Creative Industry: Cultural Production or Cultural Control?
A Critical Policy Analysis of UK Creative Industries Policy Documents

Shuao Lin[1]

[1]*Shuao Lin Cardiff University*

Corresponding author Shuao Lin Email:linshuao123@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Since the British government issued the first creative industries mapping document in 1998, the creative industry has gradually become one of the pillars of the British economy from an emerging industry. This industry is succeeding in turning art and culture into commodities. The successful development of the creative industry cannot be separated from the support of government policies. In order to analyse the role of the British government in the development process and the planning of the creative industry. The first section of this article will review current literature on the topic of the creative industries. The second section will introduce the methodology of this article derived from Adorno and Horkheimer's culture industry, along with Tony Bennett's cultural policy study to analyse the UK's creative industries policy documents. The final part of this paper will take this method to critically analyse the creative industries policy documents released by the British government. In the creative industry, the British government adopts a kind of soft control, which indirectly controls the industry by cultivating creative talents. The result of such soft control is to turn culture more profitable while inducing creativity into the economic process.

Keywords: Creative industries, Policy analysis, Cultural studies, The culture industry

1. INTRODUCTION

In 1998, the British government released the first creative industry mapping document, which provided the first definition of the creative industry, the components of the creative industries and the government's evaluation of it. After the document was published, the creative industry had grown rapidly and even become one of the most important economic sectors of the whole country. Policy support from the British government is one of the biggest significant reasons for the success of the creative industry. The UK government plays an essential role during the development of the creative industry. The British government had released several policies to encourage and help the development of the creative industry since the first mapping document in 1998. There is a need to critically examine these creative industry policy documents and think about the impact of these policies on the industry and society. The creative industry may be approached as a way of cultural administration to manage the output of cultural products. When we

consider the effects of these policies on the creative industry and the production of cultural products, we could find that it seems that the creative industry is commercialising culture and transforming art and culture into commodities in its own ways. When thinking about the commercialisation and industrialisation of culture and art, the concept of the culture industry is an essential theoretical approach.

Adorno and Horkheimer framed out the theory of culture industry in their article, "culture industry, culture as mass deception" in the early 20th century. Adorno and Horkheimer emphasised the impact of the commercialisation of cultural products on the society and the masses, and likened cultural production as an industry rather than exist as a real industry. Conversely, the creative industry is a grouping of real industries organised by the governments' policy. Therefore, the comparison between culture and creative industry in this paper is not to compare them as two different industries, but to take the culture industry as a theoretical basis and try to critically analyse the creative industry policy in the

UK. What worth notice is that the practice of commercialising culture in the culture industry is considered negative, while in the creative industry, it seems to be positive to commercialise culture production by policy design because they can bring huge economic profits.

When analysing the creative industry through the culture industry, we need to take into account the historical limitations of this analysis. The culture industry was proposed in the first half of the 20th century, while the creative industry was advocated in the 1990s. During decades, the industrial age had gradually turned into the post-industrial age. It is precisely because the term culture industry was put forward in the industrial era that the core of product manufacturing in is manufacturing. By contrast, the creative industry was popular in the post-industrial era, focusing on the use of digital technology and the design of products. The research question here is that what kind of control is the UK government policy operating during the development of creative industry? Is there any relationship between UK government's control of cultural production with Adorno and Horkheimer's notion of the culture industry?

In addition, Adorno and Horkheimer did not mention the role of the government and policy support during the cultural production in their article, which was at the heart of the development and growth of the creative industry. However, Adorno proposed his view on culture administration, which emphasised the inextricable relationship between the government and the producers of cultural products. On the side of analysing policy texts, Tony Bennett's cultural policy research can support this aspect. Bennett emphasises the study of cultural texts from top to bottom and the importance of policy research in the cultural field. Therefore, I will combine Adorno and Bennett's approach to analyse the policy document of the creative industry. Although there are distinctions between Bennett and Adorno in the view of cultural administration, I will synthesise their ideas to conduct an analysis to find a more suitable way to analyse the creative industry policy.

In section 1, I will review some previous works from different perspectives on the creative industry by different scholars to look at how different scholars are considering the effects and recent progress brought by the creative industry. In section 2, I will introduce my theory and methodology in the paper, of conducting critical cultural policy research by combing Adorno and Horkheimer's theory of the culture industry with Tony Bennett's method of cultural policy study. In section 3, I will conduct the analysis by analysing the creative industries policy document through the framework described above. The main part of the analysis will discuss how the cultivation of creative talents by the British government achieves "soft control" to the whole creative industry. Furthermore, this paper will try to find the relationship between the creative industry and the culture industry by exploring the attitudes of the two terms towards economic profit and their views on cultural output.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Since the first mapping document was published by DCMS in the 1990s, there were numbers of debates around the creative industry and other related issues. Some scholars were trying to understand the economic structure of the creative industry from the post-industrial era. At the same time, some others had studied the policies of the New Labour government to explore the incentive effect of the policies on the creative industry. In addition to the creative industry, there were many other terms related to creativity, such as the creative economy and creative labour. Moreover, some researches tried to combine the creative industry with an early term, the culture industry.

Some scholars argued that the creative industry is the product of the post-industrial era. Flew and Cunningham [14] argued that, the creative industry had been established as a central plank of the post-industrial economy. Hartley et al. [18] also viewed the creative industry as a model of post-industrial development coupled with urban regeneration. Similar to Hartley et al. [18], Blythe [7] noted the role of creative industries in urban regeneration and discussed the role of digital technology and art in the creation of creative original content. Creative industries are less dependent on manufacturing than those that developed in the industrial era. Hartley et al. [18] noticed that the products are normally high value-added services and manufactured goods. Chris Gibson and Andrew Warren's description of Australia's surf industry can be an example to support this view. The emphasis was on intellectual property and immaterial design processes, not the physical manufacture of goods. Many proponents of creative industries policy assumed that the physical manufacture of products was an uncreative and repetitive task best undertaken elsewhere (Gibson and Warren [16]).

In other words, the products of creative industries sell value-added products such as creativity or technology to consumers, more like a service industry than the manufacturing industry. Some scholars view the creative economy as an "experience economy" that could well support this idea (Andersson and Andersson [4]; Pine and Gilmore [27]). This idea suggests that the creative industries make profits by selling a special experience to the public. Blythe's [7] idea of the production process in the creative industry is mainly from the aspect of intellectual property. Blythe mentioned that "Intellectual copyright is a complex and crucial issue for the creative industries precisely because its products are reproductions, not productions", and that the means

of reproduction are in the hands of the public, rather than wholly controlled by capital (Blythe [7]). This can be distinguished from the culture industry, in which the capital controls the means of production, while the public and the producers of cultural products are hard to provide contributions in the production of cultural products.

When the topic comes to creativity, several other concepts have been researched, and most of them are related to the creative industry, such as the creative economy. Howkins [20] pointed out the pivotal position of the creative economy in contemporary society and believed that what happened in the creative economy is a way of turning unique ideas and art into commodities. In addition, Markusen et al. [23] emphasised the significance of policymakers and the cultural policy in the creative economy. Another term related to the "creative" is the creative labour, which refers to the employee who works in the creative fields. There has been some research on the relationship between the creative labour and those large corporations, as well as the employment and economic income generated by this group (McKinlay [25]; Smith and McKinlay [30]). Some of the debate centres on how governments, or corporations, directly or indirectly control these workers to achieve their goals; one of the indirect methods is through "soft control". Hartley et al. [18]argued that "The challenge for the creative industries is how to align creative talent to organisational goals through the exercise of "soft control" rather than exerting traditional managerial imperatives". The way large creative sectors achieve soft control through manipulating creative workers' desire for self-fulfilling (Hartley et al. [18]). In this article, soft control upon creative talents will be the key issue of my analysis. However, different from the argument of Hartley et al. [18], in this article, the soft control I am thinking about is imposed by the government on creative talents.

Moreover, the creative class is another key term strongly related to the creative industry. Florida [15]coined the term and separated the creative class into the "super-creative core" and "creative professionals". The former take charge of "the highest order of creative work", which includes the IT entrepreneurs, creative designers and creative producers, and the primary job function of this group is to be creative and innovative. The latter is a much larger group: "These professionals are the classic knowledge-based workers and include those working in health care, business and finance, the legal sector, and education". This group of people is responsible for turning those creative ideas into reality through their professional skills. Other similar terms, like the creative cities, are also widely argued during the rise of the creative industry (Hall [17]).

When we are studying the creative industry in the UK on a national level, a term called "Creative Britain" is frequently mentioned as a slogan of the New Labour government in the UK. It is a way to transform the cultural production into a political discourse of neo-liberalism. Hewison [19] introduced the emphasis of "creativity" as propaganda of New Labour government:

"Nonetheless, the frequency with which "Create", "Creative" and "Creativity" in the titles of official documents between 1997 and 2010 reveals the strategic aim of the Blair – Brown years. The rhetoric of "creativity" was New Labour's binding cultural theme".

Hewison [19] also argued that the Labour government believed that creativity is democratic, because "everyone is creative". Therefore, "Creative Britain" is a way of bringing democracy into the culture, which is consistent with the neoliberalism, "but New Labour' democracy was the democracy of the market, for the ideological hegemony of neo-liberal economic values under Mrs Thatcher survived rebranding by New Labour" (Hewison [19]). Flew and Cunningham also argued the creative industry from the aspect of neoliberalism. Since the 1980s, we had been an age of "neoliberal-globalisation" or "neoliberal-capitalism", and the creative industry is the product of this era (Flew and Cunningham [14]). As a brief conclusion, the New Labour government's policy moved both "Culture" and "Creativity" closer to the centre of public consciousness (Hewison [19]), which created a substantial and successful cultural infrastructure.

When the study of cultural production and the creative industry is combined with the field of cultural studies, some scholars compare it with the concept of the culture industry proposed by the Frankfurt School. Negus [26] mentioned that some nations and organisations are trying to set up an agenda to intervene in cultural production through policy. This thinking is highly influenced by Adorno and Horkheimer's analysis regarding the culture industry. Negus [26] has also argued that the research on the creative production should take a broader perspective rather than be limited to the industry itself or the capitalist industrial framework emphasised by the culture industry (Negus [26]). Raunig [28] pointed out a difference between the culture and the creative industry that, compared with the mass deception in the culture industry, there was massive self-deception derived from self-privatisation among the actors in the creative industry. Kong's study focused more on the policy study, "The shift from "culture industry" to "cultural industries" had been followed by the emergence of the concept of "creative industries," which was led by a policy shift from cultural to creative industries" (Kong [21]).

Overall, a large number of articles and research on the creative industry are based on the economic benefits

brought by the creative industry and the structure of the industry itself. In addition, some articles on the creative industry analyse the impact of government policy on the industry and the promotion effect. In addition, the impact of these policies on cultural output is another topic worth studying. The approach in this study will combine the characteristics of these studies to analyse the creative industry by looking at the concept of the culture industry and policy study together in the following section.

3. THEORY AND METHODOLOGY

3.1. The culture industry by Adorno and Horkheimer

The concept of the culture industry is a critical theoretical theory of the Frankfurt school put forward in the early stage of cultural studies. Theodor W. Adorno and Max Horkheimer introduced this term in their work The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception. They put together two words that are hard to relate: culture and industry. It is worth noting that Adorno and Horkheimer did not really think of culture as an industry. They just think that the production of cultural products is just like traditional manufacturing. In the article, Adorno and Horkheimer sharply criticised the rapid development of the entertainment industry in the USA by evaluating some negative influences brought by this trend. They also mentioned the impact of the combination of mass production and mass media on the society of cultural products.

The two authors took entertainment industries like the growing movie industry as examples to criticise the negative effects brought by the commercialisation of culture. They argued that "Film and radio no longer need to present themselves as art, the truth that they are nothing but business is used as an ideology to legitimise the trash they intentionally produce" (Adorno and Horkhemier [3]). In their view, the culture industry is a kind of infringement on art itself, because it is not in the form of a work of art, but a cultural product, in other words, a commodity. When the priority aim of an item is its commercial value, the artistic quality of the product will be dramatically reduced or even became "rubbish" as Adorno and Horkheimer argued.

On the other hand, Adorno and Horkheimer also discussed the culture industry from the aspect of technology, the technological development making mass production of cultural products possible (Adorno and Horkhemier [3]). Adorno and Horkhemier[3] believed that artistic products that can be produced over and over again must be in low taste. As they put forward the concept of the culture industry, as an industry, the primary goal is to make profits. To maximise profits, the artistic value of cultural goods would be destructed, which will greatly hit the creative thinking of real artists. Besides that, "the culture industry endlessly cheats its

consumers out of what it endlessly promises" (Adorno and Horkhemier [3]). For Adorno and Horkheimer, the essences of those goods produced by the culture industry are full of hypocrisy. These products deceive consumers by providing false promises and stimulating entertainment to break their will to resist; numb their nerves, and finally, control their thinking. Under the influence of modern industrial civilisation, artistic works lost their original artistic quality and became the entertainment of the masses. People did not have to pay a high price for entertainment. People could forget the pain brought by the real society, and people will immerse themselves in the fake world created by entertainment and choose to escape from reality.

As the theoretical basis of this paper, the concept of the culture industry provides a key reference for the later argument on the creative industry. In the term culture industry used by Adorno and Horkheimer, the "industry" is a negative connotation to denote the commercialisation of art and culture. Which would not only destroy the essence of culture but also bring negative effects to the public. Different from the culture industry, "industry" proposed by creative industries policy documents is a positive connotation. In that way, how does government administration work in post-industrial society is what this paper will discuss.

3.2. Adorno's view on culture administration

Adorno and Horkheimer did not mention the role of the state or the government in their analysis of the culture industry. Adorno discussed the relationship between government and culture in another article about culture administration. This text was a reflection on Marxism in relation to Weber's idea, that culture and administration are tied up together, no matter how contradictory it might be. Adorno [1] argued that "The dialectic of culture and administration nowhere expresses the sacrosanct irrationality of culture so clearly as in the continually growing alienation of administration from culture". For those things administrated, they were eventually subsumed, rather than comprehended. Adorno considered that the flaw of this idea is the gap between the absolute purpose of culture and the absolute rationality of administration. The aim of administration is just management, which eliminated the subjective duty and individual will. On the other hand, the purpose of culture was much pure and higher than that of administration. The antagonism between them was the reason for Adorno's sense of distortion between culture and administration. However, while criticising the antagonistic relationship between culture and administration, Adorno also emphasised the inevitable relationship between them.

He suggested that calls for those cultural creators to keep the distance from the administration, or even withdraw from it, are meaningless. Not only would this

deprive them of the possibility of earning a living, but also of every effect, every contact between work of art and society (Adorno [1]). Even though artists, or creators, may denounce official administrations, they actually rely on official funding and support for their creations. If we look around the creative industry, a large part of the British government's policy towards the creative industry is to cultivate and support creative talents, which have invested a lot of experience and planning in training schemes. Therefore, the policymakers are willing to establish a close relationship with those creative talents, and the creative talents themselves also relies heavily on the skills those schemes teach. It might be tempting to ask whether the creative industry is actually a form of culture administration which could be an appropriate way to evaluate the British government's strong support for creative talents.

3.3. Tony Bennett＇s view on cultural policy study

Cultural administration and policy are closely tied together, Tony Bennett while taking issue with Adorno, Bennett draws attention to policy aspects of culture. Bennett argued that cultural studies should not only stay at the traditional theoretical, critical level but should turn to those specific issues, like cultural administration and cultural policy. Bennett's view firstly argued that Adorno's perspective had certain historical limitations. Adorno's discussion is actually a puff piece of this form of artistic administrations because they had "successfully challenged over the postwar period because of the aesthetic, and therefore social, bias they entail" (Bennett [5]). Simultaneously at the same time, Bennett has criticised Adorno's notion of the culture industry. Adorno sharply criticised the rapid development of the entertainment industry in the USA, and evaluate some negative influences brought by this trend. By contrast, Bennett [5] deemed that nowadays, "we can absolutely treat culture as an industry, and the aesthetic disposition is only a particular market segment within the industry".

Besides criticising Adorno's view, Bennett also puts forward his own theories on cultural policy and administration. A key point in his view is the distinctions between "bottom-up" approach and "top-down" approach,

In the 'bottom-up' approach, policy is 'understood in terms of its consequences and outcomes, and in terms of the actions of those affected by it, as they exert some measure of influence upon the process' (O'Regan 1992: 409). The 'top-down' approach, by contrast, recommends that cultural studies 'should reorient its concerns so as to coincide with top-down programs and public procedures, become bureaucratically and administratively minded in the process' (412) (Bennett [5]).

Bennett [5] believed that bottom-up politics often generated and depended on top-down forms of government. According to Bennett, the proposition of introducing administration is to guide cultural studies to the society, from textual metaphysics to the research of social text. We should pay attention to social texts, that is, to how texts are structured in historical changes that make them sources of many different meanings, depending on how texts take positions in social relations (Bennett and Huang [6]). Therefore, in this paper, the cultural and social texts I choose to analyse are those creative industry policy documents launched by the British government.

Bennett's approach is relatively different from Adorno's approach. Tony Bennett's argument about the relationship between culture and society is highly influenced by Gramsci and Foucault. Gramsci's view on power lead Bennett to realise that cultural studies were completely limited to the macro field of ideological criticism, and it was difficult to clarify the logic of power operation, so he had to go deep into the micro cultural reality (Li [22]). On the other hand, Bennett takes Foucault's productive notion of power to explore precisely how the rationality of modern states realises the political and cultural practice of power operations (Li [22]). In general, a part of Bennett's view is that the top-down approach is a key issue while doing cultural study; and the impact of culture on society is another significant issue.

Although there are some distinctions between Adorno and Bennett's view on the cultural study, it is still possible for them to work together for analysing the creative industry. In the following discussion, I will take the notion of the culture industry as a theoretical approach to thinking about the creative industry. Additionally, I will also draw lessons from Adorno's views on the connections between the government and artists to think about the relationship between the British government and creative labours in the creative industry. On the other hand, this paper will take the top-down approach that Tony Bennett advocates for analysing the creative industry; through the analysis of the policy document to analyse the British government's planning for the creative industry.

3.4. Critical Policy Study, a combination of Adorno＇s critical approach and Bennett＇s policy study approach

The method I will develop to analyse the creative industry is by attempting to reconcile the two theories. It starts with the top-down approach that Bennett suggests. I will consider the role of creative industries in the UK economy as a whole. In order to analyse how the people who work for the creative industry, that is, creative labour, become subjected to a form of "soft control" (Hartley et al. [18]), thus affecting the output of cultural products.

While considering the term from top to bottom, I will also consider the impact of this policy support on the society and industry from Adorno's perspective of the culture industry. Which is aimed at thinking about whether the creative industry can be understood in terms of the culture industry in the contemporary era. More precisely, whether they commercialise art in the same way and for the same purpose. I will consider policy papers as cultural texts by conducting an analysis of them through the framework I have described. The principle policy paper I choose to analyse are mainly published by the New Labour government, which are two mapping documents [10] [11] and Creative Britain: New talents for new economy, 2008 (Creative Britain document). I will read these documents through reference to Adorno and Horkheimer's cultural theory and Bennett's cultural policy study to figure our what is the role of government, policy in cultural production in relation to the market.

4. ANALYSIS

4.1. *A brief introduction of the creative industry*

In this section, I will analysis the difference between this new approach (Critical Policy Study) and Adorno and Horkheimer's approach. The concept of the creative industry emerged in the 1990s since the Australian government put forward an idea to turn Australia into a "Creative Nation". A few years later, in 1997, the British New Labour government set up a particular research group Department for Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), in order to set the creative industry as the focus for the revitalisation of the British economy. Unlike Adorno and Horkheimer's culture industry, in the creative industry, the "industry" is a positive connotation, which is the effort made by the British government for the better industrialisation of art and culture. Afterwards, the first creative industry mapping document was released by DCMS in 1998, which was an attempt to measure the economic contribution of the creative industries in the UK. The document provided the first definition of the creative industries as "those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent which have a potential for job and wealth creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property" (DCMS [10]). Additionally, the 1998 mapping document also provided a list of industries covered by the creative industry, which includes advertising, antiques, architecture, crafts, design, fashion, film, leisure software, music, performing arts, publishing, and television and radio. There is much discussion about the Creative industries mapping document 1998, especially towards the list of industries covered by the creative industry made by DCMS. Stuart Cunningham [9] noted that "there is a rather arbitrary exclusivity in the list, for example, the heritage sector is omitted despite its economic, creative and cultural characteristics being at least, if not more, robust than some of the sectors included". Smith

argued this point from the perspective of the UK government. The reason why those industries are covered in the list of creative industries is that when the policymakers are reformulating culture policy, the first thing they considered is whether the sectors included are likely to produce employment and wealth in the future (Smith [29]).

The culture industry is a concept proposed in the industrial age when the "industry" emphasised the large-scale and mass production of products. Adorno and Horkheimer [3]'s discussion believe that mass production of cultural products will enable the capital's control over people's thought. Conversely, the creative industry is a concept put forward in the post-industrial era, when the creative industry stresses are no longer just the mass production of products. Creative industries earn profit through the added value of the product, uniqueness, in other words, creativity, which is given by those creative labours. In the creative industry, creative producers are encouraged to become enterprisers who directly commercialise art for the market. The cultural products produced by the creative industry are no longer simple culture or art, but commodities. According to this policy, creativity becomes a means to turn culture and art into commodities, and the artists themselves are the ones who directly commercialise them.

However, there is an absolute difference between the two in the commercialisation of art, and they even held two opposite views. Adorno's main criticism of the culture industry is that the commercialisation of culture will lead to impoverishment. Inversely, the creative industry directly considers culture as a means to make profits, and it can even be seen as an intermediary to transform culture into commodities.

When we are studying how does the British government achieve successful control about the creative industry, this text could be helpful. The former UK prime minister Gordon Brown once declared this point in 2008,

*So this strategy is intended to help more people discover and develop their talents and to use those talents to build a dynamic and vibrant society, providing entertainment alongside opportunity.... But it is just a start: the government can provide the framework, but we must rely on our country's talent and the vision and commitment of all those working in the field if we are to build an even more creative Britain (*DCMS [12]*).*

From this text, we may note that the core of the development of creative industries is not the direct control from the government, but to establish a framework to ensure the development of the creative industry is within the range envisaged by the government. The real key of the creative industry is creative talents under this framework. Therefore, when we think about the creative industry in the UK, it is crucial to try to analyse the effects of the policies that the UK government

has put in place for creative talents. The role played by the government in the production of cultural products is not included in Adorno and Horkheimer's analysis of the culture industry. How does the British government achieve control of the whole industry through training creative talents? This will be the focus of the discussion in the following part.

4.2. How does the UK government achieve "soft control" through creative industries policy

When the idea turns to soft control, Hartley et al.'s [18]discussion considered more about the control that companies control over creative talents. I will analyse cultural control through government policies. After the first mapping document was published in 1998, the British government started paying more attention to the development of the creative industries through the support of the policy. A few years after the first mapping document was released in 1998, DCMS published another mapping document in 2001. This document summarises the development of the creative industry from 1998 to 2001, and puts forward some expectations for the development of the creative industry,

Today, the term is more widely used and understood; in a knowledge economy the importance of these industries to national wealth is more commonly recognised; and the special needs of these industries are reflected more in policy development at national, regional, and sub-regional levels. The creative industries have moved from the fringes to the mainstream. (DCMS [11])

The creative industries mapping document in 2001 sets out a vision for the future of the creative industries as a central driver of the British economy, which had become a significant goal of creative industry policies. The production and marketing of cultural products have gradually become a more valuable economic source than traditional manufacturing. However, cultural products cannot obtain such a great commercial benefit without the commercialisation of culture. The emphasis of the creative industry is no longer on industrialised and standardised production, but on the creativity of the product itself, which is created by the employees who directly produce the product. Consequently, making reasonable use of creativity to obtain wealth is the key to the success of the creative industries policy.

In 2008, the DCMS published a document called, Creative Britain: new talents for the new economy, which provides us with an overview of the UK government's plans and goals for fostering creative talents and at the same time sets out the UK government's goals and views on the future of the creative industries again, "the creative industries must move from the margins to the mainstream of economic and policy thinking" (DCMS [12]).

We can see that the British government has a grand plan for the future of the creative industries. The creative industries policy is trying to combine the culture and economy through making cultural production more profitable, and making economic production more creativily driven. It aims to develop creative industries into the mainstream or even a pillar industry of the UK economy. And the way that the British government mentioned in this document is to develop the creative industry through improving the employment of the creative industries and significantly increasing the training of personnel working in creative industries,

The document seeks to provide our creative industries with an unrivalled pool of talent to draw on and the same formal, structural support associated with other industries, such as assistance with infrastructure and skills development...The vision is of a Britain in ten years' time where the local economies in our biggest cities are driven by creativity, where there is a much-expanded range of creative job opportunities in every region with clear routes into creative careers from local schools and colleges, and where every young person believes they have a real choice to use their talents in a creative capacity (DCMS [12]).

We can note that the British government hopes to cultivate a large number of creative talents to work in the creative industry. The program for cultivating creative talents is a very detailed program, "The journey mapped out in this plan covers the whole creative process from the grassroots to the global marketplace" (DCMS [12]). There are two types of approaches to the development of creative industries mentioned in this document. The first approach is through education, "provide more opportunities for the youth to develop creative talents at school" (DCMS [12]). These include developing children's creative skills and expanding the recruitment of apprentices. Secondly, it is expected to provide more organised pathways to creative careers. The way to do this is to provide more jobs, supporting the collaboration between schools, further and higher education through constructing a new "academic hub", where people aged between 14 and 25 could train their creative skills(DCMS [12]).

From those strategies, we could see that the UK government is creating more creative talents on purpose. So, what is the purpose of the UK government for this? Promoting the cultivating of the creative talents may be a way for the UK government to "soft control" (Hartley et al. [18]) the creative industry. Especially in the creative industry, the government does not directly control or manipulate the production of creative products but indirectly realises soft control of the industry by cultivating creative talents.

Here are some details about the way and the purpose for the UK government cultivates creative talents, especially those children,

The aim will be for young people to be supported, better informed and guided through each stage of their development from the cultural provision in and out of school for children to better and broader careers advice through initiatives like Creative Choices, and mentoring, talent scouting and national skills camps for young people (DCMS [12]).

In the creative industry, the means of production are in the hands of creative talents, who themselves become the people who transform culture into commodities, and creative skills are the tools to do that. Blythe [7] argued that "The importance of the creative industries to Arts and Design education is placed within the context of the emphasis on vocationalism by successive UK governments". The British government's training program is to turn the creative skills into working skills as a means to create employment and business value, rather than the artistry of the work itself. In other words, creativity may be conflated with industriousness. These skills are not developed for improving students' artistic taste but for improving their ability to work in the creative field in the future. In this case, creative skills become working skills, and art becomes a means to profit. Drawing and playing music are intended by the British government to be as just a practical skill, which lost the essence of the art itself. When creative skills become working skills, creative products naturally become commodities. It is just like an assembly line worker making a light bulb.

Adorno and Horkheimer [3] believed that cultural products do not need to disguise themselves as art. In the idea of the culture industry, they are complete commodities, which violates the very essence of art. "The truth that they are nothing but business is used as an ideology to legitimise the trash they intentionally produce" (Adorno and Horkheimer [3]). Adorno [2] also argued that "cultural entities typical of the culture industry are no longer also commodities, they are commodities through and through". Creative industries are creating commodities, as a matter of fact. The producers of the product and the policymakers of the creative industry regard creative products as commodities as standard. That is exactly what Adorno is criticising the cultural commodification in the 1940s. The theory of the culture industry shown that capital directly determines the kind of cultural products to be produced rather than the producers of cultural products.

On the other hand, let us turn the topic back to the "soft control" of creative talents. Training scheme of creativity can also be considered as a way to control the creative talents. The creativity skills that students learn from the program are actually policymakers and the

government's view about creativity, which would largely influence the product they produced after being trained. This effect could be more severe for those children under the program. The way the British government cultivates creative talents from an early age is to set up a program called Find Your Talent, which was aimed at cultivating children's creativity from a relatively young age. The program also mentioned that it would "allow every child and young person to develop their creative talent to the full" (DCMS [12]). In my view, this project is an important component of the UK government's soft control over the creative industry. At a very young age, children are taught creative skills and ideas that are not intended to foster creativity or make them more artistic. It is about training children to be the core workforce in the creative industries of their future career life. The creative skills children learnt in the program are actually intended for future employment in the creative industries. Therefore, the creative elements in the works produced by these long-trained creative labours are actually the creative elements defined by the government. In short, the government passes on its ideology to creative labour at an early age by fostering creativity to achieve soft control. Thus, the creative industry may become a profit-making tool, rather than spreading culture and art to the public. What happened in the culture industry is that the industry mimics capitalism to reproduce its ideology. What happened in the creative industry is using the creative output to bolster the economy.

These initiatives have achieved remarkable results, and the creative industry has become a significant economic pillar of the country. According to an official report, in 2015, creative jobs in the UK had increased by 5.1%, while this number in the total jobs of all industries was only 2%. Besides that, the value of services exported by the creative industry approached £20 billion, which accounted for 9% of the number in the whole country in 2014 (DCMS [13]). On the other hand, the vast economic effect brought by the creative industries is also what the British government is trying to measure; the DCMS has produced annual Creative Industries Economic Estimates since 2002, which could be found on the internet (British Council [8]). When it comes to 2016, there were already over 600,000 jobs in London, which was equivalent to 11.9 per cent of total jobs in the city (DCMS [13]).

On the other hand, in the culture industry, one of the most critical parts of the theory of the culture industry is its emphasis on capitalism's control over cultural products and how these products controlled the minds of the masses by indoctrinating them with values, this phenomenon also happening to employees working in the culture industry,

Entertainment is the prolongation of work under late capitalism... It is sought by those who want to escape the mechanised labour process so that they can cope with it again. At the same time, however, mechanisation has

such power over leisure and its happiness, determines so thoroughly the fabrication of entertainment commodities, that the off-duty worker can experience nothing but afterimages of the work process itself (Adorno and Horkhemier [3]).

In order to better understand this opinion, just take film company employees as an example. They work hard for the film company in their daily life; after work, they may choose to go to the cinema to see a film from their company. Even if the workers are disconnected from cultural products while working, they are still affected by those products while resting. In this almost inescapable cycle, capitalists can spread their ideas to them all the time and even control their lives. In short, the culture industry is shackling its employees through the dual control of both products and work. The creative industry may play a similar role in this regard. For those creative labour, while training, producing, and consuming creative products, employees in the creative industry are actually repeatedly instilled in the ideology and values of the creative industry, the commercialisation of culture. The culture generated under this background could become a unique form of culture, which is to treat culture as a commodity and creativity as a means to profit and economic growth. It seems that the creative industry can be regarded as a new version of the culture industry. They are very similar in the ideological aspect, which both maintain control over the cultural products and the labour who work for them. The difference is that the control from the creative industry is not so direct but indirectly distributed by influencing creative talents to condition the cultural products consumed by the public. Overall, the British government＇s control over the creative industry does not limit what kind of cultural products should be produced but is an indirect soft control realized through training creative talents. Creative talents trained through the British government training scheme will produce cultural products with more commercial value to stimulate economic growth. With such cultural output, consumers of these commodities and the society＇s cognition of culture and art will become more commercialised as well, and such cognition will be added to those creative talents who have been trained to form a closed loop.

5. CONCLUSION

The direct comparison between the culture and the creative industry is quite complicated. Firstly, the creative industry and the culture industry were proposed half a century apart, social background and technological development led to Adorno and Horkheimer＇s approach had some historical limitation. Secondly, the culture industry is not really an industry; the writers have just likened the cultural production in the USA as an industry; by contrast, the creative industry actually exists as a real industry. Adorno and Horkheimer used industry

in a pejorative way to say culture is mass-produced and therefore bad, while the creative industries policy is, in contrast trying to make cultural production into a real industry. When we evaluate the creative industry through the concept of the culture industry, we find that some characteristics of the culture industry are shown in the creative industry in some way. What is more interesting is that Adorno＇s sharp criticism of the commercialisation and industrialisation of culture actually exists in the creative industry.

In Adorno and Horkheimer's perception of culture industry, the power of capital directly controls the production of products and imposes its value on cultural products. In the creative industries, the government＇s regulation means to the industry itself is not to directly control the production of the product, but to manipulate the producers of the product through soft control, that is, those creative talents. This special soft control is achieved by training creative labour since they are young. The trained creative talents will use the creative skills learned from the Government＇s training scheme to produce cultural products, and these creative skills will be added to the values of the UK Government. That is, culture and art need to be served by economic growth, so these products are changed from pure works of art to commodities, and the values in this will also affect the people who consume them. Compared with the culture industry in which capital directly implants values into cultural products, the influence of creative industry policies is indirect

From this perspective, in the culture industry, the role who turn culture into commodities (capitalists) becomes that of employees in the creative industry. In the creative industry, it is creative talents; in other words, artists, who turn culture and art into commodities. In the culture industry, the production of cultural products is controlled by capitalists. Therefore, it seems that creative industry policy has turned artists into businessmen.

Although it has been almost a decade since the era of Creative Britain advocated by the New Labour government, the country＇s creative industries still play an essential role in the overall economic development. According to research (Mateos-Garcia [24]), the creative industries are driving the UK economy. Their employment is growing at an average rate of twice that of other industries each year. If growth continues at this rate, it will create close to a million new jobs by 2030. In that way, what are the efforts and policies of the new British government in promoting the development of creative industries, and are there any differences or similarities with the one of New Labour government? This is a topic worth continuing to study.

AUTHORS' CONTRIBUTIONS

Shuao Lin conceived and designed the study under the inspiration and supervision of Asif Ahktar. Besides, the article was written, edited, revised and researched by Shuao Lin alone.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

[1] Adorno, T., 1978. Culture and administration.

[2] Adorno, T., 2000. Culture industry reconsidered. Media Studies, pp.31-37.

[3] Adorno, T. and Horkheimer, M., 2007. The culture industry: Enlightenment as mass deception. Stardom and celebrity: A reader, 34.

[4] Andersson, D.E. and Andersson, Å.E. eds., 2006. The economics of experiences, the arts and entertainment. Edward Elgar Publishing.

[5] Bennett, T., 1992. Putting policy into cultural studies. na.

[6] Bennett, T and Huang, W. 2008 . Another Paradigm of British Cultural Studies —— Academic Autobiography of Tony Bennett. Journal of LuoYang normal university. 2007(4), pp.8-11 .

[7] Blythe, M., 2001. The work of art in the age of digital reproduction: the significance of the creative industries. Journal of Art & Design Education, 20(2), pp.144-150.

[8] Council, B., 2010. Mapping the creative industries: a toolkit. Eri ş im https://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/media/upl oads/files/English_mapping_the_creative_industrie s_a_toolkit_2-2. pdf.

[9] Cunningham, S., 2002. From cultural to creative industries: theory, industry and policy implications. Media International Australia incorporating Culture and Policy, 102(1), pp.54-65.

[10] DCMS Department for culture, media and sport, 1998. Creative industries mapping document 1998.

[11] DCMS Department for culture, media and sport, 2001. Creative industries mapping document 2001.

[12] DCMS Department for culture, media and sport, 2008. Creative Britain: new talents for the new economy.

[13] DCMS Department for culture, media and sport, 2018. Creative industries economic estimates 2016.

[14] Flew, T. and Cunningham, S., 2010. Creative industries after the first decade of debate. The information society, 26(2), pp.113-123.

[15] Florida, R., 2002. The rise of the creative class and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life . GEN, New York: Basic Books.

[16] Gibson, C. and Warren, A., 2018. Creative industries, global restructuring, and new forms of subcultural capitalism: the experience of Australia's surf industry. Australian Geographer, 49(3), pp.455-467.

[17] Hall, P., 2000. Creative cities and economic development. Urban studies, 37(4), pp.639-649.

[18] Hartley, J., Potts, J., Flew, T., Cunningham, S., Keane, M. and Banks, J. eds., 2012. Key concepts in creative industries. Sage.

[19] Hewison, R., 2011. "Creative Britain": myth or monument?. Cultural trends, 20(3-4), pp.235-242.

[20] Howkins, J., 2002. The creative economy: How people make money from ideas. Penguin UK.

[21] Kong, L., 2014. From cultural industries to creative industries and back? Towards clarifying theory and rethinking policy, Inter-Asia Cultural Studies, 15(4), pp.593-607.

[22] Li, Y. 2017. Towards Cultural Governance: The Transformation of Tony Bennett's Cultural Study Theoretical Paradigm. Journal of South China Normal University(Social Science Edition). 2017(3), pp. 168-177+192

[23] Markusen, A., Wassall, G.H., DeNatale, D. and Cohen, R., 2008. Defining the creative economy: Industry and occupational approaches. Economic development quarterly, 22(1), pp.24-45.

[24] Mateos-Garcia, J., Klinger, J. and Stathoulopoulos, K., 2018. ' Creative Nation: How the Creative Industries are Powering the UK's Nations and Regions. London: Nesta.

[25] McKinlay, A. ed., 2009. Creative labour: Working in the creative industries. Palgrave Macmillan.

[26] Negus, K., 2006. Rethinking creative production away from the cultural industries. Media and cultural theory, pp.197-208.

[27] Pine, B.J. and Gilmore, J.H., 1998. The experience economy. Harvard Business Review, 76(6), pp.18-23.

[28] Raunig, G., 2011. Creative industries as mass deception. of creativity, p.191.

[29] Smith, C., 1997. Creative Britain, London: Faber & Faber.

[30] Smith, C. and McKinlay, A., 2009. Creative labour: Content, contract and control. Creative labour: Working in the creative industries, pp.29-50.