

I'm not robot  reCAPTCHA

Continue

What is a cultive conclusion

1Volym's introduction outlined the changing rationale and contexts of public policy in the cultural sector. It did so in part by mapping out the problems faced by policy analysts as they grapple with issues of governance, accountability and indicators on which politics has leaned. In this chapter of the decision, we are concerned about the most opaciable (and heated) ways in which the cultural world itself has changed in recent years. During this period, we propose that long-standing assumptions about the organisation of cultural life or the direction of its development have been called into question. This suspicion often appears to be a set of paradoxes – a ridding or contradictions that sometimes seem impossible to us to resolve. Sherman, Murray and others have raised some of these paradoxes. Others have been developed here in a schem to highlight possible directions for future thinking and research. 2 In the first of these paradoxes, it seems clear that the steady planting of global communications networks within the worlds of work and leisure has led to an explosion of cultural activity that we could consider a craftsman. This activity includes writing blogs, publishing genealogy, setting up MP3 music exchange sites, and countless other examples of small-scale, hobby-like activities. Interestingly, such activity is both behind and above innovation programmes, which increasingly support government investment in culture (as Cunningham has described in this number). These communication networks have ensured that traditional forms of expression (such as diary or family tree) remain as strongly as they have produced new forms of experimental cultural or entrepreneurship. This new artisanal activity strengthens the interconnection lines on which social capital depends. It turns long-term connections (such as family ties) into a pretage for new communication and community activities. At the same time, however, this explosive number of micro-communities forces people to organize much of their lives around engagement with highly specialized interests. Dedication to such interests undoubtedly threatens to promote their social detachment and withdrawal from other forms of collective civic activity. 3 All definitions of citizenship assume some balance between public participation and privatized self-fulfillment. New cultural practices – especially those that apply to the Internet, but also text messages and the intertude of digital video films – will re-create this balance in ways that we cannot yet understand. As individuals build up their family history through a global messaging system, will they withdraw from the collective life to traditionally limited forms of cohesion, forms, Do they recognise that all belonging now takes place on the common and mediator public stage? When people spend their mornings reading highly personal blogs instead of newspapers, is this a form of cultural participation or withdrawal from it? It is unclear whether the social capital building block of the subculture capital invited by Sarah Thornton1 – the insider's commitment to the codes and habits of certain special interest groups – is in its broader sense, or a force preventing its further development. 4 At a time when some cultural producers (such as the makers of low-budget political films) are seeking ever greater public attention, some avant-gardes (such as certain electronic music communities) are equally striving to be invisible. The pursuit of public attention and the quest to be at peace are competing demands on governments and public policy. each represents a separate version of cultural citizenship. Understanding and calculating the state is a sign of successful intervention for the first actors. Secondly, the state agglomeration understands and counts is an example of symbolic violence at the heart of government. The problem of those working to develop cultural indicators should be clear. The state's desire to shed light on the deliberately marginalised corners of cultural activities threatens to undermine the avant-garde's efforts to develop new forms of community and cohesion. However, if a state turns away from this activity (or does not seek it), policy development is based on incomplete images of the cultural sector. As culturally interesting micro-entities increase, the state's transition to observing and calculating them may seem like an exercise in control. If these entities do not apply for support or do not require regulatory approval, the legitimacy of monitoring or measuring the cultural policy apparatus becomes unclear. 5Thly, the tensions between public and privatised cultural friendships have slowly superseded another resistance that was long at the heart of cultural analysis: the tensions between producers and recipients of cultural goods. The academic project of cultural studies was largely built on its populism, arguing that consumers of culture were active and not passive. It was always claimed that reception was an active process for interpreting cultural objects and their meaningful. Although controversial, these claims allowed researchers (and those policymakers influenced by similar ideas) to pay more attention to everyday forms of cultural participation and to seek the core of active participation most passively in behavior. 6Then who claim the empowering nature of the new media has had to give up much of this Old media, they point (at least indirectly) to the fact that audiences or consumers New media, on the other hand, have transformed consumers, making them active users of cultural creation tools (such as CD recorder or Web content creation software). The strength of these arguments lies in acknowledging the growing insignificance of the difference between producer and recipient; concepts such as the user community or creative network now better understand their potential diversity of cultural participation. However, there is a risk that consumers of mainstream television or art gallery exhibitions will recently be labelled passive, powerless citizens who remain on the wrong side of the digital divide, undermining their less heroic forms of cultural participation. 7 Understanding these ordinary forms of cultural involvement has long been a major challenge for those involved in the development or analysis of cultural policy. Consumers of network television and other old media (traditionally older and rural than the general population) may well be ignored because of two major developments in cultural policy. One, as proposed, involves highlighting new technologies and appreciating active, even subcult cultural, production of new media formats and content. The second has arrived when emphasis is placed on the role of culture in urban renewal and in nurturing the creative workforce. Richard Florida and others have offered influential claims about the power of culture to attract talented young professionals to inner-city housing. These arguments are useful for placing culture at the heart of social texture and community values. However, they focus on active and consumption-focused engagement with small-scale, high-art cultural forms (such as galleries and live performances). From such forms – education, location, linguistic ability or income – most people are excluded. This analysis both opens up definitions of culture – recognising its place in the wider ethos of urban life and citizenship – and closes it by banishing the consumption of mass entertainment and media from such definitions. After all, the forms of cultural participation that turn out to be the most resistant to analysis can still be old-fashioned activities (such as watching TV), the importance of which has always baffled analysts. 8 The recent concentration of cultural policy in cities and urban life has changed the political debate in important ways. It has allowed analysts to avoid the messy issues that have been pertinent and which long persecuted culture-driven policymakers, mainly as a national phenomenon. In the new urban change, cultural policy makers no longer need to assess the or adopt specific themes, styles, or shapes. This has made it possible for politics to focus on dynamism and creativity as social resources, resources, criteria must be developed to assess the quality or Canadianness of individual works. As Mr Murray has said in this number, there is a risk that the cultural dimensions of creative activity will be forgotten in approaches where culture is seen as just another ingredient in social capital, or as a snanity that dresses up new kinds of economic and human investment in urban areas. 9 We took colloquialism and this book to answer some of the basic questions about the basis of cultural policy and to examine the tools needed to respond to changes in the cultural environment. The contributions of this amount have provided a wide range of perspectives on the general issue of cultural citizenship, as stated above, and have also highlighted the paradoxes and contradictions that policy makers face in their efforts to understand and address the social impact of culture. 10 Is it possible to resolve conflicts and reach a place where the needs of creators, citizens and user communities can be taken into account through general policy? 11As Colin Mercer points out in his chapter that all modern governments need to know that they not only bow down to calculate, but what to calculate. Most of the assistants to this amount, even those with the most clearly expressed doubts about the instrumental criteria for cultural support measures, acknowledged that the new approach to cultural indicators was one of the places governments must start if they want to address the above paradoxes. 12 What do we need better indicators for? The stakes of this amount have eloquently given a number of reasons, but buried in each of them is one fundamental message: what governments regard as culture is not necessarily what cultural producers, user communities or citizens regard as culture. Some of this activity may still have to lie below the radar of cultural policy if it is to maintain its vitality and integrity. However, other types of cultural activity seem to be so entrenched in communities or so new that it is invisible through current policy lenses, even though they require sound. In at least the latter two cases, better indicators are a necessary precurs of better policy. In his chapter, 13Tom Sherman outlines how the cultural landscape evolves from scarcity to the landscape of abundance, even overcrowding, and how the cultural production chain is abandoning the mutual commitment of creators and citizens/consumers to building what it calls hybrid aesthetic strategies. Both Christian Poirier and Nancy Duxbury make clear and more robust cultural indicators reflecting the role of culture in the quality of life and social nature of communities Will Straw, tracing routes for cultural products and practices suggests that objects are undeniably less important than models of interaction forged, reinforced or broken in the process. 14 All this suggests that cultural indicators should focus on relationships and flows and not just on products, so that cultural policy can respond to how citizens, creators and user communities actually live their lives. It can be further pointed out that, before indicators can trace the social impact of cultural developments through communities, it is difficult, if not impossible, to assess whether and to what extent public policy measures contribute to the well-being of citizens. 15 It is essential to take the path forward of cultural policy, shaped by two somewhat contradictory trends: the globalisation of producer/consumer networks and the localisation of cultural quality of life. Since the 1980s, governments, especially national governments, have put a lot of energy into the first of these trends. John Foote's chapter gives us an overview of global challenges that are not only economic and technological, but also social and demographic. In the end, however, it can be argued, as Mrs Jeannotte does in her chapter, that social areas are still largely negotiated at local level by investing in economic, social and cultural capital. 16The cultural participation shown by Catherine Murray and Rosaire Garon does not necessarily achieve political objectives, especially when governments seem to be unclear about conceptual approaches that should support participatory policies – should they seek to attract new audiences to traditional art forms? Or should they aim to strengthen social capital, diversity or cultural rights, even if it means directing public support towards different types of cultural expression? The effectiveness of this difficult issue is reinforced by Karim Karim's observation that the effective use of civil rights and responsibilities depends as much on cultural participation as on economic and political participation. However, as he points out, spheres entred by different subcultures do not always cut in inclusive ways. 17 In this way, the way forward is not easy. Stuart Cunningham and his colleagues speak convincingly to integrate the cultural industry more closely into innovation policy, thus meeting at least two of the global challenges highlighted by Foote. But Allan Gregg puts forward an equally compelling case from the opposite perspective, arguing that culture's ability to bring citizens together and create a sense of community that should be the right focus for governments. However, both aspects are tempered by John Meiel and Gilles Paquet's cautionary advice. Advice. doubts about everyone try to quantify culture or tie it too closely to economic and social outcomes. 18 All participants stress the need to seize what Gilles Paquet has said is the new ecology of the administration. Dick Stanley strongly argues that culture is a key strategic advantage in this challenging environment because it provides the symbolic resources that citizens need to develop a consensus on their collective social lives. From this point of view, if social cohesion is the glue that holds societies together, culture is the toolbox from which that glue is created. In addition, a culture consisting of many different elements creates a more sustainable bond. This perspective is reinforced by Monica Gattinger, who suggests that states must move from government to government through the involvement of a partner with different perspectives. Only through this approach, in his view, will societies be able to organise the knowledge, resources and power needed to achieve cultural policy objectives in the new ecology of governance. In accordance with the message of a participant such as Paquet and Mercer, he reinforces the value of a number of horizontal links within and between public, private and non-state actors, while strengthening the need for leadership of public actors involved in administrative networks. 19 The introductory chapter of this section began by examining governance, and the same remark may have a certain symmetry. Our joint analysis of whether better indicators are needed to measure the social impact of culture and the possible parameters of the paradigm of a new cultural policy is based on the urgent need to adapt cultural governance to the complexity of life in the 21st century. 20 Whenever governance was raised both in colloquialism and in the chapters of this section, the idea of commitment was consistently invoked. In her remarks in colloquialism, Judith A. LaRocque, Canada's Deputy Minister of Cultural Heritage, summed up the importance of cultural engagement in this way: it is difficult to distinguish cultural engagement from community development and the growth of citizenship. When people interact with culture, they are necessarily connected, to people like them in some way and inevitably to different people. Cultural policy therefore has the opportunity to reach outside traditional industry, artist and museum to influence citizenship, values, tolerance and building canadian society as a whole. 21Such engagement can only happen if everyone feels they have a part to play in the cultural life of their community. Most important lesson We have contributed to this amount because, in the turbulent sector of cultural production and consumption that currently exists, political decision-makers cannot afford to focus solely on its industrial/economic aspects. Cultural policy also plays an important role in enabling citizens' well-being and quality of life. In this environment of complexity and overload, no organisation has the capacity to do everything, and that is why governments are forced to think and act more in more creative partnerships with others. 22 We are convinced that cultural production and the preservation of cultural heritage are most successful in an environment where citizens understand and value their contribution not only to the economy and national identity, but also to the quality of their lives and the sustainability of their communities. Much of the evidence and analysis set out in this book would seem to suggest that this appreciation must start at the local level and that instead of filtering outwards from the centre to the periphery, the seeds of any paradigm of new cultural politics must compromise from several localities (and several of their localities) to the rare atmosphere in which policymakers live. As we suggested earlier, these localities include a wide range of forms of cultural engagement. The local contexts of culture are not limited to the highly dynamic urban art scenes that have become so central to cultural policy over the past decade. Localities include a number of forms of cultural participation, from traditional to emerging, from those seeking to involve governments in those who want to resist such a commitment. They cover those who work to engage a wider audience and others whose interests may seem unashamedly narrow or specialized. Politics must form the basis for recognising these diverse forms of cultural commitment. 23 The biggest challenges, but perhaps also the greatest potential of cultural policy in the 21st century, are managing the dynamics of Gilles Paquet's so aptly polycentred regime. Whether we regarded culture as capital, diversity or quite, we agree with Colin Mercer that citizenship in cultural policy is – or should be – a question.