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The relationships between cultural change and globalization remain inadequately understood. Often reduced to the seemingly one-way impact of globalization processes on the world’s cultures, these relationships are in reality reciprocal and far more complex and multi-faceted: for one, cultures do shape globalization processes and patterns, and vice versa; what is more, the relationships in turn involve many interactions with economic, political and other factors as well — be they the impacts of regulatory environments, financial flows, migration, technology or social inequality. Addressing the richness of these relationships in the context of contemporary developments is the main purpose of The Cultures and Globalization Series (see text box for more details).

A triad of terms
The relationships between cultural change and globalization remain inadequately understood. Often reduced to the seemingly one-way impact of globalization processes on the world’s cultures, these relationships are in reality reciprocal and far more complex and multi-faceted: for one, cultures do shape globalization processes and patterns, and vice versa; what is more, the relationships in turn involve many interactions with economic, political and other factors as well — be they the impacts of regulatory environments, financial flows, migration, technology or social inequality. Addressing the richness of these relationships in the context of contemporary developments is the main purpose of The Cultures and Globalization Series (see text box for more details).

Our third volume takes up the relationships between cultures and globalization with respect to ‘cultural expression, creativity and innovation’. Why this particular combination of terms? The question is not difficult to answer, but before doing so we first need to remind the reader of the two previous themes. The inaugural theme of the Series, ‘conflicts and tensions’, addressed the broad understandings of culture as a ‘ways of life’ or identity-based concept, as commonly employed in the social and human sciences. The exponential growth in affirmations of, or claims to, cultural difference in the face of the forces of globalization has given rise to multiple ‘conflicts and tensions’ in recent years. These various manifestations of identity politics loom large in current anxieties. As we put it, ‘behind the concern for “culture” that is increasingly evoked in contemporary public debate lurks the specter of conflict: the cultural dimensions of conflict on the one hand, and the conflicntual dimensions of culture on the other’ (Anheier and Isar, 2007: 19). By contrast, the ‘cultural economy’, our theme in 2008, related rather more to the ‘arts and heritage’ understanding of culture. Here it was a question of the ‘substantive centrality’ (Hall, 1997) of goods and services based on cultural content, or outputs with significant aesthetic or semiotic content. In this case as well, the issue appeared to hinge upon global imbalances and/or divides. Given the existing patterns of market domination how can all societies possibly produce such ‘symbolic outputs’? In both cases, authors analysed the variegated landscape of cultural change in relation to globalization. They demonstrated the ways in which this complex interplay between cultures and globalization is at once unifying and divisive, liberating and corrosive, homogenizing and diversifying. The relationships also crystallize both positive aspirations and negative anxieties. The interplay transforms patterns of sameness and difference across the world, and modifies the ways in which cultural expression is created, represented, recognized, preserved or renewed. It also contributes to generating powerful new culturalist discourses that evoke ‘the power of culture’ — both in relation to conflictual phenomena (our topic in 2007) or when the cultural is at once a resource and a vector of major economic flows (the theme in 2008).
Box I.1 Cultures and globalization: the knowledge gap

While a substantial evidence base has been developed on the economic, political and social aspects of globalization, the cultural dimension continues to be the object of many unsubstantiated generalizations and unquestioned assumptions. This is the key knowledge gap the Series is designed to fill. The complex, two-way relationships between cultural change and globalization have remained largely uncharted empirically and under-analysed conceptually. One reason for this dual neglect at the global level is that conventional understandings of culture are still connected principally to the sovereign nation-state. However, today this nexus of culture and nation no longer dominates: the cultural dimension has become constitutive of collective identity at narrower as well as broader levels. What is more, cultural processes take place in increasingly ‘deterritorialized’ transnational, global contexts, many of which are beyond the reach of national policies. Mapping and analysing this shifting terrain, in all regions of the world, as well as the factors, patterns, processes, and outcomes associated with the ‘complex connectivity’ (Tomlinson, 1999) of globalization, is therefore a main purpose of this Series.

In sum, the Series aims to meet three goals: to highlight key contemporary cultural changes and their policy implications; to channel and encourage cutting-edge research; and to contribute to the development of information systems in the field of culture. In so doing, it will seek to build bridges between the social sciences, the arts and the humanities, and policy studies. Indeed, our approach is based on our awareness that the social sciences and the humanities have become too compartmentalized – a state of affairs that we seek to overcome by the kind of inter- and cross-disciplinary thinking required for a project of the kind proposed here that seeks to explore the nexus of cultures and globalization. We therefore encourage ‘out of the box’ thinking and approaches that cut across established disciplines and methods. The present volume, as with the others in the Series, is more than a compilation of separate conceptual chapters. An analytical framework and a set of over-arching questions spell out the organizing principles and substantive priorities. The present volume is also more than a compendium of country or ‘area’ studies. While such aspects are important, they take second place here to a pronounced transnational, comparative and evidence-based perspective as our key signature.

A key factor responsible for the knowledge gap in the field of cultures and globalization is the paucity of comparative information. It is for this reason that, alongside the ‘narrative’ chapters, each volume of the Series includes a significant data section. Departing from conventional approaches, we have developed a new way compiling, analysing and presenting quantitative data on specific aspects of the cultures and globalization relationship. These ‘indicator suites’ make up Part II of the volume and are based on the premise that much information on many facets of the cultures and globalization nexus is already ‘out there,’ but is not being processed in appropriate ways. Another point of departure is that for most readers interpretative information graphics are far easier to understand than ‘raw’ data in tabular form. Initiated in 2007, the methodology has been refined with each successive volume. More details will be provided in Part II, which, among other topics, presents indicator suites on aspects of cultural expression, creativity and innovation, with a special emphasis on hybridity.
Now let’s turn to the theme of the present volume. Current cultural discourse has turned the notions of ‘creativity’ and ‘innovation’ into keywords in recent years – although neither figured in Raymond Williams’s classic (1988) reference work on the subject. Indeed, the two terms have been taken up enthusiastically by advocates, analysts and policy makers alike, particularly with reference to the cultural economy; both terms have become crucial to how the latter is represented, and represents itself. The notion of creativity draws heavily, though not exclusively, on artistic quality, but in a specifically modernist reading: ‘the shock of the new, the disruptive, the counter-intuitive, the rebellious and the risk-taker’ (O’Connor, 2007: 32). Yet today, judging from the many ways creativity is evoked, it is no longer the privileged domain of art and artists. Instead, the organization of cultural commodity production on a mass industrial scale seems to have pushed artistic practice into the sidelines – despite the continuing popular veneration of the artist as demiurge. Hence it appeared essential to us to continue the Series by refocusing on cultural expression, almost as if it were the missing player at the table. We say cultural expression deliberately, instead of ‘the arts’ or ‘artistic creation’, because the latter two terms foreground the individual creative act or impulse, whereas today the emphasis is placed equally on group manifestations. Besides, in many organizational milieus (art and design schools or architectural collaboratives), genres (film, theatrical and musical performances) and in non-Western societies more generally, artistic work can be a collective project, not just an individual one. This last point is important because the notion of creativity is still tinged with mystical overtones – as Jason Toynbee points out in Chapter 7, ‘the individual artist is the locus of creativity, and her/his genius consists in extraordinary powers of autonomous expression’.

However, as several other chapters in this volume demonstrate, creativity is arguably much more a matter of ‘social authorship’ than transsubstantialisation of the soul or expression from within. This has long been recognized with respect to the cultural traditions of Asia, where creativity ‘involves a state of personal fulfillment, a connection to a primordial realm, or the expression of an inner essence or ultimate reality’ (Lubart, 1999: 340). But in the West as well as in the East, a more sociological awareness is now called for. There has been a tendency to think of creativity and innovation as things ineffable, embodied only in the individual, as the emanation of an inner inspiration. But recent thinking opens up the analytical frame to include the sociocultural context, interpreting creativity in conjunction with collective action and defining it as a process in which novelty is recognized and acknowledged collectively. As the anthropologists observe, their discipline needs to contribute to debates around creativity by challenging – rather than reproducing – the polarity between novelty and convention, or between the innovative dynamic of the present and the traditionalism of the past, that has long formed such a powerful undercurrent to the discourses of modernity’ (Ingold and Hallam, cited by Svašek, in Chapter 5 below).

At the intersection, then, of cultural expression on the one hand, and creativity and innovation on the other, understood in both its individual and social manifestations, our motivations were threefold. First, we wished to analyse the interactions between globalization and arts practice (or, more broadly, cultural expression). Second, we wished to better understand the interactions between the forces of globalization and the emergence of creativity and innovation in cultural expression itself. Third, we sought to join up the two sets of questions. How are artistic practice and behaviour evolving in relation to globalization? Within cultural practice, how is globalization shifting the ground in which creativity and innovation arise and are nurtured? Whilst questions about artistic creativity and innovation are not new in aesthetics and cultural sociology, the encounter with contemporary globalization takes such questions to a different plane. It creates new conditions of great potential as well as challenges of at least equal magnitude; also it makes a far more broad-based perspective on these matters indispensable. These motivations crystallised before we learned that the European Parliament and Council were going to label 2009 the European Year of Creativity and Innovation with the combined goals of raising awareness of the importance of creativity and innovation for personal, social and economic development, disseminating good practices, stimulating education and research.

In sum, the choice of the topic ‘cultural expression: creativity and innovation’ to follow the volume on ‘the cultural economy’ is based on the following reasons:
ISSUES AND PATTERNS IN CULTURAL EXPRESSION

i) cultural expression provides the basic human inputs to the cultural economy, and particularly so in the ‘creative industries’;

ii) the predominance of the cultural economy in current policies and practices is transforming the conditions for creative cultural expression itself, how it takes place and unfolds;

iii) this transformation has both negative and positive consequences, as it encourages some forms of cultural expression and discourages others, opens up new opportunities for some and marginalizes others;

iv) throughout this process, creativity must be identifiable and become recognized as such, and requires innovation processes to become culturally and socially sustainable as well as economically viable, while at the same time;

v) globalization generates new frameworks for creativity and innovation in cultural expression that vary across fields and genres.

‘Creativity’, ‘Innovation’. We are all too aware of the inflated, and often imprecise, uses of these two terms, particularly in the popular management literature as well as in some cultural policy work. Writing as long ago as 1971, Raymond Williams pointed out that ‘no word in English carries a more consistently positive reference than “creative”... yet, clearly, the very width of the reference involves not only difficulties of meaning, but also, through habit, a kind of unthinking repetition which at times makes the word seem useless’ (1971: 19). More recently — and more polemically — John Tusa has observed (2003: 5–6):

‘Creative’, ‘creation’, ‘creativity’ are some of the most overused and ultimately debased words in the language. Stripped of any special significance by a generation of bureaucrats, civil servants, managers and politicians, lazily used as political margarine to spread approvingly and inclusively over any activity with a non-material element to it, the word ‘creative’ has become almost unusable. Politics and the ideology of ordinariness, the wish not to put anyone down, the determination not to exalt the exceptional, the culture of oversensitivity, of avoiding hurt feelings, have seen to that.

What kind of creativity and innovation?

Despite and indeed because of such difficulties, we confine ourselves essentially in this volume to the notion of creativity in cultural expression broadly understood, a field in which its meaning is relatively unambiguous, rather than extending it to practically every sphere of human and social endeavour. We take creativity to be the generation of novel ideas and artifacts; innovation is the process by which new ideas and artifacts lead to new cognitive and behavioural practices such as genres, ways of going and organizing, conventions, models, etc. In much of the current cultural policy literature, however, particularly in relation to city planning and management, the concept of creativity is used both more broadly to encompass far more than the arts (see, for example Florida (2002), and more loosely as well (for example Landry, (2000)). Such usages are somewhat metaphorical, lacking the kind of analytical rigor displayed by the recent boom in creativity research in the natural sciences through to psychology and other cognitive sciences. Different approaches have analysed individual creativity in a broad range of task domains, including of course the arts (Sternberg, and Lubart 1999), linking them to the societal as well. Hence our advocacy of an essentially sociological perspective, rooted in the interactions between individual and society rather than in the individual alone, where Eureka or ‘Aha’ moments are sufficient to convey the idea of the creative act.

We have been able to take a cue here from confluence approaches to the study of creativity in contemporary psychology (Sternberg and Lubart, 1999), foremost among which is the ‘systems perspective’ pioneered by Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi (1996; 1999). Here the interactions between, first, the creative person, second, the domain (a specific cultural symbol system) and third, the field (defined as made up of domain gate-keepers such as art critics, gallery owners, star performers, etc.), are what determine the emergence and in particular the recognition of a creative act or product. The creative individual takes information in a domain and transforms or extends it; the field validates and selects the new ideas and methods; the domain then in turn preserves and transmits creative products to other individuals, societies and generations. In this perspective, says Csikszentmihalyi, ‘creativity is any act, idea or product that changes an existing domain, or that transforms an existing domain into a new one’ (1996: 28). As Howard Gardner has shown, ‘the development of creative projects may stem from an anomaly within a system (e.g., tension between competing critics in a field) or moderate
asynchronies between the individual, domain and field (e.g., unusual individual talent for a domain) (1993, cited in Sternberg and Lubart, 1999: 10).

Similarly, research in organizational sociology and management demonstrates that creativity and innovation emerge at the crossroads of social, cultural and political forces, and more frequently at the margins and boundaries rather than at the centre of systems, be they political entities, organizations or professions (Nelson and Winter, 1982; Pettigrew and Fenton, 2000). Studying the question of how organizations evolve, Romanelli and Tushman (1994) introduce the notion of punctuated equilibriums to refer to discontinuous transformations. They assume that organizations pass through relatively long periods of stability in terms of structure and activity. These are punctuated by short bursts of fundamental changes during revolutionary periods, triggered when several key organizational domains are threatened or otherwise become critically uncertain, particularly in terms of available resources. In response, some but not all organizations will seek to adapt by introducing changes in terms of strategy, structure, incentive and control systems, as well as power relations that are more far-reaching than would have been the case otherwise. Organizational theorists suggest that revolutionary periods are times of greater creativity and improved innovation performance in those organizations that manage to break the structural and cultural inertia of embedded routines.

Cultural creativity, too, is surely embedded in social, cultural, and political phenomena and is related to specific configurations in terms of structure, power and meaning. However, while embedded, creativity seems, at the same time, more likely to be fostered in situations of change, tension and discontinuity, when overlapping and criss-crossing configurations create interstitial spaces. In the context of globalization, the question is: what happens to these configurations and relationships? That is the question many of our authors address, while others focus more exclusively on cultural expression alone.

In relation to this usage, we should recall the working definitions of the two central concepts that we have adopted for this Series, drawing largely on the systematic coverage proffered by Held et al. (1999). We take globalization to be the highly accelerated movement of objects (goods, services, finance and other resources, etc.), meanings (language, symbols, knowledge, identities, etc.) and people across regions and intercontinental space. In other words, the various processes of time-space compression. The working concept of culture we have adopted is the following:

Culture is the social construction, articulation and reception of meaning. It is the lived and creative experience for individuals and a body of artifacts, symbols, texts and objects. Culture involves enactment and representation. It embraces art and art discourse, the symbolic world of meanings, the commodified output of the cultural industries as well as the spontaneous or enacted, organized or unorganized cultural expressions of everyday life, including social relations. It is constitutive of both collective and individual identity.

Creativity and innovation in cultural expression

To be sure, creativity continues to manifest itself as an individual product, in which latent and manifest talents, expertise and serendipity combine in often seemingly unpredictable ways. Yet alongside and perhaps gradually superseding this image of the individual genius kissed by the muse is a new one: it is based on the understanding that the likelihoods of creativity to emerge, of creative acts to be recognized, and of both leading to innovation, yielding sustained change, are all closely linked to the organization of economy and society as well as patterns in the cultural domain itself. In other words, art is itself a 'set of historically specific ideas and practices that have shifted meanings across the course of the centuries' (Errington, 1998: 63) and creativity varies across cultures. And as cultures interact with globalization the ensuing cultural change in turn enriches or impoverishes the conditions in which creativity can emerge.

As Stuart Hall (1997) has observed, the means of producing, circulating and exchanging cultural products and processes have been dramatically expanded in our time through new media technologies and the information revolution. Directly, a much greater proportion of the world’s human, material and technical resources than ever before goes into the ‘cultural’ or ‘creative’ industries sectors, while indirectly these have become the mediating element in every other process. Moreover, as a result of today’s technological upheaval, the nature and
forms of cultural expression are changing profoundly. Take, for example, the world of virtual reality in which actors are free to make choices and play roles normally unavailable to them in the social world of everyday life and in which technology turns many individuals into ‘creators’ themselves. From the personal computer and digital camera to the cell phone, humankind inhabits an increasingly networked world in which communication and personal expression and development reign supreme. YouTube, for example, offers those so inclined the possibility of directing and producing their own movies, while Karaoke machines have unleashed the inner singer within each of us and the literary shibboleth of the day is ‘Every blogger is a star’.

Yet what are the standards by which creativity is identified and assessed; how do we know if something is truly novel? Do the creators themselves care about standards, or are creative acts more play for entertainment than work inspired by the muses, and more about escaping the status quo than changing it? Market-driven phenomena may well be creating new figures of the symbol creator as a ‘motor of innovation’ and altering the profile of the ‘creative subject’. The World Wide Web with its attendant domains of the internet and cyberspace may signal a ‘brave new world’ to some, though beyond its virtual borders significant areas nevertheless still manifest age-old problems – a persistent scarcity of food, shelter and clothing haunts the planet. Does artistic creativity today channel in relation to this dark side of things some of the visionary edge that has energized the arts since the Enlightenment? Artistic creativity, according to Adorno (1991) and other critical thinkers, reveals and helps us appreciate the possibility of a better world – be it through literature, music, painting or other genres.

What happens to this premise in the face of the globalized cultural industries? In this volume, our authors also interrogate the perceptions of globalization as a threat to ‘diversity’, as it erodes cultural identity and distinctiveness across the world. This ‘homogenization-produced-by-cultural-imperialism’ view takes it for granted that distinctive repertoires and potentials of creative expression are being eliminated by globalization. Yet many observers point to the processes of re-pluralization that are occurring, dialectically, as the values of different ways of life have risen into consciousness and have become the rallying cry of diverse claims to a space in the planetary culture. ‘Before, culture was just lived. Now it has become a self-conscious collective project. Every struggle for life becomes the struggle of a way of life’ (Sahlins, 1994: 6).

While the changing relationships between creativity and diversity are particularly clear in domains such as literature, the visual arts and music, the politics of identity maintenance practised by governments tend to privilege not just the arts but also the audiovisual sector and more broadly, the cultural industries (as was analysed in the 2008 volume of Cultures and Globalization). The core tension between current opportunities and threats is now enshrined in the 2005 UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions, whose Preamble observes that ‘while the processes of globalization … afford unprecedented conditions for enhanced interaction between cultures, they also represent a challenge for cultural diversity … . The very process of globalization of communication makes the maintenance of cultural identity more difficult.

Although the cultural imperialism thesis may be an oversimplification, the question remains as to the real nature of the new repertoires of cultural expression that appear to be emerging. What is the true composition of the hybridities and intercultural fusions that are being produced? Should we expect a global culture that resembles ‘the eclectic patchwork we are witnessing in America and Western Europe today – a mixture of ethnic elements, streamlined and united by a veneer of modernism on a base of scientific and quantitative discourse and computerized technology’? (Smith, 1992: 573). Are globalized consumer industries moulding motifs as well as tastes, and thereby steering most of the creative talent and innovation their way? It is clear that many aspects of contemporary Euro-American cultural expression, especially popular music, films, videos, fashion and some foods, are being spread worldwide in the guise of consumer commodities, art styles in media and tourism – well illustrated by Barber’s stark (1995) imagery of McWorld. Or are we moving towards a multi-polar world of cultural expression with competing centers, as Allen Scott suggested in the 2008 volume of this Series (Scott, 2008)?

Yet at the same time, expressive forms from many other places are exerting a trans-national influence, and encouraging creativity and innovation, often in hybrid forms that work with, or blend in
with, Western and other forms and repertoires that are now being re-interpreted in terms of locally specific perceptions, understandings and styles. These new hybridities involve adaptations that are often accompanied by the often very self-conscious rediscovery of and return to indigenous expressive forms; while such processes of culture-based identity building have been ongoing since the nineteenth century, there can be no doubt that they have multiplied exponentially in our time, often occurring with sufficient depth and force to occasion the ‘conflicts and tensions’ we explored in 2007 (Anheier and Isar, 2007).

Images and pictorial representation have never been more dominant in day-to-day life. No longer is the circumscribed world of art and art history capable of decoding and interpreting the extremely visual culture that environs us. Strategies of representation are no longer, if they ever were, neatly divisible into the ‘seeable and the sayable’. Art critic Gerardo Mosquera, a contributor to this volume, wrote earlier of the world being divided into curating cultures and curated cultures (1994). The former have actively created narratives into which the latter would passively let themselves be inserted. Could it be that the forces of globalization continue to favour a ‘one-way decoding’ where ‘other’ cultures are translated into a standard lingua franca, generating easily swappable and exchangeable packets of virtual meaning. At the same time it may well be simplistic to pretend that globalization has not also had unintended spin-offs that empower and connect marginalized groups, communities and individuals in ways never before imagined. How, then, has popular or subaltern creativity globalized itself in different forms and avenues of cultural expression?

Finally, copyright, as someone has pointed out, is the ‘legal face of globalization’ subjecting creative products as intellectual ‘property’ to the strict legislation of their circulation and reproduction. In the past, it was argued that copyright was necessary in order to promote creativity; only by guaranteeing the creator or inventor’s copyright could the author of a work be compensated financially for her creativity. Without this financial incentive, it was argued, the creative impulse would wane. Yet it is precisely the copyright regime and the organizations and interests that benefit from it most that seem subject to the punctuated equilibrium observed by the organizational theorists mentioned above. In other words, what was meant to protect and provide incentives for creativity now opens up new creative opportunities while also posing new threats.

There are other areas of cultural creativity, however, that would seem to resist trends towards greater use of property rights altogether and irrespective of the regulatory framework in place. These suggest the existence of other communal circuits of creativity that ought to be investigated. Humour as manifested in the jokes that circumnavigate public culture and recipes used in the preparation of food are two examples in the sense that they are not attributable to single authors or identifiable with particular property rights yet there is no dearth of new, innovative material in either of these areas. How can we learn more about the way creativity works in such domains and cultural commons more generally, and how are these affected by globalization?

Questions

Against this background, we posed several sets of questions as a ‘brief’ for those authors who would be contributing analytical chapters to Part I:

- **Creativity.** What does creativity mean in a globalizing economic, cultural and artistic landscape? How does creativity manifest itself empirically, and what are the economic, sociological and cultural factors that help account for variations in creativity across genres, fields, regions, and societies over time? Are transnational milieus and clusters of creativity emerging? What institutions, organizations and professions as well as artistic, political or economic interests are behind such milieus, and how are they inter-linked? Is the changing ‘map’ of creativity related to the various drivers and patterns of globalization? How does cultural/artistic creativity differ from creativity in other fields, in particular the sciences, the business world and in politics?

- **Diversity of cultural expressions.** What are the dimensions and manifestations of diversity in cultural expression in terms of artistic languages, repertoires and practices? Are there diversifying genres, or fields, or regions or localities as well as professions and organizational
systems or clusters? Conversely, are there fields and domains in which diversity is stable or even regressing? How are such patterns related to the other forms of globalization? What are the cultural, sociological, economic and political correlates of the nexus between creativity and diversity, and how is globalization affecting it?

- **Innovation.** What kinds of innovations are taking place in cultural expression? As globalization propels the growth of the increasingly powerful cultural industries, how are artistic languages, repertoires and practices being affected? Are the cultural industries factors of dynamism and growth for cultural expression or are they factors of constriction instead? What are the threats to the diversity of cultural expressions in this respect? To what degree does commodification stifle or foster creativity?

- **Artists as entrepreneurs.** The Western notion of cultural creativity has long celebrated what some analysts have called the ‘cult of originality,’ and the rejection of the past. In other cultures, by contrast, artistic creation is closer to the shared, living identity and re-enactment of past lessons projected and made meaningful to the here and now. Are these visions converging? Is cultural expression increasingly becoming both individualistic and social, community-based entrepreneurship?

- **Hybrids.** What new hybridities are emerging? What sorts of boundary crossings, disruptions, flows and displacements are taking place in artistic practice? Is more cross-cultural collaboration being promoted in the contemporary global landscape? What organizational and/or collaborative forms have developed trans-culturally and what factors are encouraging and discouraging speciation processes? Are these hybrids stable, pointing to consolidations in the way creativity and innovation are institutionalized in inter-cultural or transnational contexts?

- **Agency and dominance.** In what forms are agency and dominance exerted in cultural expression today? How do certain actors seek to encourage, control or discourage creativity as a matter of policy? How do such effects occur unintentionally? Is cultural expression becoming homogenized across the world as a result of globalization as a result? What countervailing forces are now challenging hegemonic tendencies? Who are the cultural-political entrepreneurs, institutions and organizations in this respect, and how are they achieving specific goals?

- **Outcomes.** Are some expressive forms and genres being marginalized, or becoming increasingly excluded, while others move to the centre of cultural attention, political salience and economic investment? Who and where are the ‘winners’ and ‘losers’?

- **Policy implications.** Finally, what, are the policy implications that follow from the questions above, and what policy recommendations can be made at local, national and international levels as a result?

**Responses**

As in most such anthologies, not all of our contributors have addressed the questions exactly as they were asked. Most of them have addressed a subset of the questions above, and some have chosen to tackle other, perhaps equally important ones, that are also relevant to the issues at hand. The Series has always been eclectic in its embrace of many different disciplines and intellectual perspectives. It represents no single school of thought. It is also resolutely international in its coverage; in each volume we seek to explore the issues from a true world diversity of geo-cultural perspectives. Hence here too the sheer variety of apparent universals such as cultural expression, creativity and innovation is made plain by the diversity of contributions from all the world’s regions. Although academy-based, our enterprise has always welcomed contributions from public intellectuals, journalists, activists and indeed artists. In this volume, as befits the topic, there are even more contributions from artists and/or arts activists than in the previous two; and precisely because artistic expression is the core issue, we are also pleased to include 16 extra pages of colour illustrations at the end of Part I.

In line with previous volumes, we solicited and then organized the contributions under several different structural headings. The first set includes chapters tackling overarching, general issues across a range of genres or disciplines. Next, and by contrast, we have placed contributions that analyse issues that are specific or at least particularly salient in different world regions – though here too, it must be said, some of the phenomena
described could well occur, although perhaps less strikingly, in any other part of the world. The third section includes chapters that deal with particular artistic genres or issues.

**Overarching Issues**

 Appropriately for a volume which seeks to challenge the monopoly which the ‘creative industries’ discourse has acquired, Rustom Bharucha opens the Overarching Issues section with his “‘Creativity’: a plea for alternative paradigms’, an essay that analyses the everyday traditional Indian art of floor-drawing. *kalam*, which is not linked to an individual artist, but to the cultural expression of an entire community which earns its livelihood through the perpetuation of this practice. He highlights creative principles like impermanence, ecology, and humility that are exemplified by this expressive language, which because it is also religious operates at both ‘material and immaterial’ levels. While it could be argued that a vast body of creative practices in the ‘global South’ are no longer as resilient as the *kalam* – and therefore, a policy for their preservation and the income generation of their custodians becomes mandatory – the articulation of such policy should come from the communities themselves. However, in the top-down expertise that marks the rhetoric and legislation of many policies that purport to preserve or strengthen cultural expression, people’s considerations are all too often erased.

‘Recognition and artistic creativity’ is the topic Joni Maya Cherbo and Harold L. Vogel explore. Their treatment focuses on the USA, yet they also reject the methodological individualism of the Romantic solitary genius perspective. Inspired by Csikszentmihalyi’s systemic approach, they foreground the importance of social recognition in the phenomenon of creativity. Even in contemporary Western society, artistic creativity is a high risk endeavour; most artistic products fail to cover their investment. Analysing the social context, the authors identify the various stages involved in the process of bringing an artistic work to fruition: origination, presentation/promotion, distribution and evaluation. At each stage various social factors can assist or hinder the reception of any artistic product. In different ways, these conditions are being enhanced by an increasing global interconnectivity between peoples, as technology enables and encourages access to new audiences and provides outlets for artistic careers.

Gerardo Mosquera’s metaphor of ‘walking with the Devil’ further problematizes issues such as these. Based on his long experience as a leading international curator, his chapter analyses contemporary globalized art circuits. It explores the tensions between cultural homogenization and the countervailing efforts of new cultural subjects who are diversifying international art practice, and also discusses the new epistemological grounds in which artistic discourses unfold. The dramatic expansion in the creation and circulation of contemporary art has developed ever-increasing globalized art scenes while stimulating new local energies. However, instead of a global mosaic of distinct artistic practices, what we see is the plural construction of international art and its language. The Devil in his title is an allegory for hegemonic, internationalized Western metaculture (while God is the local and the singular): in an old fable, a peasant invokes both, contradictorily, in order to cross a perilous bridge. But in the new version of the fable, the Devil tells the peasant, ‘Follow your own path, but let me accompany you, accept me, and I will open the doors of the world for you’. And the peasant, somewhat fearful, yet at the same time pragmatic and ambitious, accedes. Walking with the Devil has become a plausible strategy for visual artists everywhere …

Gilane Tawadros also walks the terrain of contemporary visual art in her chapter entitled ‘… But What is the Question? – Art, Research and the Production of Knowledge’, but interrogates this domain as a form of knowledge production. How does artistic knowledge production differ from text-based forms of research and knowledge production, she asks? What new insights or investigations are made possible by the processes of making artworks (or, indeed, of making exhibitions)? What are the implications of this for the ways in which we have traditionally understood and validated knowledge? How does globalization contribute to our understanding of visual art as a form of knowledge production? This chapter takes specific artworks and exhibitions as its ‘evidence’ base for exploring these questions and investigates the role that artworks and exhibitions play in the production of knowledge in a globalized world.

Maruška Svašek’s ‘Improvising in a World of Movement: Transit, Transition and Transformations’
sees improvisation as the key to interpreting how globalizing forces stimulate cultural production, appropriation and recontextualization. To what extent are these processes controlled, welcomed or criticized by the various actors involved? She argues that creativity should be measured across the entire production process, exploring the active embodied engagement of cultural producers with their work in progress and explores three projects in which two flag makers and one contemporary artist from Ghana have interacted with individuals and groups in Northern Ireland. Svasek defines ‘transit’ as the movement of people, objects and images across space and time; ‘transition’ refers to transit-related changes in the products of cultural production in terms of their meaning, value and emotional efficacy; ‘transformation’ concerns the dynamic ways in which people in transit relate to changing social and material environments. Through ‘improvisation’ they react to new challenges and demands, taking on contextually-specific roles and identities, and gaining various degrees of ownership over the working process and its outcomes.

Transit is also the concern of the West Indian political economist Keith Nurse, who recounts how the intersection of globalization and diasporas in our time has led to new geo-economic, political, social and cultural spaces that link societies, transcend the boundaries of nation-states and hybridize cultural identities. This domain shows how cultural influences move in many different directions nowadays, bringing about rather more artistic hybridization than homogenization. Much of the literature tends to see global flows principally in a North to South or core-to-periphery direction and fails to capture the tremendous impact of migration and the growth of contemporary diasporas on the North. While the periphery is greatly influenced by the societies of the core, the reverse is also the case and as a consequence it is critical to examine the counter flow, the periphery-to-core cultural flows. Nurse therefore analyses the transfer of popular culture forms from the Caribbean and Latin America to the North Atlantic on the basis of reggae/on, which has risen to prominence and influences Latino and worldwide youth audiences, and on the transnational success of Caribbean carnivals. He argues that diasporic cultures in general, often embodied in popular cultures, employ an ‘aesthetic of resistance’ that confronts and subverts hegemonic modes of representation and thus acts as a counter-hegemonic tradition to the geo-cultural constructions embodied in notions of empire, nation, class, ‘race’, gender, sexuality, and ethnicity. They express what Stuart Hall (1997) calls the ‘redemptive move’ ... ‘born of travelling, rupture, appropriation, loss, exile’. In this sense, the popular cultures of the diaspora are not just an aesthetic and commercial space where artistic expressions and psychic and bodily pleasures are enacted, represented and marketed, but also an arena where social values and meaning are put on public display, negotiated and contested. Nurse concludes that diasporic cultural expressions and practices facilitate aesthetic innovation as well as socio-political change in both receiving and sending countries.

Copyright, the main form of intellectual property in cultural production, has played a key part in globalization. Although it is presented as an unalloyed good by its powerful defenders in corporations and states, Jason Toynbee’s chapter argues to the contrary that copyright is of dubious value. For in fact, he argues, the expansive copyright regime which characterizes the present era threatens vulnerable cultures – both traditional and hybrid – around the world. He refutes the conventional rationales for copyright, both economic and aesthetic, drawing supporting evidence from the cases of music making in Jamaica and Bollywood films. These surprisingly parallel examples suggest that creative cultures can flourish in, and may even depend upon, the absence of effective copyright. While IP has been expanding since the mid-1980s, no case has been made as to how extensive IP rights actually need to be in order to overcome the economic ‘problem’ of non-rival, non-excludable cultural goods. Copyright has grown longer, and covered more forms of cultural practice and technologies of replication. It has also extended its reach into the poorest countries of the world. Yet there is no evidence that we have seen a concomitant increase in creativity. Indeed, some economists argue that the current ‘big copyright’ regime is leading to less innovation in cultural markets.

Two essays on generic issues close this overview section. The first, ‘Exile, Culture and Identity’, consists of reflections on the part of a diasporized philosopher, Rasoul Nejadmrh, now a leading cultural actor in Sweden, whose itinerary has taken him from his native Iran to Scandinavia.
He explores the cognitive values of being born in a nomadic family, of being a political exile and of organizing a music festival, *Culture in Exile*. The argument is that exile and nomadic thought are two key inter-connected features in a world characterized by movement and the dissolution of boundaries, where few stable positions can be adopted by the individual. Dislocation is a creative state of mind that enables a radical critique of the dominant discourses on culture and identity. Ever thought-provoking, the theatre scholar and cultural activist Dragan Klaic interrogates a raft of recent and ongoing manifestations of evil. How ‘creative’ are these behaviours on the part of both small and big time crooks who indulge in various forms of crime and destruction? Evil, affirms Klaic, can be surprising and innovative, but not creative. Creativity needs to be affirmed in its utopian core, in benefits to be shared as a common good. In this perspective, he sees combating climate change and its consequences as the major challenge to artistic creativity today.

**Regional Realities**

Paul Brickhill, a life-long cultural entrepreneur in Zimbabwe, opens the *Regional Realities* section with his treatment of ‘The “creator” as entrepreneur: an African perspective’, an exploration of how artists across the continent have succeeded in creating a diversity of hybrid continuously evolving art forms and techniques in the face of grinding economic poverty and an extremely limited infrastructure, both of which have led to the large emigration of many others. How do those who stay and survive as artists make their livelihood? What is the social interplay between livelihood and the creative process? What types of connections and contradictions exist between African art and global influences? In what ways is African art both ‘universal’ and ‘African’? A starting point for Brickhill is storytelling – in which artist and audience are interwoven – for this is how all African art is understood by Africans themselves. The historic migration of peoples has created an awareness of art as being transient, informed by memory, captured by stories, crafted by improvisation and retold in limitless variation of forms. While there is a distinctive connectedness between culture and social life in Africa, individual creative genius also drives the artistic process. The author looks at the ways the practices involved are imagined, lived and retained and linked to globalization, taking examples drawn from stone sculpture, township jazz, Ghanaian highlife, Afro-beat, Zimbabwean mbira, marimba, and Nigerian film.

In *The Turn of the Native: Vernacular Creativity in the Caribbean*, Annie Paul, a writer and critic at the University of the West Indies, takes up similar issues. In the island countries of the Caribbean, ‘low-budget’ people have creatively married oral traditions with the most advanced technology to create a highly mobile, popular, hybrid musical product that is competitive internationally with similar products from the most affluent societies. Utilizing the transistor set, the recording studio and the gigantic sound system, Jamaican music has disseminated itself to a multitude of audiences – spanning the local, the national, the regional, and the diasporic and transnational with an ebullience and success unmatched by the formal, official, ‘standard’ English-speaking circuits of culture. Jamaican music has also subverted standard notions of copyright, creativity and originality, adapting the Western music model to the new hybridities thrown up in the syncretistic plantation spaces of the Caribbean. The ‘vernacular’ that Paul uses refers precisely to subaltern practices of expressive engagement that reflect the dynamic, adaptive, character of Jamaican patois, in constant dialogue and negotiation with the diasporic, the transnational and the global.

The experience of socially conscious graphic designers is the topic of Huda Smithshuizen Abifarès’s chapter entitled ‘Creative Contemporary Design in the Arab World’. Herself a skilled practitioner from the region, she sheds light on yet another variant of the encounter between locally anchored creativity and the challenges of globalization. Historically, the interaction of Arab peoples with others has shaped and consolidated the visual aspects of the rich traditions of Islamic art. This type of mixing and assimilation of foreign aesthetic repertoire is still part of the Arab visual culture. How are these creative practices being renewed today in the Arab world and in the Arab diaspora? The work of a new generation of cultural entrepreneurs, their networks and other cross-cultural collaborations, together represent a striving to shape visual culture in ways that capture and express contemporary...
identity, as young designers embrace Western design ideologies, yet subvert them to their own ends and needs. The resultant hybrid creative practices are being steadily recognized, building up a following, and putting into motion new forms of globalized creative production.

Cultural freedom, the artist’s licence to express, comment and critique, is clearly under siege in many parts of the world. One of the factors working against artistic freedom is the perceived threat of ‘contamination’ by globalization. Political scientists Laurent Gayer, Christophe Jaffrelot and Malvika Maheshwari explore how in South Asia, Islamist and Hindu fundamentalist movements have exerted an ever stronger influence, introducing novel forms of ‘cultural policing’ that reject artistic freedom, and in the process erode the colonial legacy of judicial activism. They understand ‘cultural policing’ as all attempts at imposing ways of thinking and behaving on behalf of value systems pertaining to religion or morality that resort to symbolic or physical violence, blackmailing or any other form of constraint. Significantly, agencies of this form of governmentality are non-state actors – fundamentalist groups, guerrillas, militias – which may, however, be used by government in an indirect manner. In this sense, cultural policing represents a certain privatization of the implementation of law and order. Thus, in Bangladesh, India and Pakistan, writers, painters and filmmakers have been attacked for ‘blasphemy and outraging religion’. They have also faced the wrath of the moral police for interpreting homosexuality and widow remarriage. The state apparatus in these countries has not necessarily protected the victims of this form of social control; in a sense cultural policing has become part of the state’s authority. South Asia thus finds itself in the situation of negotiating permissible boundaries for artistic creativity, whose integrity is now more than ever dependent on the rule of law.

Taking us from cultural constraint to cultural change, Zala Volcic explores ‘The Struggle to Express, Create and Represent in the Balkans’. How have peoples in the countries of the former Yugoslavia managed to symbolize the subsumption of politics to popular culture? Where once the landscape bristled with statues of political heroes and military leaders, now a new breed of statuary has emerged in the form of a bronzed homage to icons of the global pop culture: Bruce Lee, Bob Marley, Rocky, etc. Rather than dismiss these often kitsch sculptures as symbols of the victory of commercial culture at ‘the end of history’, Volcic sees them as evidence of a particular kind of cultural expression, creating *bricolage* in a region still searching for a twenty-first century sense of identity. What we are witnessing, the author suggests, is a global diffusion and a local creative appropriation of popular culture. At the same time, and taking a cue from geographers, she analyses the importance of various sites of mourning and remembering, exploring how new monuments are being built, how new holidays and ceremonies are being introduced, how new creative symbols are being developed, and how new hybrid identities are emerging.

Another general question is that of how certain discourses of creativity and culture become globalized. Geographer Lily Kong’s ‘Globalizing Discourses and the Implications for Local’ asks how the notions of ‘creative economy’ and ‘global city’ get diffused and circulated across the world. She is concerned in particular with two key elements of these discourses: the development of creative industry clusters and the attraction of the ‘creative class’ as residents. She asks how these Western European notions (cf. our Introduction to *The Cultural Economy* volume in 2008) have migrated into contexts which are generally quite different from their origins, and the implications of their importation for local creative cultural work. She examines the ways in which monumentality constitutes symbolic capital for the global city, evidenced, for example, in the development of urban mega projects, and interrogates the accumulation of cultural capital through the construction of a large-scale cultural infrastructure in the East Asian cities she observes. The global city, it is believed, must endow itself with cultural institutions such as museums, theatres and libraries, in order to support cultural activities, to exude cultural ambience, and to develop cultural ‘ballast’. In the cities Kong has observed, as the creative class component of creative economy discourse and the monumental component of global city discourse intersect, the development of indigenous creative cultural work actually takes a back seat.

**Genres and Issues**

Peter Tschmuck’s exploration of creativity in the music industry opens the *Genres and Issues*
section both because it represents another ‘take’ on the creative industries discourse and because it also anchors the creative act in its broader political economy context. The history of the music industry since its emergence in the late nineteenth century reveals a business cycle in which different configurations – from tight oligopolies to highly competitive markets – correspond to different degrees of creative output. While during oligopolistic phases more or less one music style (Swing in the 1940s or superstar-pop in the 1990s) dominates the scene, in more competitive phases such as we are experiencing today there is a great diversity of music expressions. Tschmuck explores the interrelationship between changing industry structure and changing creative expression, and uses this to generate a model of innovation and creativity. He also explicates the new network of production, distribution and reception that dominates the music industry today, reconfiguring the relationships between artists, record labels, music publishers, concert promoters, property rights agencies, etc.

In ‘Creative Communities and Emerging Networks’, Clayton Campbell, a practising artist and pioneer of the global artists’ residency movement, reveals analogous transformations in the not-for-profit arts sector, as he examines a range of networks and ‘creative communities’ founded by artists, and discusses how their formation is informed by artist practice. The ‘divergent thinking’ that forms a cornerstone of artistic creativity engages globalization in imaginative ways, as these alternative artist spaces construct new forms of international collaborations and partnerships. Campbell provides ‘snapshots’ of such alternative art centres and networks that take a holistic view of global thinking, share a common concern for social justice, and seek to replace the global models of market capitalism with the global principles of community and inclusion. Reading globalization from the vantage point of the creative artist, the chapter presents examples of how artists themselves are providing innovative templates for interaction, stimulated by the propensity in contemporary art-making towards collaboration and team building. These are communities and networks informed by the direct practice of the artist, and they are stimulating the growth of new kinds of inter-cultural connection.

Different sorts of ‘creative spaces’ are explored by Canadian scholars Nancy Duxbury and Catherine Murray. What are the forces structuring those sites which appear to foster new types of collaboration between and among individual creative acts? In these creative spaces the design of place, contextualization and aesthetics of space all have a strong bearing on creativity and innovation. This chapter outlines the conceptual underpinnings of creative spaces as physical, embedded places where creative production, exhibition and consumption occur. Their scale can range from the global hierarchy of cities, their emergent rivals and the satellite communities or cracks at the margins and boundaries of systems, to the sub-city-scale hubs and particular places of connection in which global and local flows of creativity and innovation mix and are facilitated. The chapter examines a knowledge production process consisting of ideas (embedded intelligences and imagination), planning (patterns of involvement and intervention), and policy (integration). The authors argue for a ‘cultural ecology’ that is constructivist, holistic, and based on both physical and social infrastructure. They argue that creative space-making as a policy sub-field must more adequately incorporate issues of locality, sociality, cultural diversity, and equity while bridging disparate professional vocabularies or grammars of space.

Translation is central to understanding how cultural expression travels and is transformed. While much critiquing of the globalization of literature focuses on the hegemony – and homogenizing tendencies – of the English language, Stefan Helgesson’s close comparative study of actual translation patterns tells a different story. Taking the Mozambican writer Mia Couto’s work as its main example, this chapter on literary hybrids and the circuits of translation shows how each translation may bring different meanings and emphases to emerge. Even Couto’s own writerly practice, with its hybridized language, can be read as a translation of sorts that addresses the consequences of an earlier globalization, i.e. colonialism. Hence, translation functions creatively and sometimes critically at many levels of a ‘globalized’ literature.

Digital culture is a ‘brave new world’ in the making, explored in this volume by the Brazilian dancer and performance theorist Ivani Santana, who discusses the reconfigurations of cultural expressions emerging as a result of the intertwining of visual and digital culture. Santana illustrates her argument with her personal experience of telematics, deployed in order to stage a dance spectacle with
dancers and musicians in three different Brazilian cities: dance in Salvador and Brasilia, music in João Pessoa. In Brasilia the public watched the spectacle in a theatre where some dancers interacted with (the image) of their colleagues located in Salvador. While the public was present in Brasilia, the space in Salvador was configured as the studio of an 'intelligent stage'. The image of the video-scenography was processed in real time; the result on the Internet was the sum of these layers of images.

Creativity in fashion is so spectacularly at the forefront these days that our volume would be incomplete without an exploration of this domain. Mo Tomaney and Julie Thomas do not merely tread celebratory ground, however, for their concern in the ‘Fashion and Ethics’ chapter is to raise key ethical debates relating to the production and consumption of fashion and textiles in the context of fashion as a global industry. Fashion, by its nature and definition, gives clothing a status that represents more than just protection from the elements or modesty; rather, it is a vehicle for self-definition, a sophisticated form of self-expression that touches most people, while at its most expressive, clothing and fashion can be used as a creative instrument that emulates or becomes artistry or performance. The consumption of clothing is universal; however, the way people consume fashion is not. The authors also evoke possible new models for creative practice and fashion consumption in relation to craftsmanship, ‘slow fashion’, recycling, the second-hand clothing trade, and the clothing industry.

There is an interface between organizational creativity and innovation and the cultural sector. Private foundations have long claimed the privilege of more creative ways of working. In ‘Philanthropy and the Promotion of Cultural Expression’, Diana Leat addresses these claims, as she discusses the role of philanthropy in cultural expression, creativity and innovation. This interplay in the context of globalization is more complex than it might first appear. Foundations are indeed subject to global homogenizing trends in the way in which they work – their standards and processes – but that this does not (yet) necessarily imply a similar homogeneity in what they fund. While some philanthropic giving reflects homogenizing trends there are at least four factors that limit these: the variety of philanthropic structures; real and imagined legal restrictions restricting global reach; a variety of approaches and purposes in funding artistic and cultural expression; and the resistant creativity of, in particular, endowed foundations. In point of fact, foundations act as small but significant buffers against the centralizing tendencies of the global art and media markets; sources of both innovation and preservation, independent of the market; forces for increased democratization, access to and recognition of artistic and cultural expression and forms; and bridge-builders between traditions and cultures, and between competing frameworks for the evaluation and legitimation of the value of artistic endeavour.

Without straying too far from artistry, our core concern, we have chosen to highlight broader forms of expressive social behaviour by asking the Mexican cognitive scientist digital researcher Eugenio Tisselli to explore the ways in which digital social networks can be seen as ‘strategies of the imagination’ – his chapter’s title. These now pervasive networks offer tools enabling millions of users to publish online all types of content and personal information. Making ‘friends’ on these networks is as simple as pointing and clicking. Yet the participative facade of these online applications conceals a set of disciplining technologies for contemporary capitalism, he argues, where the apparent excess of socialization really stands for the multiplication of weak and disengaged relationships. His chapter explores how the standard modes of operation of digital networks can be and are being overridden through appropriation, and how this appropriation can lead to socially relevant innovation and change. An example is zexe.net: a project in which digital networks and technologies are appropriated and used by marginalized communities to speak out and raise public awareness about their specific issues.

Part I is brought to a close by Guest Editor Chris Waterman, a professional double-bass player and ethnomusicologist, currently Dean of the School of the Arts and Architecture at the University of California at Los Angeles (UCLA). His own chapter is based on a set of vignettes reflecting different types of engagements between popular cultural expression and globalization processes. These range from a comedy/music group in pre-World War II Japan and their pastiche of American popular culture, to community musicians in rural Peru inserting commentary on 9/11 in their locally grounded creativity, and to a Yoruba taxi driver’s intense emotional identification with the power of
the praise poems sung at his father’s funeral. For Waterman, all three examples testify to the prosthetic power of the many forms of cultural expression that cut across the local and the global, occupying the interstitial spaces, the in-between, and also challenging the established categories of cultural hierarchies and institutions.

These expressive forms, as well as all those discussed by the contributors to this volume, are living testimony to the ways in which cultures, instead of being taken as fixed essences, are lived and experienced as ‘worldly, productive sites of crossing: complex unfinished paths between local and global attachments’ (Clifford, 1998: 362, 365). These are the routes of a ‘discrepant cosmopolitanism’ that ‘gives us a way of perceiving, and valuing, different forms of encounter, negotiation, and multiple affiliation in the place of simple difference’. Indeed it is these pathways of creative expression that challenge those global scripts of the culture concept itself, understood both as ‘ways of life’ and as ‘arts and heritage’, those conflated understandings that, as we observed in our Introduction to the inaugural volume of this Series, have generated such a range of expectations, anxieties and illusions across the world. The expectations are tied to what Stuart Hall (1997) has called the ‘centrality of culture’. The anxieties arise from its frequent abuse, while the illusions are the result of overblown visions, of simplifications that are reducive, and readings that are instrumental. We can only reiterate our conviction that the expectations can be justified, the anxieties allayed and the illusions dispelled by the patient and methodical marshalling of evidence in informed and conceptually sensitive ways. It is our hope that this volume in its turn will contribute meaningfully to this task.

Notes

1 The theme for the 2010 volume is ‘heritage, memory, identity’ of cultural policy and in 2011 the fifth volume of the Series will tackle the topic.
2 As O’Connor also observes, though, most traditional notions of art also emphasized skill, craftsmanship, balance, harmony, the golden mean, the middle way. All are qualities which tend to be excluded from this new use of creativity. (2007: 32).
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