

Available online at www.worldscientificnews.com

World Scientific News

WSN 72 (2017) 604-617

EISSN 2392-2192

Creativity in creative economy critical analysis (of the rhetorics) of creativity from the point view of cultural political economy

Joanna Kasza

Institute of Culture, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland

E-mail address: joanna.kasza@o2.pl

ABSTRACT

One can't notice that the contemporary creativity, like innovation, has become the word-key, contemporary mantra, which often referenced (misused) in public discourse, particularly strongly affects the social imagination (imaginaries) as well as reality at the beginning of the XXI century. Direct result of this unprecedented popularity is the growing interest in many scientific disciplines, each of which within its semantic field defines this concept in its own way (different context), which obviously leads to growing confusion or ambiguity (of terminology). What's more, within so called colloquial discourse we often have to deal with inaccuracy or inconsistency in building the discourse, absorbance of different meanings and ways of understanding the creativity, without taking into account the existing differences between them, which further obscures more than brightens the entire discourse and impede the agreement. Meanwhile, the meaning of the term of creativity, rarely, if ever, is subjected to broader (public) discussion or deeper reflection - this article is the excerpt from broader my publication (polish monograph) upon the reflection on defining and understanding the concept of creativity [Kasza 2016] which basically relates to the on-going dispute between the culture, art, and economics in refers to different ways (contexts) of its defining or understanding. The fundamental in its essence dispute, that applies to both ideological issues (different values) as well as political ones (different interests)- is crucial not only for understanding the current mechanisms of creating values in postmodern culture, art, economy or management at the beginning of the XXI century, but also for future scenarios and/or their development strategies.

Keywords: creativity, liquid modernity, imaginaries, cultural political economy, cultural policies, cultural industries, creative industries

1. INTRODUCTION: THE CONCEPT OF CREATIVITY IN “LIQUID MODERNITY”

Creativity has become a contemporary mantra (source code for creative economy), slogan often referenced and declined (evoked) within multiple public discourse by numerous cases in different context, from humanities to social science and recently more and more often in economics and informational sciences. One can think, that this on-going repetitiveness has more to do with a typical post-modern „enchantment” of reality, rather than, with more or less quantifiable results within social, economical or cultural realm. Generalization of creativity, traditionally applied to art, nowadays has become the dominant discourse assigned not only to culture, but also increasingly to technology and economics, though becoming their basic parameters and requirements.

As such, the concept of creativity undoubtedly belongs to the set of paradoxes, emerging from the (critical) analysis of the contemporary economy (capitalism) - originally defined as an expression or right to authenticity, spontaneity and self-fulfillment (expressed as a part of counterculture rebellion and/or opposition to bourgeois culture (of middle class)), acquired in the course of a difficult and lengthy process of building self-awareness, over time has become a necessity and a must, almost coercion or imperative attribute of living within so called ‘liquid modernity’ [Bauman 2000],¹ where old values behind the rebellion have been internalized, becoming the immanent part of the discourse (ethos) of contemporary economy.

Direct result of this unprecedented popularity is the growing interest in many scientific disciplines, each of which within its semantic field defines this concept in its own way (different context), which obviously leads to growing confusion or ambiguity (of terminology). What's more, within so called colloquial discourse we often have to deal with inaccuracy or inconsistency in building the discourse, absorbance of different meanings and ways of understanding the creativity, without taking into account the existing differences between them, which further obscures more than brightens the entire discourse and impede the agreement.

Meanwhile, the meaning of the term of creativity, rarely, if ever, is subjected to broader (public) discussion or deeper reflection, mainly because the interest in creativity in large part due to practical reasons: its relevance to the economy. The term of creativity itself has been evoked in contemporary history in 1927 by English philosopher Alfred Whitehead in famous Gifford lectures [Whitehead 1929]², author of the process philosophy where the only

¹ "Liquid modernity" is a term coined by Z. Bauman to define the fundamental changes within post-modern society, where "condition of actions are changed before they start crystallizing (solidifying) in the customary and routine formulas", the war against all paradigms (conformity, routine or homeostasis supporting ‘heavy’ or solid modernity), thus announcing post-paradigm era of ‘light’ or ‘liquid’ modernity , in which the culture becomes a call to revolution of our presuppositions and/or routine interpretation - a call to create a cultural utopia(s), but utopias that "are not ready-political projects, but endless experiments, which mark the boundaries of human capabilities". *Liquid Modernity* concludes the analysis undertaken in Bauman's two previous books *Globalization: The Human Consequences* and *In Search of Politics* - this new remoteness and un-reachability of global systemic structure coupled with the unstructured and under-defined, fluid state of the immediate setting of life-politics and human togetherness, call for the rethinking of the concepts and cognitive frames used to narrate human individual experience and their joint history [Bauman 2000, 2012]

² Whitehead argued, that reality consists of processes rather than material objects, and that processes are best defined by their relations with other processes, thus rejecting the theory that reality is fundamentally constructed by bits of matter that exist independently of one another [Process and Reality 1929]. For Whitehead, there is no

fundamentally existent things are discrete "occasions of experience" with the basic reference point (measure) of freedom and creativity (as a basic principle of being) [Weber, Desmond 2008]. But the real interest (fascination) with this topic has really began in the 70's with the so-called 'cultural shift' (culturalization) within social sciences, when in western capitalism under the conditions of more and more difficult market play (growing competition) the natural sources of growth based in consumption has burned up, replaced then by creativity (along with innovation), that become new source of sustainable competitive advantage on the global market.

Within the contemporary discourse about creativity, we account undoubtedly not only the unclear terminology, but also overlap between different axiological systems: art, culture, philosophy, psychology, sociology, economics and business (management sciences).

Therefore the aim of the article is to assume deeper reflection on defining and understanding the concept of creativity, presenting itself as a fierce (on-going) dispute between art, culture and economics in refers to different ways (contexts) of defining or understanding the creativity as well as its mechanisms of creating values within contemporary economy, culture, art and society.

This fundamental in its essence dispute applies to both ideological issues (different values) as well as political ones (different interests)- is crucial not only for understanding the current mechanisms of creating values within contemporary art, culture and economy, but also for future scenarios and/or their development strategies. Its rarely admitted, that social science, especially economics, much more then we think, are based more on ideological issues (values) than political ones (interest), usually the power of interest is merely overestimated in reference to the power of ideology. Classic J. M. Keynes in 'The general Theory of Employment, Interest and money' insisted, that the ideas rule over the interests (although it was 1930s- the era of splendour of the great ideologies followed by 1960s, when D. Bell announced the end of ideology).

The contemporary, almost permanent crisis clearly demonstrates that Bell was wrong, the perfect example to confirm that thesis is the testimony of A. Greenspan, when asked about the cause of his wrong decisions (doings) as a head of FED at a Hearing by the House of Representatives in 2008, the beginning of global crisis.³

such thing as wholly inert matter - all things have some measure of freedom or creativity, however small, which allows them to be at least partly self-directed. His approach of process philosophy underlined "urgency in coming to see the world as a web of interrelated processes of which we are integral parts, so that all of our choices and actions have consequences for the world around us." As such Process philosopher David Griffin coined the term 'panexperimentalism' (the idea that all entities experience) to describe Whitehead's view, and to distinguish it from panpsychism (the idea that all matter has consciousness) [Griffin 2001]

³ To illustrate that thesis, B. Jessop in the article '**Cultural political economy and critical policy studies**' evokes the extract from a Congressional Hearing (23.10.2008) of Alan Greenspan (former head of the Federal Reserve) acknowledging, that the cause of the financial crisis (2008) was his unwavering faith in (neoliberal) paradigm of the free market, aside from the social costs of this decision and its consequences for the world economy "Greenspan: "Those of us who have looked to the self-interest of lending institutions to protect shareholders' equity, myself included, are in a state of shocked disbelief" Questioner: "Do you feel that your ideology pushed you to make decisions that you wish you had not made?" Greenspan: "Yes, I've found a flaw. I don't know how significant or permanent it is. But I've been very distressed by that fact". This quotation proves nothing but it is emblematic of a more general shock to the neo-liberal mindset, especially during the panic of late 2008. Nor does it follow that the advocates of neo-liberalism will abandon the field of ideological contestation or resign from further involvement in decision-making." [Jessop 2010, s. 336-356]

Within this fundamental dispute of defining and understanding the concept of creativity, the creativity itself becomes a tool for political economy (of creativity), therefore in further analysis I address to the term of ‘imaginaries’ evoked by Bob Jessop as a main concept assigned to *cultural political economy* [Jessop 2008 ; Jessop, Ngai- Ling 2006].⁴

Cultural political economy, combining the concepts and tools of critical semiotic analysis and critical political economy, underlines in particular the importance of the cultural factor in political economy, thus creating the possibility to post-disciplinary look at both the economic and political sphere, as well as social and cultural one. As a result, draws attention to the fundamental role of the adopted ‘ideas’ or ideology in the social sciences, especially in situations when the terminology becomes unclear, or disputed in principle, pointing out the main source of the ambiguity is the paradigm gap between theoretical paradigm and political (policy) paradigms.⁵

According to cultural political economy (CPE), in refers to theory of complexity, we are not able to perceive the reality in all its complexity in real time, as a result, we need to simplify (reduce) to be able to understand anything and function within the world more or less effectively.

For that reason we need ‘imaginaries’, which become a key concept within CPE, described as a type of cognitive conceptual framework, the way we perceive the reality, crucial (essential) for our ability to cope in the real world. As a result our action in the world is directed through (mediated) the ‘imaginaries’, not the reality (as we don’t have the direct access to reality) - the problem is that between imaginaries and reality always arise (emerge) important gaps or intervals (discontinuities, ambiguities, inaccuracies). Cultural political economy focuses in particular on how the complexity is reduced through sense and meaning-making (semiosis) and through limiting compossible social relations (structuration).

The CPE underlines, that with the growing complexity of the world around us, it’s more and more difficult to understand the reality - in this situation the imaginary as a simplification become more dangerous, and at the same time more difficult to live without it. As such, the result is significant increase in gaps ‘in between’ (discontinuities, ambiguities, inaccuracies) and growing problem how precisely (effectively) they ascribe the reality. In this situation, there is growing necessity for public and open debate on how the dominant imaginaries are being constructed (institutionalised) and what are the prices of evoked reductions (simplifications).

⁴ Cultural political economy is one of the current heterodoxy fields in economics, firmly rooted within cultural turn, that implicates a number of ontological, epistemological and methodological assumptions with the main focus on the common development of semiotic (discursive) and extra-semiotic (non-discursive) aspects of the currently existing approaches in political economy (dialectics in refers to path dependency and path shaping). It combines concepts from critical, historically sensitive, semiotic analysis and critical evolutionary and institutional political economy - in this context refers both to trans-disciplinary approach (oriented on post-disciplinary horizons) and expanding field of empirical study [Jessop 2006]

⁵ Policy paradigms derive from theoretical paradigms but possess much less sophisticated and rigorous evaluations of the intellectual underpinnings of their conceptual frameworks. In essence, policy advisers differentiate policy paradigms from theoretical paradigms by screening out the ambiguities and blurring the fine distinctions characteristic of theoretical paradigms. In a Lakatosian sense, policy paradigms can be likened to the positive heuristics surrounding theoretical paradigms. Accordingly, shifts between policy paradigms will be discontinuous, follow theoretical paradigm shifts, but occur more frequently than theoretical paradigms since they don’t require fundamental changes in a negative heuristic [Wallis, Dollery 1999, w; Jessop 2002]

It's important, that these imaginaries were named and were debated (in between), so we understand what happens when they will prove irrelevant, what are the consequences, what's even more important, such a (public) debate shows, what's the current structure of distribution of power within maintaining the dominant (hegemonic) imaginary (paradigm).

Taking that into account, lack of coherent imaginaries of creativity simply creates a space for mis-use, manipulation or instrumentalisation, thus becoming nebulous concept that invoked at every occasion, used for everything, does not explain anything.

Universalisation of creativity, while becoming mantra of liquid modernity, merely increase the probability that those who will use it, will not be able to understand each other, which only lead to further mis-understandings and as a result, undecidable conflicts. But what's even more important, different or contradictory 'imaginaries' usually lead to different or contradictory politics, as such post-modern 'creative economy' drifts apart from 'policy based on facts', and sinks into 'facts based on politics'.

2. DIFFERENT APPROACH TO DEFINE, UNDERSTAND AND PERFORM CREATIVITY: 'IN BETWEEN' MULTUPLICITY OF MEANINGS AND FUNCTIONS IN ART, CULTURE AND ECONOMICS

To fully comprehend this fierce dispute of defining and understanding the concept of creativity 'in between' discursive practise in art, culture and economics, we need to further investigate on each of the prescribed disciplines, each of which within its semantic field defines this concept in its own way (different context) and thus experience growing confusion or ambiguity of terminology (cognitive dissonance) present within contemporary public discourse. As such, within public or so called colloquial discourse we often encounter ambiguities and/or inconsistency, especially in building the media narrative (absorption of different meanings and ways of understanding creativity without taking into account the existing differences between them).

In this situation, the ambiguity or inconsistency of the evoked concept of creativity, becomes de facto the constitutive feature of described discourses, involving constant explication and generation of often irreconcilable variety of senses (discursive elements coming from different sources: scientific disciplines, media narratives, or common knowledge), rather than a desire to further clarify and build the consensus on the way the painstaking negotiation of meanings. This simply means, that the most important function of language in contemporary media discourse is not descriptive function (reference to the meanings commonly defined as literal and/or fully understood), but a political function, focused mainly on the formation or transformation of the individual (identity) as well as the (glocal) collective processes of economic, social and cultural sphere.

To begin with classical discourse of creativity in art, one need to make a distinction between the concept of the art-making and the creativity, which seem to be similar in its scope and meaning, however art-making is the notion of a broader concept, referring to the process of creating artwork (identifying creator, creative process and its results in the form of artwork), while creativity is the ability assigned to individual (referring to a person and her/his features, related to openness, curiosity of knowing and tolerance for ambiguity) [Andrzejewska 2003].

W. Tatarkiewicz, in its deliberations on the process of art-making (creation of artwork) highly underlines, that in antiquity the notion of creativity or the creator did not exist, because the art was strictly determined by the form and canon [Tatarkiewicz, 1975, s. 289-310].⁶ Commonly known nowadays, traditional concept of creativity, in which the creator becomes synonymous with artist, emerged only in 19th century. In 20 century the concept of creativity has been extended to cover other areas of human activity, as a result egalitarian concept of creativity appeared, in which creativity, is not as thus the unique attribute, referred to distinguished or prominent artists, but rather applies to all individuals. Analysing the historical evolution of both the concept and the idea (*imaginary*) of *creativity in art* on the basis of culture, we can distinguish various stages: from denial (sphere originally reserved for the Creator: *creatio ex nihilo*), through elitism (domain of an elite group of artists: the inspired creators and/or geniuses), into egalitarianism (available to all as a permanent element of mass culture, as such the boundary separating process of creation from re-creation becomes imaginary).⁷

As said before, traditionally concept of creativity had been attributed solely to art, referred to the autonomous concept of art, self-referential phenomenon, focused mainly on formal experiment bringing and/or initializing new: values, ideas, forms in the act of spontaneous, free artistic expression, accompanied by the feeling of 'pure joy'. According to H. Arendt, artistic creation is often accompanied by the feeling of pure joy, simply because the art is about beauty that defies any rational or causal validation or justification – she underlines, that that beauty in its essence is devoid of purpose or benefit, with no purpose outside itself "If beauty would have to satisfy any need, it's just those founded by the act of artistic creation" [Bauman 2013, s. 126]. What's more, Arendt clearly stresses, that artistic expression become compromised if its properties are treated solely through the prism of functions, important or played in the current social processes, mainly because art or culture often goes outside and above the current reality, not referring to the present (time), in order to break free from the imposed restrictions [Arendt, 1968: Bauman 2011].

Analyzing the cultural industries P. Bourdieu [1996] explicitly oppose - the autonomous production of art, with the main focus on formal experiment, which sole purpose is the production of symbolic values or capital (in the act of spontaneous and selfless creation or artistic expression) from - cultural production, subjected to external pressures (of political, economic or social nature) focused mainly on the promotion or operation of already existing

⁶ In the antiquity the Greek term *poiein*, like Roman *creare*, meant "do or perform", because the art meant to "perform or do things according to the rules or canon" with the main objective to recreate what already exist in nature (as a result, art referred to re-creation, creation per se was not indicated). Plato believed, that one need to "look up into perennial pattern, because what is beautiful, always remain beautiful for itself" [Tatarkiewicz 1975 s. 289] At the end of the Middle Ages, a new context of the art-making appears "*creatio ex nihilo*" (Creation from nothing) in which the concept of creativity was rather domain of the Creator (God) than the creator, the artist still had to re-create. The right to create new things in art come forth in Renaissance (XVII)- M. Sarbiewski as first used the concept of "*de novo creat*" (create new things) even though it only applied to poetry [Tatarkiewicz 1975]

⁷ Within postmodern art we are rather encounter quite specific, ambivalent form of creativity, based on paradox of originality manifesting itself through artistic, inter-textual game (of different signs and meanings, contexts, citations, and repetitiveness -eclecticism and bricolage- of all known trends and/or artistic styles) on one side, and structural or logical repeatability (mediated mainly by new technologies) on the other, totally different from traditional (modern) conceptions of creativity or creative process (constant transgression, search for new perspectives- within art field and/or artistic expression as the dominant form of artwork and art making) [Kasza 2016]

content: ideas, forms, or values & with its main purpose of exchanging the symbolic value or capital for cultural and economic value or capital.

As such the cultural production becomes fundamentally short-term strategy, focused mainly on a rapid return on investment (max of profit) and exploitation of already existing symbolic & cultural resources, in contrast to the autonomous production of art, which as a long-term strategy is fraught with high risk, but also if not primarily with enrichment of symbolic & cultural resources. Bourdieu often underlines, that art often permeates the tension (or evoking S. Žižek metaphor short circuit)⁸ between the purely symbolic (artistic) value and (often pragmatic) economic or market value, what more he stresses, that often symbolic value of art is inversely proportional to its invested capital or value- as a result in art, at the end of the day, what really counts is that, what it's uncountable.

When it comes to the creativity in culture - the concept of creativity within cultural discourse refers to the 'real ambivalence' as the concept of culture itself, based on the opposition of: creativity and the normative control (tension between creating new and preservation of old, tradition and change, uniqueness (originality) and repeatability (institutionalisation)). This kind of ambivalence of culture, evoked by Z. Bauman in the context of species definition of culture, thus underlying the unique human ability to think and create symbolically (as a primary attribute of creativity), including manufacturing of arbitrary symbols, and broadcasting the collectively shared meanings [Bauman 2013, s.139-162]. As such *the imaginary of creativity in culture* refers primarily to the collective process and collective values, where talents, or the processes of creation are not a spontaneous expression of talented individuals (as in the case of autonomous art), but rather the subject to complex processes through interaction, diversity and adaptations, embedded within the local culture and community.⁹ As a result, in the cultural discourses often appears the systemic approach to creativity, that emphasizes both the role and the importance of infrastructure, social networks of cooperation and exchange, and networks of communication, that brings together (unifies) the individuals into a bigger project [Bilton 2010, s.72-73]. Complex theory of creativity assumes, that creative processes do not consist only of individual talents, but also the ability to manage this processes on a collective level, as a result focus only on the individual level makes the collective ability to add value (creation) threatened.

Described systemic approach to creativity leads in a logical manner from a policy based on cultural production to policy based on the creative process, which integrates not only all the stages below the production process; but also above and below in the value chain, as such it refers to the primacy of the networks over individuals and the assumption that creative ideas are immersed in the cultural context, embedded in local cultures and communities [Bilton 2010, s. 72-73]. With the main focus on the collective process of creativity, the rhetoric of

⁸ Favourite metaphor of S. Žižek (2006) in its proprietary publishing session Short Circuits he wrote "short circuit occurs when there is a faulty connection of network, faulty of course, from the standpoint of network's smooth functioning. It's not the shock of short-circuiting, therefore one of best metaphors of critical reading? Isn't it one of the most effective critical procedures to cross wires that do not usually connect with each other? "

⁹ According to Bauman "the idea of creativity, of active assimilation of the universe, of imposing on the chaotic world the ordering structure of the human intelligent action - the idea built irremovably into the notion of praxis - is indeed comprehensible only if viewed as an attribute of community, capable of transcending the natural or 'naturalized' order and creating new and different orders. Furthermore, the idea of freedom, associated in turn with the notion of creativity, acquires an utterly different meaning when considered as a quality of a community, from when it is discussed in terms of a solitary human individual. In the first case it is the freedom to change the human condition; in the second, freedom from communal coercion and limitation [2013, p. 243-244].

creativity in culture, inevitably refers to the cultural dynamics of the relations (cultural hegemony) between group of managers (privileged) and managed groups (subordinated) and related dividing lines based on the asymmetric models: "participation in culture" and "culture of participation".

The first refers to the traditional culture, based on the one-way flow of cultural content, or cultural interaction (one-way cultural governance), in which the participant is compelled to receptive (passive) model of "participation in culture". Second refers to the "culture of participation", based on the two-way flow of content and/or interaction (two-way cultural governance), in which the individual becomes not only an active participant, but also the co-creator of cultural content [Morawski 2010, s. 430].

Of course, contemporary digital revolution does not remain without an effect on the free access to the content of culture, as well as dynamic relations or interactions between all participants in cultural process, thus emphasizing community and collective aspect of cultural activities in digital network (although this includes activities or interaction based on the cooperation and collaboration, as well as those based on competition or conflict). What we can observe nowadays is a qualitative change in the models of participation in culture in the direction of "a culture of participation", growing rapidly mainly due to the almost unlimited possibilities of digital circuits of culture, beyond the current limitations (time and space), and "affordances of digital technologies, which allow individual users to perform any role in the circulation of cultural content" [Filiciak, Tarkowski, 2010, s. 87].

Last but not least, we approach the creativity in economics, evoking 'Creative Economy' by J. Howkins who notes that "creativity is not the economic good itself, but it's products may be" [Howkins 2001].¹⁰ *When describing economic imaginary of creativity*, it mainly appears in the public discourse in the context of creative economy, creative class or creative cities, referring primarily to the individual talent and innovation as the "source code" of creative economy. Emphasizing an approach based on individual talent and skills and spontaneous expression of talent (genius), economic imaginary cares primarily about originality and distinctiveness (individuality), not continuity and context (collective process of creativity), based solely on the "intellectual property" right and the continuous pursuit for innovation and change (just to maintain the competitive advantage on the global market). Such an approach inevitably leads to concentration on production and products, or innovation, not the creative process itself as well as the creativity.

Thus recalling described earlier Bourdieu's distinction on the artistic production, whose sole purpose is the accumulation of symbolic value (capital), and the production of culture with the aim exchange symbolic value (capital) for cultural or economic value (capital) - the main objective of economic imaginary is mainly the accumulation of economic value (capital) (in accordance with neoliberal doctrine, that any social and cultural life should be included in an economical transaction).

¹⁰ While economists still continue to argue whether there is a class 'culture goods' separate from the (regular) economic goods- we need to underline, that, the paradigm of neoclassical economics based on perfect competition, developed on the basis of Smith's theory by Jevons, Menger and Walras, treats both creativity and innovation or technological changes, as exogenous quantities, essentially outside main interest of economics. In this context, much more useful for the understanding of the postmodern creative economy is Schumpeter's 'creative destruction' paradigm, which takes into account the role and importance of both creativity and innovation within the economy, not to mention modern theories of endogenous growth. [Kasza 2016]

According to C. Bilton, within the economic approach (imaginary) to creativity "social processes and systems, that precede the glimpses of individual inspiration and creativity, and those following them, are being pushed aside" or simply ignored [Bilton 2010, s. 70].

By emphasizing individuality (distinctiveness and originality) it completely disregards the complex social context, based on diversity, interaction and adaptation, embedded in 'glocal' culture and communities. Such an unilateral (one-sided) approach, based solely on individual talent or skills, stressing genuinely the originality and individuality, not continuity and context (of the collective process), inevitably leads to concentration on production and products and its outcomes, rather than the creative process itself. This unilateral approach to creativity results in further increase of reduction (misconceptions) in refers to contemporary economy imaginaries, accompanied by gaps or intervals (discontinuities, ambiguities, inaccuracies), leading to consequences difficult to predict in long term (horizon). Meanwhile, as said before, the complex theory of creativity notes, that the process of creativity does not emerge only from the individual talent, but imply also an optimal coordination (management of the resources on a collective level), as a result, focus mainly on the individual level makes the collective ability to add value (creativity) highly compromised.

3. CONSLUSION: IMAGINARIES OF CREATIVITY FROM THE POINT VIEW OF CULTURAL POLITICAL ECONOMY

To conclude our critical reflection upon defining and understanding the creativity within art, culture and economics, it should be noted that the contradictory definitions (imaginary) of creativity lead to the adoption of contradictory policies towards creative industries and/or creative economy. Stating that, if we believe in the primacy of individual talent and spontaneous ingenuity of genius, the political response is *laissez faire*: pure neo-liberal cultural policies (deregulation of the role of the state, elimination of subsidies and the adoption (domination) of the free market) in which cultural policies often merges with the liberal economy. In practice, however, pure neoliberal model is quite rare, usually because it's often accompanied by a cultural policies, which supports native talents, and/or creative resources (by subsidies, support grants and scholarships, as well as art education programs), treating them in terms of public goods, as a result, cultural policy(ies) can blend with national cultural policy(ies).

In European cultural policies we could still see this two contradictory traditions of cultural policies, socio-democratic idealism of late 70 XX, which defines cultural industries as a part of democratic (inclusive) approach to mass culture (participatory culture) on one hand, and economic neoliberal pragmatism of 80 XX, in accordance with the assumption that all cultural and social life should be included in the framework of the economic transactions on the other. Taking into consideration this collision of different imaginaries of creativity (caught 'in between' social democracy and neoliberal pragmatism, as well as 'in between' cultural industries and creative industries) - contemporary rhetoric (semiotic) reallocation towards creative industries seems to be a significant political act [Bilton 2010, s. 70].

Of course, these contradictions are embedded within the very core idea of creativity itself -however, the rhetoric of the creative industries seems to ignore the complexity, by putting a simple equal sign between talent, creativity, intellectual property rights and profit.

Although such a simplified definition (imaginary) of creativity is not enough, somehow it neatly fits into the political and economic interests around the arts and culture per se.

You can see it perfectly while analysing the changes within the discursive practises of cultural policies: the replacement (substitution) of the term ‘cultural industry’, traditionally used in European countries focusing on the fact that creativity is embedded in the specific cultural context (thus highlighting the cultural content of the ideas, values or traditions) with the term ‘creative industries’, referring to this unclear definition of KEA,¹¹ which highlights new ideas and products, by placing the creativity in the context of individual talent, innovation and productivity.

This significant shift (replacement) clearly indicates the current priorities of the ‘imaginaries’ of creativity, referenced mainly to the economy and politics, thus signaling some of the political imperatives that derive from these assumptions.

Stating that, one need to underline, the emergence of the term of ‘creative industries’, in any case is not a universal phenomenon, it rather reflects the Anglo-American tradition in cultural policy, especially a tendency to perceive the intellectual property rights in terms of usable economic goods. According to Bilton, historically the Anglo-American copyright interpretation differs fundamentally from the European approach, not to mention the French perspective.¹² This has led to a sharp dispute in the World Trade Organization (WTO) between France, Europe and the United States while negotiating on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) on the issue of whether cultural products are defined in terms of public or private goods [Bilton 2010].United Kingdom was one of the first countries, that introduced the term ‘creative industries’, replacing the existing term of ‘cultural industries’, which as the dominant trend or brand (cheap flag of culture and art) was quickly introduced in Australia, Canada, Taiwan, Singapore, South Korea, or China. Meanwhile, European countries, in particular France, or UNESCO decided to stay (back up) with the term of ‘cultural industries’, resisting to treat (define and understand) art and culture as a commodity (strictly economic good), as well as neoliberal approach (efforts) to eliminate the subsidies, or other financial instruments protecting cultural products from the free market influence (regulations).

What’s interesting, within this fierce dispute the Council of Europe has chosen the intermediate approach, using the term of ‘audiovisual industry’ as an industrial application of art and culture.¹³ However, as the concept of the creative economy is spreading more and

¹¹ The KEA (KERN European Affairs) while analysing the economical value of cultural and creative industries made a significant distinction, between the cultural industries (industries, whose production focuses on specific areas of art and culture, offering customers final product (art-making) in the form of goods or services) and creative industries (industries and activities that use culture as a add value to manufacture non-cultural products or services), based on the model of concentric circles, the first of which contains indigenous non-productive art and cultural activities (art-making), the second involves first circle along with the culture industries, while the third contains previous two extended with creative industries [KEA 2006]

¹² In Europe there is long tradition of cultural policies, which stems partly from the concept of the welfare state (welfare state), defining the cultural goods in terms of public goods, with the distinctive example of French policy of "exception culturelle"- in clear opposition to long tradition of Anglo-American liberal cultural policies of defining culture goods in terms of private goods

¹³ It is worth noting, that EU has two distinct, separate rules governing, policies: a cultural policy and audiovisual policy –the distinction of audiovisual policy out of the broader context of cultural policy is mainly due to the fact, that the media (and in fact media products or services) are not only cultural goods, but most of all economical ones (as a result, the legal basis for developing EU audiovisual policy are articles of the TFEU

more amongst the members of the World Trade Organization (WTO), the struggle for preserving the status quo seems impossible to win by Europe (approach). In this context, as said before, the transition from the 'cultural industries' to the 'creative industries' is an important political step toward defining and understanding the creativity as the value which is privately owned (private good).

As such, the phenomenon of creativity is based on its importance and the role enacted (played) simultaneously within the artistic, cultural, and social practices, as well within the economy - as a result, it can be defined as a 'common space' of the reflection upon the culture, art, economy and social processes within the context of society as a whole. However, such a 'common space' requires common concepts (imaginaries) of creativity, thus in the evoked dispute 'in between' art, culture and economics, the creativity itself becomes (as said before) a tool to fight for domination between the different imaginaries, the one that will win, will determine future scenarios of developments (growth) for the so called creative economy. Meanwhile, the true meaning of creativity lean on the complexity and an ambivalence contained within this concept, which makes the concept of creativity not only ambiguous, but also multi-contextual.

Creativity it's not as often defined "simple ability to think otherwise, or producing (creating) new ideas" (convergent thinking), but rather the ability to think differently (divergent thinking), and the ability to tolerate contradiction while moving around seemingly conflicting (contradictory) perspectives. The difficulty is due to the conflicting nature of the creative process itself, that requires to split our attention 'in between' current realities and future possibilities, between the individual and the collective, the organisations and systems, courage to go into unknown with the ability to hold uncertainty and irrationality without the urgent need to reach the facts and logic reasoning. This fundamental ambivalence embedded within the concept of creativity, teaches us how to better adapt to the complexity and volatility of the post-modern world, and as a result to deal with 'uncertainty, discontinuity and ambiguity' of so called liquid modernity. No one should claim that such an ambivalence is easy, it's definitely more difficult than the innovation itself, that pushes us into the unknown, but does not require from us to understand the meaning of what we find there.

That's why creative economy based on the true sense of creativity, should tend to recognize their own limits, as well as basic contradictions and the mechanisms of their support, which form the very basis (core) for its operation, and express willingness to take the risk to of transgressing its own limitations. At the same time, based on the complexity and the multi-contextuality of the concept (imaginary) of creativity, should take into account and accumulate different values and capitals: symbolic, cultural and economic to create a delicate balance 'in between' those ideas (imaginaries), also in the context of their representation in the form of countable and uncountable values or capitals. What's more, should go beyond purely practical (pragmatic) interest in creativity, resulting mainly within its utility for

concerning the free movement of people, goods , services and capital, competition policies, industry/ies, technological standardisation, and education, professional training and culture). Recently, however, there is a change in this respect, as new programs combining "Culture" and "Media" emerges within the framework of 2014-2020, mainly to improve the situation of the cultural and creative industries in Europe. To conclude, interestingly enough, within the initial period of European Communities (EC) issues of the cultural sector was primarily dedicated to the Council of Europe, with the activities limited mostly to the recommendations, resolutions and declarations (non-binding legal acts formally) and only later passed to EC ratifications, when it turned out that purely economic or political cooperation is not sufficient to ensure a sense of community necessary to deepen the integration process [Hausner, Karwińska, Purchla 2013 s. 362-366].

economy and one-sided development growth strategies, contemporary equated mainly with economic and/or technological development (which C. Taylor described in terms of the hegemony of instrumental mind).¹⁴

Ascribed, fundamental in its essence dispute in between art, culture and economics, is a manifestation of much deeper process: crisis of values within post-modern culture and economy (different classification values) associated with the post-structural shift in humanities on the one side, and hegemony of neoliberal discourse in economics on the other, with acknowledgement of post-modern economy transition (post-industrial economy, referred also in terms of creative economy or knowledge-based economy), not to mention the increasing complexity and interdependence of overlapping local processes: technological, economic, social and cultural.

Only then we can really talk about the creative economy per se, otherwise, the focus on the one-dimensional, often economical 'imaginary' of creativity, leads in the longer horizon to undercutting its own foundations, the very roots of the creative economy itself (it's symbolic cultural or creative resources). With the described political shift from cultural industries to creative industries, the assumptions embedded within the economic (neoliberal) rhetoric become global in nature, thus imposing continuous pressure on the creative talent in the context of existing symbolic, cultural and creative resources. However, with the excessive focus on the accumulation of economic capital, without the counterbalance accumulation of symbolic and cultural resources, leads only to the exploitation of already existing symbolic, cultural and creative resources, similar to the exploitation of natural resources. From this natural fear (anxiousness) arises as a result of imposed one-sided (unbalanced) imaginaries of creativity, clearly associated with a specific cultural policy, or rather its lack, with the end result of increased global harnessing of the collective creative resources and past talents accumulated thus far (cultural heritage: symbolic and cultural values), instead of creating new ones to further accumulate (expand and/or augment) already existing creative resources for the future generations. Concluding, to fully extrapolate from ascribed reflections, creative economy should build long lasting foundations, with the main reference to the long-term strategy growth embedded in the core resources: symbolical, cultural, creative (intellectual) as well as social and digital. This long-term strategy development should apply to both 'hard infrastructure' solutions: legal, institutional, economical, and technological, as well as those 'soft ones', related to education: culture, art, media (digital) and social resources (along with acquisition of competencies associated with them), fully adapted to the requirements of the contemporary post-modern world, and the potential of change associated with the development of information communication technologies.

¹⁴ The concept of instrumental mind or the dominance of "economic reason", is distinctly present within the discourses of modernity, mainly as a concept of rationalization introduced by Weber, defined as a process of emancipation of reason as a consequence (embodiment) of capitalistic form of production and development [Krasnodębski 1999] The direct result is the "dominance of material goods, which increasingly prevail over people and bind them with steel shell" [ibid., s. 97] inevitably leads to objectification and/or alienation as well as instrumentalisation of all the other areas of life, dominated by economic rationality (reason). This compulsive (instrumental) reasoning, based on logical or analytical rationality, is doomed to mechanical repetition), resulting with the excess: overproduction of goods and signs deprived of its meaning on one side, along with the overconsumption on the other (limitless consumption), accompanied by the state of permanent unfulfilment [Kasza 2016]

BIOGRAPHY

Joanna Kasza – master degree in economics in (SGH) Warsaw School of Economics (fields of specialisation: Master of Business Administration; Management and Marketing), PhD (work in progress) in Institute of Culture, Jagiellonian University. *Main field of interest and professional experience:* interdisciplinary relations (research/projects) ‘in between’ economy, art and culture, and technology or in a broader perspective in between: political economy (economics, political science) and humanities (semiotics, cultural studies) in relation to technology (ICT or digital revolution) and identity (in particular the determinants of identity influenced by modern paradigms: scientific, cultural, economical and technological) within the context of contemporary questions about the relations between culture and ideology, hegemony and power and politics/political. Author of many articles and publications in the field of economics, culture management and creativity *Pure Joy or coercion of creativity. Analysis of creativity from the perspective of cultural political economy* (2016) and impact of new ICT technologies on contemporary culture and identity : *"Simulacra and simulation: the impact of ICT upon 'radical transformation' of culture"* *"Post-modern identity: in between real and virtual"*

References

- [1] B. Andrzejewska, Kreatywność, tożsamość, adaptacja w dobie zmian społeczno - gospodarczych, *Socjologia Wychowania*, XV (2003), Zeszyt 360
- [2] H. Arendt, *La crise de la Culture*, Paris 1968 w: Bauman Z. *Kultura w płynnej nowoczesności*, Narodowy Instytut Audiowizualny, Warszawa, (1968, 2011)
- [3] H. Arendt, *La crise de la Culture*, Gallimard, Paris, (1972)
- [4] Z. Bauman, *Culture as Praxis*, Sage Publications, London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi, (1999)
- [5] Z. Bauman, *Liquid Modernity*, Polity press, Cambridge, (2000, 2012)
- [6] Z. Bauman, *Culture in a Liquid Modern World*, Polity Press in association with National Audiovisual Institute, Cambridge and Wrocław (Poland), (2011)
- [7] Z. Bauman, *Kultura jako Praxis*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, (2013)
- [8] C. Bilton, *Polityka Kreatywności w: Gwóźdź A., (red.), Od przemysłów kreatywnych do kreatywnej gospodarki*, NCK, Warszawa, (2010)
- [9] C. Bilton, *Creativity and Cultural Policy*, Routledge, London, (2011)
- [10] P. Bourdieu, *Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, Stanford University Press, (1996)
- [11] P. Bourdieu, *Reguły sztuki. Geneza i struktura pola literackiego*, Universitas, Kraków, (2007)
- [12] M. Castells, *Spółczesność sieci*, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, (2011)
- [13] R. Caves, *Creative industries: contracts between art and commerce*; Harvard University Press, Cambridge Massachusetts and London, England, (2000)
- [14] M. Filiciak, A. Tarkowski, *Niebezpieczne związki - rynkowa i społeczna produkcja kultury*, w: *Od przemysłów kreatywnych do kreatywnej gospodarki* NCK, Warszawa, (2010)

- [15] R. D. Griffin, *Reenchantment Without Supernaturalism: A Process Philosophy of Religion*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press, (2001)
- [16] J. Hausner, *Kultura w cywilizacji informacyjnej*, w: Gwóźdź A., (red.), *Od przemysłów kreatywnych do kreatywnej gospodarki*, NCK, Warszawa, (2010)
- [17] J. Hausner, A. Karwińska, J. Purchla, *Kultura i rozwój*, NCK, Warszawa, (2013)
- [18] M. Horkheim, T. Adorno, *Dialektyka oświecenia*, Wydawnictwo KP, Warszawa, (2010)
- [19] J. Howkins, *The Creative Economy. How People Make Money from the idea*, Penguin, London, (2001, 2013)
- [20] B. Jessop, *Governance and Meta-governance in the Face of Complexity: On the Roles of Requisite Variety, Reflexive Observation, and Romantic Irony in Participatory Governance*, 2. 33-58, *Participatory Governance in Multi-Level Context*, VS Verlag, (2002)
- [21] B. Jessop, S. Ngai-Ling, *Towards a Cultural International Political Economy in: International Political Economy & Poststructural Politics*, Palgrave MacMillan, NY, (2006)
- [22] B. Jessop, *Refleksja nad politycznymi paradygmatami i politycznymi narracjami w sferze rządzenia. Zarządzanie Publiczne nr. 2 (2) / 2007*, UE w Krakowie, (2007)
- [23] B. Jessop, *Kulturowa ekonomia polityczna a analiza dyskursu w: Duszak A., Fairclough N. (red.) Krytyczna analiza dyskursu. Interdyscyplinarne podejście do komunikacji społecznej*, Universitas, Kraków, (2008)
- [24] B. Jessop. *Cultural political economy and critical policy studies. Critical Policy Studies* 3 (3-4), (2010)
- [25] J. Kasza, *Czysta radość czy przymus kreatywności. Analiza(retoryki) kreatywności z punktu widzenia kulturowej ekonomii politycznej*, Sophia, Katowice, (2016)
- [26] KEA Report, *The Economy of Culture in Europe, KEA Report on Contribution of the Creative Industries to the Economy*, (2006) (www.keanet.eu)
- [27] J. M. Keynes, *The General Theory of Employment, Interest and Money*, Palgrave Macmillan, NY, (1936)
- [28] L. Kopciuch, *Kryzysy kreatywność i wartości*, Wydawnictwo UMCS, Lublin, (2015)
- [29] Z. Krasnodębski, M. Weber, *Wiedza Powszechna*, Warszawa, (1999)
- [30] S. Lash, J. Urry, *The Economies of Signs and Space*, Sage, London, (1994)
- [31] H. Marcuse, *Człowiek jednowymiarowy: badania nad ideologią rozwiniętego społeczeństwa przemysłowego*, Wydawnictwo Muza, Warszawa, (1991)
- [32] Milner, *Re-imagining Cultural Studies. The promise of Cultural Materialism*, Routledge, London, (2002)
- [33] D. McCloskey, *The Rhetoric of Economics*, Wisconsin Press, Madison 1985 w: David Throsby, *Economics and Culture*, Cambridge 2001

- [34] W. Morawski, Konfiguracje globalne, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, (2010)
- [35] K. Polanyi, The economy as instituted process, w: M. Granovetter, R. Swedberg (red) The sociology of economic life, Bolder, Westview, (1982)
- [36] D. Tapscott, A. Williams, Wikinomia. O globalnej współpracy, która zmienia wszystko, WAIP, Warszawa, (2008)
- [37] W. Tatarkiewicz, Dzieje sześciu pojęć : sztuka, piękno, forma, twórczość, odtwórczość, przeżycia estetyczne, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, (1975)
- [38] W. Tatarkiewicz, History of Aesthetics, Thoemmes Press (1999), Continuum Int. Publishing Group (2005),
- [39] D. Throsby, Ekonomia i Kultura, NCK, Warszawa, (2010)
- [40] D. Throsby, Economics and culture, Press Syndicate of University of Cambridge, (2001)
- [41] J. Wallis, B. Dollery, Market failure, Government failure, Leadership and Public Policy, Basingstoke, Macmillan, (1999)
- [42] A. Whitehead, Process and Reality: An Essay in Cosmology, Macmillan Company, New York 1929. Based on the 1927–28 Gifford Lectures delivered at the University of Edinburgh; Free Press "corrected edition" ed. David Griffin and Donald W. Sherburne 1978,
- [43] M. Weber M, W. Desmond, Handbook of Whiteheadian Process Thought, Vol. 1, Ontos Verlag, Frankfurt, (2008)
- [44] S. Žižek, The Parralax view, The MIT Press, Cambridge, London, (2006)
- [45] S. Žižek, Lacrimae Rerum, Wydawnictwo KP, Warszawa, (2011)

(Received 04 April 2017; accepted 24 April 2017)