influence of a specific national, Imperial, context on disseminating and propagating a core discourse associated with the globalisation of cultural policy, in Bonet and Negrier we see a more profound question as to the future of cohesive national culture(s) in the face of diversity. Bonet and Negrier, and O'Brien, demand a re-reading of the history of specific elements of national cultural policy to better meet the challenges those policies face, as well as giving more of a

cutting edge to those seeking incisive critical positions on state or institutional policy actions. Just as creative industries discourse has become central to much of government cultural policy via the specifically Anglophone and Anglophile paths of policy transfer, questions over cultural diversity are crucial to a range of different states in both Europe, Latin and North America, and beyond.

Diversity, with its associated models, modes of governance, and challenges, is not only the domain of the nation state, but is also manifest in cultural policy's engagement with transnational and global interactions, whether as development policy or diplomacy. Here we draw on Nurse's paper on culture and sustainable development alongside Ang, Raj and Mar's work on diplomacy. It is clear from the previous paragraph that culture's economic and social role vis-à-vis the nation state has been a powerful and important part of both the study and policy of cultural policy. For Nurse, culture represents an opportunity as a central pillar of sustainable development agendas. At the same time it represents a more complex and subtle form of power relations as it manifests in the sorts of diplomatic relations noted in Ang *et al.*

Engagements with sustainable development and cultural diplomacy share a common aim of broadening academic and policy understandings of the meaning and role of culture. This is in order to facilitate a potentially enlarged role in the various activities understood as development or diplomacy. For Nurse, cultural policy proposes *'a non-deterministic approach that breaks out of progressivist, universalistic and dependency-creating development thinking and promotes self-reliance, social justice and ecological balance'*, breaking with Western models of development. This can serve to reorientate development discourse around cultural industries, to diversify economies and protect cultural expressions and cultural heritage in the face of often-dominant external cultural producers, such as the United States.

Cultural diplomacy presents a similar problematic, particularly in its iteration as the expression of 'soft power' by dominant global actors. The choice of Ang *et al.*, as with Bonet and Negrier, and Nurse, reflects a desire to introduce a critical and alternative reading of cultural diplomacy as it emerges as an important sub-field within cultural policy (e.g. Nisbett 2015) The paper draws on the Asia-Pacific experience to craft a conception of cultural diplomacy *'beyond the national interest'*. Thinking through related questions to Nurse's focus on sustainably transforming the role of local cultures in the face of dominant powers, Ang *et al.* reassert the role of

the non-governmental actors in shaping cultural diplomacy. The importance to the future of cultural policy studies is twofold. First, pointing both to a definition of cultural diplomacy that moves beyond just the narrow power politics of individual nations, via a relational conception of culture and communication. Second, and at the same time, re-engaging with core debates about the limits of cultural policy, such as the im- and ex-plicit versions introduced in volumes 1 and 2.

One way of thinking through the question of the limits, or otherwise, of cultural policy, is to consider the future for the social impact agenda. Looking forward, health and the associated but distinct concept of wellbeing are important areas for cultural policy practice and scholarship, as reflected by the inclusion of Parkinson and White, and Marsh and Bertranou.

Parkinson and White represent an overview of cultural policy and public health, along with an international perspective that is an important part of future developments in cultural policy. Indeed, following their introduction to developments in cultural policy and public health, they point to the specific population challenges, of ageing, social isolation, addictive behaviors, substance abuse, obesity and mental ill-health, to which cultural policy may have much to offer. The challenges, around measurement and metrics, definitions of culture, and the relationship between practice and the state, are continuing and common themes throughout the futures of cultural policy.

A different vision of health and cultural policy comes from discussions of wellbeing. Wellbeing is set to be an important, but contested, concept for cultural policy in the coming years. The longstanding relationship between culture and conceptions of the good life, often made explicit in cultural policies of work and participation, production and consumption, has found a new expression in wellbeing agendas. At the same time, wellbeing has emerged in conjunction with new metrics for understanding the impact of culture and then translating that impact into monetary equivalents. Marsh and Bertranou offer an introduction to wellbeing metrics, raising important questions as to future directions of measurement in cultural policy, alongside the appropriate place for wellbeing, life satisfaction, and even happiness itself in cultural policy as policy.

The emergence of new forms of measurement and new conceptions of the function and purpose of cultural policy returns to the longstanding question as to the value of culture. The UK's Arts and Humanities Research Council's *Cultural Value Project*, detailed by Crossick and Kaszynska is one such attempt. Here we see the most

recent iteration of questions as to the value, or otherwise, of culture. In this reading the focus is pointed to the experience of culture, to what happens in cultural experiences.

Although the project reported as this collection was being assembled, it is clear that the experiential element of culture is crucial in thinking through core debates in cultural policy. Indeed, in the Anglophile settings of Australia and England, funders have invested in metric systems designed to capture the quality of the individual's experience of a cultural engagement. The long march of the metric in modernity continues, one that now concerns itself with a focus on the individual, whether as consumer or as a potentially happy citizen, alongside the more traditional population-level concerns over participation and consumption.

It is vital to take account not only of the role of metrics in the future of cultural policy as policy, but also of the assumptions and architecture underpinning the metrics themselves. This attention provides a path into two core concerns for the future of cultural policy, that of digital methods and inequality.

The latter is addressed across selections from Oakley and O'Brien, Peters, Wright, and Stevenson *et al.* Oakley and O'Brien look at the role of education on shaping the cultural workforce as well as on shaping cultural taste. Who is producing, who has access to cultural work, alongside the associated barriers and blockages for those who do not, is an essential question for cultural policy scholarship to develop alongside the more well established concern with who, and who does not, consume the differing artefacts of state and market developed culture. Likewise Stevenson *et al* set this discussion in the context of the construction of those who are not consuming the products of state supported cultural organisations as 'problem' populations of 'non-participants. Here the policy response may suggest activity to, in the Foucauldian sense, discipline better cultural consumers whose tastes align with that culture granted legitimacy by state support. Non-participation is thus, all at once, a problem for cultural policy practice; a product of specific cultural policy ideology that is shared across Europe; an issue rendered visible by forms of survey and metric design; and an issue for academics and practice to resist and reconstruct.

The configuration of non-participation, as well as inequalities of production and consumption, is placed into the digital context by Wright. The abundance offered by the digital turn in both production and consumption challenges traditional taste hierarchies and raises profound questions for cultural policy. In the first instance, if 'good taste' is now associated with attitudes of openness and suspicion of hierarchy,

then where does this leave the practice of cultural policy that, for better or worse, is often associated with more traditional, Western, forms of elite culture? Second, the mediating role of technology in paving the way for new forms of cultural circulation is also an area in need of scrutiny, a point taken up by authors more focused on digital infrastructure discussed below.

The elite/popular divide is a contentious one. It is one that also serves to conceal broader inequalities around the legitimacy, or otherwise, of a range of cultural forms. This is an issue that is not limited to cultural policy. *Why is My Curriculum White?* has been included to give a sense of where questions of legitimacy, in this instance over the exclusion of scholars of colour from philosophy syllabi, may be emerging that have implications for cultural policy. Whether manifest as online controversies of #gamergate or #Oscarssowhite, which questioned and critiqued gender and racial underrepresentation in popular cultural forms, the controversy captured by Peters, himself a senior white academic working in New Zealand, points towards the importance of reflexivity in cultural policy both as a policy practice and as a field. Returning to Oakley and O'Brien's focus on education, we can ask why is cultural policy's curriculum, and indeed its policy practices and outcomes, white?

Inequalities are, of course, not confined to singular social categories, but are distributed and experienced in an intersectional manner. This concept of intersectionality is foregrounded within Ellis and Kent's extract, which seeks to situate the rise of a digital society at the intersection between accessibility and a host of social barriers, foremost those associated with disability. This has been chosen because of its focus on *regulation* as a mode of determining access. This idea has long been a key concept for cultural policy studies, dating back to the Foucauldian formations of Tony Bennett's work. Ellis and Kent draw attention to the often hidden architecture of regulations that shape questions of who, and who does not, get access to culture, specifically outlining how the promise of digital in overcoming questions of access may still carry the legacy of how digital culture is '*designed to reflect the ableist oppression of the analog world*'.

In the same vein, the focus on the influence of digital architecture in shaping patterns of cultural consumption is the focus of Burrows and Beer's paper, drawing attention to how digital architecture is shaping cultural consumption practices. These practices give rise to debates that have a very different character to the concerns of access or excellence that dominated the anglophile world of cultural policy studies before the dominance of digital as a means of cultural consumption.

Indeed, whilst Burrows and Beer sound a note of caution associated with the role of algorithmic decision making in shaping cultural taste, the technologies they detail, such as *profiles* and *metadata*, also speak to the questions that both debates and practices that cultural policy as policy has struggled to resolve. Notably these issues crystallise in the figure of the prosumer, who is both producer and consumer of culture, albeit one who may be excluded from the architectures facilitating forms of pro-sumption that may challenge and destabilise cultural policy.

Durose et al, although not working on digital questions per se, offer an approach that can assist with this exclusion. Their work is situated in the space that concerns the role of methodological choice in shaping policy outcomes. If the intersection of inequality and digital data discussed by the pieces selected for this collection points to a profound exclusion of the user from systems designed to attend to their cultural preferences, a reorientation towards participatory methods can be an important antidote.

How best to sum up the future of cultural policy? It is clear that the origins of the field in the practice of governments and the associated academic debates within cultural studies have now been broadened out to reflect a much more comprehensive and open definition of cultural activity, whichever theoretical framework the authors or policy makers are using. Intersectional inequalities, the digital turn, health and wellbeing agendas, metrics and measurement, and the longstanding contests over the nation state in a globalised, transnational, world, are areas that will be important for policy makers, practitioners and researchers alike in coming years. Moreover, these areas are brought together under issues associated with environmental sustainability. To do cultural policy is increasingly to be dependent on specific technologies, as Wright, Burrows and Beer, and Ellis and Kent all note. The impact of these technologies on the earth, along with the question of the sustainability of the production and consumption of devices, with the associated power, storage and connectivity needs, demands a response from cultural policy. Maxwell and Miller, writing from the vantage point of media studies, point to the needs of the green agenda alongside a green citizenry that might offer ways to frame a rejoinder. Similar agendas in cultural policy will be essential for the future.

References

Bakhshi, H. and Cunningham, S. 2016. Cultural Policy in the Time of the Creative Industries. London: Nesta.

Bakhshi, H., Freeman, A. and Higgs, P. 2013. *A Dynamic Mapping of the UK's Creative Industries*. London: Nesta.

Belfiore, E. and Bennett, O. 2008. *The Social Impact of the Arts. An Intellectual History*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Bell, D. and Oakley, K. 2015. *Cultural Policy*. London and New York: Routledge.

Benjamin, Walter. 1969 [1936]. The work of art in the age of mechanical reproduction. In *Illuminations*, ed. H. Arendt. New York: Schocken, pp. 217–251.

Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. 2006. *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Verso.

Crossick, G. and Kaszynska, P. 2016. *Understanding the Value of Arts and Culture*. The AHRC Cultural Value Project. Swindon: Arts and Humanities Research Council.

Cunningham, S. 2009. Trojan horse or Rorschach blot? Creative industries discourse around the world. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 15:4, 375–386.

Florida, Richard. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.

Frank, T. 1998. *The Conquest of Cool: Business Culture, Counterculture, and the Rise of Hip Consumerism*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gibson, C. and N. Klocker. 2005. The 'cultural turn' in Australian regional economic development discourse: neoliberalising creativity? *Geographical Research*, 43:1, 93–102.

Gordon, C., Powell, D. and Stark, P. 2013. Rebalancing our cultural capital. Available at http://www.theroccreport.co.uk/downloads/Rebalancing_FINAL_3mb.pdf

Heath, J. 2006. *The Rebel Sell: How the Counter Culture Became Consumer Culture*. Chichester: Capstone Publishing.

Markusen, A. 2006. Urban development and the politics of a creative class: evidence from the study of artists. *Environment and Planning A*, 38:10, 1921–1940.

Miles, A. 2016. *Wither the Creative Class? Occupation, Elites and Social Class in*

- Britain. CRESC Working paper 141. Manchester: CRESC.
- Nisbett, M. 2015. The art of attraction: soft power and the UK's role in the world – policy review. *Cultural Trends*, 24:2, 183–185.
- Nussbaum, Martha C. 2011. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Oakley, K. and O'Brien, D. 2016. Learning to labour unequally: understanding the relationship between cultural production, cultural consumption and inequality. *Social Identities: Journal for the Study of Race, Nation and Culture*, 22:5, 471–486. DOI:10.1080/13504630.2015.1128800
- Peck, J. 2005. Struggling with the creative class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29:4, 740–770.
- Schlesinger, P. 2009. Creativity and the experts: New Labour, think tanks, and the policy process. *International Journal of Press/Politics*, 14:1, 3–20.
- Scott, A. J. 2006. Creative cities: conceptual issues and policy questions. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28:1, 1–17.
- Warwick Commission. 2015. *Enriching Britain*. Available at <http://www2.warwick.ac.uk/research/warwickcommission/futureculture/finalreport/>
- Williams, R. 1981. *Politics and policies: the case of the Arts Council*. Reprinted in R. Williams (1989) *The Politics of Modernism: Against the New Conformists*. London: Verso.
- UNESCO. 2013. *The Creative Economy Report: Widening Local Development Pathways*. New York: UNESCO.