

King's College London  
Witness Seminar Transcript:  
*1998 Creative Industries Mapping Document*  
11 December 2018

**Participants:**

Deborah Bull, CBE (Baroness Bull)

Dr Jonathan Gross

Professor Ian Hargreaves, CBE

Janice Hughes, CBE

John Newbigin, OBE

Gail Rebuck, DBE (Baroness Rebuck)

Chris Smith (The Rt Hon Lord Smith) (via pre-recorded video)

## Welcome

**Deborah Bull**

I am going to say hello and welcome, everybody. What a fantastic room we are in. What did you tell me it used to be, Jonathan?

**Jonathan Reekie (Director, Somerset House Trust)**

The Inland Revenue Chairman's office.

**Deborah Bull**

If you wondered where your taxes went, there you go. It is really wonderful to see everybody here for what I know is going to be a very special event. I am going to apologise right now and say that I cannot stay for it, but I am really looking forward to reading the transcript in due course. I am very pleased to welcome you all, not as audience members but as participants – so, just a bit of warning there – in this discussion about the *1998 Creative Industries Mapping Document*, which I think we all recognise now was a key moment in the development of cultural policy not only in the UK but internationally. I am old enough to have taken part in some of those discussions when the whole concept was very new, but the language of the creative industries really has entered all our vocabularies now. Indeed, the academic department, of which Jonathan Gross is a part, in which

this research project sits, is called Culture, Media & Creative Industries, so it is possible that, without that piece of work, the department might not exist, or at least it would certainly have had a different name.

In many ways, this notion of the creative industries has really transformed the language and the landscape of cultural policy and practice and it has changed the nature of the claims that the broadest sector can make to government about its value and its return on investment. Today is an opportunity not just to look backwards but, as it were, to place ourselves back in the late 1990s, which may seem like a halcyon period from the perspective of where we are now, and to revisit that period leading up to the creation of the *Mapping Document* and its subsequent publication.

I hope that this will be a memorable occasion for everybody. Perhaps more importantly, it is a chance to make a significant contribution to the historical record. These witness seminars really are a fantastic way to put down on record that period before the internet really was alive and kicking because, of course, now, all of our histories are there and we will never erase them. There was, however, a period when many significant evolutions took place and they are not really on the record in a way that we would like them to be, so this helps to put down on the record that really crucial moment in the cultural policy landscape.

Thank you to John Newbigin, who was very much at the beginning of this story. He spoke to me about this idea a long time ago, recommended by Hasan Bakhshi. Beyond that conversation, however, I claim no credit at all for this event. There are many people who have made it happen: members of the Culture team, including Kate Dunton, and of the Department of Culture, Media & Creative Industries, including Jonathan Gross. Thank you to Jonathan Reekie and his team at Somerset House for hosting in this quite magnificent room.

We are really pleased to have Ian Hargreaves to chair us this afternoon. Ian is Professor of Digital Economy in the School of Journalism, Media and Culture at the University of Cardiff. He has had a career that extended across much of the journalism landscape. I will not read it out but it includes Editor of *New Statesman*, Director of BBC News and Current Affairs, and many other positions. He undertook a review of policy towards the creative industries for the Welsh Assembly government in 2009–10 and a review of intellectual property [IP] for the UK government in 2010–11. In his current role, Ian's work includes the Creative Cardiff initiative, which connects creative organisations and individuals in the region with the knowledge generated by universities to support the momentum of the local creative economy. I know that, for many of us, that is a cause very close to our hearts. It makes Ian the ideal chair for this event – no pressure on you, there. We are really grateful to you for taking the time to do this in your very busy life.

A warm welcome to Ian and to all of you. Apologies that debates in the 'other place' [the House of Lords] are dragging me away, but I hope you have a fantastic afternoon and I really look forward to reading and hearing about it later. Thank you.

## Overviews

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Thank you very much, Deborah, and thank you for listing a few of the places where I have worked, which saves me from doing that. I consider myself to be a lifelong worker in the creative industries. I know that not all journalists regard themselves as being in any way part of the creative industries, and probably fewer academics do, but whatever I have been doing has always felt to me like creative work and entitled to some kind of involvement in the creative industries.

We are going to try, in the discussion that follows, which will spread outwards to include everybody here, to ask three basic questions: why, how and with what consequence the *Mapping Document* that has been referred to happened. That is the shape of what we would like to inquire into. What I would like to share with you is one quote and one thought. The quote is from the magnificently antique document, the Labour Party Manifesto of 1997, *Because Britain Deserves Better*. In it, the matter before us this afternoon is addressed in the following way:

‘The Department of National Heritage [DNH] will develop a strategic vision that matches the real power and energy of British arts, media and cultural industries. Art, sport and leisure are vital to our quality of life and the renewal of our economy. They are significant earners for Britain. They employ hundreds of thousands of people. They bring millions of tourists to Britain every year, who will also be helped by Labour’s plans for new quality assurance in hotel accommodation.’

Just picture the scribe or the official or the advisor who saw the opportunity to slip in a bit about the hotel industry that distinguished itself from the airy-fairy nonsense that preceded it in declaring the birth of the creative industries and the renaming of the Department of Heritage as the Department for Culture, Media and Sport [DCMS]. What a time it was.

In all of the work that I have been involved in over the years with regard to the creative industries – and it continues now with the work that we are doing in Cardiff – I have felt that there has been a running story which has not always been as well addressed as it might have been, and that is the relationship between the other big thing that was happening in the late 1990s – namely, the emergence of the internet – and the emergence of the creative industries. That is what has lain behind some tensions about regulation of the industries which now stretch from Silicon Valley internet-platform companies to companies that we more comfortably recognise as being part of the creative industries.

It includes something which I remember debating a lot at the time, not least with David Puttnam: the issue of what sort of role, if any, the emerging new regulator, Ofcom, which got going properly in 2003, would have in setting and supervising rules that would govern aspects of behaviour on the internet. That was an example of a moment lost when intervention might well have avoided some of the rather panicky reactions to the regulatory challenges of the internet that we now see very much about us.

There are challenges to be made to the vision that led to the creative industries and its announcement by the first Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, Chris Smith. I offer that as an example of the kind of topics – and there are many others – that we might try to draw together in a way that contributes to the work of this witness seminar, whose primary interpreter and scribe is Dr Jonathan Gross from King’s College. Jonathan is now going to talk to us a little bit about the

research which has already occurred and put a more detailed frame on the conversation which he and we are all hoping will emerge in the course of the afternoon. Thank you.

### **Jonathan Gross**

Thanks, Ian. I am Jonathan Gross, a researcher in the Department of Culture, Media & Creative Industries here at King's. I am going to speak very briefly just to contextualise today's session in two contexts, the first of which is the series of interviews that I have been conducting in the run-up to this witness seminar with officials, politicians and creative-industries leaders who were involved at the time in the creation of this document. Those interviews have been structured around the three research questions that Ian alluded to: why, how and with what consequence this document was created. Those questions will structure our conversation during this witness seminar and they will also structure the report that will be published, drawing both on today's conversation and on the conversations that have preceded it.

I just want to supplement those three research questions with three uncertainties that I have been interested in within the interviews so far, to draw those out and add those to the mix for today's conversation. These are areas where there is still more to be spoken about particularly, the first of which connects very much to what Ian has just been reflecting on: the extent to which the transformation of the economy by digital technology was an explicit part of the discussions that led to and drove this mapping work at the time. Digital transformation is touched upon by some interviewees and indicated as an important factor, but not by others.

The second question is the extent to which the creative industries were really central to the Labour Party's project of modernisation, including its vision for 21st-century economic policy. The interviews again indicate a range of views on that question.

Third, some interviewees emphasised that resources were limited within DCMS and that what the Department could do primarily in undertaking its work on the creative industries was twofold: first, simply to bring people together around the issue; and second, to establish an initial set of statistics. How exactly, then, was it anticipated that the *Mapping Document* would have consequences or, to put it in other words, what specifically was the theory of change?

Those are three questions that I am interested in thinking further about. They may or may not be touched upon by the conversation that develops but I would add just a fourth question to those three: are there ways in which the panellists feel that the discussions of the past 20 years have misunderstood or misrepresented the process of creating the *Mapping Document* as you experienced it at the time? What are the parts of this story that you feel have not been told or have been lost?

The second context is simply to say something about the witness seminar as a format. I was hoping that Michael Kandiah would be here but, unfortunately, he has not been able to make it. King's has run witness seminars for some years under Michael Kandiah's stewardship. What they do is to bring together a range of people who have been involved in a piece of legislation or a significant political event, process or institution to offer multiple perspectives on that significant historical development and to contribute to the historical record with a transcript of the conversation.

There are a couple of examples to give you. A few weeks ago, Michael ran a very interesting event at King's, looking at the role of women in the Northern Irish peace process. Whilst some of you

may have attended the session that James Doeser and colleagues ran two years ago to mark 70 years of the Arts Council.

That is what we are doing and as has been indicated by previous speakers, you are participants in this event as well, so we would very much welcome your contributions with questions and comments later on. We would be delighted if those contributions could be on the transcript. So if you do contribute, please say who you are; and at the end of the event, if you could make your way to someone in a red T-shirt, we have a consent form to ask you to sign.

Finally, in terms of your contributions to this research, if there are things that you would like to feed into this process that you do not have the chance to say today, we would be very happy for you to make a written submission, which you can email to me at jonathan.gross@kcl.ac.uk. If you could do that by 21 December, that would be very welcome. It might even be that, if you were there at the time, you have documents in your attic which relate to this process. They are coming out all the time – discussion papers and speeches – so, if you happen upon any of that, we would be very happy to receive them.

Huge thanks to the panellists and to everyone who has taken part in the research, several of whom are not able to be here today. Thanks to you all for coming and being part of this, and I very much look forward to the conversation.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Thank you, Jonathan. All three of our panel members, I believe, were there at the panel that really mattered when the work was done on this foundational *Mapping Document*: from the right, John Newbigin, Janice Hughes and Gail Rebeck. I think, in making your opening remarks, you are also just going to say a little bit more about yourselves and how you came to be in that room or those rooms and those places at that time, and what you were bringing to the discussion, before we then go into the 'why', 'how' and 'consequences'.

### **John Newbigin**

Thank you, Ian. I was the Special Advisor at the Department for National Heritage, as it was, the day after the election in 1997. As Ian has read out, the Labour Manifesto hardly set out any indication that there was going to be a major piece of work on the creative industries, but there was quite a lot going on in the zeitgeist, I would say, about this. It may sound relatively minor but one of the issues was that Tony Blair was very keen on things Australian. He had been in Australia a bit before the election. Paul Keating's government had produced a document called *Creative Nation*, which basically said, 'Although people think we make bad movies, drink lager and behave badly, that is all part of our culture and we ought to think about how we use that to project a different image of Australia. These things are also all part of the economy.' That was an idea which seemed to fit with a lot of the thinking that was going on inside the Labour Party. Around March 1997, two of us persuaded Blair to make a speech, which he was making at Mansion House anyway, about the creative industries. It is probably somewhere in my attic, Jonathan; unfortunately, I cannot find it.

There was a lot of conversation going on about this issue, even though it is not reflected in the manifesto. It was clear that, once the new government post had been established, one of the things that we, collectively, who had been involved in thinking about overall policies for the Labour Party, was committed to was doing something around the cultural and creative industries, which had had a pretty bad run. People like John Myerscough had produced books about the cultural industries

which had been pretty much trashed by the Treasury as not being respectable pieces of work. Finding something that brought all this together in a realistic and effective way was high on the list of priorities.

I will perhaps come back to Jonathan's point about how central it was to the modernisation programme of the Labour government later on, but, by way of introduction, that is all I would say for now.

### **Janice Hughes**

I am Janice Hughes. I was running an advisory company at that time when John and I first met. We specialised in media and telecoms. I had been involved with setting up Oftel on the regulatory side and had previously worked with Sir Bryan Carsberg. We had done a few key pieces, including a study for the Home Office on, essentially, the privatisation of the BBC, which we did not recommend. The report was thrown away by Mr Tebbit. We then went on to do a lot of work for the BBC, ITV and the film industry. I had previously done a number of studies in the City on the size, scale and dynamics of the financial markets: how large they were and the enormous contribution of exports.

As I came from writing two books – one on City 2000 and another one on Tokyo 2000 – it struck me that it was ridiculous that the creative industries were so unrecognised for the important contributions that they were making to UK PLC. I felt that they were not properly represented and that there was an ecosystem going on here, where design, film and perhaps even tourism all fed off each other, creating a very dynamic, labour-intensive collection of sectors that were completely unmonitored and not really coherent as a grouping and as a contributor to the British economy. I was subsequently asked if we might try to pull together some of the data for the *Mapping Document*, so that is how I got involved.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Who were you working for at the time?

### **Janice Hughes**

I was working at my own company, Spectrum Strategy.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

I am sure lots of people in the room were aware of Spectrum Strategy. Gail, how did you get involved in and drawn into this?

### **Gail Rebuck**

In 1998, I was running a publishing company, Random House, and we had just been acquired by Bertelsmann, the German media group. We found ourselves becoming the largest trade-publishing company in the world. I became involved because Chris Smith phoned me up and asked me if I would come and sit on this new Task Force he was putting together. I was pretty busy at the time but what attracted me about it was that he had pulled together a bunch of practitioners: people who ran their own businesses. We did not come from the world of policy, apart from Janice. It was an

opportunity to find out areas of commonality – of which there were many, interestingly – between us at that first meeting. With one exception, we pretty much all hung on in there for the duration of our time together.

It was at the very first meeting that we identified, all from our different perspectives, the need to quantify the economic size and importance and to make an argument for the importance of the creative industries taken collectively. Bear in mind that we were a bunch of small and medium-sized companies. There were no metrics in those days.

I should say one thing that may not be absolutely 100 per cent clear: when Janice volunteered to do this mapping study, she did so pro bono. It would not have happened – there was no money for it. Although she depended on many of the trade organisations like The Publishers Association, she did it, essentially, as a gift to the nation, so thank you very much in case there was no thank you for it. I am sure there was.

When you were talking about quotes from Tony Blair, I thought you were going to read out this quote from 1997, which inspired me and was one of the reasons why I was keen to join the taskforce. Tony said, 'In the 21st century, we are going to see the world increasingly influenced by innovation and creative minds. Our future depends on our creativity.' That is something that I would like to put on the side of a bus – maybe going past the Department for Education might be quite a good idea.

That is my story and we will come on to other elements in a minute, but I was a practitioner. All the others were practitioners and we were very frustrated by the view of the creative industries as 'a bunch of luvvies'. That is what we were: a bunch of luvvies. In fact, we were all running quite complex and successful businesses, so the opportunity to see what we could do together was very exciting.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Just fleshing it out, and maybe just to ask you, John, how big was this group that was gathered?

### **John Newbiggin**

There were about 10 practitioners that included Waheed Alli from television; David Puttnam from film; Eric Salama from WPP advertising; Richard Branson, who then got Robert Devereux to substitute for him; Paul Smith as a fashion designer; Alan McGee as a record producer; and Janice and Gail. At the first two or three meetings, there were senior representatives from pretty much every department in Whitehall. That was something which had never happened before. It would be true to say that not all ministers came to all the subsequent meetings, but they were there at the initial meeting and getting all government departments to sign up to the fact that this was a piece of work, that little old DNH – stuck away at the end of Whitehall and not taken terribly seriously as a government department by some other departments – was going to be leading this work. That, in itself, was quite contentious. The Board of Trade, which still existed then, the Treasury, the Foreign Office, the Home Office and everybody was represented at that first meeting, so it was quite a high-level buy-in from across Whitehall that this work should take place.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

You already knew Chris Smith well. Janice and Gail, did you know Chris Smith?

**Janice Hughes**

No, I did not know him before I joined the Task Force. I was introduced to him via David Puttnam. We had so much in common in the sense of trying to grapple with these sectors, which, as Gail has said, were described as luvvies, and how we could get the Treasury to understand the true size and scale of these organisations and sectors.

**Gail Rebuck**

I think I had met him, but I did not know him.

**Ian Hargreaves**

We now have a video.

[Video shown]

**Chris Smith**

Hello. I am Chris Smith and I am very sorry not to be able to be with you all for your discussions today, but I did just want to reflect for a moment or two on what happened back in the late 1990s when we set up the Task Force on the creative industries and began to put together the work that led to the two mapping documents [in 1998 and 2001].

I remember, when I became Secretary of State for Culture, I had this feeling in my bones that all the creative industries – the things that depended on individual creative talent for their ultimate economic value – were of all real importance to our economy, but what I discovered was that no one had any idea at all of how much they were worth and what that contribution was. That is why I had the idea of putting together the Task Force on the creative industries. I brought together representatives from many of the creative industries themselves: Gail Rebuck, who I think is with you today; David Puttnam; Alan McGee; Paul Smith; and a whole range of people who knew what working in the creative sector was all about.

I brought them together with ministers from a whole range of government departments and I will never forget the first meeting of the Task Force, when the ministers had all come with their briefs prepared by their civil servants. They sat with the briefs open in front of them and they started reading out what had been prepared for them. Meanwhile, the people from the creative sector were just talking about what it was like and what their own experience was, very freely and very informally. Suddenly, we began to see all the ministers folding up their briefs and starting to engage in the conversation in a very real way.

That is, I think, one of the reasons why the Task Force was ultimately successful in pushing this agenda forward, and it led fairly rapidly, over the next couple of years, to the creation of the first *Mapping Document*, which tried, for the first time ever, to set out what the real extent of the creative industries was. Because we had virtually no resources to be able to do it, we relied on the generosity of Spectrum to do a lot of the hard donkey work for us. We are eternally grateful to them for doing that.

Of course, the results astonished us: the sheer extent, the number of people employed, the contribution to the national economy, the slice of gross domestic product [GDP], and the fact that



the creative sector had been growing and was still growing in those days at a pace far ahead of the rest of the national economy. That, of course, was then reinforced by the second *Mapping Document*, which came a couple of years later.

Now, eventually, it has become mainstream orthodoxy within not only our government but governments all across the world. I have to say, it took a bit of time to get the rest of central government really understanding what all of this was about and how important it was. It took quite a few years. The people who very rapidly latched on to the importance of the creative sector were regional and local government. Regional development agencies and many of the major cities around the rest of the UK immediately got the potential of the creative industries and they began to put policies in place to make sure that they could thrive within their locality. It took the rest of central government – and especially, I have to say, the Treasury – a bit longer to get wholly used to how important this was. Now, absolutely everyone is in agreement and I am delighted that it has now become so much part of mainstream thinking.

The only other thing I would throw into the pot for your discussion today is that we identified, as we began to talk about these issues in the Task Force, a number of major issues where government could help. The creative industries did not need government subsidy as such; what they did need, however, were government policies that enabled them to thrive.

There were four particular areas that we identified early on. One was the need to maintain the importance of creativity in the education system. It is something we still do not do enough. Second was access to finance, especially for small, start-up creative business. Third was access to workshop accommodation, especially in clusters and in creative bohemian quarters within cities. Fourth was the need to protect and value IP and to make sure that the IP, which is where the value of the creative thinking that went into putting together a creative product or service, could be properly remunerated. All of those four issues still remain important. We have not made enough progress on all of them. I hope that we can once again reiterate their importance and put them very firmly on the map.

Good luck for your discussions today. This is a really important area of discussion. I am delighted that it is now taken up much more around the world than it was back in 1997, but we still have quite a way to go. Thank you and good luck.

[Video ends]

### **John Newbigin**

I remember the first meeting of the Task Force took place in one of the old Cabinet rooms in 70 Whitehall, which was full of ceremonial furniture. Bob May, who had just been appointed the government's Chief Scientist, said, 'Christ, even the bloody furniture in this country is hundreds of years old.' That seemed like a very appropriate starting point for our conversation.

## **Panel Discussion**

### **Ian Hargreaves**

I am sure we will return to all four of Chris Smith's closing points, where he states that there is an incomplete agenda, but let us, for the moment, try to structure, in the manner of the witness seminar procedure, answering the questions why, how and with what consequence. We are going to juggle the sequence of those questions to reflect the fact that Gail has an appointment in 'another place' which she needs to be at, so we are going to start with why, we are going to talk about the consequences and then we will come back and refocus and discuss the how – the issues that the Task Force dealt with. Quite a bit of the why has already been thrown up in the air. Gail, you are going to start.

### **Gail Rebuck**

As you said, we have talked a little bit about the why – at least why I was interested – and Chris has talked about the various areas of focus. I should say that, having gone to this meeting and been very excited about the amount of commonality of interest, we were then asked by Chris to go off into little huddles and produce papers. My task was to go off with David Puttnam and Paul Smith, and to write a paper on training and education with a focus on creativity. I still have it and I think I have sent it to you, Jonathan. One of the things about being in the same company for a thousand years is that everything is saved somewhere or other.

A few things occurred to me as I was looking back over all this material. Simply not enough has changed. I talked about education. If anything, we have gone the other way. Creative education in schools has been downgraded behind science, technology, engineering and maths [STEM]. STEM is extremely important, particularly in terms of more women in STEM subjects, but please, not at the expense of creativity. It seems to me that we have lost sight of where innovation and entrepreneurship happens, which is the juncture of engineering, computer science and design or the arts. I chair an organisation called the Royal College of Art, and I see first-hand that we launch more new businesses than Oxford and Cambridge put together. At one point, our chancellor was James Dyson, who was, of course, the poster boy of new higher education. He did his undergraduate degree at Imperial but then did two years of design at the Royal College of Art. That is something that I feel very passionately about and that has not been particularly well followed up by government.

The creative industries have grown phenomenally from 1998 to today and continue growing. The last stat I saw was in a newsletter that said that creative industries were now £100 billion and had grown 53 per cent since 2010, which is pretty incredible. However, access to finance is still difficult. Getting loans is difficult for start-ups. If they can get any money at all, it is normally for a large chunk of equity. IP is well recognised. You have done a lot of work in this area, Ian, and it is recognised as an important factor, although, to Jonathan's original point about the impact of digitisation, that is something that we have yet to really focus on.

One small point that I find rather interesting is that, when we looked at publishing in the sector that contributed towards the report, in 1998 magazines were growing hugely – and so were newspapers, bizarrely; books were pretty steady. Fast-forward to today and the impact of digitisation: magazines are struggling all over the world; newspapers have lost their advertising, thanks to Facebook and Google; and books, bizarrely, which made quite a good transition to digital, if they have not grown

at the extent that they did perhaps in the late 1990s, are at least stable in terms of volume and value. I just throw that out because you were talking about the impact of digitisation. The size of the sector is probably quite similar but it has inversed completely.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Let me ask you one follow-up question to that, Gail. If, as probably everybody in this room agrees, the creative industries have grown and shown momentum – there are more jobs and they are growing more quickly than the rest of the economy, according to all the stats that we now have and are able to read – why would that not have had the effect in the education world of encouraging more education that is creatively considered and, as it were, feeding a hungry market?

### **Gail Rebuck**

I do not have a clue. I find it utterly bizarre. Literacy in this country from those days to now has not increased exponentially. The number of adults with very poor literacy has remained about the same. It baffles me, frankly. I was at an evidence session the other day on literacy and spoken word, and kids are coming into school unable even to express themselves because no one talked to them properly at home, which is an increasing problem with digital media. I do not have a clue. To me, it is self-evident. In many ways, the creative industries have grown despite government as opposed to thanks to government.

Let us have some main exceptions to that, like the creation of Channel 4, which kick-started excellent independent production. There is tax relief on film but, if I think of my own industry – book publishing – and literacy being enormously important to us, with a vibrant high street for discovery rather than being clobbered by ridiculous rates, I just do not feel that government is truly listening to the industries and to the practitioners around having joined-up policies that could genuinely help creative practitioners.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

John, I think you were going to go next on why.

### **John Newbiggin**

Points have been touched on already. There was already this zeitgeist in the Labour Party for the modernisation programmes that Jonathan referred to. The convergence of an interest in culture with what was happening in the digital world meant that that had a particular salience for the government. Second, around that, was this whole idea of convergence: that these traditional areas of science and technology and the arts were all beginning to converge.

Another initiative that came out of the government at the same time was Nesta, which was the National Endowment for Science, Technology and the Arts. The whole point about that was that it was looking at issues of convergence and the fact that the British economy and education system was not geared up for an economy in which creativity was clearly going to be important – the mantra was ‘education, education, education’ and was absolutely core to what the government was doing. In that sense, this area of policy, which might not otherwise have had nearly as much profile in government, had the added impetus of these three things: the digital change; the fact that

convergence was clearly coming down the track and the economy was changing; and the fact that our education system needed radical overhaul.

It was also partly because the new government was very keen to reposition all sorts of things that had been going on for a very long time without changing in the UK. That was the perception: the idea of pulling together all these disparate industries and giving them a common brand identity. At the end of the day, it seems to me that the creative industries were really a kind of branding exercise. Of course, there were new industries – in particular, videogames, and nobody had done any work on the videogame sector. The Treasury almost denied that it existed and did not know what to do with it, because nobody had done that kind of mapping. Even so, the already existing activities that were seen as quite important in their own right did not have enough heft together to constitute a sector of the economy.

Controversially, and I am sure we will come on to this, by putting part of software in with the creative industries – and lots of people asked, ‘How do you get away with that?’ – that was an expression of the fact that convergence was beginning to drive things in a way that had not been the case previously. That is why, when you put them all together, suddenly the corporate brand, so to speak, had a much bigger profile than anybody had anticipated. Those were the forces that helped generate the level of interest which was sustained enough – not enough to pay Janice – but enough to get the work underway and to get the first document published. In a sense, the real consequences, when we get into those, began to play in when the second document was published in 2001.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Janice, your world was a lot broader than the creative industries in that list of subsectors or sectors. Why did you think that this kind of mapping or staking-out-of-ground exercise was so important?

### **Janice Hughes**

It was definitely about sizing and pulling together how important this industry was. This idea of job creation and labour intensity was very important. David [Puttnam], at that time, was in the Department for Education, but also lived and breathed film. I remember having endless conversations with David about, ‘The film industry is just a cottage industry. The production business is a cottage industry. I know we can transform this.’ We had *The Full Monty* at the time. I remember the money that came back into the UK was about £3 million or £4 million and all of the rest was off out there in the ether, a bit like the money from the digital world, if you like, at the moment, with the FAANGs [Facebook, Amazon, Apple, Netflix and Google]. He was very concerned that somehow these disparate sectors needed to be shone a light on and encouraged to develop scale and confidence in what they were doing.

How right he was. Let us just take one person and one piece of IP: JK Rowling. She is so creative and so incredible. The credits and revenues David Yates, producer of five of her films, including the latest *Fantastic Beasts*, amount to over £5 billion, and that is not all of them. I suppose that she is responsible for an industry in her own right, if you added in multipliers, of some £10 billion. This is extraordinary. The numbers we had back then were that the film industry and everything put together that you could possibly add in was £900 million. If you look at the numbers today, it is £10 billion, with so many huge series running out of the UK. Of course, we now also have tax breaks to stimulate people to come and make their film productions and big dramas here.

I have taken a quote that we put in [the 1998 *Mapping Document*] just to remind us how small the industry was. In the section on film and television, we said, 'The market will also be stimulated by the launch of digital video discs [DVDs] in 1998.' We talk about 'pre-internet' but heaven knows we were 'pre-everything' then. It was early days and there was a genuine recognition that creativity was there in every corner of the UK. Of course, if you go into primary schools it hits you the minute you go into the classroom and you go 'Wow.' Progressively, as you go through education and you go into the classrooms of the older kids, what you really notice is that, visually, it becomes less and less creative. Dare I say it becomes narrower and less visual?

I still think, as you were saying, that we are really at the beginning of this process and that there is so much more that we can do. On the why, it was around, 'How do we get all this out there? How do we let the public and the government know what this is all about and what potential and growth it has?'

### **Gail Rebeck**

Or even, 'How do we let ourselves know?' You mentioned JK Rowling. The interesting thing – and it has taken me 10 years to get the publishing industry to map this – is that the three highest-grossing global franchises of all time are based on British authors: JK Rowling, *Lord of the Rings* and James Bond. 'Twas ever thus, it is true and it is a fact, but even the publishing industry did not know it. For the first time, we mapped the impact of the publishing industry, and it turns out that 50 per cent of award-winning and highest-grossing films are based on books. If you do a high-end drama that goes on television, you get more viewers if it is based on a book: for example, *Little Drummer Girl*, Elena Ferrante and *Killing Eve*. In terms of theatre, *War Horse* is based, again, on a book. Even in our industries, we do not recognise the impact beyond the end of our nose, which is the sale of books.

### **John Newbigin**

Just picking up on something that Janice said, she is absolutely right that the labour-intensity issue was a real driver. I am just thinking of why, politically, it had the salience that it had. There was this sense that the previous government had allowed things to go to waste. Nothing much had been going on and there was a huge amount of wasted opportunity. Here was an area which was going to generate jobs which did not depend on huge amounts of capital investment and gave the opportunities for communities and people all around the country, who were being shut out of economic activity, to find a new way in.

One of the things that, strangely, probably did not drive it was a real interest in IP. In a way, to put the generation of IP at the core of that definition was really important because it was not something with which certainly Parliament was engaged. People tended to glaze over when you talked about IP. Now, the discourse around IP is much more mainstream than it was then. Maybe I am forgetting, and John Howkins has done a huge amount of work on this, but I just think that IP was not something which was very high in anybody's thinking in Whitehall. Although it was not one of the drivers for this, the fact that it was put absolutely at the centre of the definition was really important.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Nobody has suggested in those responses that there might have been some good reasons not to do this. I am not going to suggest what those might have been but I suspect maybe one or two people

in the room have thoughts about why it may not have been a 100 per cent uncontroversial, good idea to go down the route that we went.

I would like to move on, however, to consequences – we need to keep moving along.

**Lydia Kan**

Before you do, would you mind if I address Gail's question around education?

**Ian Hargreaves**

I would not mind, if you could address it as concisely as you can.

**Lydia Kan**

Thank you. I am Lydia Kan. I led the 2000–01 *Creative Industries Mapping Document*, which ran out of City University. I had just come to the UK on a student visa and was doing doctoral work looking at what happens when corporations team up with creative industries in sponsorship and partnership, basically saying that the companies get far more in goodwill and grant valuation than what they expect. It was investment, not expenditure.

What really struck me, coming from having grown up and worked in the US, was the categorisation and the narrowness around education. When I went to the Office for National Statistics, of course most of the creative industries did not have Standard Industrial Classification [SIC] codes and things like that, because they did not have categories.

Also, looking at the background that kids – now my godchildren and children of friends – have, by 13 and 14, narrowed down which A-levels they will be most successful in and get the good grade in to get the university place that they want. I come from a very different background in the US, where Madeleine Albright was my university mentor as I studied science, technology and international relations. I left that and I started at the Thelonious Monk Institute of Jazz. It is a whole different perspective. If you get to the root of that in terms of the narrowness of education and choosing one over another, if that fundamentally changed, the whole sector would benefit, as well as the economy.

**Ian Hargreaves**

Thank you for that important additional point of emphasis. We are going to move on to consequences, starting with John, and then Janice and Gail.

**John Newbiggin**

In one sense, the consequences have been beyond our wildest imaginings, in the sense that this is now seen as a significant part of the global economy and is taken seriously by almost every government. The *Mapping Document* was called a mapping document because it was mapping uncharted territory and it was a first shot. One of the defences against scepticism was to say, 'Well, we have to start somewhere.' I am sure we will come on to this but some of the data was pretty robust and some less so, but it started things going. In one sense, it is extraordinary how this has become such a significant part of the global economy.

In another sense, it is extraordinary to me that, 20 years on, it is still primarily located in the culture department and has not really transitioned into the core of Whitehall. Someone said to me the other day, talking about the Industrial Strategy, 'At the Department for Business, Energy & Industrial Strategy [BEIS]' – in its current incarnation – 'they pretend to understand the creative industries but still do not really.' It may be an unfair criticism, but it is interesting how difficult it has been for government to engage with this whole agenda. Doing things in other countries, I quite often come across people asking, 'Where should the creative industries be located: the culture department, the education department, the economic-planning department or the business department?' Of course, it runs across all of them, so it naturally gives government a headache and probably always will, because it is such a tricky beast.

If you look at the Industrial Strategy now, £4 billion of spending was the advertised top line. That is £200 million for car batteries or whatever it is but, for the creative sector, it is £20 million administered by the Arts Council. Even on the government's own statistics, however, the sector is bigger, contributes more to gross value added [GVA] and employs far more people than automotive, aerospace and life sciences put together. On the government's statistics, it is massively significant.

Government is still struggling to work out quite what it should do. As Chris Smith said, it is not a matter of subsidy but of policies. We are in this bizarre situation where it is not just here where it seems the education system has been going backwards. If you go to a private school, it is entirely different, but in the maintained sector, the reductionist view of education is happening not just here but in many countries around the world, while, at the same time, their governments and ours are protesting the importance of the creative economy. It is a weird paradox.

One of the things that Chris Smith mentioned in that video is access to finance. It is still a real problem to have a sophisticated conversation between the financial world and the creative world. The movie business took 100 years to get there, so maybe it just takes a lot longer for these things to happen. On the skills agenda, we are still struggling to think what skills we need for a future economy.

In short, then, I would say that the consequences are that it succeeded beyond our wildest imagining. Second, this idea of giving this quite disparate set of industries a common brand identity has really worked. It is intriguing that we could all argue forever about where the definition comes and why software is in there. Every industry is creative, so what is so special about these? Individual creative talent generating IP is the core proposition. It seems to me that, in a way, the arguments about definition no longer matter. My favourite phrase recently is from talking to somebody running the local enterprise partnership in Warwickshire, who said, 'We do not bother about definitions of the creative industries any more. It is a state of mind.' In a funny way, it has almost become a state of mind, which means that the way that our government and other governments interact with it has changed quite radically.

I still think it is odd, however, that it has not made that transition into being a core part of thinking about industry and finance, really, even in this country, where there has been more engagement by politicians and certainly by officials and by financial institutions than almost anywhere else in the world. There is still a hell of a long way to go, it seems to me.

**Ian Hargreaves**

Do you think there is anything in the argument that what has happened since 1998 has created an atmosphere of marketisation around the whole of the cultural sector that has damaged its way of thinking and operating?

**John Newbigin**

Yes, you are absolutely right to raise that. The consequences for the arts have been double-edged at best. The confusion of the arts and creative industries being one big happy family is not useful because it is not the case. In terms of government engagement, they are very different things. They are intimately related but they are not the same thing. The most dangerous policy aspect of this is that arts education then becomes part of the necessary feedstock for the creative industries rather than a core part of what every citizen should have as part of their education. In that sense, confusing the two has been of huge disservice to the arts, and that is something that, in time, will need to be sorted out far more comprehensively than we have done.

**Ian Hargreaves**

Can you track the logic that takes Blair's invention of creative industries to Corbyn?

**Participant**

You are joking.

**Ian Hargreaves**

I am just asking the questions.

**John Newbigin**

I think that requires a different witness seminar.

**Gail Rebuck**

Well dodged.

**Janice Hughes**

Just to add to that, it gave us a language. From this, we were able to think about it in a different way. We were able to see this proliferation across the UK into all the regional bodies, which was fantastic, with people embracing it and knowing how to talk about it. It led to the high growth and the extraordinary numbers that we have seen in most of the sectors.

What we did not know at the time was that the UK is a global leader in absolute volume. In terms of books, we are world leaders. If you cut by per-capita terms, we are number one or two in the world in all creative industries. In terms of consequences, I firmly believe that we are still underdeveloped in what we can potentially do. Across government, I am not sure that they fully understand that we need to unpeel design or think about manufacturing. There are vast areas where



people are coming back to the UK and manufacturing design-based army boots in Yorkshire. It is this level of IP. The bridges in London are all talking to each other. They have very smart sensors in them. As high tides come in along the estuary, the bridges start saying, 'The high tide is coming' and they tell the next one. The same creator who designed that chip is looking at going into sport. She has rebaked cricket balls in her own oven, with a chip inside. There is masses of this across every area of activity which involves design, and I firmly believe that most departments in government still do not give enough credit where credit is due. We could do so much more.

It is about trying to think about digital 3.0 and where we go from here, whether it is in artificial intelligence or robot design down in Bristol. How do we get these things singing together in an ecosystem where you can see the layers of the value chain that David Puttnam had this vision of: small cottage businesses with a few people who needed scale, needed to build design and needed to protect their own IP, and how government could enable them to do all of those things in a global market that is deeply pirating all the time, deeply taking money out of our economy offshore into all the digital industries such as Facebook etc, who are not contributing. How do we recognise where we are today? What has happened in advertising? Billions have gone offshore. Why do we not recognise that and wake up to that, and ask 'What are we going to do instead?' We are not a country that interferes too much but let us put it down on paper. Let us get people talking about it. Let us articulate it and say, 'We can do this.' In terms of the consequences, there is a longer list of what we need to do in understanding these ecosystems and getting them talking to each other, and protecting that IP wherever we can.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

I am just trying to register what you said there. On balance, you are optimistic and positive about what has been achieved but you are suggesting that there is an agenda that arises in the maturing of the creative industries which needs to be addressed in different ways. Is that a fair way of summarising what you said?

### **Janice Hughes**

Yes, it is. Whether it in the car industry and smart cars or the chip-design element – and we have just sold ARM to the Japanese – there is more that can be done. In every sector, there is going to be a need for data analysis and a probing into what else can be done, with that design element coming into it. It is about how we put those pieces together to help them to work together, and that starts in education. It flows through into looking at how the funding can come into the UK through venture capital [VC] or investment vehicles. I have colleagues in China and Hong Kong who have investment vehicles, and they ask me, 'Janice, do you know any really traditional British manufacturing companies that would like to work with us in selling their authentic Britishness and their quality products, be it T-shirts or clothing or whatever?' There is still the potential to do a lot more and to bring those creative industries together with each other in this ecosystem.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Thank you. Gail, could you answer the consequences question?

**Gail Rebuck**

Everything and nothing is what I would say. If I take that paper that we wrote, I remember it going to many ministers in different departments. Everyone said, 'It is so interesting. It is food for thought', and nothing happened, so we were all quite surprised, being practitioners, at why nothing happened. There were two ideas in it – and there were many. One was an electronic library of excellence, which was not a bad idea, and the other was something that all the practitioners felt important, which was a digital library of financial courses for creative entrepreneurs. All of us had come up through the creative side of our businesses and then found ourselves running something but without the digital skills. What is interesting to me is that it is the private sector that stepped in there. A company like Bertelsmann has a full suite of different online courses that can be downloaded by any of its 70,000 employees, but I do not really see this happening on a wider scale.

Part of the problem in terms of policy is that, while we have talked about access to investment and IP, the specificity of what is required in each different creative industry is very specific to that creative industry, so it is quite difficult having a conversation because it might go across various departments.

To your point, Janice, of government departments not recognising the importance of design, it is probably true as an intellectual concept but, fairly recently, the Ministry of Defence came to the Royal College of Art and asked the Fashion department to redesign soldiers' uniforms in order for them to have places to put all the new weaponry and IT bits and pieces that they have to carry around with them. I think that that was an interesting development in terms of where you go to do this.

The final thing that I will say is that, when you have someone who has been immersed in culture – and I am going to talk about Matt Hancock now – and then goes on to another department, I read a speech of his the other day and I was absolutely delighted to hear, now that he is in Health, that he was talking about the role of the arts in tackling mental health; about poetry by prescription and about reading-aloud groups – there are many charities with mental health patients who read aloud at book groups to each other; and about music helping dementia patients off medication – and I know of music companies going into prisons to work with prisoners, with virtually zero reoffending as a result of creating an internal music company. Your point about marketisation is very important because it is almost like the world has gone full circle. We were angling to see the value of the creative industries, and now you are criticised for only talking about their value: 'What about art for art's sake?'

What I think needs to be done next is to look at the intangible impact of the arts and the creative industries on some of the big societal problems that we have, such as social inclusion or children's mental health. I was rather pleased to see Matt Hancock giving this speech. Let us get more ministers from Culture into different departments – we might get some action.

**Ian Hargreaves**

I would like to challenge the three of you to imagine an answer to this question: we are looking back 20 years and more or less congratulating – not congratulating ourselves as individuals – but that a good job has been done and something has been moved forward that had not moved forward before, with significant economic benefits that can be pointed to. If you think ahead 20 years, do we think that we are on course for a further, bigger harvest of benefits, or do we need to do

something very different in order for there to be the amount of energy and momentum that we have had in the last 20 years? It may not be a question that you enjoy.

### **John Newbiggin**

Janice touched on local and regional. One of the things that perhaps was not anticipated was the way in which this thinking about the creative industries would feed into all the wider social and cultural questions around local identities and identity of place. There are 60 cities in the world now that call themselves creative cities, and one of the reasons for that is to distinguish themselves. This idea of the creative industries being reflective of the place in which they are located and of the skills and heritage that are located there is quite an interesting development at a time when people are feeling that globalisation is a steamroller of uniformity. It is a way of engaging in the economy in a contemporary but very distinctive way.

Moving forward, the other thing is that, whatever else, we know that the Fourth Industrial Revolution is going to have a huge impact on jobs and change the labour market. I am not suggesting that the creative industries are the answer but they are going to remain labour-intensive in some areas longer than or in different ways to many other sectors of the economy.

In terms of their significance as an employer of labour all around the world, they are going to become even more significant than they are now. Barriers to entry are low and it is easy to get carried away and have a very romantic vision of it, but it is going to feed this local-identity agenda and this whole move from thinking about nation states to thinking about cities as the key drivers of the economy, and thinking about the future of employment in a global sense that is going to be of growing significance. That is where, one would hope, things will change in the next 20 years. In the 2013 Nesta manifesto, which looked at the shift from thinking about the creative industries to thinking about the creative economy, this design thinking is beginning to permeate every aspect of the economy. In a while, it will be pointless to talk about the creative economy in the same way that it is pointless to talk about the digital economy. We may talk about the algorithm-driven economy and the human-driven economy, but that is a different thing.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Gail, is there anything that you would like to say on that, as well as anything that you would like to say on 'how'?

### **Gail Rebuck**

I do not have much on 'how', but I hope you are right, John. If you talk to someone like Yuval Harari, he will say that machines are going to produce better art, better books and better music – better anything. I hope that you are right about the human imagination, but he seems to think the opposite.

The importance of the creative industries and the arts, looking 20 years ahead, is the fact that most jobs as we know them at the moment – white-collar jobs – are not going to exist. They are going to be taken over by robots and we are going to have so much more leisure time. What are people going to do with it? It gets back to our sense of ourselves, our purpose, our meaning and our identity, as well as sense of community and a sense of empathy. I hope that this will come from cultural products and the power of our imaginations, and that this will hold communities together in a way that it does not perhaps at the moment, because people are going to have a heck of a lot more

time on the hands. What are they going to do with it? What we do not want is an increase in mental health problems and exclusion; we want more cohesion and a better, more purposeful society. Whether the creative industries are going to be the last to fall in terms of digitisation and robotisation, I just do not know. There are two arguments to that, but certainly the product of the cultural industries will be more important than ever.

I am sorry I have to slip off, but carry on.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Thank you very much. Janice, do you have anything that you would like to say about the next 20 years and how it feels?

### **Janice Hughes**

I certainly agree with John and I do believe that it will remain very labour-intensive. I still think people will want real art and real music, with live performances. I do not think we will ever lose that. In industry, however, it is almost like dozens of helium balloons, and I am worried about whether we can cling on to them in terms of scale. In some ways, I do not think we did really cling on to manufacturing. What different departments in government need to do is, rather than short-term one-to-four-year forecasts, we need to think, as they do in Japan or China, about the 20-year vision for some of the sectors and where we can play a role. Maybe we can never be Germany and be the car industry, but perhaps we can be involved with the development of entertainment in smart cars, which is already a big thing in China. We have a project working on what entertainment in cars will look like when you are queuing for your battery recharge for three hours.

Scale is important because, if it starts with JK Rowling and goes on, she is still in charge. She is quite happy to tell Warner's that she will put her foot down, so she has incredible power. In these sectors, which are very much dominated by scale, you can lose that power. If we look at some of the very big media companies, these include Discovery. We have welcomed Comcast into the UK now. Where, however, will the power be and where will the decisions be made? In the case of Discovery, if you understand it from way back when we worked with them years ago, the concentration of power, decision-making and creativity is really in Washington. What you are doing in the UK is reselling the channels and checking how large the Tajikistan market is for the channels. I am worried about whether we can cling on to these helium balloons which David originally worried about, or whether they will be overtaken and we no longer do those things.

The government has a very crucial time ahead of it to get to grips with our leading sectors, and the £100 billion creative industries are more important than the financial industries in terms of their potential generation of jobs, more wealth and more GVA. They have inherent growth that I do believe in – and I am an optimist – because, as people get more leisure time or if our wealth increases, they will continue to spend it on all sorts of entertainment. This is a great sector to be in, but we should be guarding it with our lives and looking at how to make it better. I just do not see that in government at all, and it is very depressing.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

We have skipped around the question of how and the methodology. Before we open the conversation to everybody in the room, is there anything, John, that you would like to put on the

record about what made it possible to get done the stuff that has been done on the creative industries agenda on the back of that mapping approach? What do we have to learn from that?

### **John Newbiggin**

This is really one for Janice, in a way, but the fact that it was a mapping document that set out, however arbitrarily, to try to define the sector and pin it down started a conversation. In a sense, that was the most valuable thing it did. When the second *Mapping Document* was published in 2001, what it did was show that this sector, as we had arbitrarily defined it, was generating jobs at twice the rate of the rest of the economy. That was a game-changer and evidences the fact that having data and tracking data systemically over time is a good way of developing effective policies.

We had lots of discussions about what should be in and what should not be in that initial definition. In a way, historically, it does not matter because that definition has been very robust, but it started the conversation. By pinning down some numbers and then being able to track those over time, to see how they have changed and grown – that is the thing that has really made the sector acquire the salience that it has.

### **Janice Hughes**

In terms of the size and scale, the employees and the exports of all these sectors, it was incredibly difficult. As Gail said, there were certain associations which were incredibly good: publishing and TV and radio; film was quite good although quite woolly around the export side; some of the music industry was relatively easy to measure; design and fashion were much more difficult; software was really hard because, in a way, it was vast. What, exactly, were we measuring? When we went into government departments' national statistics such as SIC codes that measured trade, they measured manufacturing. If you asked them where the music exports were, it was impossible. There was no linking between value added, when you were trying to look at the GVA, and the transition into exports or the share of it. There was nothing. We just had to, in a way, put some pointers down on the map and say, 'We need to relate employment to how we measure these sectors and how they cross over.' It was really quite a vacuum that we were working in initially, except for the trade associations, which collected data in their own peculiar way, rather than it being coherent. It was definitely lots of apples, oranges and pears; we did not have serious data.

Of course, as a result of that, if you did go to the Department for Trade and Industry [DTI] or the Board of Trade, as far as they were concerned the creative industries did not exist. They were not on the radar, and that is why the DCMS had no money. It was decided, 'We will give a little bit to the arts over there', but there was no serious thinking about, 'We can create hundreds of thousands more jobs by recognising this' and encouraging people to understand that there are interesting jobs in these creative industries and that they could go after these jobs from an early age, or leave school and become an apprentice in these craft skills, learning camerawork or film production and different activities. It was an empty basket initially.

### **John Newbiggin**

My recollection about the software thing was that the definition was 'interactive leisure software', and I never quite understood how you pinned that one down. What data did you use?

**Janice Hughes**

We had to go and do lots of interviews for the software side. We were trying to focus on the leisure side of software. You could go into a hotel and say, 'Hotel management systems' but that is not really the creative industries. However, if they were running entertainment, you could consider it. We did a lot of interviews trying to look at a sub-segment of software and then asking, 'Is there a part of that which underpins the creative sectors?' Going on from there, you were able to go one step much further than we were able to.

**Lydia Kan**

We split software from gaming. The DTI really helped me with that. It made a difference.

## **General Discussion**

**Ian Hargreaves**

Thank you very much to the two members of the panel and to the third member of the panel, who has had to leave early. That completes the expression of views by the panel. The methodology of the witness seminar also depends even more critically on the gathering of views from the room on any dimension of the matters that are under discussion here today: the nurturing of the creative industries through the agency of a particular mapping document or a particular method; what we think about that in terms of its importance, its achievements and strengths; and what it may have missed. If we were in a position today to be thinking about the further development of the creative industries, what sort of activities or actions would we think we would be commending to government or to industry, ganging up together to take initiatives? Who would like to speak?

**John Holden**

At the same time that this was going on, almost in parallel, you had Ken Robinson doing *All Our Futures*. I have two questions about this. That was done on a very similar kind of basis; in other words, when government is facing a set of questions that are urgent, important and interesting but have the misfortune of also being original, it can never find any money to pay somebody to answer them, so an ad hoc group is convened to try to come up with some sort of solution.

My first question is on the history. Did this group have any discussions with Ken Robinson? Were either of your pieces of work informed by the other? The second is: although both turned out to be very important and really useful documents that have had tremendous significance, is this really the best way of going about things?

**Ian Hargreaves**

What is the 'this' in your question?

**John Holden**

Having a high-level, ad hoc, unpaid group to do work on it, rather than having a proper process within Treasury and joined-up working between departments etc.

**Ian Hargreaves**

Let us hear a few voices before bringing the panel back in.

**Robert Hewison**

I have a completely different question. I am a cultural historian. As a forensic exercise, this been a complete failure because it has totally failed to engage in the historical connections. For instance, we have heard no mention of 'the group' – John Newbiggin should know about that – nor have we had any reflection on the political connections between the people who were chosen to appear on the Creative Industries Task Force, which was only one of about 198 [task forces]. Thirdly, I have a document – *Create the Future: A Strategy for Cultural Policy, Arts and the Creative Economy* – which has not been mentioned in this witness seminar. At the back of this document is the whole reason why creative industries policy in this country has failed, and that is this particular concentric model of how the creative industries work. This has now become the international model, supported by UNESCO [the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization], and it is a complete nonsense because no one in government – and I speak for the arts – understands how artists work.

**Ian Hargreaves**

Would you just mind identifying yourself?

**Robert Hewison**

I am Robert Hewison. I am a cultural historian. I wrote a little book called *The Rise and Fall of Creative Britain*.

**Ian Hargreaves**

Thank you. Who else would like to speak?

**Andy Pratt**

I was the first person to set up the Department of Culture, Media & Creative Industries at King's and I am now at City University. One of the things I wanted to point out was the wider context – we have already heard of history. There was a slight slippage in what the panel were saying between cultural industries and creative industries. The cultural industries pre-dated this and were something that most metropolitan authorities were doing in the 1980s and 1990s in terms of policies. Much of the initial impetus of these debates and some of the early mapping attempts were taking place there. There is a continuity – these things carry on through – but do not forget that. There was a question about whether the *Mapping Document* would have happened and, in terms of the point around cultural versus creative, I have written about this several times and, as far as I am concerned, the choice of creative industries rather than cultural industries was the signalling of old

and new Labour. There is, then, a really important pre-history that had been happening in the regions and, therefore, I contest the idea that suddenly the cities took this idea up. They were there first and had been doing it all the time, as well as the regions.

The second point is that I am really astounded that every interaction I seem to have with anybody involved with the mapping process, as well as politicians and policymakers, is that nobody wants to talk about anywhere outside the UK. This whole process has been desperately inward-looking. What has flown from this, interestingly, is a process by which the cultural and creative industries have developed internationally and also with international agencies. The UNCTAD [United Nations Conference on Trade and Development] and UNESCO creative-economy reports are, in a sense, the ending point of the process you kick-started. Within that global context, how on earth could you say anything about the cultural and creative industries unless you were comparing one country with another? Otherwise, it is just an internal debate. It is this non-referenced idea that would really start a proper debate.

The key thing that the *Mapping Document* did was to align this to something that the Treasury would accept and understand. It went mainstream then. However, you then need to speak across the world. This is a global industry and yet, still, as you say, people have not really woken up to this. It is that international context that we have been desperately slow to do, and the real legacies of this debate are that, if you go anywhere else in the world, they point to the *Mapping Document* and the policy that the UK had. That, of course, is another question: what policy? There was no policy and there is still none. That is the biggest problem with the whole issue. It is great window-dressing and really important, and has changed so many things, but the policy follow-up is something for someone else to talk about.

### **Geoff Crossick**

I am glad I am following on from what Andy said about policy, because a fair amount of what we heard from the panel was about the policy failings that followed the imaginative opportunities created by the *Creative Industries Mapping Document*. I wonder whether many of the policy failings derive from the fact that the creative industries were established as an idea at the wrong time: that is, at the moment when the digital/technological change was suddenly offering all kinds of amazing changes. That may be the origin of a particular failing of policy in this country, which is the belief that the creative industries are about technology, not about content.

Most government initiatives have been about technology, insofar as they have got involved in initiatives. There are occasional ones on content, like some tax credits and so on, but governments – both New Labour and a much longer period more recently of Conservative governments – have found it very hard to see the creative industries as not being primarily technologically driven, hence many of the policy failings, hence the nature of the Industrial Strategy, hence school education and hence the fact that, just a couple of weeks ago, just before he resigned, Sam Gyimah, the Minister for Higher Education, said that he was going to crack down on creative arts degrees because they were not yielding very much for their graduates. Content has never been part of creative industries strategy in a serious way and that may be traced back to the moment of the invention of creative industries, which was, paradoxically, the wrong time.

### **Hayden Phillips**

I was the founding Permanent Secretary at the Department for National Heritage and third Permanent Secretary at the DCMS. I have three observations. First of all, you should mention John



Major when looking back. Had he not brought together seven small bits of different departments in 1992, he would not have had a platform to make the advance that mattered. There is a cross-party connection here and it was not just all New Labour.

Second, when looking back, I suppose we spent the first five years in the department doing what departments do, which is tracking down the traditional contacts that those departments have had. When something like the *Mapping Document* appears, you have to try to make sure that government gets ownership of it. You manage to get the department to gain ownership of it, and that was tremendous, but you must remember that all the other departments are institutionally largely incapable of really understanding what one is trying to achieve, because they are dealing with all their traditional clients. They cannot help it – that is just in the DNA – so something different has to happen now in order to embed the good things you have been saying, whatever the criticisms from others may be of what comes out of this.

Third, the main next 20-year campaign is to reverse the collapse of creative artistic education in schools. We all say this – it is self-evident – but nobody does anything about it, other than make the odd speech. Tristram Hunt came to a conference I was running recently and gave a very brilliant talk about the connection between the arts, museums and galleries, and education in schools – and that is where the challenge really lies as technology takes over our lives and people have more time to think about what they are going to do when they are not at work, if they are at work, whatever ‘work’ is. There is a real, big task there, and I do not think it is too difficult. If you get the Department for Education, which is meant to understand and is in charge of education in the maintained sector, as well as more broadly, to capture it, you can achieve an enormous amount. Somebody somewhere has to get a strategy together for harnessing that rather big engine of educational policy and pushing it in the right direction.

I worked for a bit in the creative industries as chairman of the National Theatre during the glory years of Nick Hytner’s tenure as director: *War Horse*, *The History Boys* and *One Man, Two Guvnors*. We made piles of money, which substituted happily for every cut imposed upon us by the Arts Council, and more. When I got out of my government life and became a part of a thriving cultural-content institution, I began to be able to see all the skills that you need to get a creative operation going, and they are many and varied. That is not often understood, and government finds that very difficult to deal with, whatever party is in power. Institutionally, it is unimaginative – I should know.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Janice, there is quite a bit to come back on there.

### **Janice Hughes**

One thing that perhaps crosses over from the ‘how’ chimes in with what I would call the rise and rise of the creative industries, not the rise and fall, and I think we still have the opportunity to say rise and rise again, or rise some more. In the ‘how’, because we had these disparate sectors to look at, one thing that was common between them all was the value chain. In each value chain, we started at the core, which is the content, every time. We then went across that into the aggregation of that content: the sale, the marketing, the packaging and the distribution of that content. Below it, we layered the involvement of technology in each element of that. Of course, the labour intensiveness varies. When we look forward into the next 20 years and think about jobs being replaced, with even better 4K cameras and whether robots will be operating them, there will be, for

sure, but we have to think about layering back to that core content to ensure that it is fed into the value chain, whether in music or in software, or coming up strategically with the idea, let us say, for a women's game. There is *Candy Crush* and a couple more but the games industry per se is particularly narrowly focused. When we talk about diversity, black and ethnic minorities and all kinds of ethnic and gender diversity in companies, we have a huge way to go in this country. We are on the path to doing some of those things about getting more diversity. In fact, I am working on diversity in a games company right now. At the end of the study we are currently doing is, 'We would like more diverse content because we are a bit narrow. Most of the games are aimed mainly at a male audience', and the same for e-sports.

Looking forward over 20 years, we can build on the content, but we should look at the value chain that precedes that. What is it that contributes to this extraordinary, world-leading, world-beating – whether it is writing books or coming up with the most incredible performing art? What is it? You go back into the education system and into adult education. You go back, as someone mentioned, into mixing disciplines. How do all these things work? How does a Dyson work? We have to think about the elements that give us Creative Britain or Creative UK.

I feel we have only scratched the surface in terms of understanding it, and I think government departments should have a 101 on, 'I am in Education. Where do I fit into UK PLC? What do I contribute? How can I make it better?' Having examples of great case studies or role models is very helpful. You can map the numbers. Nowadays, we can really say, 'This is part of the contribution', and point to the diversity of people who come into this country and where they come from. We have 180 different languages in London. All of this adds to what we have, so let us measure it. Let us talk about it. That is why I feel we have done a tiny piece of it, but there is a lot more to do.

How do you then disseminate that into the government? How do you get Margot James [Minister of State for Digital and Creative Industries] working with you and thinking through her ideas? Here is someone who has been in business. She is very interested in diversity and she is just very encouraged by it. It would be great if we could see that happen in every department.

### **John Newbiggin**

There are so many points to respond to. In terms of Hayden Phillips' contribution a moment ago, I dimly remember a conversation not very long into the government, in which Hayden said to me, 'You have about six months to make happen all the things you really want to happen. After that, the shutters come down.' One of the things that I found interesting at the start of that 1997 government was that the Labour Party had been in opposition for a long time, and Shadow Cabinet members spent a great deal of time talking to each other. As soon as they are in government, everybody is locked into their baronial, departmental castles and, instead of working together, everybody says, 'How come that bastard got on *News at 10* and I did not?' and phones up Number 10 to complain. It becomes very competitive and very insular. It is a function of the massively complicated, bureaucratic machine that is government. It is that idea of departments owning something.

Since we are talking about policy here today, one of the interesting things about this *Mapping Document* was it was a bit of kite-flying in a way. However, because the department felt itself to be quite marginal in Whitehall terms, to have something which felt like a new initiative that was going to help put it more centre-stage was something that people got behind. Even if they were slightly sceptical about the process, they liked the idea and, therefore, it was owned by the department.

John Holden referred to *All Our Futures*, which was a big, comprehensive look at the way the education system worked, with a similarly glitzy array, including Lenny Henry and Dawn French. It was a big group of people but the problem with it was that it was never owned by the DfE [Department for Education]. It was a bunch of people telling the DfE what they ought to be doing. My experience of the DfE is that they are so used to people telling them what they ought to be doing that they have just stopped listening, because it is just too irritating.

This sounds like a flippant point, and I remember at the time having rows about this, but *All Our Futures* had 73 recommendations. You cannot produce a report that is going to implement any kind of policy change if you have 73 recommendations. It is just bonkers. If you have three or four, they are more likely to happen. In a way, because the *Mapping Document* did not threaten it, because it was in completely uncharted territory, and because it was quite a simple proposition, and because it helped to raise the profile of the department, it was owned by the department, with some enthusiasm. That is exactly why some other departments were fairly sceptical: 'What are these people from Culture and Heritage doing, telling us about the economy?' There was significant resistance to it. In terms of policy implementation, that thing of making sure that the politicians and then the officials feel that they own whatever the initiative is is absolutely crucial, and very easy to forget.

In terms of Andy Pratt's point on international, there are two issues. One is that it has been quite difficult – and you have done more work than just about everybody else in this area – how do you compare the creative industries as defined in country A with those as defined in country B? It was not until things like the SIC and SOC [Standard Occupational Classification] codes began to get more contemporary that the possibility of doing accurate comparisons between different national economies has become more possible.

Sitting side by side with that, something that has been a terrible disservice to this country is that all politicians, having gotten enthusiastic about the creative industries, are now very happy to stand up and say, 'We are the most creative nation on earth', which seems to me an extremely dangerous, smug and untrue thing to say. There are areas where the UK has produced a lot of extraordinary talent but the idea that somehow it is our God-given right to be the most creative people on the planet is pretty dangerous. There has been a huge amount of innovation in policy that has affected company structure and social, creative and cultural enterprises of one kind and another coming out of this country. But the more there is an international comparison, the more it will compel, one would hope, our governments, policymakers and practitioners to think more about what the UK's role in a global creative economy is and what areas it makes sense for us to really focus our energy, build alliances and think about skills.

Coming back to one of the many things that Robert Hewison said is the dreaded concentric circle, with arts in the middle, with various degrading incarnations. You then get to videogames, which are almost too rude to allow into the house. It has always seemed to me that that is completely bonkers. The fact that it appears in a policy paper is only proof of the fact that policy is a long, hard, tortuous road.

I am not quite sure what 'the group' is, but I think it is an overestimated view of a bit of history. One of the reasons why this took off is because it was a new government. It was a bunch of people who had not been in government for a very long time and, therefore, wanted to do some new things and make them happen – and make them happen quickly. They also had a new bunch of friends. However corrupt and inappropriate that is, there is a certain amount of inevitability in the fact that a bunch of politicians forming a government are going to turn first to people who they know and

trust. When that is a new broom, that is fine; when that becomes institutionalised after a terrifyingly small number of years, it becomes very corrupt and stultifying. Renewing that is a really tricky thing to do, and any party that manages to sustain the energy, freshness and new voices in the government for more than five or six years is doing pretty well.

### **Dick Penny**

I am Dick Penny from Watershed in Bristol. I want to follow on from what Geoff Crossick said. I quote him endlessly about spaces where something can happen. I am just making this up as I go but, when we moved from being an agricultural economy, we did not move from being an agricultural industries economy to being a manufacturing industrial economy. We moved from an agricultural economy to an industrial economy. The use of 'creative industries' suited the purpose of getting into government and getting government to acknowledge – but my experience of creative industries, particularly when you are out of London, where you do not have institutions or corporations of scale, is that what you have is a cluster. It is all about talent, imagination, ideas, connections and networks. It is an ecosystem rather than an industry, so it behaves differently. Certainly, what I have seen of investment that is coming through in the latest Industrial Strategy is that they feel comfortable with technology. Somehow they think they can touch the technology, even though most of it these days is software; somehow, it is more concrete than these people with ideas and content.

While calling it creative industries absolutely works at the moment, I wonder whether that is also part of what is doing us a disservice, because it means that we have to describe ourselves using 19th-century, Industrial Revolution language, which is terribly linear – each step adds value – whereas it is massively non-linear and collaborative.

### **Lydia Kan**

I am a CEO coach and I work with a lot of start-ups all over the world, particularly in creative economies. One of the key points that we have found – and I think it is even more so now – is that most of these occupations are not jobs. A lot of people were doing things part-time, on the side or on the weekend. In terms of that mythology about creating jobs, it creates revenue, turnover and business but not necessarily countable jobs. That is a piece that is probably worth looking at going forward. If you look at the World Economic Forum, the whole world is moving to skills: 'These are the skills that are needed.' The human element within the creative industries is probably the strongest going forward, in terms of the next 20 years: the humanity. That is, as was just mentioned, around collaboration, around touchability, and around the idea, the spark and the emotion. Creative industries evoke emotion, which is something that I do not think a robot can take away.

### **Brian Leonard**

I worked at DCMS about four or five years after the *Creative Industries Mapping Document* and participated in the attempt to resurrect the platform and the opportunities that that provided in a department which had more or less forgotten about it. Several people were helpfully involved in that at the time – Hasan [Bakhshi], John Howkins, Geoff Crossick and Dick Penny, for example. What that leads me to try to contribute tonight, apart from agreeing with lots of things I have heard as an analysis of where we are and how we got here, is that the question for the next 20 years

revolves, to a large extent, around two options in my head. It is a very nebulous world and it is very difficult to say what works and what would not.

First, is something like this going to get a major step change up in the governmental policy system? That means a secure, enduring programme of resources, in particular, so that it is constantly, year after year, being invested in at the level of ideas; bringing thinkers in and getting those thinkers to contribute things; and being invested in, in the sense of producing outcomes such as funding programmes in education, design and technology etc, much of which has been talked about tonight as positive things. Are we going to get that? Is it going to happen as a permanent part of the infrastructure?

When we resurrected the *Mapping Document* in 2005–06, it was exactly the same kind of experience that John described in the late 1990s. We had a creative industry division which was doing film and music, nothing else, and the whole idea was to try to expand it, picking up on the *Mapping Document*. We got one and a half extra posts to do that and less than £100,000 in non-staff money. It did reasonably well, thanks to the pro-bono contributions of many people, just as Janice had done then. However, as soon as that ended, it came down. That is the first paradigm shift: to try to get us up there, and we are not there yet. I query whether anyone wants to take us there. It would take another Prime Minister, probably, who was not preoccupied with certain things.

The only second option that I can think of is to keep on sending rockets up into the sky, just as the *Mapping Document* was and just as what we did in 2005–06 was, and just as has been attempted later. If you cannot do that, you have to keep reminding people, bringing energy and enthusiasm together and making a splash, and involving as many people as you can to do that at a national level and at what used to be called regional level – if somebody could tell me what regional level is now, I would be interested – or at local level. It is the only alternative. To make the policy system respond, you have to have one of those three things.

### **Janice Hughes**

Those two points were really interesting. My own question is: what is the funding of DCMS today compared with when we were working back in 1998? I do not know whether it has gone up by 5 per cent, 10 or 100 per cent.

### **Participant**

50 per cent.

### **Janice Hughes**

On the point about rockets, the Board of Trade that existed way back then was closed down. It continued in various smaller incarnations. Three or four years ago, the Department of Trade was disbanded because of Brexit. Now, 1,000 people have been recruited into what is now the Department for International Trade under Liam Fox, so that department suddenly has masses of money but is also a million miles away from the creative industries and has, I would argue, a great knowledge of what has been experienced in DCMS with the mapping documents and thoughts about their role in the next 20 years. I like your idea of a splash and the rocket, but that is probably all that can be done, because we do not seem to be able to get across that it should be both overarching across all sectors – Health, Education and Exports – as well as drilling down into this

ecosystem of how businesses work and the idea that it is not a funnel of activities. They are all mixed together. Of course, many companies are global, with different elements here and there, and sharing and partnering. They cannot exist on their own just in the UK.

### **Hasan Bakhshi**

I am from Nesta and the Creative Industries Policy & Evidence Centre. There has been quite a lot of commentary about the distinctive characteristics of the creative industries and why these call for distinctive policies around IP, etc. However, Brian alluded to a really important point about the institutions of policy. The distinctive needs of the creative industries call for different types of institution, and herein may lay the beginnings of how we might have a sustainable engagement from government with these industries, which are the new institutions. John Newbigin mentioned my institution, Nesta, which could take up an entire seminar in itself in terms of its different incarnations over the last 20 years, but I think that an organisation like Nesta is an institution that can keep sustained engagement between government and the creative industries.

The Arts and Humanities Research Council, which evolved from the Arts and Humanities Research Board, is playing an important institutional role in its current incarnation in terms of getting public investment into the creative industries, particularly in the area of research and development. There are other institutions that we can think of as well: the Creative Industries Council and the Creative Industries Federation, which is a significant membership body. The institutional mix and reflecting on what works institutionally is an important part of this story, certainly when you think over the next 20 years about how we create institutions that can keep the agenda fresh for the creative industries. We expect these sectors to continue to be dynamic and fast-changing. How can we capture the benefits of having institutional engagement without sapping the creativity and instilling a conservative agenda? That is an important part of this story.

### **John Newbigin**

A lot of us had been thinking about policies for that Labour government in 1997. After the election, it was, 'Hurrah. We get to run the train set and we can make everything happen.' Of course, government is such an incredibly complex machine that making these things happen is really difficult. The temptation to structurally reorganise is great. DTI, BIS [Business, Innovation & Skills] – it is an alphabet soup but the same old thing. How do you achieve a paradigm shift?

At Creative England, we cannot bang on in our relationship with BEIS and say, 'We are being given metrics that are all about jobs and we exceed the metrics in jobs, but we are generating work.' It is a different work. Looking at the sustainability of companies, if you are setting up special purchase vehicles to make a film and then closing them down again, it is a completely pointless exercise.

Then you get on to trying to explore new ways of measuring the success of societies, not just using GDP but using happiness and wellbeing etc. Everybody is feeling around in these genuinely difficult areas and it seems to me that the occasional rocket is a really good idea, because you can sometimes get the paradigm shift, but thinking through what the efficient structures of government are is becoming so complicated in our society that that is one of the drivers for the fact that the creative, cultural and economic energy in the world now seems to be more and more going to city or city-region level, which is where you can just about make these things work. In one sense, we are going back to a slightly medieval landscape of city regions, and it is the poor buggers in between who are going to suffer because they do not have anything going on for them.

In that sense, all this thinking about the creative industries was opening, in an unanticipated way, a Pandora's box of all these other issues about the switch to a digital economy and the switch to individual creativity being such an important driving force. How do we structure government to deal with all these things? To hang on to tech is so much easier, because it is so much easier to quantify what you are doing, but it is the old game of whether we measure what is of value or whether we value the few things that we manage to measure.

We have come quite a long way in the last 20 years, but we are absolutely in the foothills of thinking through what the future of all kinds of things looks like. Gail said we are going to have lots more free time. Lots of people have said we are going to have lots more free time, whenever there is any change in technology. What it generally means is a whole lot more people out of work. There are 620 million unemployed young people worldwide, according to International Labour Organization statistics that I was looking at. What the hell are they going to do? It does not seem to me that there is anything in the way that we are currently constructing our metrics that suggests we are going to achieve any kind of fundamental social and cultural change in the balance of forces and wellbeing, unless we get much more radical about how we do things.

### **Martin Smith**

I work in the investment business. We are going in a number of different directions here but could I just make one more Whitehall point that follows on particularly from a lot of what John has been saying, and one finance point?

The first point is to query how far an understanding of the creative industries – what drives them, what makes them tick, how value is created – has really seeped into other government departments in Whitehall. If we go back to the Industrial Strategy process, which is the big game in town, as John said earlier, just look at the green paper that came out in February of last year. Out of 200 pages, two are on creative industries, one of which says, 'We will ask Peter Bazalgette to do a piece of work.' That entire document is marinated in STEM thinking. There is no understanding at all, anywhere in that document, of what creativity means and how it relates or should relate to industrial policy. What makes it worse is that Peter then goes off and does his report. Although there is some interesting stuff in it, that document then becomes a white paper at the end of the year and nothing has changed. It is still all marinated in STEM thinking, and that is deeply depressing.

Last Friday morning, to make the same point from a different direction, I had the happy experience of going to a conference and listening to Donald Stark, a rather important civil servant in HM Treasury. He is the civil servant responsible for supervising government thinking about investment: in particular, investment thinking in terms of how you encourage investors to go into industry. He is responsible for tax-advantaged VC [venture capital]: for example, enterprise investment schemes or VC trusts. This is all rather important stuff for anybody who is interested in what is usually called access to finance. It was absolutely clear from what Mr Stark said at that conference that there is no understanding in the Treasury of content businesses investing in stuff or investing in new creative businesses from start-up, through incubation to early late and later stage, and the scale problem, which is what we have with creative businesses. There is no understanding of that in the Treasury at all. I would seriously question how far, in terms of government machinery, some of the understanding that is shared by people in this room has really permeated.

Second, access to finance is hugely complicated and, generally, vastly oversimplified. For those who work in the investment business, one person's access-to-finance problem is another person's access-to-investible-propositions problem. Let me make a different point, which is that I do not

believe that there is, within the City of London, any more understanding of what it takes, what it needs or what we need as a country to help boost this sector than there is in Whitehall. You could argue that it is worse. It certainly became worse at the top of the dotcom boom crisis in 2001, when financial institutions lost confidence in how to value media businesses. That is a very serious problem. I work for a business which is basically about creating a bridge between creativity and finance. We will be well on the road when there are another 500 businesses like ours, because that really is our problem. It is bringing more financial people who understand creativity to work with creative people who need the money.

Two points, then: how much progress have we really made? Hasan is right in terms of institutional structures. We have made a lot of progress but I would query, whether in Whitehall or the City, there has been much advance in understanding what drives creativity and how to map that on to finance.

### **Janice Hughes**

Witness the fact that Gavin Patterson [Chief Executive of BT Group] was fired. I was with him in March this year. He was about to launch into more content and invest in a new, UK-based drama business as part of his content strategy, but the City got rid of him. What else is BT going to do? What is it going to do? What is its strategy? It no longer has a strategy. It was aiming at value added and trying to get into subscription and higher-value subscription, but it could now run a wholesale business and become like Cable & Wireless. Why not? That went down the tube.

### **John Newbiggin**

I recently had a conversation with the man who runs the Design Council in Singapore. They are initiating a programme to make all companies in Singapore creative. That is a pretty good ambition. He said, 'As a result of talking to companies, we are arriving at the conclusion that the three outcomes we want from secondary education are wisdom, kindness and curiosity.' I thought it would be worth having a conversation with some people in Singapore about that because, in terms of international comparisons, we are still saying we are the most creative nation on the planet. We have a lot of very creative people and it is also important to say that, in this country – and I realise this more and more working internationally – we are blessed with having a strange mix of public and private. We have the BBC, Channel 4 and Nesta, we have Skillset as was, and we have Creative England. There is a mix of public and private institutions, and those somewhere in between, which have served us quite well, but there is this idea that we cannot be learning from what other people are doing. It is one thing to say, 'Let us have wisdom, kindness and curiosity as the outcomes of the education system'; it is another thing to deliver it. The fact is that they are thinking like that, and they have that thinking because they have been talking to businesses, is really interesting.

Having been pushing and pushing for so long, it may be that some of these paradigm shifts are beginning to happen, and they are going to start happening pretty quickly in other parts of the world. We need to make sure that we are in a position to learn and exchange as much as we can.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Thank you. We are drawing towards the end of the allocated time for this event. Has anybody else indicated that they would like to make a contribution?



**John Howkins**

I will be brief. I am getting more depressed as we go. I want to say two things. First, when we talk about the consequences, we must try to come up with some examples of positive and negative consequences that relate to the *Mapping Document*. A lot of the examples that have been put forward happened before the *Mapping Document* or would have happened anyway, or happened because of some technological change. We have not had many examples – we have had very few, in fact – of the effect on other aspects or the policymaking machine or of effects on domestic business. I was listening to the examples and none of them had anything to do with the *Mapping Document*, but they are always the examples that are quoted.

The other thing I want to mention picks up on the phrase 'creative industries'. Is the phrase 'creative industries' beginning to be a problem? I am writing a book on the future of work, like everybody else is – it is a good way to get a job in the future of work – and I start with a distinction between 'work' and 'jobs'. 'Creative industries' is a top-down, government label. Governments worry about jobs and do not think about the work that goes on inside the job. Is the phrase 'creative industries' stopping us thinking about some of the other things that other countries are very happily thinking about and moving towards? Has it become a roadblock that is stopping us moving quickly enough?

**Participant**

It is an oxymoron.

**John Newbiggin**

It is not an oxymoron. The response to that is that, in 1997, the purpose of the exercise, which both Ian and Janice have referred to, was to persuade the Treasury and Whitehall more generally to take the economic impact of these activities seriously. The immediate accusation was, 'You philistines. You are completely ignoring the fact that they have intrinsic value as expressions of our culture.' It was to say, 'There is another aspect to this which government is not picking up.' If we had called it the cultural industries, it would have gone straight in the bin anyway because everybody had tried 'cultural industries' and it had not got any traction in Whitehall. 'Creative' is now so totally overvalued as an adjective that it is becoming counterproductive itself, but calling it 'creative industries' put it on a slightly different plane.

I agree that it seems to me that, in talking about a creative economy and the fact that there are all kinds of new skills and new industries that are emerging, it becomes less and less valuable to try to define it as a sector. This sounds flippant but I come back to my earlier point about it being a state of mind. It is moving from being a sector: 'This is creative industry and that is not a creative industry.' We had to start somewhere. It was a mapping document. Already, we have moved on sufficiently that that terminology is not useful, so I agree with you.

**John Howkins**

It was perfect then in the late 1990s.

**John Newbigin**

I think that is right.

**Catherine Dunton**

I hate to be the last speaker because I am certainly not an expert on this. I am an educationalist working here at King's and my interest is in creativity across all disciplines here at King's, and where culture intersects with things like health and science etc.

I have been sitting here and wondering whether, if you talk to some of these people who have been a great boon to the creative and cultural industries, where that seed started for them as a kid. Was it in the local library? Was it in the Saturday cinema club or a local art group? I am just thinking of some other work that we have done about everyday arts and the idea of arts as a social and human right, developing people's creative capabilities as part of their rights as individuals and as human beings. That would be such a rich seedbed. It comes back to John's earlier point of thinking we have such a wonderful creative culture. That came out of somewhere. It is not innate. What are those things that create that culture and looking at it more from the approach of cultural capabilities and social rights?

It is the opposite end from policy but almost taking a leap of faith. If you create spaces for play, risk and experiment, those things will come out down the line. As an educationalist, it is not narrowing it down to a skills agenda; it feels important.

**Ian Hargreaves**

John and Janice, would you like to say a closing word, connected in some way to the ground that has been rampaged over in the last couple of hours?

**Janice Hughes**

Change occurs where there is the power. It is at those high levels. Something I will be interested in is what the new rocket is: what is the new ideology that takes us into those next 10 or 20 years? Can we think again and come up with something that could engage who is going to be in power, such that they engage with us and try to work at a holistic level across government, whether it is Treasury or Health or wherever? As we move forward, it is across everything. That is what I would say as a last comment.

**John Newbigin**

John Howkins made the point that nothing was invented and nothing was changed. All this stuff existed. For me, one of the intriguing things about this was that it was a branding exercise. It was taking something that was very woolly and ill-defined and giving it a name. Just by giving it a name, it has enabled it to have a different status in governments all around the world. I find that fascinating. It was political marketing. In terms of all these words – 'culture', 'creativity' and 'innovation' – innovation is creativity when it has been housetrained. These words are so woolly but we just hit a phrase which has been very useful. It has probably served its time.

## **Conclusion**

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Perhaps history will record that the creative industries met their end in a wing of Somerset House previously occupied by HMRC. That would be quite a thing.

### **John Newbiggin**

That is a good outcome.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Perhaps that would be such a thing that we should make sure it does not happen. The onward procedure for the witness seminar is that Jonathan and colleagues will gather the transcript. Is there anything else that needs to be said, other than consent forms?

### **Jonathan Gross**

Just to repeat, if anyone would like to submit anything material to this process by 21 December, please email me at [jonathan.gross@kcl.ac.uk](mailto:jonathan.gross@kcl.ac.uk). A report will be published on the basis of today's conversation and the series of interviews that have led up to today.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

How surprised are you – if you are surprised – at any difference that you may have noted between what has transacted in this room in the last couple of hours and what was transacted in your interviews?

### **Jonathan Gross**

We anticipated, on the basis of the range of people who had signed up to be here, that would be lots of people with things to say, and we have certainly heard a range of perspectives, which has been great. There is then the process of drawing that together into the narrative of this report, so thank you very much for your contributions.

### **Ian Hargreaves**

Thank you very much, everybody, for coming. There is a drink over which further incendiary trains of thought can be explored, so please do join us for a drink before you hit the streets. Thank you very much.

**This Transcript was produced by Ubiquis UK ☎ +44 (0) 20 7269 0370**  
**<http://www.ubiquis.co.uk> / [info@ubiquis.com](mailto:info@ubiquis.com)**