THE PENNSYLVANIA STATE UNIVERSITY
SCHREYER HONORS COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF FILM-VIDEO AND MEDIA STUDIES

A DIFFERENT CLASS: TRANSFORMING CREATIVE EMPLOYMENT UNDER
NEW LABOUR

MICHELLE KARTH
SPRING 2013

A thesis
submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements
for baccalaureate degrees in Media Studies and
Psychology with honors in Media Studies

Reviewed and approved* by the following:

C. Michael Elavsky
Assistant Professor of Media Studies
Thesis Supervisor

Dr. Susan Strohm
Senior Lecturer of Advertising/Public Relations
Honors Adviser

* Signatures are on file in the Schreyer Honors College.

ABSTRACT

In order to fully grasp how social, economic, and cultural policies have merged since the 1980's, it is crucial to first examine how the creative industries came to be seen as an entity that could cure both economic and social troubles. Thus, the beginning of this thesis focuses on the tenets of Thatcherism and the relationship between neoliberalism, cultural policy, and creative industry quarters. After studying the impact Margaret Thatcher's government had on creative employment, the present next provides an examination of how Tony Blair used the creative sector to further New Labour ideals by merging economic discourses with elements of nationalism, public policy, and social inclusion. Finally, this research concludes with an examination of the current coalition in order to assess whether or not culture is still being used as an aid to achieve social policy objectives in contemporary Britain.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction

Since the 1980's, cultural policy in Great Britain has transformed from "being a marginal concern [to becoming something that is] highly visible and explicitly linked to economic, social, and cultural development" (Brown, O'Connor & Cohen, 2000, p. 437). Thus, in order to examine the evolution of creative labor over the past three decades, it is important to analyze the economic, political, and social changes that have occurred since Great Britain has shifted from an industrialized economy, to an economy reliant on the exploitation of information and creativity. To gain a better understanding of these transitions, it is crucial to look beyond what has been presented on the surface level so that we can see how deindustrialization and the emergence of new technologies have changed the nature of creative labor and cultural policy in the 21st century. By analyzing the creative economy from a socio-economic perspective, we are able to scrutinize how these convergences have changed the development of cultural policy and how these changes have affected the rights and opportunities of creative workers. Thus, the goal of this thesis is to examine how social, economic, and cultural policies have converged since Margaret Thatcher's Premiership in 1979 and to consider how these convergences have impacted the approach central government takes toward developing cultural policies within the music industry.

In order to examine these changes, this research will focus on the Premierships of Margaret Thatcher, Tony Blair, and David Cameron so that a better understanding of cultural policy and political influence can be understood with regard to the music

industry. By studying this timeframe, it is possible to examine how these three governments have each approached the creative sector in terms of employment, social inclusion, and economic regeneration. Ultimately, if we want to understand creative labor in today's music industry, it is crucial that we examine how different political strategies have impacted the development of British music over the past three decades. Clearly, this includes looking at the broader aspects of society so that the covert effects of related policies (e.g. welfare, business, media, etc.) can be analyzed within the context of popular music development. Thus, the shift to a neoliberal state during Thatcher's Premiership can be looked at as one of the most important transitions in British history because it not only impacted politics and policymaking, but culture and entertainment, as well.

In fact, according songwriter Billy Bragg, "whenever [he's] asked to name [his] greatest inspiration [he] always [feels inclined to name] Margaret Thatcher [because the] Tories [forced him] to question the assumptions [he] had made about the British state and [his] place in it" (Kureishi, 2009, para. 14). Ultimately, Bragg claims that "it was only when Thatcher started to menace the miners that [he] began to see things in ideological terms" because when he did gigs in coalfields, he felt connected "to an [older and less tarnished] tradition of working-class resistance" (Kureishi, 2009, para. 14).

Clearly, Bragg's account of these events illustrates how understanding the broader effects of Thatcher's policies can help us comprehend how politics and neoliberalism influenced cultural production throughout the 1980's. From this perspective, it becomes evident that larger societal factors (e.g. unemployment, deindustrialization, neoliberalism, etc.) contribute to the overall development of popular music and culture in society.

While examining the ideologies of politicians may seem irrelevant when studying the development of popular music, it is actually incredibly beneficial to examine how different policies (media, public, social), political structures, and technological advancements have influenced the creative sector throughout history. For example, many of Thatcher's social policies (e.g. the Enterprise Allowance Scheme) had a significant impact on British music labels (e.g. Creation Records) because it gave entrepreneurs the needed money to start up their own businesses. While it is true that the scheme was initially set up to curb unemployment and promote neoliberal ideals, it inadvertently helped develop local creative businesses that contributed to Britain's ever-growing culture.

For us to fully grasp how social, economic, and cultural policies have merged since the 1980's, we must first examine how the creative industries came to be seen as an entity that could cure both economic and social troubles. While Thatcher's government venomously rejected popular music, local councils willingly accepted the arts and recognized that various aspects of culture could be used to boost economic growth, social inclusion, and employment in communities. Ironically, the consequences brought on by the Conservatives during the 1980's encouraged local Labour Councils to develop cultural quarters that could work against the malicious approach Thatcher had toward the arts. By working outside the confines of central government, these regional Councils were able to discover an effective means to revive the local economy through art, culture, and music. Clearly, the fact that this 'model' was used by Blair in the 1990's and by Cameron in the present era indicates that Thatcher had a tremendous influence on the development of popular music. After examining these effects, it is evident that the

impact Thatcher's political philosophy and economic policies had on British culture is still being felt today. Ultimately, the influence Thatcher's government had on cultural industry quarters would transform the way subsequent governments would view popular music production for many years to come.

After receiving a cold reception from Parliament in the 1980's, the creative sector got an enthusiastic response from the government in the late 1990's when Tony Blair was elected into office in the spring of 1997. In a pledge to form a new administration that acted in the interests of the people, Blair reformed the Labour Party with the intent of reestablishing hope in the British population and restoring their faith in politics. To achieve this goal, Blair created a modernized version of Labour that had the courage "to embrace the new ideas necessary to make [previous] values live again for today's world" (Blair, 1997). Ultimately, having this type of leftist mentality meant Blair was willing to open up new opportunities for the creative sector that would allow British culture to develop both domestically and abroad. By utilizing the cultural quarter model at the national level, Blair was able to propel the creative sector to the forefront of society so that it would become intertwined in every aspect of British life. As an avid music fan and former musician, Blair's overzealous admiration for popular music brought tremendous attention to the British music sector that established a relationship between the music industry and Parliament that is still seen today. Thus, it could be argued that Blair's support for the creative industries "as a problematic way [to tackle] the issues of economic and social exclusion" is what led to the convergence of social, economic, and cultural policies in modern day Britain (Oakley, 2006, p. 255).

According to Oakley, creativity was vital in New Labour's attempt to reposition itself as the party of the aspirational middle class because it allowed them to develop a 'self-help' strategy that rejected interfering positions in a variety of different policy areas (Oakley, 2006, p. 271). Most notably, the Blair administration focused on the various ways culture could be used to cure individual and collective problems that would abolish unemployment, social exclusion, and youth delinquency from society. In fact, Blair believed that "economic development [could serve as] a pre-requisite for social justice" and thus promoted the idea that creative labor could be used as a way to incorporate individuals "who lacked the means [to] participate in [the] social, cultural, and political life" of Britain (Levitas, 1998, p.1). Ultimately, Blair used a 'social integrationist' approach toward social exclusion that promoted labor market participation as a way to alleviate poverty and social exclusion (Fahmy, 2008, para. 23).

While this work-centric method may have benefitted government agendas, "it is unlikely that these therapeutic, youth work-orientated approaches [made any significant changes in] tackling youth exclusion in the absence of mainstream, macro-economic and social policies" (Fahmy, 2008, para. 26). In fact, linking work schemes to social and cultural policies not only failed to safeguard "the material well-being of all young people [but failed to] restore their access to [the] social citizenship rights [that had been] eroded by [the] neoliberal reforms in the 1980's" (Fahmy, 2008, para. 23). Given these consequences, it is unclear if Blair's attempt to curb social exclusion through economic and culture driven work schemes (e.g. the New Deal for Musicians) had any effect on bettering the conditions of working class musicians during the New Labour era.

In fact, it could be argued that the New Deal for Musicians was too "bureaucratic [in its setup because] it not only [forced musicians to work with] a New Deal Personal Adviser, but a Music Industry Consultant and a Music Open Learning Provider, as well" (Cloonan, 2002, p. 61). Unfortunately, this close supervision made it difficult for musicians to expand their talent and creativity because it forced them to work in a controlled atmosphere that hindered artistic freedom and innovation (Cloonan, 2002, p. 62). Ultimately, these flaws indicate that Blair had more of an incentive to develop work schemes for economic benefits and government agendas rather than future opportunities in the music industry. As a result of the consequences created by deindustrialization during the Thatcher, Parliament had to rethink how England could remain competitive in a global economy that was fast becoming focused on creativity and information. Given these shifts, it is understandable why Blair instilled schemes that could potentially develop talent in industries where intellectual property could be exploited. If nothing else, New Labour used the creative sector to further its political agenda by merging economic discourses with elements of nationalism, public policy, and social inclusion. Clearly, this can be seen in the way Blair's government used working class images in popular music to promote its meritocratic vision of a classless and egalitarian society.

Clearly, the ideals represented in British popular music at the time typified the ideology of the New Labour government and offered an attractive image Parliament could use to promote working class principles and values. Because many of the artists associated with the Cool Britannia movement made an effort to present themselves as 'distinctly British' it was easy for the Blair government to use British music to both reject American imperialism and promote British nationalism for economic and political

purposes. In Blair's eyes, "the old establishment [needed to be] replaced by a new, larger, more meritocratic middle class" because meritocracy "was the only [type of society] that [had the ability to fully] exploit its economic potential for all [people]" (Blair, 2000). According to Blair, a meritocratic society was the only way to create "a Britain where any child born in this millennium [could] make the most of [their] God-given ability [regardless of] their background, race, or creed" (Blair, 2000).

Ultimately, the Blair government was attempting to use a series of promising, quick fix policies to solve a complex network of interlinking problems that had been lingering in Britain since the early 1980's. Evidently, it was this increased government intervention that resulted in specific policies (e.g. work schemes, business schemes, etc.) that were designed to create the infrastructure needed to pull Britain out of its economic decline. Because of the emerging creative economy, it was inevitable that Blair would give more attention to industries (e.g. music, film, art) that would produce products that could become successful exports. Thus, it seems only natural that Parliament would opt to instill policies that would develop employment in the industries that could contribute most to this transforming economy. Still, the convergence between economic, social, and cultural policies has created a conflicting system that has unfortunately hindered the number of quality opportunities for working class musicians in the present era. Ultimately, this contradiction comes from the fact that government officials have consistently implemented acts that have encouraged economic growth at the expense of employee well-being.

After looking at the Premierships of Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair, it is easy to see why certain policies have emerged under the current coalition. In many ways

similar to the Blair era, the current government has opted to view culture as something that can be used to help achieve social policy objectives in contemporary Britain. Working under the moniker 'progressive Conservatism,' the Cameron government has attempted to shed the image of the callous Tory Party by publically endorsing liberal ideals such as culture, the National Health Service, and a shared community. While these statements (made during Cameron's first year as Prime Minister) seem to promote this ideology, subsequent years in office have proven that the Conservative Party has opted to endorse policies that benefit economic interests rather than social welfare. In fact, it could be argued that Cameron's lack of incentive to develop schemes to improve the number (and quality) of opportunities for musicians indicates that his Party places its political agendas ahead of creative labor.

Because Britain's economy has changed so much in the past three decades, it has become crucial for politicians to rethink how future policies can be adapted to suit modern society. In order to better past conditions, it is crucial for Parliament to recognize that previous policies need to be reworked so that they can evolve with the changing economic, political, and social landscape of Britain. Unfortunately, it appears that Parliament's current policymaking approaches have not taken into account the effect greater urbanization has had on the lives of British citizens. While it is true that new innovations and technologies have emerged during the creative age, it is also true that a greater divide has developed between the wealthiest and poorest individuals in Great Britain. Most likely, this growing inequality has been the result of changes that have occurred since Britain shifted from a labor force built on manufacturing to one built on service sector jobs. Clearly, these shifts can be partially attributed to what John Howkins

calls the 'creative economy,' which has brought forth major changes in the way we think about "human creativity [being a driving force] in our economy and society" (Florida, 2002, p. 4). As a result of these transitions, creativity has become essential "to the way we live and work [in today's] today" because "new technologies, new industries, new wealth and all other economic things [have become products of creativity]" (Florida, 2002, p. 21).

Unfortunately, merging intellect and creativity with economic and social policies has had a contradicting and sometimes detrimental effect on creative labor. While Blair attempted to utilize these convergences "to develop new possibilities for the alignment of British creativity and intellectual capital," Cameron has decided to tackle the cultural industries in a more unpredictable manner (Flew, 2011, p. 11). While it is true that Cameron has emphasized the importance of the creative industries, he has put more effort into funding the sectors that can provide the greatest economic benefits. For example, while the Prime Minister has given significant attention to the development of Tech City (Britain's emerging media and technology hub), he has failed to allocate necessary funding for the music industry that can provide more opportunities for young musicians. Clearly, this example illustrates which industries in the creative sector are viewed more favorably by the current coalition.

According to the UN, it is inefficient to solely examine the creative economy from a monetary perspective because the creative sector not only has the potential to enhance "income, jobs and export earnings, but social inclusion cultural diversity, and human development, as well" (Newbigin, 2011). With these thoughts in mind, it could be argued that Blair's policies toward creative labor were actually more beneficial for

music development than anything Cameron's government has done since 2010. While

there may have been flaws in some of New Labour's work schemes (e.g. the New Deal

for Musicians), there was nonetheless an attempt to bring more opportunities to aspiring

musicians. In contrast, the Cameron government has seen the music as less of a priority

and has instead chosen to focus on supporting the technological development and

innovation. In fact, the business schemes that have been developed to help creative

entrepreneurs (e.g. independent labels) have provided more funding to individuals in

areas outside of music. Despite the fact numerous musicians have complained about the

difficulties they have faced when attempting to access funding, Parliament has repeatedly

chosen to ignore this issue.

Still, while it is true that the music industry has suffered through a myriad of

difficult changes, there have been a number of recent developments that suggest a trend

toward developing better opportunities for British musicians. Most notably, perhaps, has

been the replacement of the Licensing Act 2003 with the Live Music Act 2012, which

"removed the Local Authority requirement for venues with an alcohol license to purchase

an additional license for hosting a performance of live music for small venues"

(www.ukmusic.org). According to UK Music's chief executive:

> *"This act will reverse the damaging effect the Licensing*
>
> *Act had on live musical performances in the UK. Our most*
>
> *successful musicians, Joy Division, The Sex Pistols and the*
>
> *Rolling Stones all learnt their trade and earned their*
>
> *livings in small clubs and bars. Reversing overzealous*
>
> *licensing regulations will create new opportunities for*

British artists. The Rose & Crown in Totteridge Park and

The Constitution in Camden Town will be - thanks to this

Act - full of music and seedbeds for talent. [The] headline

acts [of tomorrow] will grow from these seedbeds, which

[will be] great for music lovers and for the wider UK

economy" (www.ukmusic.org).

In addition, the Department for Media, Culture, and Sport's new 'Creative Industries Council' has taken it upon themselves to investigate the trouble local musicians have had trying to access funding at the local level. While it is true that the Council has not paid much attention to music funding in the past, a recent report addressing these issues suggests that the organization's agenda has shifted to include popular music. Most recently, the 2012 *Creative Industries Council Access to Finance Working Group Report* has acknowledged "creative industries sole traders [as] pivotal figures and key contributors [in the development of] high value creative innovation" (Creative Industries Council, 2012, p. 8). In fact, the report specifically makes note of the fact that many of the songwriters and producers who have worked with British artist Adele have contributed to large businesses projects that far exceed the size of their own microbusinesses (Creative Industries Council, 2012, p. 8). Needless to say, "the [mutual] success of different business [sizes and types has become so] interlinked" that the combined efforts of micro and macro businesses will no doubt play an important role in the future development of the creative industries (Creative Industries Council, 2012, p. 8).

Chapter 1

Margaret Thatcher and the Development of Cultural Industry Quarters

When examining the history of popular music, it becomes clear that Great Britain has produced some of the most well-respected and highly acclaimed musicians of all time. For decades, British artists such as The Beatles and The Rolling Stones have succeeded in creating popular music that resonates with individuals across genres, cultures, and generations. Through music, listeners have been able to experience the political turmoil, cultural movements, and social issues of previous eras in Great Britain. While numerous and noteworthy artists have emerged throughout Britain's history, the 1980's can be thought of as a significant turning point in time when music collided with the economic, social, and political factors brought on by the state. During this time, the contested policies of Margaret Thatcher helped cultivate a series of notable changes that transformed the way politics and policies would influence the production of culture and popular music for decades to come.

'The Winter of Discontent' and the Rise of the New Right

It has often been said that Margaret Thatcher was not only one of the most ruthless Prime Ministers to ever lead Great Britain, but one of the most vigorous, determined, and successful enemies of socialism the world has ever known. In fact, Thatcher truly believed that Britain's economic decline in 1979 was the result of the socialist actions of the Labour Party and their inability to control the union strikes that

were occurring during the 'Winter of Discontent.' However, despite what Thatcher claimed to be the problem, the union strikes were actually the result of much deeper troubles within the global economy and really stemmed from factors related to the US government's need to print large sums of money to pay for the Vietnam War. In fact, this move resulted in a tidal wave of inflation across the West that caused many low paid workers to strike because they felt they were "being made to pay for an inflationary crisis that they had no part in creating" (Jones, 2012, p. 49). Consequently, it could be argued that Britain's economic decline had more to do with what was happening outside of Great Britain, rather than the policies that were implemented by James Callaghan's governments.

Understandably, the strikes caused the British public to become frustrated with unions during the late 1970s because of the inconveniences and cancelled services that resulted. Unsurprisingly, the Conservatives used these sentiments to launch a series of new laws and policies that forbid union workers from striking while making them liable for huge financial penalties (Jones, 2012, p. 49). Clearly, the Thatcher government did everything in its power to illustrate to the public that the high unemployment rate was a result of the policies that had been executed under Callaghan's government. The constant reminder of these woes served as a catalyst to get British citizens to accept the fact that drastic changes needed to be made to boost England's economy. If nothing else, these accusations were used as a way to suggest that it had been Labour's "repeated attempts to accommodate the demands of interest groups and trade unions" that had caused the severe economic decline of Great Britain (McAnulla, 2010, p. 289). Ironically, even after thirty years have passed, the Winter of Discontent remains to be "a kind of right-wing

folk story that can be used to bash unions whenever there is even a murmur of industrial unrest" (Jones, 2012, p. 49).

According to McAnulla, "one of the key successes of Thatcherite ideology was the way it [was able to use] the apparent failures of [previous Labour] governments [to] justify the project of rolling back the economic frontiers of the state" (McAnulla, 2010, p. 289). For example, this tactic can be seen from examining the Conservative Party's 1977 document *The Right Approach to the Economy*, which was used to explain how the failures of previous Labour governments had led to Britain's economic crisis in the 1980's (King, 2011, p. 129). Ultimately, the document suggests that the socialist policies that were executed by Labour during 'The Winter of Discontent' were "rooted in theories of ownership and class conflict [that were] already decades out of date" (King, 2011, p. 131). In fact, the document claims that the Labour government selfishly promised a golden decade of exaggerated hopes and dreams that could serve as short-term political advantages for Parliament. Ultimately, this document proclaimed that the Labour Party was an 'old-fashioned' establishment with a redundant ideology that refused to listen to the people or look to the future. Ironically, the Conservatives proclaimed that they were the Party of the future because their goals "matched the manners, the customs, the laws, [and] the traditions of the British people" (King, 2011, p. 131). Above all else, Thatcher's government sought to position itself as possessing ideals that were needed to "develop [a] modern industrial society" that created wealth solely by the individual (King, 2011, p. 132).

With this background, it becomes clear why Tony Blair decided to create a new political consensus in the 1990s that embraced both social democracy and neoliberalism.

After being positioned as an out-of-date Party with selfish incentives, it is no wonder that

Blair would attempt to distance himself from past Labour governments that supposedly

aided in the decline of British society. According to his 1997 General Election speech,

Blair claimed that New Labour was created "not a mandate for dogma or for doctrine, or

for a return to the past, but [as a] mandate to get those things done in [Britain] that

desperately [needed to be done] for the future" (Blair, 1997). Ultimately, Blair saw

"modernization not [as] an end [within] itself [or as] the enemy of justice but [as an] ally

[to society and the British people]" (Blair, 1997). Rather than returning to the values and

morals of the Party before eighteen years of Conservative rule, Blair chose to adopt a new

vision that aimed to make Britain "nothing less than the model [nation of the] 21st

century" (Blair, 1997). Clearly, these sentiments illustrate the significant impact

Margaret Thatcher's government has had on political leaders in Great Britain over the

past three decades.

There is No Alternative: Margaret Thatcher and the Neoliberal State

When Thatcher took office in 1979, her first priority was to stimulate economic

growth in a way that reduced (what she claimed to be) the excessive public spending and

intervention of previous governments. According to Thatcher, "stimulating investment

and productivity through the reduction of taxes and inflation" was an effective way to

transform the UK into a country that supported a largely compliant labor force that was

built on the basis of relatively low wages (Harvey, 2005, p. 59). From Thatcher's

perspective, Britain's failing economy could be saved by replacing government

dependency with a "cult of individual freedom" that operated "under the influence of

economic liberalism [and personal responsibility]" (Kruger, 2007, p. 2). In order to

achieve these goals, Thatcher cultivated a middle class that would consent to her neoliberal ideals and relish in "the joys of home ownership, private property, individualism, and the liberation of entrepreneurial opportunities" (Harvey, 2005, p. 61). Ultimately, Thatcher attempted to push for the privatization of state-run enterprises so that personal and corporate responsibility could help facilitate greater productivity, modernization, and individual/corporate enterprise in everyday society (Harvey, 2005, p. 60).

Clearly, the shift to this neoliberal mentality helped elevate the social status of the entrepreneur because it turned Britain into a consumer-driven culture that favored profit, growth, and moneymaking (Dellheim, 1996, p. 34). If nothing else, this change "marked an [extensive] shift to centralized power" that not only affected the welfare, housing, and education of British individuals, but their complete range of local services, as well (Hollowell, 2003, p. 207). Unfortunately, the consequences that arose from Thatcher's neoliberal policies went beyond the economic or business level because the effects could be felt by individuals in *every* aspect of British life. In fact, neoliberalism had a tremendous impact on the way Britons perceived individual success and failure as being more about entrepreneurship virtues and personal shortcomings rather than external exclusions brought on by class or race. Under these circumstances, citizens were taught to believe that their misfortunes were not the result of greater societal forces, but the result of insufficient investments made into their education, training, or work" (Harvey, 2005, p. 66). Unsurprisingly, a mentality such as this benefited the neoliberal ideology of the Thatcher government because it urged citizens to take responsibility for their own actions and accomplishments.

Clearly, market deregulation plays an important role within this neoliberal framework because it allows market forces to act as self-regulating mechanisms that can move capital in a quick and efficient manner across international borders. For Thatcher, this laissez-faire approach meant returning to Victorian values that would minimize the power of the state and encourage people to stand on their own two feet without government assistance. Above all else, this return came as part of a larger effort to reverse Britain's economic decline through an economic policy that 'rolled back the state' to allow individuals and businesses to make money without government intervention (Cloonan, 2007, p. 34). Ultimately, the Thatcher administration wanted to implement a series of policies that would support the interests of big business, capitalist money, and profit maximization. Unfortunately, to achieve these means, "Thatcher [ended up fighting] the most aggressive class war in British history [by unashamedly] battering trade unions into the ground, shifting the tax burden from the wealthy to the working class and poor, and stripping businesses of state regulations" (Jones, 2012, p. 48).

Most likely, Thatcher's fixation on self-sufficiency and glorified self-employment came from her belief that "the welfare state had turned once-industrious Britain into a 'dependency culture' [built on an appeased] cradle-to grave security" (Dellheim, 1996, p. 33). In fact, Thatcher believed that it was her duty to create a new government that would allow individuals to be free to make their own choices and their own mistakes without intrusive government intervention. From these statements, it becomes clear that one of the hallmarks of Margaret Thatcher's Premiership was the way she relentlessly approached economic and social policies from a rigid and inflexible neoliberal standpoint. Because these principles have played a significant role in music,

policymaking, and politics, it is essential to look more closely at the history of neoliberalism in order to gain a better understanding of the impact it has had on British society in subsequent eras.

Neoliberalism: A Closer Examination

Since its beginnings, neoliberalism "has been lurking in the wings of public policy," ready to act as a "potential antidote to [any] threats to the capitalist social order" and the "central values of civilization" (Harvey, 2005, p. 20). According to Harvey, "neoliberalism is a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be [best] advanced [through the liberation of] individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills [under] an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade" (Harvey, 2005, p.2). Since the 1970's, almost all countries have embraced some version of neoliberal theory, which has had a pervasive effect on the way citizens have come to understand themselves and their surrounding world (Harvey, 2005, p. 3). As a result of the widespread occurrence of neoliberalism, a significant amount of 'creative destruction' has transpired within "divisions of labor, social relations, and welfare provisions" that has changed the way individuals perceive themselves, life, and society (Harvey, 2005, p. 3). Ultimately, neoliberalism has come to operate as an ethic in itself that can be used as a guide to define the actions, values, and desires of human beings.

Based on the principle that the "political ideals of human dignity and individual freedom [should serve as] 'central values of civilization,'" neoliberal theory has often been thought of as a quest for personal choice and greater freedoms of speech (Harvey, 2005, p. 5). In fact, neoliberal values are typically believed to be threatened by any

"form of state intervention that [aims to] substitute collective judgments [with policies that will prohibit an] individual's freedom to choose" their own destiny (Harvey, 2005, p. 5). According to neoliberal theory, these individual freedoms are re-conceptualized along economic lines that use free-market and free-trade rules to promote competition and individualism into society (Harvey, 2005, p. 7). Through this framework, the individual becomes an economic entity that relies on the accumulation of human capital to achieve their goals and desires in life. In other words, the individual begins to embody the characteristics of neoliberalism by choosing to act in their own self-interest in order to obtain the greatest amount of wealth and success for the self.

While it may seem as if this mentality resulted from Thatcher's ideologies, neoliberalism actually has a long history in countries other than Great Britain. According to Harvey, the first "experiment with neoliberal state formation" occurred in Chile after the US backed coup d'état overthrew Salvador Allende because his socialist tendencies had the potential to harm US business abroad (Harvey, 2005, p. 7). The aftermath of these actions resulted in a seventeen year dictatorship lead by Augusto Pinochet that sought to restructure the Chilean economy through "repression [of] all social movements and political organizations of the left" (Harvey, 2005, p. 8). Strangely enough, this reconstruction was implemented by a group of economists known as the 'Chicago Boys,' who had been trained through a US funded program that was created to "counter left-wing tendencies in Latin America" during the Cold War (Harvey, 2005, p. 8).

Clearly, the fact that these individuals were trained through a US program indicates that the US had its own incentives in mind when choosing to overthrow Allende and put Pinochet in place as the new Chilean leader. Ironically, the severe social

consequences this reconstruction had on the Chilean economy went unnoticed when British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher declared it an economic miracle that brought about a thriving, free-enterprise market. Unsurprisingly, Thatcher has cited Pinochet as one of Britain's closest allies and, despite the fact that "more than 3,000 people were killed or "disappeared" during his leadership," has credited him for bringing true democracy to Chile ("Pinochet death 'saddens' Thatcher," 2006, para. 24).

Beginning Policy Convergences: Creation Records and the Enterprise Allowance Scheme

More often than not, "the political neoliberal state will tend to side with a good business climate as opposed to either the collective rights (and quality of life) of labor or the capacity of the environment to regenerate itself" (Harvey, 2005, p. 70). Overall, the "diminished personal resources derived from the job market [and] the neoliberal determination to transfer all responsibility for well-being back to the individual has had doubly deleterious effects" on members of the working class (Harvey, 2005, p. 76). In fact, it could be argued that "there has been no greater assault on working-class Britain than [the] two-pronged attack [Margaret Thatcher led] on industry and trade unions" in the 1980's (Jones, 2012, p. 48). Unfortunately, the new ideals Thatcher put into place during this time abolished the old working class values of community and society because they supported an ideology based on individualism and competitiveness. Ultimately, "the new Briton created by Thatcherism was a property-owning, middle-class individual who looked out for themselves, their family, and no one else" (Jones, 2012, p. 71).

Above all else, Thatcher's philosophy promoted the idea that "people were poor because of their own personal failings" and the fact that they "did not know how to budget [or] spend their earnings [wisely]" (Jones, 2012, p. 64). In effect, Thatcher believed that "the idea of poverty did not really exist" because people were poor as a result of a "hard fundamental character-personality defect" that inevitably led to their hardships and adversities (Jones, 2012, p. 64). When it ultimately came to people on welfare, Thatcher proclaimed that 'their poverty [was] not material but behavioral' and that 'welfare dependence [was] the classic manifestation of a still-too-socialist society" (Jones, 2012, p. 65). As a result, Thatcher made it her mission to institute a number of initiatives during her Premiership that would foster self-employment and individualism in Great Britain.

Perhaps the most well-known work scheme to develop under Thatcher 's government was the Enterprise Allowance Scheme, which was designed to encourage unemployed workers on welfare benefits to become self-employed capitalists. For its main purpose, the Enterprise Allowance Scheme was established to provide the unemployed with "£40 a week for up to a year" so that they could start up their own businesses as self-sufficient entrepreneurs (Dellheim, 1996, p. 33). By 1988, the scheme had made it so British society consisted of more than 3 million entrepreneurs with "nearly 11 % of the labor force [defining themselves as being] self-employed" (Dellheim, 1996, p. 33). Surprisingly, this major growth in employment "reflected an increase [that was] six times greater than the rise in self-employment [that occurred] in the previous three decades combined" and ended up helping nearly 325,000 individuals become self-employed between 1983 and 1988 (Dellheim, 1996, p. 33).

Still, the impressiveness of these statistics does not provide an accurate representation of the overall *quality* of the employment that was cultivated under this scheme. Like many initiatives implemented by later governments (e.g. Blair's New Deal for Musicians), the EAS was structured in way that gave more attention to employment numbers as opposed to work quality and employee satisfaction. According to the National Audit Office, "one in six entrepreneurs assisted by the Enterprise Allowance Scheme fell by the wayside within a year" because there were "insufficient employment opportunities for those pushed out of work by [the] recession" (Dellheim, 1996, p. 33). Furthermore, this scheme often failed to provide "startups with solid training and sustained support to develop the managerial skills [that would be necessary for] would-be entrepreneurs" (Dellheim, 1996, p. 33). As a result of these flaws, many have claimed that this this scheme was only set up by government to boost employment rates by categorizing the unemployed as 'self-employed' during the recession (Gunnell & Bright, 2009). Needless to say, the Enterprise Allowance Scheme provides an excellent example of the dangers that can result from linking business enterprise with social welfare. Unfortunately, the link between economics and social well-being has remained to be an integral part of British politics and has resulted in similar contradictions and concerns during the Premierships of those that succeeded Margaret Thatcher.

Still, while the laissez-faire approach of Thatcher's government may have had unfortunate implications for other areas of society, it ironically had several positive outcomes in Britain's cultural sector. In particular, the EAS had a significant impact on the British music industry, which appeared to flourish under a hands-off system that did not intervene in creative expression or innovation. Throughout the 1980's, many

influential Britons in the cultural realm ended up benefitting from the scheme and the additional funding it provided. Among these entrepreneurs, the most prominent may have been Alan McGee, who used the scheme to help establish the successful independent label Creation Records. Founded in 1983 by McGee and his close friend Dick Green, Creation Records went on to have tremendous success with well-known British bands such as Oasis, Primal Scream, and The Jesus and Mary Chain. As a former railway worker with only a single O-Level, McGee started the label with nothing more than a salary of £40 a week, "a passion for music, and an ear for a hit" ("Alan McGee: The alternative music man," 1999, para. 2).

Aside from taking out a £1,000 loan to finance this endeavor, McGee claims that the label was built on a very low-key, low rent operation that "financed its recording activities [through] pub gigs in London" ("Alan McGee: The alternative music man," 1999, para. 5). While it is true that these gigs contributed to the label's overall success, there is no question that the additional support McGee received from loans helped the label reach its fullest potential, which strongly supports the idea that proper access to funding is important for creative entrepreneurs and musicians. According to McGee, "it is incredibly hard for anyone to make their mark [in the music industry because] at times it seems to be run by public school boys [with wealthy friends and established connections]" ("Alan McGee: The alternative music man," 1999, para. 28). Thus, it would be incredibly difficult for someone like McGee to start up a label in today's music industry, which has seen fewer and fewer opportunities for creative entrepreneurs to access funding for these types of projects.

Ironically, it should be mentioned that after achieving great success in the 1990s, McGee went on to work closely with Tony Blair during the New Labour era as a member of the Creative Industries Task Force, an organization Blair established to measure the creative industries' contribution to the overall economic performance of Britain. While Thatcher's cold reception toward music resulted in a number of surprising success stories during the 1980's, the excessive attention Blair gave to the music industry in the 1990s resulted in a contradictory mix of both successes and failures. Ultimately, it was the way Blair merged economic, social, and cultural policies during this time that resulted in such varied outcomes and the way he attempted to use Britain's thriving music sector as a means to cure social and economic ailments in Great Britain. While Thatcher's economic and social policies were not developed with the music industry in mind, Blair took it upon himself to establish policies that would not only alleviate unemployment in Britain, but would provide more opportunities for musicians, regenerate the nation's failing economy, and modernize the country with a renewed sense of British nationalism. As will be discussed in chapter two, combining these contradictory policies ended up hindering the number of *quality* opportunities available to British musicians during this era.

Cultural Policy Beginnings: The Greater London Council

According to Hesmondhalgh, "cultural policy [can be defined as the] subsidy, regulation, and management of [the] creative [and] non-scientific forms of knowledge activity" that are often associated with the art and culture of a particular country (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p. 138). "Since the early 1980's, cultural policy has moved from [narrowly focusing] on expressive [high-brow] art, to [focusing on] the lifestyles,

meaning systems, and everyday creative practices [of] cultural formation" (Bennett 1995;

McGuigan 1996; Miller and Y´udice 2002). Beginning in the mid-1940s, cultural policy

first developed out of the wartime government's decision to fund the Council for the

Encouragement of Music and the Arts (CEMA) in order to preserve the highest standards

of art, music, and drama during the war (Cloonan, 2007, p. 26). Billed as a way to

establish more opportunities for individuals to experience the art, culture, and music of

Great Britain, this funding was mainly used to get various performing tours around the

country so that more employment opportunities would be available to artists during

prolonged times of conflict (Cloonan, 2007, p. 26). Because Parliament considered

music to be a top priority under these circumstances, it ended up receiving nearly 40% of

CEMA's early grants, which amounted to a surprising £71,000 of the total £135,000

available for all cultural activities (Cloonan, 2007, p. 27). Ultimately, this funding went

toward preserving the high art that would maintain the culture of the elite and generate

the greatest economic benefits for the country.

While there was a definite desire to fund music during this time, it should be

noted that it was the profitable nature of music that led to Parliament's decision to

provide the sector with ample amounts of funding and support. In fact, it was this

economic rationale that helped transform CEMA into the Arts Council of Great Britain,

the non-departmental public body designed to "develop a greater knowledge,

understanding, and practice of *the fine arts exclusively*" in society (Cloonan, 2007, p. 26).

First headed by economist John Maynard Keynes in 1945, the primary goal of the ACGB

was to "increase the accessibility of the fine arts to the public and to improve their

standard of execution" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 26). Based on the model of the University

Grants Committee, Keynes hoped that the ACGB would help establish an "intermediary body between the state and civil society" that allowed the organization to receive state funding while operating independently from Parliament (Cloonan, 2007, p. 27). Ultimately, Keynes was hoping that this setup would ensure the absence of political influence during any level of creative production. According to Keynes, it was important that the direction of the ACGB be shaped by the members of its Council because he believed that the artistic spirit operated best outside of "political, social, financial, or structural constraints" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 27).

Still, while this strategy was used as a way to protect the creative expression of workers in the fine arts, it was not used to protect the interests of those who worked in popular or commercial culture. Here, popular music had a severe disadvantage because it was not considered to have any benefit or aesthetic value that could contribute to society. In fact, it would be twenty some years before "the rise of The Beatles lead [many] intellectuals to [believe] that commercial culture [could contain any] creative importance" or artistic value (Cloonan, 2007, p. 28). Furthermore, it was extremely difficult for British musicians to create a *national* identity during this time because most of British culture had been developed as a *multinational* art form. Ultimately, this meant that traditional forms of popular music in Britain (e.g. folk, music hall) possessed few characteristics that the British could truly claim as their own. Needless to say, this turn of events strongly contradicts what later occurred in the 1990s when New Labour used popular music to promote a British national identity that could be packaged as a product to ship overseas.

After examining how the ACGB evolved during the 1940s and 1950s, it becomes evident that no major changes were developed during this time that significantly altered the way popular music was funded. While it is true that "the 1959 General Election proved to be the first in which support for the arts became an electoral issue," funding for the arts was not seen as a major political issue at this point in time (Cloonan, 2007, p. 29). However, this all changed when the 1960s ushered in a host of new changes that eventually lead to the arrival of rock and roll and a new Labour government in Great Britain (Cloonan, 2007, p. 11). In fact, it was during this decade when the UK first introduced an official White Paper on cultural funding (*A Policy for the Arts*) that would "acknowledge previous underfunding, announce more money for the ACGB, and recognize the changing definition of culture" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 31). Most likely, this dramatic change had to do with the fact that the gap between highbrow and lowbrow culture was lessening to the point where forms of popular music were slowly becoming eligible for state funding.

In addition to these transitions, the success of The Beatles also led to a series of major changes that had a huge impact on the way popular music was funded in the U.K. In fact, the band's interaction with Parliament helped develop a new socio-political context in Great Britain that would influence British politicians for many years to come. At the height of their success, many politicians praised the Liverpool band for their overseas achievements and proceeded to use the band's popularity as a 'political gimmick' that could help the government gain support from young citizens (Cloonan, 2007, p. 11). Despite happening nearly thirty years before Blair took office, this political strategy strongly resembles Blair's attempt to align his Party with popular British

musicians in order to gain the support of young voters. While it is true that this political tactic seemed to pass Margaret Thatcher by, it ended becoming a central way for Blair to promote nationalism and New Labour ideals throughout his Premiership. Coincidentally, the association between politicians and musicians can still be seen in today's government, with David Cameron willingly professing his admiration for artists such as The Smiths, Radiohead, and Adele. Thus, the early relationships that developed between Parliament and popular music help explain how cultural policy and music funding operate under the current coalition.

Contrasting to the 1960s, the 1970s was hit by an economic downturn that caused the government to withdraw its funding of popular music for more traditional art forms like the National Theatre. Furthermore, the Conservative government appeared to take a step back from the liberal ideals of the previous decade when they expressed unease about funding cultural works that had the potential to offend society. In addition, the relationship between politics and popular music took a more heated turn during this time, and failed to capture the same level of amity between politicians and musicians as previous eras. Most likely, the rise in far-right sympathizers contributed to the sudden clash between politics and music and emergence of anti-racist music events like Rock against Racism and Red Wedge. Ultimately, these events were created in response to BNP supporters such as Enoch Powell and Eric Clapton, who expressed strong racist remarks against black immigrants in Great Britain. Thus, the main purpose of Rock against Racism was to provide British musicians like The Clash, Elvis Costello, and Paul Weller with a way to draw attention to the increased amount of racism occurring in the U.K. For the first time, it seemed that popular music was being given a platform to "offer

political solutions [that could] raise leftist spirits [and] engender political change" in society (Cloonan, 2007, p. 16).

Unfortunately, not even these potential political powers could stop the 1979 victory of the Conservative Party and the eventual move from the Keynesian consensus to marketization (Cloonan, 2007, p. 16). Ironically, it was during Thatcher's reign as Prime Minister when the concept of 'local socialism' began to develop after local authorities began developing left-wing policies that could act in opposition to the strong Conservative government (Flew, 2011, p. 15). Thus, the election of Margaret Thatcher "saw a parallel trend towards the election of Labour Councils in numerous UK cities, [that] were committed to programs [that supported] local economic development [and] progressive agendas [that favored the rights of] women and minority groups" (Flew, 2011, p. 15). As a result, many of the Labour Party activists associated with these Councils were interested in re-branding post-industrial cities by combating unemployment through local cultural production (Cloonan, 2012, p. 19).

Out of all of the Councils that were established during this time, the one that had the greatest impact on the music industry was the Greater London Council, which has since served as a template for creative industries policies at the state level. Above all else, the policies that were developed by the Greater London Council "were directed against elitist and idealist notions of art" that failed to recognize the centrality of commercial production in modern culture (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p. 139). Spearheaded by Ken Livingstone from 1981 until 1986, the main objective of the GLC was to "promote ethnic and community arts [that would] represent minorities in the cultural sphere" (Flew, 2011, p. 16). Ultimately, it was this liberal attitude that helped the GLC

"put forward a number of important changes and provocations of public policy [that benefitted] cultural sectors [at the regional level]" (Flew, 2011, p. 16). Perhaps most importantly, the GLC's Cultural Industries Strategy team helped influence the notion that the cultural industries could be linked to local economic development in cities through policy strategies created by local, rather than central, governments (Flew, 2011, p. 16). Ultimately, these strategies included plans that utilized the local production of film and video, music recording, publishing and design to regenerate local economies that had been negatively affected by Conservative policies and deindustrialization (Brown, O'Connor & Cohen, 2000, p. 439). Sadly, despite these major contributions, the Council was eradicated when "Thatcher's government used the 1986 Local Government Act to abolish any metropolitan Councils [it deemed to be] centers of resistance to government policy" (Cloonan, 2012, p. 19).

Still, even though the GLC was shut down because of government opposition and resistance, the association between culture, regeneration, and economic policy later resurfaced in the 1990s when "talk of the social and economic importance of the cultural industries [became] commonplace" (Cloonan, 2012, p. 19). For the most part, this resurgence reemerged because of the "broader changes in the Labour government's attitude [toward] economic competitiveness, social policy," and the creative sector (Oakley, 2006, p. 257). Despite the fact investment in the cultural industries [has been proven to] boost local wealth and employment, [research has shown that combining these policies can be] problematic" because of the paradox that exists between economic and social policy debates (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p. 141). Ultimately, "what [has been most] problematic [about this association has been] the inherent tension [that exists] between

social and economic goals [that attempt to] bury [societal issues] under the mantle of [creative production]" (Oakley, 2006, p. 256).

Case Study – Manchester's Northern Quarter: Developing Infrastructures and a Working Class Identity

Surprisingly, it was deindustrialization and the result of declining jobs in the manufacturing sector that inevitably linked the cultural industries with urban regeneration strategies in the 1980's. As Flew states, "culture became identified as a way to provide new opportunities that [would fuel] economic growth in cities" hindered by the accelerated unemployment brought on by Thatcher's government (Flew, 2011, p. 17). The music industry, more or less, offers an excellent example of this phenomenon by illustrating how cities used new policies to harness and endorse their vibrant and diverse popular music cultures to promote tourism and new investment (Brown, O'Connor & Cohen, 2000). As evident in the case of Manchester, the use of music for city 're-branding' "saw local government getting involved in popular music initiatives as [an] attempt to use the cultural industries for economic regeneration" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 19).

Thus, the link between "cultural industries and urban regeneration strategies [first began to] emerge around the notion of cultural quarters [during the late 1980's]" (Brown, O'Connor, & Cohen, 2000, p. 439). For example, the success of Manchester's Northern Quarter "contributed to the development of the local music scene and businesses [through] recording studios such as Strawberry set up by 10CC, record labels like Factory, and venues like The Hacienda" (Brown, O'Connor & Cohen, 2000, p. 441). Arguably, all of these factors played an important role in establishing the 'Madchester'

music scene, which interested "the international media and music industry [enough to cause] an explosion of club culture (Brown, O'Connor & Cohen, 2000, p. 441). Unsurprisingly, this sudden interest led to a proliferation of clubs and record shops that attracted DJs and designers to the city. Ultimately, the popularity of the 'Madchester' scene created "a growth in small, often closely networked groups of music-related businesses" that enticed young people to explore the cultural aspects of the city (Brown, O'Connor & Cohen, 2000, p. 441).

"A clear example of this new cultural attitude and the starting point of the Manchester music scene was the concert given by the infamous London punk band, The Sex Pistols at the Lesser Free Trade Hall on June 4, 1976" (Botta, 2009, p. 353). In fact, those rumored to have been in attendance were members of Joy Division, The Fall, The Smiths, and The Buzzcocks, who all went on to become notable bands from Manchester. Arguably, one of the turning points that inevitably helped create the explosion of the internationally recognized music scene in Manchester was the consolidation of Factory Records and the opening of the Hacienda club. Here, the importance of infrastructure becomes apparent in the ways these ventures enabled the music in Manchester to prevail despite little interest or support from the nation state. Most notably, Tony Wilson, a Manchester born and Cambridge educated TV journalist, helped the scene succeed by organizing music events and signing bands to Factory, the independent label that published most of the records from the local music scene. Ultimately, Factory allowed "these bands [freedom] in their artistic choices" because "profit was distributed fairly between artist and label, without label interference in the copyright of the produced material" (Botta, 2009, p. 357).

According to Middles, Factory Records was unique because it possessed the "socialistic belief that worthwhile art [could be] found in the most unlikely places and [could] be produced by the most unlikely people" (Middles, 2009, p. 5). In fact, it could be argued that the democratic approach the label took toward popular music helped the city gain recognition for being a culturally diverse region with innovative music, art, and fashion. Clearly, the label's investment in the Hacienda nightclub not only supported the city's local talent, but encouraged new and already established musicians to come to the city to perform on a regular basis. As such, the impact of Factory Records was felt beyond the realm of popular music because it merged into other areas of culture that had no direct connection to the label. For example, the label's influence on world culture became apparent when the Football Association asked New Order (one of the bands signed to the label) to record a song for the 1990 FIFA World Cup (Smith, 1997, p. 141). As a result of this maneuver, Factory's image became recognizable outside of the city's culture and became an identifiable component of what was at the time, the most watched World Cup in history.

Aside from these ventures, Manchester music was also highly promoted by Wilson overseas in America, where he unapologetically informed the American public that they were falling behind Manchester as a result of the city's thriving music scene (Sawyer, 2012, para. 6). Clearly, overseas recognition such as this indicates that Manchester music was quickly becoming familiar around the world, and was earning admiration from American artists looking to bands emulate bands such as The Smiths and Joy Division. Currently, this can be seen in American bands like The Killers and Interpol, who have cited Manchester bands as having a tremendous influence on their

careers. In fact, according to Killers' singer Brandon Flowers, one of the greatest

moments of his career was "playing the same clubs as Oasis when they [first] started

[performing, and] visiting all [of] the Smiths' sites" in Manchester (Kent, 2006, para. 11).

For Flowers, the music became so "irresistible to try to emulate" that he "couldn't stop

himself from adopting an English way of expressing himself [despite] never [having]

been to Manchester before" (Kent, 2006, para. 12). Ultimately, this example illustrates

the influence Manchester music has had on current forms of commercial music that have

become successful not only in the U.S., but around the world.

　　While the world recognition of music from Manchester has been important, the

early beginnings of the region's music should not be overlooked or ignored. To build

such recognition, the city needed to cultivate the necessary groundwork that would

enable local talent to develop outside the strict confines of Thatcher's government.

Luckily, the local clubs and tight knit music community of the city allowed a stable

infrastructure to develop that benefited local musicians, clubs, and businesses. Likewise,

the anything-goes attitude the Manchester scene heralded gave a new generation of

entrepreneurs more opportunities to prosper through record labels, fashion houses, design

agencies, and music venues ("Rave on (and on) - We're Still Riding a Madchester Wave,"

2012). In fact, one of the main reasons Manchester had such a healthy music scene came

from the fact the city possessed many disused industrial warehouse spaces that could be

used by musicians for recording, practicing, and performing. For example, places like

T.J.Davidson's and the Boardwalk became prime locations for bands like Joy Division,

the Happy Mondays and the Buzzcocks to rehearse. With these thoughts in mind, it

could be argued that deindustrialization contributed to the local music scene in a

surprisingly positive way because it created spaces local artists could use to develop their talents. Clearly, the unique structure of the Manchester music scene gave many musicians the opportunity to pursue their dreams because the city provided all of the necessary production elements in one concentrated area.

Ultimately, it was this tight, interconnected infrastructure that allowed Manchester music to flourish throughout the 1980's. Unlike other regional areas in Britain, Manchester's lively nightlife and innovative culture meant that it had the potential to rival the fashion, music, and art that was being produced in central London. Because the city was able to establish its own network of producers, clubs, and designers, Mancunian musicians were no longer forced to move to London to develop the necessary connections they would need if they wanted to succeed in the music industry. For example, the Manchester band Happy Mondays had their album covers designed by the local creative company, Central Station, which was founded by the cousins of band members Shaun and Paul Ryder ("Rave on (and on) - We're Still Riding a Madchester Wave," 2012). Ultimately, signing with an independent label in Manchester gave the Happy Mondays complete freedom to express themselves because there was no consideration given to the cost of an album or its profit outcomes ("Rave on (and on) - We're Still Riding a Madchester Wave," 2012, para. 64).

What is perhaps most interesting about Manchester is how it was able to transform its image from an industrialized city into a creative environment full of successful entrepreneurs and commercial talent. In fact, even *Time* magazine recognized the cultural significance of the city when it featured the legendary Hacienda night club on its front page in the early 1990s. According to Tony Wilson, The Hacienda was such an

integral part of Manchester's culture that it was not a stretch to suggest that its

association with the city resembled the association between Michelangelo's David and

Florence, Italy (Brown, O'Connor & Cohen, 2000, p. 442). Clearly, statements such as

these indicate that the city not only rebuilt its poor economic situation through cultural

regeneration, but struck a chord with the world through its music, clubs, and rave scene.

For many individuals, the Manchester scene was a different and enlightening experience

that ended up "changing [their] lives and opening [up their] heads to new people and

possibilities" (Sawyer, 2012, para. 14). In fact, most believed that the music had been

created by the people, for the people because it was not built on the ideals of corporatism,

posh clothes, or commercial success (Sawyer, 2012, para. 14). As a result of these

beliefs, many felt a deep connection with the music because it allowed them to enjoy

something other than what was being produced by the major labels in London.

      "Yet as 'Madchester' was translated for a wider constituency by the national

media and music press, it became simplified [and] reduced to a formula (e.g. Hacienda,

flares, scallies on E, indie-dance, etc.)" that "belied the diversity and history of the city's

nightlife" (Collin, 2009, p. 168). Unfortunately, the press had become so fixated on

providing the masses with a caricatured image of the city, that it rarely acknowledged the

contribution black subcultures had made in regards to Manchester's dance culture and

music scene (Collin, 2009, p. 169). In fact, London music magazines *NME* and *Melody*

Maker were heavily biased in featuring white, Mancunian bands like The Stone Roses

and Happy Mondays because they believed that these types of bands would appeal most

to audiences in Britain. Ultimately, the press chose to capitalize on the success of the city

by developing a commercialized version of the British working class that would appeal to

the largest number of individuals in the country. As evident from the way Tony Blair promoted the British working class in the 1990s, this commercialized image has resonated well with British individuals, and remains to be used as a stereotype to portray the ideal image of the British working class. Because Blair used this working class portrayal to promote Labour ideals throughout his Premiership, it is crucial to examine how it developed and how it relates to policy convergence and popular music in the New Labour era.

Even before the hedonistic 'Summer of 1989' and the popularity of rave culture, Manchester's working class image was romanticized through popular music. According to Botta, bands such as The Smiths, The Fall, and Joy Division had a natural ability to reinterpret an 'ugly' northern industrial environment into a world renowned cultural mecca that could be respected and loved by commercial media and local society alike (Botta, 2009, p. 351). Ultimately, the way these bands and their successors portrayed Manchester in their music allowed it to be constructed into a myth-like place that could be filtered through fictitious or glamorized representations of the British working class (Botta, 2009, p. 351). As Sara Cohen has examined in her research on Liverpool's local music scene, a city's "sound" can be determined by the "media stereotypes, rock culture, local narratives and economic changes" that surround the music during its production (Botta, 2009, p. 351). Clearly, the music that was produced in Manchester during the 1980's was a reflection of the difficult economic times that had resulted from Thatcherism and deindustrialization.

In fact, many of the visual elements, lyrics, and song titles associated with Manchester bands help recreate specific places and localities of the city. For example,

bands such as The Smiths and Joy Division were regularly photographed in front of factories, flats, chimneys, and cobblestone streets in order to illustrate how the gloom in their music could be linked to "the empty and decaying temples of capitalism" (Botta, 2009, p. 356). If nothing else, these bands were thought to "exemplify the emptiness of capitalist society and industrialism [by representing] the idea that when money stops coming in, unemployment and whole districts are left in physical and social decay" (Botta, 2009, p. 356). By referencing the deteriorating environment (e.g. iron bridges, disused railway lines, and cemetery gates) and psychological effects (e.g. isolation) of living under the Tory government, these bands were able to establish a connection with the working class individuals who had been affected by Thatcher's policies. Through this connection, Britons were able to reimagine a community that had been destroyed by events (e.g. the closure of mines) that had ripped apart the social fabric that held together their communities (Jones, 2012, p. 55). Thus, the working class imagery and ideals of these Manchester bands created a visual landscape that brought the hardships of living under Thatcher's government to life.

Ultimately, Manchester's Northern Quarter provides an excellent example of how important it is to have an active City Council that is willing to promote the music and culture of a particular region. While it took some time before Manchester's City Council caught up with the hype, it eventually recognized the importance of cultivating an environment to develop the city's local music. In fact, one City Council document even mentioned that:

> *"The [music] industry craves new products, new ideas and*
>
> *it is important that the environment which enables this*

small scale activity to flourish is maintained - a hands off

but strongly supportive approach from the City Council"

(Urban Cultures Ltd, 1992, p. 31).

Similarly, the City Council's Arts and Cultural Policy Officer, Lyn Barbour once acknowledged the significance of developing an atmosphere where creativity and inspiration could emerge without too much government intervention. According to Barbour:

``*...the (local) music industry [in Manchester] didn't want*

any Council intervention. What they wanted was a city that

they could operate in more effectively. They wanted

transport sorting out, they wanted licensing sorted out, and

the kind of issues they were concerned with were not about

supporting businesses... that wasn't the way they felt we

should be intervening. They felt we should create a city

which doesn't have the barriers which exist at the moment.

So we didn't include within our strategic vision any specific

intervention into the cultural industry sectors and

specifically popular music" (Brown, O'Connor, & Cohen,

2000, p. 442).

While Manchester's Council did provide some assistance toward the In the City music industry convention (the UK's first major international music industry convention), it pretty much operated with a 'hands off approach.' In fact, it has been argued that Manchester's music scene was able to flourish in ways that Sheffield's

cultural quarter could not because Manchester's City Council did not meddle in its

cultural sector the way Sheffield's did (Brown, O'Connor, Cohen, 2000, p. 443). Due to

Clearly, it is important to examine how government intervention has impacted the

production of popular music at the local level when economic regeneration (whether local

or national) is considered to be a major concern.

After analyzing the economic, political, and cultural shifts that occurred during

Margaret Thatcher's Premiership, it becomes evident that broader societal factors play a

significant role in the development of music infrastructures at the local level. By

examining the effect of government agendas, we are better able to see how particular

policies can impact the economic, social, and cultural progress of popular music. In

order to truly understand what can be done to improve the state of music development in

England, it is important to examine all aspects of society from both a historical and

cultural perspective. Evidently, the shift to a neoliberal state, the deindustrialization of

heavy industry, and the emergence of capitalism all helped to shape the way the creative

industries would develop over the next thirty years. In fact, the infrastructure model that

was first developed in Cultural Industry Quarters was later used by Tony Blair as a way

to rebuild England's struggling economy through the exploitation of intellectual property.

After witnessing how the creative industries could be used to boost economic growth,

employment, and ideological agendas, Blair made a conscious effort to align himself with

the music industry throughout his Premiership. Clearly, these initiatives not only

impacted the future of British music, but helped shape an important part of England's

political and cultural history.

Chapter 2

Tony Blair and the Beginning of Policy Convergence

While many consider the Thatcher era to be one of the most altering times in the history of Great Britain, it could be argued that many of the events that influenced modern day politics and culture actually occurred during the Premiership of Tony Blair. Because Thatcher promoted her neoliberal ideals and principles in such an overt manner, it is easy to assume that Blair's public endorsement of social democracy would generate policies designed to promote the interests of British citizens. However, after closer examination, it becomes apparent that Thatcher and Blair are surprisingly similar in their neoliberal ideologies, despite being labeled as political opposites. In fact, the assumed dichotomy of Conservative and Labour governments is what allowed many of Blair's early policies to avoid any excessive scrutiny from the political Left. For the most part, British citizens were thrilled to see an end to eighteen years of Conservative rule, and were swept up in Blair's optimistic claim that "politics should [always] be about the service of the public" (Blair, 1997). After several years in office, however, Blair's unpopularity with the public grew rapidly as British citizens became disillusioned with the false promises and hopes the former Prime Minster promoted throughout his Premiership.

Ultimately, "the fundamental cause of [Blair's] demise [was his involvement in] the Iraq war" and the deception he used to trick the British public into believing that Iraq possessed weapons of mass destruction (McAllister, 2006, para. 2). While many

American seemed to (more or less) forgive George Bush for his dishonesty, Britons were determined to hold Blair accountable for his actions and by 2005, 51% of the British population still considered him a dishonest liar (McAllister, 2006, para. 2). In fact, "he [ended up becoming] the most unpopular Prime Minister ever to be re-elected" and continues to be a disliked figure in current British politics. While this can certainly be seen from various accounts today, it was also apparent by the late 1990's when Blair was still in his first term as Prime Minister. Throughout this time, many of the musicians who originally supported New Labour eventually came to the realization that they had been deceived by the "PM of Pop" because he had "failed to deliver on [his] election promises to help the poor" ("It's all over now Tony Blair- PM," 1998). Clearly, the way Blair concealed the truth behind many of his political agendas gave the public reason to believe that what he preached was indeed what he intended to practice.

New Labour and the Third-Way

When Tony Blair was elected into office on May 1st 1997, it would mark the first time the Labour Party had won a general election since the Conservatives had come into power eighteen years earlier. In a landslide victory that earned the party a formidable 419 seats (the largest it had ever obtained), it was clear that Great Britain had finally had enough of Tory ideals and was ready to look toward a promising future under a new political leader. Needless to say, the apparent optimism in Tony Blair's 1997 general election speech indicated that the young politician was ready to rid the country of the remnants of Thatcherism and move toward an improved society. In his speech, Blair promised to restore England's trust in politics by decentralizing the government so that people could once again gain "hope that politics is and always should be about the

service of the public" (Blair, 1997). Ultimately, Blair assured the public that the goals of New Labour would be rooted in the values of justice, progress, and community so that the government could pursue noble causes that focused on the people of Britain.

While many have cited Blair's win as a true victory for the Left, it could be argued that the political ideals Tony Blair pushed throughout his Premiership were merely repackaged versions of the neoliberal policies previously pushed by Margaret Thatcher in the 1980's. In fact, Flew goes so far as to argue that the policies New Labour manifested during the Blair era were "a direct continuation of the neo-liberal economic and social problems of Thatcherism," albeit disguised under "a [more acceptable] social democratic gloss" (Flew, 2011, p. 17). While it is true that Blair attempted to create a more socially democratic society during his Premiership, it should also be made clear that one of Blair's main goals was to ensure Britain's competitiveness in the global marketplace, whether it maintained the rights of British workers or not. Consequently, it is crucial to examine the role neoliberalism played in New Labour policies, and to examine how the drive for economic growth in the creative industries impacted the well-being of workers employed in the sector.

While it may appear that the transformation of the Labour Party began when Blair took office in 1997, the first hints of change actually occurred in 1994 when Blair (then leader of the opposition) decided to re-write Clause IV of the Party's constitution so that the country's commitment to nationalization could be revised. Ultimately, it was Blair's ardent belief in modernization that drove him to create such a change, because he believed that the original policies of the Clause were not compatible with the socialist values of the changing society. According to Blair, modernizing Britain meant changing

the Clause's initial purpose of promoting common ownership and secured workers' rights, to a profit driven initiative that focused on a dynamic economy that served the enterprise market and the rigor of competition. Unsurprisingly, Blair defended this alteration by claiming that it would strengthen the private sector and allow the nation to rebuild its struggling economy. Still, "the ditching of Clause IV [of] the constitution, the weakening of [Labour's] links with trades unions, and the abandoning of [previously] cherished policies effectively killed off [any remnants of] "Old" Labour" (Assinder, 2007, para. 3).

As Blair moved further to the Right, the transformation of the Labour Party became more apparent as it began to favor public-private partnerships, joint-up governance, and supply-side reforms over state ownership and a collective welfare state. By adopting a more centrist attitude, Blair believed that the Party could create the ideals and policies needed to adapt to the modern values of a social democracy. In fact, Blair contended that it was necessary for all social democratic governments to follow New Labour's centrist example because it was the only way a nation could prosper in the current economy. According to Blair, reconciling left-wing and right-wing politics was essential for governments who wanted to achieve greater egalitarianism in society because it enabled them to embrace both the social policies of the left and the economic policies of the right.

Needless to say, such politics are often adopted by social democrats who wish to modernize traditional socialism by rejecting state socialism so that equal opportunities can be embraced while incorporating personal responsibility and the decentralization of government power. By embracing 'Third-way' politics, Blair was essentially attempting

to create an ideology that embraced the idea of the state playing a major role in bringing about entrepreneurship, wealth creation, and greater social justice. Ultimately, in its most basic form, the Third-Way can be described as something different and distinct from liberal capitalism because it rejects both top down socialism and traditional neoliberalism.

Consequently, one of the criticisms of Third-Way politics is that it "attempts to construct a bogus coalition between the haves and the have-nots [because it ensures to] the haves that the [sound] economy will [protect] their interests, [and promises to] the have-nots [that the] world [will be] free of poverty and injustice" (Dickson, 1999, para. 7). While it could be argued that the Third-Way was utilized so Labour could gain more middle class supporters, it could also be argued that the Third-Way became popular in the 1990's because of the economic and social changes that were occurring as a result of globalization. Ultimately, the rapid movement of capital minimized the capacity governments had to control their nation's destiny because it left them with only two variables they could influence to ensure the right conditions were cultivated for the maximization of trade and investment (Dickson, 1999). For Blair, this not only meant strengthening citizens' skills so that the British workforce had higher levels of education and training, but building an efficient infrastructure that supported hospitals, transportation links, and utilities. Consequently, the way cultural, economic, and social policies converged during the Blair era allowed culture to emerge "as an interwoven and fundamental fabric and backdrop to the identities and quality of life [experienced by] residents [in different] communities [around Britain]" (Stevenson, Rowe & McKay 2010, p. 252).

Social Exclusion and the Welfare State

After Blair was elected Prime Minister, he pledged to create a classless society that ensured no group of people could prevail over another and that every man had equal access to employment, wealth, and power. According to Blair, having an equal stake in society meant improving employment and education programs so that more people could work their way out of poverty and into the rankings of the middle class. For Blair, it was important to create a new "Britain where the extraordinary talent of the British people [could be] liberated from the forces of conservatism [so that opportunities were] not [based] on privilege, class or background, but on the equal worth of all" (Blair, 1999). Ultimately, this meant fighting for the Party's cause of social justice so that every person had the power to "make the most of what [talent was] in them" and what opportunities they should be given (Blair, 1999).

Consequently, it is important to recognize the significant changes that emerged when New Labour reformed the welfare state during Blair's Premiership because it marked the end of the Labour Party's commitment to raising the conditions of the working class. While former Labour Ministers such as James Callaghan paid tribute to trade unions and the working class identity, the Blair government favored a society that shunned working class ideals in order to promote the principles and values of the middle class. As a result of these differences, it is important to recognize that the ideologies of 'Old' and 'New' Labour are not the same and that the two Parties should be considered distinct and separate entities. In fact, one of the biggest differences between these two Parties is the fact that Old Labour sought to improve working class conditions, while New Labour helped individuals escape from them. For Blair, this meant transforming

British society's perception of the working class so that more citizens would attempt to leave their working class roots so that they could join the elusive 'Middle England' New Labour helped create.

By defining the British working class in two distinct ways, Blair was able to separate the image of the 'respectable' working class from the image of the new 'underclass,' which stereotypically includes those who opt to live off government benefits rather than employment. According to Blair, individuals either fell into the category of the 'aspirational' working class or the 'non-aspirational' working class, which meant that you were either ambitious enough to pull yourself out of the lower ranks of society, or too lazy to care about improving your living standards. In either instance, success was judged on the level of aspiration individuals had to climb the social ladder and rise above the standards of their previous social class. By claiming that working class people were responsible for their own plights and misfortunes, the government could conveniently argue that the individuals who suffered most did not care enough to improve their quality of living. Needless to say, this mentality resembles the neoliberal ideals of Thatcherism because it proposed that "being [a member of the] aspirational working class [meant] embracing [the] individualism and selfishness" needed to compete for a top spot in society (Jones, 2012, p. 90).

In fact, much like Thatcher's own stance on welfare, Blair was quick to conclude that Britain's high unemployment rate resulted from the 'cradle to grave' benefits system because it created less of an incentive for the underclass to find work. In essence, Blair argued that the new underclass needed to find employment because they hindered Britain's move toward modernization and presented a regressive image that clashed with

the rebranding efforts of New Labour. According to Blair, modernizing Britain was crucial in rediscovering a true national purpose because it gave the country the chance to serve as a model for a 21st century developed nation that other countries could follow and attempt to imitate. Ultimately, Blair believed that the nation's stable economic management, dynamism, and enterprise in business could make it the best educated and creative nation in the world.

With these thoughts in mind, it should come as no surprise that one of the solutions the Blair government developed to achieve these goals was a 'welfare to work' scheme that would enhance the economy, boost employment, and curb social exclusion all in one swoop. Ultimately, the goal of these programs was to deal with the huge increase of unemployment that had taken place during the 1980's and 1990's, and to end the culture of benefit dependency that had become a major concern regarding the British underclass. More specifically, New Labour chose to focus on youth oriented policy 'problems' such as teen pregnancy, unemployment, education, and deviancy because it believed that tackling youth marginalization would strengthen community and family values through joint-up policy solutions that curbed a variety of different social ills (Dickson, 1999). Ultimately, it was believed that developing programs such as the New Deal for Young People, the New Deal for Musicians, and the New Deal 25+ would integrate youth into society through the aspects of paid work, job training, and education.

In order to push social exclusion policies at a more aggressive rate, the Blair government decided to set up a Social Exclusion Unit in 1997 that aimed to help "the growing number of [British youth] who [lacked] the means, material and otherwise, to participate in [the] economic, social, cultural and political life [of] Britain" (Levitas,

1999, p. 1). Through the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU), the Blair government sought to

tackle issues related to unemployment rather than poverty because it ultimately believed

that the primary cause of poverty itself was unemployment caused by a lack of skills,

education, or training. As a result, New Labour sought to fix "the impact of severe

marginalization rather than [tackle] the wider enduring effects of social inequalities in

young people's transitions to adulthood" (Fahmy, 2008, para. 7). In fact, much like

Thatcher's own perception of the British working class, the Blair government believed in

a 'moral underclass' whose social exclusion resulted from an individualized social

pathology rather than external societal inequalities. Thus, instead of focusing on the

crucial causes of social marginalization, the SEU focused on "the behaviors and attitudes

of 'vulnerable' young people and the ways in which their 'complex problems'

[contributed] to their [own] exclusion [from society]" (Fahmy, 2008, para. 13).

Ultimately, New Labour paid less attention to the underlying structural conditions that

produced social inequality and focused more on the individual characteristics citizens

needed to make the most of an "insecure [and] competitive world" (Oakley, 2006, p.

261).

   Evidently, New Labour believed that there was a link between "increased

employment, economic growth, and the development of welfare policies [that could be

used] to ameliorate aspects of inequality [and social injustice]" (Oakley, 2006, p. 260).

In fact, the Blair government believed that achieving social inclusion meant participating

in the labor market and possessing a high level of skills that would enhance an

individual's employability and marketability in the workforce. Ultimately, it was Blair's

goal to develop 'supply-side' economics that would equip employees with the education

and training needed to compete in a competitive and global job market where "the processes that [produced] exclusion [became] a given [and] all one [could] do [was] 'adapt' [to the changes the ensued]" (Oakley, 2006, p. 261).

Arguably, the way Blair promoted the benefits of idiosyncratic differences in society helped foster the mentality that individuality and uniqueness could help liberate individuals up the social ladder and out of the impoverished underclass (Oakley, 2006). Throughout the Blair era, individual differences were seen less as social inequalities and more as benefiting characteristics that could help individuals succeed in a neoliberal and meritocratic society. Needless to say, the main objective behind these provisions was to "create a nation where the creative talents of all people [were] used to build a true enterprise economy for the twenty-first century [where competition was based] on brains, not brawn" (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p. 2).

National Regeneration: Cool Britannia

When New Labour came into power, the British economy was experiencing a dramatic transition that saw the labor force shift from heavy industry jobs towards jobs in the service sector. As a result, the cultural industries were placed at the heart of Britain's plan for economic regeneration because of the sudden interest in the exploitation of intellectual property and creativity. According to Blair:

> *"Britain was once the workshop of the world. It led the*
>
> *industrial revolution. It was defined by ship building,*
>
> *mining and heavy industry... Yet more people now work in*
>
> *film and TV than in the car industry...The overseas*
>
> *earnings of British rock music now exceeds those generated*

by the steel industry. I believe we are now in the middle of

a second revolution, defined in part by new information

technology, but also by creativity" (Tony Blair The

Guardian, 22 July 1997).

While Britain was undergoing this transformation, the music industry was experiencing a surge in popularity that not only benefited the emerging creative economy, but also cemented New Labour's relationship with the recording industry. As both a musician and fan of popular music, Blair was quick to realize how the creative industries could help accomplish New Labour's goals to regenerate the economy, curb social exclusion, and modernize the country. Despite the fact previous governments paid less attention to the creative industries, New Labour chose to embrace them and quickly set out to nurture their development in ways that would benefit the economy and society as a whole. Here, it is important to note the similarities between local regeneration (cultural industry quarters) and national regeneration (creative industries). In many ways, New Labour's intentions reflect the actions of Labour Councils in the 1980's, but on the national level. In both instances, politicians attempted to regenerate the economy through industries that focused on creativity, as opposed to manual labor. Evidently, the deindustrialization that occurred during Thatcher's Premiership helped formulate the changes that inevitably changed the way individuals lived, worked, and learned in Great Britain.

According to the think tank DEMOS, the emergence of the creative economy was primarily "driven by [the development of] information and communications technologies, economic globalization, [and] the shift from an industrial [economy] to a knowledge-

based economy" (Seltzer & Bentley, 1999, p. 1). Ultimately, transitioning into the creative economy meant learning to adapt to a 'weightless' economy that included 'weightless' work and an increased gap between knowledge and skill inclusion (Seltzer & Bentley, 1999). As John Newbigin states in "The Creative Economy: An Introductory Guide," the creative economy is difficult to define or measure because it is challenging to determine how to estimate their worth (Newbigin, 2010). Evidently, this can be seen in the early approaches New Labour took in trying to map the economic profitability of the creative industries in the late 1990's.

Ironically, the definition of 'creative individualism' meshes well with the neoliberal practices of the Thatcher era and the idea of the 'creative individual' promoted by New Labour. Needless to say, when developing its creative industries policies, New Labour chose to classify the creative individual (or independent) as someone who considered themselves to be highly-individualistic, anti-authoritarian, and (sometimes) anti-corporate (Oakley, 2006). According DEMOS, "creativity [has become] vital to meeting the social, political, and cultural challenges of the next century" because "institutional renewal, community regeneration, and the capacity of politics to solve emerging problems depend on our ability to [use] the full range of knowledge resources in the most effective ways" (Seltzer & Bentley, 1999, p. 7).

The transition from an industrial economy to a 'creative' one saw the beginning of the marketization of culture, where the arts could be used to enhance economic stability in ways that helped encourage business investment in Great Britain. Because the "creative industries [were] aligned with the prestigious information society and knowledge economy" they became a highly attractive way to modernize Britain, fuel the

economy, and the cure social ills brought on from deindustrialization (Flew, 2012, p. 11).

According to Hesmondhalgh, "creativity is set to become a more important part of future

economies [because] the creative industries [could] provide a valuable key to unlocking

the secrets that concern creativity in the 'new' economy" (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p. 147).

In fact, British creativity became such a vital part of Blair's plan to regenerate

Britain's economy that significant attempts were made to specify to the world what

exactly made 'British creativity' distinct from other cultures. For the DMCS, this meant

establishing a 'culture test' for British films so that they could be distinguished from

other films by recognition of what made them 'distinctly Britishness.' Ultimately, these

policies required films to score a minimum of fifty points on a DMCS created scale that

'defined' what it meant to be 'British' in terms of cultural content, cultural hubs, and

cultural practitioners (Stevenson, Rowe & McKay, 2010). Needless to say, the DCMS's

strong intent "to promote everything from Beefeaters to Britpop" resulted in cultural

policies that were designed to keep the definition of 'Britishness' at the national (rather

than local) level so that creative output could contribute to the national re-branding

efforts of the New Labour government (Stevenson, Rowe & McKay, 2010, p. 251).

According to Tony Blair, "rock and roll is not just an important part of our

culture, [but] a [vital] part of our life" because "it's an important industry, an important

employer of people, [and] an immensely important [part of Britain's future] (Harris,

2004, p. 101). In fact, Blair argued that Parliament needed to start taking the music

industry seriously because it was time the nation started recognizing the value of its

record industry and vibrant culture (Harris, 2004, p. 191). As a result, the Blair

government chose to utilize the short-lived 'Cool Britannia' movement to further develop

its working class ideologies, promote British music, and encourage nationalistic pride. By associating himself with popular 'working class' musicians like Noel Gallagher, Blair was able to position himself as a politician who supported the rights and well-being of the common man. Furthermore, the British aspect of Britpop bands gave Blair the chance to associate the Party's ideals with popular culture so that they could resonate into society through a less noticeable hegemonic process. Consequently, because many of these bands modeled themselves after bands like The Smiths or The Stone Roses, they were furthering the glamorized version of the working class image that had begun in Manchester during the 1980's.

Evidently, promoting working class musicians in this way had its benefits for the Blair government when they were riding the wave of Cool Britannia during the late 1990's. During this time, a stylized and repackaged image of the 'working class' musician emerged that undoubtedly had its roots in bands like The Smiths, The Kinks, and The Stone Roses. In fact, middle class musicians such as Blur's Damon Albarn began avidly professing their disdain for all things 'upper class,' and attempted to distance themselves from their more privileged roots to suit the style of the times. According to Pulp's Jarvis Cocker, the British working class was moved to center stage during the Britpop era, whereas during the Thatcher era it was ridiculed and marginalized (Live Forever: The Rise and Fall of Britpop, 2003).

Thus, it is important to note the paradox that existed between the way Blair championed the working class aesthetics of musicians such as Oasis, Pulp, and Blur (who, it should be noted, were from middle-class backgrounds) with the way he stereotyped the emerging underclass as feckless, welfare scroungers. Ultimately, the

sudden fixation on the British working class can be seen as both an effect of the Britpop movement (which was utilizing British nationalism to reject US imperialism and the Grunge movement) and New Labour (which was utilizing the ideal working class image to promote its ideology through pop culture). As a result, British music played an increasingly important role in helping Blair achieve his social, economic, and cultural goals as Prime Minister.

The Department of Culture, Media, and Sport

When John Major set up the Department of National Heritage in 1992, it was done in an attempt to create a more cohesive society that recognized the benefits of the arts, culture, and heritage. Stemming from the ideas of Hugh Jenkins (a Labour arts minister from 1974-1976), the DNH brought together previously 'unrelated' sub-sectors into one department under one coherent policy (Cloonan, 2007, p. 36). Acting as a direct opposite to his predecessor, Major oversaw a 23% increase in funding for the Arts Council of Great Britain and introduced the National Lottery Act to provide "money for 'good causes' in [various] areas [that included] sport, the arts, charity, [and] national heritage" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 36). Besides serving as a precursor to the Department of Culture, Media, and Sport, the DNH helped establish previously unavailable funding for amateur artists based on the strength of their bid rather than elite hierarchies and genres. Ultimately, this meant a new stream of funding for popular music projects that would later include the National Foundation for Youth Music, the National Centre for Popular Music, and the Tune Up program in Scotland (Cloonan, 2007, p. 36).

After the ACGB devolved in 1994, what remained of it became the Arts Council of England, which ended up showing little interest in popular music throughout the

1990's. In fact, the 400 page bibliography of the Council [currently] fails to mention popular music or jazz (in favor of classical music) and does little to investigate the impact of music related policies on the ground level (Cloonan, 2007, p. 37). Even former secretary-general of the Arts Council, Anthony Everitt acknowledged that little attention had been given to the areas of rock and pop music in Great Britain, and cited France as an example of a country that took the two genres seriously (Cloonan, 2007, p. 37). Consequently, Everitt believed that the organization had "alienated a large part of its potential audience" because it had never produced a popular music policy that sought to engage the sector (Cloonan, 2007, p. 37).

Consequently, the cold assistance the ACGB gave popular music can be seen as a result of the shift toward economic goals that was occurring at the time, which focused primarily on "cultural products" such as the cinema, literature, and crafts (Cloonan, 2007, p. 38). Due to the fact that a popular music policy was never constructed, popular music was generally included in the realm of social inclusion policies, which meant funding inconsistent support that was provided in response to funding applications. Still, this is understandable considering the initial reason behind the start of the ACGB was to protect high arts forms and promote national cultural identity. Needless to say, popular music was not seen by the ACGB as a high art form or as something that would "have a role in defining national culture" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 38).

With these thoughts in mind, it becomes evident why the ACGB and the state failed to provide assistance to popular music before the late 1990's. While the divide between 'high' art and 'popular' art can definitely be attributed to popular music's exclusion from funding, the commercial success of popular music can also be considered

as a contributing factor regarding its lack of financial support. Ironically, the UK did not develop proper popular music agencies because politicians believed that UK artists held a comparative advantage against other countries because they sang in English (a 'universal language') and had access to developed recording industries (Cloonan, 2007, p. 38). Consequently, it was assumed that British artists did not need any financial support because they were capable of maintaining success on their own. Ultimately, popular music only received state funding at the local level when it was used to combat unemployment and promote inner-city regeneration. Needless to say, this would later change when New Labour recognized the benefits of popular music and began associating it with policies geared toward economic and social gains.

When New Labour entered office in 1997, a host of changes emerged that inevitably ended up transforming the way popular music was approached in the UK. First, Blair renamed the 'Department of National Heritage' as the 'Department of Culture, Media, and Sport' in order to shift the focus from 'traditional' art forms to aspects of culture that were considered more 'trendy' and economically substantial. In other words, the move "towards a hipper department was underpinned by an economic rational" that sought to follow the template of the cultural industries quarters in the 1980's (Cloonan, 2007, p. 40). Acting under newly appointed Secretary of State for Culture Chris Smith, the DCMS's main objective was to bring culture into the mainstream so that the creative industries could act as key drivers toward economic success. Evidently, Smith's previous background in London politics (and knowledge of the GLC) played a major role in his shaping his strategy to rework (in national terms) the concerns Labour municipal authorities had throughout the 1980's (Cloonan, 2007, p. 40).

Unlike previous Labour arts ministers, Smith focused more on promoting the arts in ways that would make them internationally competitive and economically beneficial in Blair's national regeneration plan. In order to better understand the economic potential of the creative sector, Smith set up The Creative Industries Task Force to create a mapping document that would calculate "the current activity in the sectors deemed to be a part of the UK creative industries [by the measurement of] their contribution to Britain's overall economic performance" (Flew, 2011, p. 10). Specifically, the reasoning behind this organization was to ensure that proper policy measures would be created that would further develop the areas in the creative sector deemed to be the most economically successful (Flew, 2011, p. 10). As a result, the CITF was a central part of the Department of Culture, Media, and Sport and Blair's regeneration scheme because it documented the commercial achievements and potential of the creative industries. Ultimately, these measurements marked the "overall strategic importance [the creative industries had toward] Britain's export profile and international branding" (Flew, 2011, p. 10).

"By bringing together the arts and media within a department concerned with the formation of culture, the Blair government was signaling a move towards more integrated approaches to cultural policy" where "the future of arts and media in Britain lay in a transformation of dominant policy discourses towards a productive engagement with digital technologies" (Flew, 2011, p. 3). Consequently, one of the goals of the DCMS was to develop new possibilities for the alignment of British creativity and intellectual capital that would utilize the creative industries for economic growth.

Intellectual Property Management in the Creative Economy

According to The Creative Industries Mapping Document, the creative industries can be classified as "those industries [that have their] origin in individual creativity, skill, and talent and a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property" (Flew, 2011, p. 9). Consequently, the intent to use the creative industries for economic growth can be seen in the choice of words the government used to frame the sector as 'creative' rather than cultural. As Hesmondhalgh states, the government "used the term creative rather than cultural so that more sectors could be linked under [the DMCS, so that] a much larger and more significant part of the economy (than would have otherwise been popular) [could be included]" (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p. 145). Particularly, this was evident in the music industry and the success of Brit Pop during the Cool Britannia movement of the 1990's. Needless to say, New Labour took advantage of this success and sought to continue to cultivate the music industry by establishing a symbiotic relationship with the industry. While the government used the industry for its economic potential, the industry saw the government as both a protector of its interests and possible supporter because it could implement the necessary laws and regulations needed to manage intellectual property (Cloonan, 2007).

This convergence between Parliament and the music industry can be seen in the relationships that developed between government officials and select musicians. For example, the Music Industry Forum, a newly developed lobbying group to promote the economic interests of the music industry, had the likes of Alan McGee (creator of Creation Records) and George Martin (The Beatles' producer) on the board of directors (Cloonan, 2007, p. 46). Ultimately, this forum was set up as "an informal channel of

communication with representatives of the music industry to discuss (and act on where appropriate) matters of concern to the industry" (Cloonan, p. 46). Sure enough, the group's first meeting discussed issues involving copyright protection in the digital age, while the second talked about training, education, the New Deal for Musicians, and the proposed Youth Music Trust (Cloonan, 2007, p. 46). Evidently, this was the beginning of what would eventually merge into a convergence between cultural policy, economic policy, and social policy in regards to the music industry.

Unsurprisingly, this close relationship was praised by many and included music industry personnel such as EMI chair Eric Nicoli, (who was on the board), and popular publications such as *The Guardian*, and the *Observer*. While the forum had no official budget, it nonetheless set up working groups on exports, small business support, creative growth and new technology (Cloonan, 2007, p. 47). Clearly, these efforts helped to cement the link between the government and music industry by creating an environment where the government learned about the music industry and the music industry learned about the government. By the sixth meeting, the MIF was discussing issues regarding support for UK exports and the independent sector, with future work planned to examine "net technologies, creative growth and export promotion, and small business support" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 47). In addition, the group focused heavily on copyright protection and piracy, support for the 'indie sector,' live music, education, and training within the industry. Unfortunately, these ambitions failed to make any significant contribution to the British music industry and the MIF ended up disbanding in early 2003 after five years of inconsistent meetings and ad hoc operations.

By aligning the creative industries with the "prestigious information society and knowledge economy," cultural policy began focusing more on the supply side of artist creativity and the belief that strengthened copyright laws could further develop the creative industries (Flew, 2011, p. 19). Despite the limited evidence that has been found to support the idea that copyright protection actually benefits creative producers (apart from copyright owners), copyright protection has played a significant role in securing the economic benefits of the music industry for major corporations. Needless to say, the number of organizations devoted to copyright legislation in the music industry is significant and include (among others): British Music Rights, the British Academy of Composers and Songwriters, the Music Publishers Association, and the Mechanical Copyright Protection Society (Cloonan, 2007, p. 50). Arguably, all of these groups were developed to "show the economic importance of the British music business" by "promoting an understanding of rights and raising awareness of the impact of new technologies" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 50). Ultimately, many lobby groups aimed to persuade the government to introduce measures that would ensure the music industry remained competitive in the increasingly global market (Cloonan, 2007, p. 50).

Because most of the music industries' concerns lie within the framework of copyright protection, it is essential for corporations to keep the issue high on political agendas. Here, it has been the goal of lobby groups to get government officials to promote the commonsense ideals of the industry so that political changes will act in favor of the interests of the recording industry to ensure it gains profits from recordings (Cloonan, 2007, p. 50). Clearly, these concerns have strengthened over the years, and can be seen in the development of the Creative Industries Intellectual Property Rights

Forum, which was established by the government in 2005 to reinforce the existing laws on copyright protection. Operating under the heading CREATE, this forum developed a list of recommendations that examined the creativity, respect for rights, education, access, trust, and economic benefits of intellectual property (Cloonan, 2007, p. 51).

Converging Policies: Social, Economic, and Cultural

Despite the fact many considered New Labour to be "the first British administration to actually understand and appreciate the aesthetics of popular music and its centrality to British people's sense of national cultural identity" there was still a need to justify state support for popular music. More often than not, justification for investment in culture was generally attributed as a way to "replace outmoded 'rust belt' industries, or the deployment of expressive arts [that could be used] to 'reach' marginalized social groups" in society (Stevenson, Rowe & McKay, 2010, p. 254). Unlike previous Conservative governments, New Labour was keen on "promoting integrative and marketable cultural development through cultural policy stimulation" that included policies related to social inclusion, economic development, and cultural diversity (Stevenson, Rowe McKay, 2010, p. 254).

Needless to say, both culture and the arts began to be regarded as good societal elements that could help achieve a number of social policy objectives (Stevenson, Rowe & McKay, 2010). Under New Labour, "cultural policy [became a way] to address an ever-expanding range of social governance issues such as the effects of industrial restructuring of cities, the local and national consequences of increased global migration, and the negative effects of structural unemployment" (Stevenson, Rowe & McKay, 2010, p. 254). According to Flew, the creative industries policies that were developed during

this time were different from traditional cultural policies because they "focused on economic wealth generation, creative entrepreneurs, and the private sector rather than publicly funded culture" (Flew, 2011, p. 6). Needless to say, the cultural policy the emerged under New Labour became increasingly market driven so that "terms such as performance measurement, market share, and return on investment have become entrenched in policy discourse" (Stevenson, Rowe & McKay, 2010, p. 257). Rather than being rewarded for its virtue, culture became valued for its measurable ability to contribute to the economy, to improve the skills and education needed to enhance the quality of living in the towns and cities of the region (Stevenson, Rowe & McKay, 2010).

According to Blair, reform was a part of rediscovering a true national purpose that was part of a bigger picture in which Britain was a model of a 21st century developed nation that possessed sound, stable economic organization. By incorporating dynamism and enterprise in business, Blair believed that the country could become the best educated and creative nation in the world, with a welfare state that promoted the aims and achievements Great Britain. Ultimately, this included increasing access to cultural opportunities and providing increased employment opportunities so that a dependency on state benefits would be removed. Arguably, this had strong repercussions for many musicians from lower class backgrounds who had claimed state benefits throughout the 1970's and 1980's to support themselves and their careers. Despite New Labour's enthusiasm to rebuild the music industry, there were a number of conditions that hindered the prospects of working class in the 1990s. For the most part, the majority of these reasons were structural and resulted from insufficient workfare schemes, higher tuition

(art schools were becoming increasingly absorbed by universities), and unobtainable council flats.

Despite these hindrances, New Labour believed that "the creative class was meritocratic, open to talent and unlikely to be bound by prejudices about race, gender or sexuality" (Oakley 2006, p. 262). In fact, there was a strong hope that the creative sector could provide outlets for socially excluded groups to become more integrated into society. While it is true that the idea of social exclusion predates New Labour and the third way, it was the Blair government that "most assertively embraced not only the language of social exclusion, but placed it at the center of its policy program" (Stevenson, Rowe & McKay, 2010, p. 258). Ultimately, "the goal of the New Labour government across its three terms of government (as of 2009) was to put policies in place that would include the socially and economically excluded—or at least give the opportunity to be included" (Stevenson, Rowe & McKay, 2010, p. 258). As mentioned in a 2008 report from the DMCS, the main objectives of this new focus were to increase access to cultural opportunities and provide increased opportunities for work that would remove individuals' dependence on state benefits (DCMS, 2008).

Consequently, it could be argued that one of the underlying reasons New Labour became so focused on reducing poverty had to do with Blair's plan to modernize the country, in the hopes that it could compete with "the thriving metropolis of the West" (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p. 141). Unfortunately, this ambition faired less favorably for "working class populations [who were soon] seen as regressive [hindrances that would] hold the country back [in terms of] entering competition with [other nations]" (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p. 141). In fact, this unfair stereotyping went beyond

unemployment and extended to the realm of popular music when BPI, the Department of

Work and Pensions and the Federation Against Copyright Theft claimed that those

known for defrauding the benefits system were also the biggest culprits of copyright

fraud (Cloonan, 2007, p. 53). Thus, in 2006 the three organizations combined their

efforts to forge the "biggest ever UK crackdown on counterfeiting and benefit fraud"

because it was believed that individuals who engaged in illegal downloading were more

likely to leech off the benefits system (Cloonan, 2007, p. 53). Needless to say, this

example illustrates how interconnected government, the welfare state, and popular music

had become at this point in time, and how certain stereotypes were not only being used

for traditional forms of labor, but for music related instances, as well.

 With a changing economy, increased unemployment, and a drive to put Britain

back on the map, New Labour began to 'borrow' from the American-style workfare

system by implementing a series of new policies that had the ability to take benefits away

from those who refused to work (Powell, 1999, p. 16). For Blair, creating the New Deal

program in 1998 meant tackling youth unemployment through a series of different

training schemes that were designed to get 18-24 year olds off benefits and into paid

employment. In fact, it could be argued that these new initiatives ended up embracing

"the American vision of an economically and socially mobile society where everyone has

the opportunity to procure for themselves [a] place in the social and economic hierarchy

[for] which their energies and talent merit" (Powell, 1999, p. 18). According to Blair, the

era in which Britain has been ruled by the elite came to an end when New Labour took

office in 1997 because a new meritocratic society had begun to transform the way class

was structured in in the UK.

In fact, an article by *The Guardian* in 2009 claimed that a "radical shift in power had moved away from the old establishment towards a new middle class [that was made up of a] meritocratic majority" (White, 2009, para. 1). As Blair ambitiously put it, society had then become comprised by a middle class that not only possessed a greater ambition to succeed, but a greater tolerance for the differences of others. Ultimately, Blair envisioned "a middle class that [would] include millions of people who traditionally [saw] themselves as working class, but [had] ambitions [that were] far broader than those of their parents and grandparents" (White, 2009, para. 3). In defense of his vision, Blair argued that at the end of the government's ten year social exclusion program, Britain would have "an expanded middle class, with ladders of opportunity for those of all backgrounds [that would encompass] no more ceilings that [would] prevent people from achieving the success they merit" (White, 2009, para. 3).

In other words, New Labour believed that social factors had no effect on one's ability to make it in the work world, and if one were ambitious enough to seek employment, it was ready and waiting for them. Ultimately, it was hoped that the New Deal program would provide a welfare-to-work program that offered specially designed training, subsidized employment, and voluntary work to individual subgroups that had a higher risk of being unemployed. While there were several programs developed to help unemployed individuals find work, the most relevant to music was the New Deal for Musicians, which was designed to help unemployed musicians obtain the skills they would need to find work in the creative industries.

Case Study: The New Deal for Musicians

The New Deal for Musicians focused primarily on 18-24 year old musicians who had been on Job Seekers' Allowance for more than six months and became a mandatory requirement if such individuals wanted to keep their state benefits. Ultimately, the idea for this scheme came from the way previous musicians (such as Oasis or Pulp) were able to 'perfect their craft' by taking advantage of long, sustained periods of unemployment. Consequently, it was believed that "forcing musicians to take up unsuitable work would stifle talent and thus harm the very industries which the government claimed to want to help" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 104). In fact, Oasis manager Alan McGee went even further by proclaiming that the proposed welfare reforms would end up harming musicians by forcing them into routine jobs that lacked creativity. Because New Labour had become so closely associated with the music industry, and Blair so invested in the current music scene, it was decided by New Deal Minster Andrew Smith that a new scheme had to be developed to assist musicians looking to start a career in music. According to Smith, the government needed to make sure that the new system "was t tailored properly to the needs of people who, in a bona fide fashion, genuinely [wanted] to carve a music career [for themselves]" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 104).

The New Deal for Musicians was officially launched on October 26 1999 as a "genuine attempt to help young musicians pursue careers within the music industry, to respect musicians' work," and to weed out any "obvious time wasters" using the scheme for advantages unrelated to music (Cloonan, 2007, p. 105). While many in the industry praised this decision, it was unsurprisingly mocked by right-wing politicians who bitterly complained that New Labour had become so fearful of offending rock artists that they

unfairly allowed them to skirt the new welfare-to-work requirements. Consequently, it should be noted that whatever the initial motives were behind the scheme, or whatever the final outcome was, there were individuals involved who genuinely cared about the scheme's primary purpose: to help unemployed musicians. The most notable example perhaps, is Sir Paul McCartney, who strongly supported the scheme and incorporated it into the programming at the Liverpool Institute of Performing Arts (LIPA), the school he and Mark Featherstone-Witty founded in 1996 (www.lipa.ac.uk/).

Based out of the Liverpool Institute High School for Boys, McCartney's old school, the institute was set up to create a new type of training that would help young performers learn both the business side and the performing side of the entertainment industry. For six years the institute ran the program with the goal of creating better prospects for those looking to work in the music industry. Because obtaining such jobs are not only competitive, but hard to come by, the institute went beyond what was required and set up an educational program (the Certificate for Professional Development in the Music Business) that would give everyone entered into the program something they could include on a CV or resume.

Arguably, this additional feature is one thing that made LIPA's use of the program unique because it gave individuals a better chance to secure a job in the music industry after leaving the program. While the Department of Work and Pensions (DWP) measured success based on the number of jobs that were secured out of the scheme, LIPA focused more on the types of jobs musicians would obtain once they left the institute. In fact, those who obtained the certificate from the institute were not even counted by the DWP as having successfully completed the program, which illustrates the difference in

quality employment between LIPA's program and Blair's. Evidently, this example illustrates how the NDfM scheme was measured on the basis of job outcomes rather than quality employment, which further suggests that Blair's motives behind this scheme were done for reasons other than quality music employment. Furthermore, the fact that LIPA's program took the quality of its training into account also demonstrates that many of the organizations enrolled in the NDfM program offered different, rather than standardized, types of training.

As a result, the lack of scrutiny of the NDfM resulted in a number of similar programs throughout the United Kingdom that differed in their approach to the training and education of music industry employment. In fact, the type of service musicians received typically depended on their area of residence, which could ultimately mean the difference between an excellently run program, and a program that failed to meet the requirements of the scheme. In fact, in the first published evaluation of the scheme, it was noted that "provision under [the] NDfM differed considerably from one part of the country to another" because access to Music Industry Consultants (MICs) and full-time education and training routes varied in different parts of the UK (Cloonan, 2007, p. 105). In fact, highly populated areas such as London and the South East region were only allotted one Music Open Learning Provider (MOLPs), while Wales (which has a much smaller population) was given four (Cloonan, 2007, p. 105).

Ultimately, this lack of standardization illustrates how inefficiently this system was run by the New Labour government and how carelessly some of the policies of the scheme were thrown together. Still, it has to be questioned whether or not the government should be blamed for these inefficiencies, or if the individual Music Industry

Consultants that taught, evaluated, and supported the musicians they recruited should be the ones put to blame. In order to better assess this question, it is important to briefly analyze the various components of the scheme so that its overall structure can be better critiqued.

According to previous research, the scheme consisted of two distinct music industry routes that either assisted musicians on full-time education and training (FTET) or self-employment. The FTET route had two separate options for musicians to choose from and included either a structured course leading to a National Vocational Qualification (NVQ) or a more individualized route that focused on open learning materials. Of the two, the Open Learning route was generally more popular in the way it allowed clients (the scheme's preferred title for musicians) to study a series of music industry workbooks on their own time for six months under government appointed supervision. Arguably, this self-directed and informal way of learning was developed not to improve the qualifications or musical skills of aspiring musicians, but to improve their overall employability (which is evident from the fact only two of the workbooks related directly to the music industry) (Cloonan, 2007, p. 107). Consequently, the language found in these workbooks is misleading in the way they denounce the limited number of positions available in the music industry and claim that the knowledge obtained from the books will develop the skills you need to be able to work in the industry (http://www.ndfmlearning.co.uk/).

In the sense of pursuing work as a performing musician (which is arguably what the initial scheme was designed for), it is questionable whether or not these individualized learning tools benefited musicians in the same ways as subsidized funding

from welfare once benefited bands such as Oasis, The Smiths, and Pulp. Arguably, it appears that the scheme's focus on employability did more for improving government employment rates than it did for improving the skills and talent of the musicians enrolled in the program. In fact, the structure of the MOLP was unmistakably job driven in nature and comprised mostly of advice that any self-employed musician might be better off discovering through fellow musicians or on their own. At best, the descriptions, projects, and advice offered in these manuals merely provided a false sense of hope to any musician who aspired to be among the ranks of bands such as The Who or The Rolling Stones, because it gave young artists the impression that musical talent could be achieved through a system set up like a college or university.

After examining the contents of the manuals used for this scheme, it becomes evident that the NDfM exemplified the same false sense of hope that Blair promoted when he was first elected Prime Minister in 1997. Evidently, this sense of falsity can be seen from examining the way the workbooks claim that becoming a lead vocalist in a band or gaining a recording contract can be achieved by merely "developing your talent with your mates" (http://www.ndfmlearning.co.uk/). For example, one particular workbook attempts to detail the types of skills that are 'required' to be a lead vocalist in a band, and offhandedly suggests that "high levels of performance and stagecraft skills" are a must, while having "an ability to act or dance" is an added bonus (http://www.ndfmlearning.co.uk/). Clearly, these types of 'directions' force us to question whether or not it is truly possible to 'teach' musical talent through a series of workbooks that have been designed to get individuals off of welfare and into *any* area of employment. In fact, some areas of the music industry were so strongly opposed to this

type of training that they protested the NDfM because they felt that it would hinder the future of British creativity.

While it could be argued that the scheme *did* place economic incentives ahead of quality music training, it should be noted that the NDfM did result in a few success stories (e.g. James Morrison, The Zutons) that ended up benefiting the careers of several British musicians. However, despite the success of these musicians, it is questionable how much the program actually contributed to their careers and overall achievements. Arguably, the biggest problems associated with the NDfM had nothing to do with its intended purpose, but with its lack of organization at the local level.

After nearly ten years, the New Deal collapsed in 2009 when private welfare training companies such as A4e (Action for Employment) failed to find enough employment for the overabundant number of individuals seeking work through the scheme. Consequently, it should be noted that the Department of Work and Pensions has terminated its contracts with A4e since March of 2012 because of various scandals that have emerged regarding the firm. For example, it was not uncommon for operational staff at A4e to report false job outcomes on a number of legacy welfare-to-work contracts so that erroneous jobs were recorded giving the impression that targets for job outcomes had been met (Peacock, 2012). What is more disturbing about this collapse perhaps, is that the DWP was informed about the fraud accusations made toward Emma Harrison (the multimillionaire founder of A4e) before current Prime Minister David Cameron appointed her his 'families champion' (Mason, 2012). Needless to say, it is ironic that this position gave Harrison the power to develop services that would help families with multiple needs find employment (Mason, 2012).

Evidently, this helps illustrate the corrupt nature of British politics when it comes to developing schemes that are intended to serve both the interests of the public and the interests of the state. While it may appear that Blair took significant steps toward developing a system that benefitted all areas of British society, it is clear that different aspects of these policies were ranked higher on his political agenda than others. Despite Thatcher's lukewarm response to culture and music, it could be argued that she and Blair both failed to make any real improvements in the lives of creative employees. In fact, Blair's overzealous attitude toward music had a less than desirable effect on creative labor and the overall development of popular music in Great Britain. While most associate Brit Pop with New Labour and 'Cool Britannia,' it should be noted that much of the music that emerged from that subgenre was produced well before Blair took office in 1997. For example, 'quintessential' Brit Pop albums *What's the Story (Morning Glory)?* (Oasis) and *Parklife* (Blur) were released in 1994 and 1995, several years before Blair was elected into office as Prime Minister. In fact, it is often criticized that Blair piggybacked off of the cultural movement in order to make his nationalistic agendas more appealing to the British masses.

Still, while there were significant flaws in many of Blair's policies, the Prime Minister did help facilitate a greater government appreciation for the music industry than that of previous eras. Therefore, it is important to consider how Blair's actions have influenced the views of current politicians and the present state of popular music. Clearly, Blair's accomplishments have had a major impact on the way music is being overseen by David Cameron's government and the newly appointed ministers in the Department for Culture, Media, and Sport. Given the amount of influence Blair's

government has had on recent cultural policies, it is important to examine where New

Labour excelled and where it lacked in constructing beneficial policies that could

contribute to the development of popular music. Needless to say, these major changes

have greatly impacted the way the current coalition has approached intellectual property,

music funding, and creative industry policymaking in contemporary Britain.

Chapter 3

David Cameron and Cultural Industry Policy in the Creative Economy

While Margaret Thatcher and Tony Blair both had clear political agendas during their Premierships, it seems that David Cameron has been more ambiguous on where he stands in terms of culture, welfare, and other leftist social issues. In fact, it is difficult to examine the agenda of the current coalition because it appears to combine a seemingly contradictory mix of views that both promote and oppose Conservative and Labour policies. For example, in the early stages of his Premiership, Cameron avidly promoted leftist ideals by showing a strong support for the NHS, communitarianism, and social welfare. However, the latter years of Cameron's Premiership have proven to be more contradictory than one would have originally thought, because the Prime Minister has since turned his back on welfare schemes, art funding, and music education. In fact, despite his overzealous enthusiasm for the 2012 Olympics and Britain's GREAT campaign, Cameron has done little to support the British music industry when it comes to providing funding and creative employment opportunities for British citizens.

In fact, the Conservatives have put more effort into funding Britain's growing technology sector rather than supporting popular music at the local level. Needless to say, this shows the contradictions that now exist between Thatcher, Blair, and Cameron when it comes to funding popular music. While Cameron has expressed an admiration for the British music sector, government policies have not provided accessible funding for musicians and have yet to establish more opportunities for independent labels to break

into the commercial sector. Instead, Parliament has chosen to focus on other areas of the creative sector that are considered to be less risky and more economically viable. Unfortunately, these changes have dramatically altered the way government forms policies that impact the development and production of popular music in Great Britain.

David Cameron and Progressive Conservatism

When David Cameron was elected into office in May of 2010, it was evident that the Conservative Party was making a strong attempt to distance itself from the negative stereotypes typically associated with Tories. In fact, despite being a Conservative himself, Cameron made it clear that he intended to abolish any association between he and Margaret Thatcher, and even went so far as refuse to meet or have his picture taken with her during his early days in office. Ironically, Cameron's will to ideologically change the face of the Conservative Party came down to utilizing the philosophies and viewpoints of Tony Blair and New Labour, which he claimed as surprising inspirations toward his own political agendas. Consequently, the admiration the Conservative Party has for Blair and Third-Way politics has caused some senior Tories to refer to him as "The Master" and to claim that he is "like the footballer Cristiano Ronaldo – gone but still greatly admired" (Jones, 2012, para. 1). In fact, as journalist Owen Jones candidly puts it, when one thinks of Blair supporters, "screaming teenagers at Take That concerts [often] come to mind" (Jones, 2012, para. 1). Ultimately, it is important to understand why such progressive reforms have taken place and why the Party has tried so hard to inject compassion into its Conservative ideology since Cameron has been elected into office.

For starters, the speech Blair gave to the Labour Party Conference in 1999 may have something to do with the Tories' ardent decision to change the image of their Party, because the speech unashamedly depicted Conservatives as weird, weak outcasts (Blair, 1999). In fact, some have even argued that Blair used his speech to rage an outright war on the Conservative Party because the large number of attacks and insults that were used showed no signs of congeniality or amicability. In fact, Blair went so far as to claim that the Conservative Party was "the only Party that [had] spent two years in hibernation, searching for a new image, [before finally coming] back as the Adams Family" (Blair, 1999). Likewise, Blair also argued that "after decades of Tory boom and bust" the Conservative Party appeared to get more extreme as they got more useless, and even made sure to point out that the Conservative Party had "voted 51 times – yes, 51 times, against the creation of the NHS" (Blair, 1999). Needless to say, for many Conservatives this served as a wake-up call that significant changes had to be made if they ever wanted to reclaim their place as the dominant Party in Britain.

For Cameron, this meant attempting to set aside any differences between his Party and the opposition so that the two Parties could merge to create a coalition that promoted more liberal ideals classified as "progressive Conservatism" (King, 2011, p. 13). While a coalition between the Conservatives and the Liberal Democrats may have seemed unlikely in previous eras, the circumstances in May 2011 proved otherwise and the government decided to forge a "new politics" that would "place national interest above Party interest" (King, 2011, p. 17). Ultimately, it could be argued that such a move allowed the Conservatives to regain their power in government because it allowed the Party to react to the necessary changes occurring in modern society. In fact, the Party's

2010 election manifesto claimed that it was not breaking away from the values of traditional Conservative, but rather bringing them up to date to suit contemporary politics (King, 2011, p. 21). Needless to say, this can be seen from the way the Conservatives agreed to create a coalition that would pursue both left and the right agendas, rather than interests devoted to a single Party.

Due to the complex nature of politics, it can be hard to pinpoint an exact definition to describe the ideological underpinnings of a particular politician or government. Consequently, the ambiguity of the term 'progressive' makes it difficult to define the term in a concrete manner because it allows it take on a variety of different meanings and interpretations. Thus, in order to establish a definition that suited the needs of his Party, Cameron gave what he hoped to be a persuasive and convincing description of the term in a speech to the left-of-center think tank 'Demos' in 2009. Here, Cameron argued that the term 'progressive' meant "a vision of the good society and the good life" that could be used to create:

> *"(i) a fair society which helps people stay out of poverty*
>
> *(ii) an equal society where everyone 'can write their own life story*
>
> *(iii) a greener society which is environmentally stable and*
>
> *(iv) a safer society where people are protected from threat" (Cameron, 2009).*

Consequently, after hearing Cameron's pitch on the benefits of his progressive ideology, Demos launched The Progressive Conservative Project in 2009 so that more research could be done on the areas of patriotism, community, markets, poverty, and political thought in Great Britain (www.demos.co.uk). According to the Demos website, the project seeks to develop "policies and ideas that [not only follow] the Conservative

tradition, but reflect the progressive values of personal and community empowerment [so that] poverty and inequality" can be combated through Conservative strategies (www.demos.co.uk). Ultimately, the goals of the project were designed to comply with Cameron's objective to use Conservative means to reach progressive ends in contemporary Britain.

While it would be easy to assume that David Cameron and Margaret Thatcher share similar political ideologies, the truth of the matter is that the two politicians possess very different viewpoints that make them surprisingly dissimilar from one another. In fact, one of the main differences between these leaders is the fact that Cameron has attempted to break free of the image that has pegged Conservatives as ruthless politicians "only concerned with economics [and privatization]" (King, 2011, p. 116). Evidently, this break from tradition can be seen when examining the Party's 2010 election manifesto, which devoted nearly thirteen pages to green issues and only three pages to issues dealing with the growing deficit (King, 2011, p. 119). Likewise, this mentality is also apparent from the way Cameron has criticized the institutional reforms of the Thatcher era, which he claims "brought an unwelcome move toward [the] centralization of power and control" (McAnulla, 2010, p. 290). As a result, Cameron has been very critical of Thatcher's decision to neglect the negative social consequences of society and has instead cited Tony Blair as an example of a politician who truly recognized how extensively external social concerns contribute to poverty and unemployment. Needless to say, the irony of this statement not only highlights the contradicting nature of Cameron's politics, but sheds light on the similarities that exist between the motives he and Blair have when it comes to policies devoted to welfare and employment.

The Big Society and the Welfare State

For many around the world, Margaret Thatcher will always be synonymous with a string of catchphrases that claim that 'there is no alternative' and that 'there is no such thing as society.' Despite what many regard as pop culture references designed to entertain and amuse individuals, these phrases actually emerged out of Thatcher's desire to abolish solidarity from British society so that hyper-individualism could prevail as the dominant ideology in the 1980's. For Thatcher, individual people mattered more than any attempt at "social engineering" because "the individual citizen [would] have more encouragement to provide for his own future" if he was distinguished from other members of society (King, 2011, p. 133). Ultimately, Thatcher designed polices that would restore and defend individual freedom and responsibility from excessive State interference because she believed that the self-confidence and self-reliance of British citizens would be hindered if the government had too big of a role in society (King, 2011, p. 134). According to Thatcher, "the years of make believe and false optimism [were] over" because it was time for Britain to come to terms with reality and recognize that "they no longer [had] time for politicians [who glossed] over the hard facts of life" (King, 2011, p. 135).

Consequently, it should be noted that when David Cameron entered office in 2010, the country was still adjusting to the radical changes that resulted from the experimental policies of Tony Blair and Margaret Thatcher in previous decades. In order to deal with these remnants, Cameron attempted to 'revamp' the situation with welfare by unveiling a new formula that, unlike social exclusion, would focus on the role of the community rather than a government/citizen partnership. Using the catchphrase 'The Big

Society,' Cameron hoped to remove responsibility from the state and place it on the shoulders of the community in order to: give communities more powers through localism and devolution; encourage people to take an active role in their communities through volunteerism; transfer power from central to local government; support co-ops, charities and social enterprises; and publish government data in an open and transparent government.

Ultimately, the goal of this project was to release the grip of state control over society and place more power in the hands of the people running communities. Still, while the thought of these ambitions may seem promising, it is important to examine whether or not these broad and optimistic statements have actually manifested since Cameron has been in office, or if such claims have merely been used to help reposition the Conservative Party as a progressive government.

While it may appear that this attempt at solidarity would fare better than Thatcher's individualism theory or Blair's social exclusion manifesto, the truth of the matter is that after two years of its implementation, the effects of the "Big Society" have been less than stellar. Needless to say, when one looks more closely at the differences between Thatcher's 'no society' and Cameron's 'Big Society' it becomes evident that the two ideologies are not as different as they appear to be on the surface. In fact, a closer examination reveals that both politicians ended up cutting public expenditure, reducing welfare benefits, and stigmatizing the people who received them as dependent, scroungers (Beresford, 2011). As a result, Britain has "witnessed [an] extension of economic inequality and reduced social mobility" during both Thatcher and Cameron's Premierships because each of these politicians chose to implement reforms that increased

social divisions, undermined social cohesion, and damaged the manufacturing industries of Scotland and Wales (Beresford, 2011, para. 2). Thus, while the idea of the "Big Society" may sound appealing to those who suffered the negative consequences of the Thatcher and Blair establishments, it is crucial to analyze whether or not the new promises of progressive Conservatism will create beneficial change in Britain, or simply perpetuate the plights of past Prime Ministers.

Needless to say, when one examines the policies of the Conservative Party more critically, it becomes clear that what the Tories preach is not always what they choose to practice. Understandably, it is difficult to discover such paradoxes when effective propaganda machines have allowed politicians like Blair and Cameron to conceal the true intentions of their lofty, centrist claims. While it is true that Cameron attempted to soften the Tory image and humanize the Conservative Party during his early days in office, he has decidedly taken Thatcher ideals to new heights in more recent times and has dared to venture to places even the Iron Lady never risked going. Despite the fact Cameron and Blair have taken greater empathy on the poor, they have by no means improved the conditions of those in extreme poverty, and have in fact perpetuated many of the stereotypes associated with those on welfare. Regardless of the attempts these politicians have made to cure poverty through ambiguous catchphrases, there continues to be high levels of unemployment and significant economic troubles in Great Britain.

The Creative Economy

Given the way Cameron has modeled his government after Blair's, it should come as no surprise that the two politicians share similar views when it comes to modernization and the creative industries. While it is true that Cameron never actually played in a band,

he nonetheless differs from many of his Conservative predecessors because he has paid

quite a bit of attention to the economic benefits of the creative sector. In many ways that

resemble Blair's incentive to modernize Britain, Cameron's Conservatives have taken to

viewing the creative industries as a strategic priority that can boost the economic growth,

employment, and social cohesion of Great Britain. In fact, Cameron has been adamant

about encouraging overseas investors to support the UK's art, film, television, and music

industries because he feels that now is the time to support the creative sector and the

incredible talent of Great Britain ("Cameron Urges Overseas Investors to Back UK Arts,"

2012). Ultimately, Cameron has argued that now is the time to come and invest in

Britain if you are involved in the creative industries because many of the stars that have

dominated 21st century entertainment (e.g. Adele, JK Rowling, Christian Bale, etc.) have

come from the United Kingdom ("Cameron Urges Overseas Investors to Back UK Arts,"

2012).

Needless to say, Cameron's attempt to exploit the creative industries in a way that

enhances economic growth and national pride resembles the Blair government's cultural

agenda in the 1990's. In fact, one of the first major speeches Cameron gave as Prime

Minister in 2010 stated that it was the government's first priority to transform the

economy so that Britain's next decade could be the most entrepreneurial and dynamic in

its history (Cameron, 2010). In order to achieve such a goal, the British Council set up a

Creative and Cultural Economy Program in 2010 that would examine how the creative

industries could help stimulate economic growth in response to the social, cultural and

technological challenges of the information age. According to the British Council's

website, the program strives to connect creative entrepreneurs through links of cultural,

economic and social importance so that international ideas can be exchanged while necessary policies and infrastructures are developed (www.britishcouncil.org). Ultimately, this includes offering opportunities that provide the skills individuals will need if they wish to pursue careers in the creative industries and contribute to cultural trade in the creative economy.

While it is true that the creative economy initially emerged during the era of New Labour, it appears that more attention has been given to the creative industries in recent years, and that more attempts have been made to encourage growth in the creative sector. In fact, the number of skills programs that have been designed to enhance the creative economy are too numerous to examine in this writing, and will therefore only be limited to those pertaining to creative labor in the music industry. Consequently, the explosion of such programs may have to do with the fact that governments across the world have finally begun to recognize the economic benefits of the cultural industries and have started to create policies that support the development of the creative sector (http://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/).

Evidently, this can be seen from the way the British Council has acknowledged that "a sustainable and competitive creative economy [can only be] shaped by a series of government interventions and regulations" that result from effective policymaking (http://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/). Needless to say, the fact that the UK is considered to be "the most successful exporter of cultural goods and services in the world," makes it clear why the nation would want to cultivate a vibrant creative sector during an economic downturn (http://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/).

Regeneration in the 21st Century – Britain is GREAT and the Revival of Cool Britannia

In terms of national regeneration, the Cameron government has made a tremendous effort to reposition Great Britain as one of the "very best places in the world to visit, live, work, study, invest, and do business" (www.fco.gov.uk). According to David Cameron, the goal of his government has been to make sure Britain's place in the world continues to rise so that it remains a dominant player in global trade and foreign investment. Since taking office, Cameron has been able to shape international perceptions and decisions about long-term trade and tourism fairly easily because the 2012 Olympic Games has given the government a platform to promote UK interests to the rest of the world. Ironically, this could be considered an extension of New Labour's attempt to regenerate the nation through culture because Blair was the one who helped secure Britain's bid to host the 2012 Olympic Games during his Premiership. Needless to say, the recent coalition has used this opportunity to highlight Britain's excellence in a number of different areas that include: "technology and innovation, entrepreneurship, creativity, knowledge, green, heritage, sport, shopping, music and countryside" (www.fco.gov.uk).

In order to achieve such recognition, the DCMS, British Parliament, and Visit Britain (the national tourism body of Great Britain) developed the 'GREAT campaign' to promote the nation's creative expertise through "the spotlight provided by the London 2012 Olympic Games and the Queen's Diamond Jubilee" (Parsons, 2012, para. 3). At a staggering £25 million dollar budget, the four year campaign was designed to attract an

additional 4.6 million visitors to the UK and to entice foreign investors to take note of all

Britain had to offer in the creative sector (Parsons, 2012). Arguably, this strategy

resembles Blair's attempt to combine music with politics because it illustrates how music

can be used to help the government improve employment rates, foster national pride and

enhance economic growth. Needless to say, the similarities between these two eras are

obvious and it appears that the Conservatives have attempted to use the GREAT

campaign to fuse glamor with politics in their own unique way. Consequently, the fact

that both politicians have recognized the significance of the creative industries in a fifteen

year time span illustrates how important the sector can be in terms of economic

regeneration and global investment.

While it is true that every section of the GREAT campaign (e.g. technology,

shopping, sport) has had its own set of celebrity ambassadors and special events, the

'Music is GREAT Britain' campaign has been special in the way it has set aside a full

week devoted to discussions about British music. For example, in an evident attempt to

boost nationalism and recreate the 'magic' of Britpop, the campaign has sought out

popular artists to explain why they feel British music is great and why they are proud to

be British. Specifically, the campaign has asked British pop diva Jessie J to promote the

reputation of British music abroad and to drum up national support for British music on

the domestic front. Throughout the campaign, Jessie has been very vocal about

expressing her pride for Great Britain and has stressed on numerous occasions how

important it is to be proud of your heritage ("Jessie J Shows Support for Music Is Great

Week," 2012). In addition, she has consistently reminded citizens about Britain's rich

musical history and has stated that there is no other place in the world she would rather

be from than the UK ("Jessie J Shows Support for Music Is Great Week," 2012).

Evidently, these efforts illustrate that politicians are aware of the economic benefits of the

creative sector, and that they understand how it can be used to help rejuvenate the

nation's economy.

In addition to these events, the 'Music is GREAT Britain' campaign was also

featured throughout the opening and closing ceremonies of the Olympics so that the long-

term successes of British music could be highlighted. For example, the opening

ceremonies featured an extravagant number that acknowledged several significant

cultural movements (e.g. British Invasion, Rave, Britpop, etc.) that have been influential

in shaping British music and culture over the last few decades. Similarly, the closing

ceremonies featured a number of performances by influential British artists so that the

rest of the world could gain a new appreciation for the long musical history of the nation.

While performances by The Who, Paul McCartney, and Ray Davies were shown to pay

tribute to the British Invasion, performances by Muse, One Direction, and Tinie Tempah

were used to draw attention to the current crop of British talent. Needless to say, both

ceremonies provided a comprehensive look at the cultural evolution of the nation because

they celebrated the most influential films, books, and music Britain has contributed to the

creative sector. Consequently, it is evident that the opening and closing ceremonies were

structured in a way that allowed Britain's finest writers, actors, and musicians to gain

global recognition from businesses and citizens all around the world.

Creative Skills, Education, and Employment in the Creative Economy

In today's ever-changing world, it is becoming increasingly important for nations

to "develop strategies [that can] unleash the creative potential of all to respond to the far

reaching cultural, economic, social and technological shifts [that have occurred throughout the 21st century]" (Newbigin, 2010, p. 11). According to John Newbigin (chair of Creative England), today's jobs, wealth, and cultures are created from the images, sounds, symbols, and ideas we experience every day because people all over the world are changing the way we make and exchange goods, services, and culture (Newbigin, 2010). Ultimately, the basis of the creative economy rests on the desire people have to pay creative individuals to create goods that communicate cultural value through products (e.g. music, drama, fashion) "whose value is [beautiful or imaginative but] not purely practical" (Newbigin, 2010, p. 11). While it is true that these types of ancient traditions existed long before the development of digital technology, they did not take on an economic purpose until they began to merge with modern economic activities (e.g. advertising, film, music) that allowed them to take on an exchange value in the global market. Needless to say, it was during this time when people began using the term 'creative economy' to describe the emerging relationship between a product's cultural value and its economic value.

As manufacturing has become more dependent on technology and less dependent on human labor, employment patterns have changed so that "a growing proportion of the workforce [has moved] from manual labor into service and managerial jobs" (Newbigin, 2010, p. 19). In fact, "the adoption of the term 'creativity' in cultural industries policy during the late 1990's and 2000's was no accident [because a] keen interest [already existed] among managers and business academics that innovation was the basis of business success" (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p. 142). Consequently, the key resource for economic growth has shifted from muscle power to creativity so that talent, imagination,

skills, and knowledge have become crucial attributes for workers to possess. In fact, John Howkins has argued that "people who own ideas have become more powerful than people who work machines and, in many cases, more powerful than people who own machines" (Newbigin, 2010, p. 18). Needless to say, it is evident that we are moving into a time where "the relationship between capital and labor, and investment and resource, is changing fundamentally" so that the value of creative expression has become one of the core elements of economic growth (Newbigin, 2011).

Ultimately, the overall value of a cultural product is no longer based solely on the material costs of the commodity, but on "the human ingenuity, skill, and creative expression that goes into [it]" (Newbigin, 2011). In fact, Will Huton has stated that the ideas of expressive value are not only about commodities or pure business, but about creating new insights, delights, and experiences that stimulate our emotions, increase our knowledge, and enrich our daily lives (Newbigin, 2010). Consequently, it could be argued that the transition to a creative economy not only impacts the lives of workers in the creative sector, but the lives of individuals who consume cultural products through education, work, leisure, and entertainment. Therefore, it is important for us to use education to provide young people with roots into the creative industries so that they can develop the skills to work in the creative sector, and the skills to actively engage with creative products as consumers. Ultimately, if we want to continue to drive change in the creative economy, it is important to make sure that the consumers of cultural products are as sophisticated as the creators of cultural products so that the "demand [for creative output] [is] demanding [enough]" to push the boundaries of creativity (Newbigin, 2011). Needless to say, it is crucial for the government to continue to fund art and music

programs in schools all over Britain, so that every individual has the opportunity to gain access to education within the creative sector.

Despite the cool reception music education has received in previous decades, the Cameron government has attempted to improve the access impoverished youth have to a quality music education so that more children have the opportunity to be exposed to music at an earlier age. For example, the coalition launched The Importance of Music scheme on July 16 2012 so that every child, regardless of social status or upbringing, could have the opportunity to learn to play a musical instrument while attending school. As the UK's first ever national music education program, the plan seeks to act as "a radical social-inclusion project [that allows] children from the poorest backgrounds [to gain an] intensive music education [that can] help them escape [the trap of] poverty" (Higgins, 2011, para. 4). Ultimately, the government hopes that instilling local hubs in deprived areas will help establish "a music education system that [will encourage] everyone, whatever their background, to [discover their true talent and] enjoy music" (Higgins, 2011, para. 11).

On the surface level, the proposed plans for this scheme appear to be benefitting local music education so that all individuals are provided with equal opportunities to gain access into the creative sector. However, just because this plan has improved the quality and consistency of music training across various regions does not mean that it has provided equal funding to all areas of the UK or that it has provided new opportunities for every individual in England. In fact, because the plan is designed to give more money to underprivileged areas in the UK, cities, such as Manchester, have been less able to fund music education programs in their region because they have received inadequate

levels of funding. Needless to say, one of the main goals of the scheme has been to

devote an extra £1m to the 'In Harmony' music education program in Liverpool,

Norwich, Lambeth, so that change can be brought to the most disadvantaged areas in

England (Higgins, 2011, para. 4). While it is important to provide areas such as these

with proper access and increased opportunities, it is crucial to examine how other areas of

the UK are being affected by inequalities in funding. Ultimately, it is important to

recognize that these inequalities have resulted from the government's decision to reduce

music education funding by 20% over the next two years so that money allocated for

music tuition will fall from £77.5m to £58m by the year 2014 (Higgins, 2011, para. 13).

With these thoughts in mind, is should come as no surprise that the severe Art

cuts that have occurred throughout Cameron's Premiership have resulted in higher

education costs, higher unemployment rates, and the closure of libraries and theatres. By

attempting to reduce the nation's debt through education reforms and art subsidy cuts, the

Cameron government has managed to threaten the future of British culture by hindering

the opportunities of those who shape England's cultural landscape and creative sector.

For example, raising tuition fees for art schools has the potential to deter poorer students

from pursuing careers in the creative industries because it reduces the number of

applications to those who can afford the high cost of education. In fact, according to

statistics from the Universities and Colleges Admissions Service, the number of

applications for creative art and design courses dropped 27% in the year 2012 when the

£9,000 a year tuition fee began to take effect at many colleges (Davis, 2011, para. 3).

Understandably, worries about high tuition fees and unstable jobs in the creative sector

have turned off applicants who wish to further their talents at the university level.

Ultimately, providing less privileged individuals with opportunities such as these could give aspiring musicians the time to work on their creative talents while making possible connections that could help them reach their future goals. Evidently, a government that does not acknowledge the arts fails to fully support the industries that benefit most from individuals with an art education.

While previous decades have seen numerous art school attendees go on to become extraordinary contributors to music, literature, and film, it appears that more and more musicians, artists, and writers are coming from privileged backgrounds of wealth and status. In today's creative sector, it seems that a significant number of musicians have either attended prestigious universities for degrees irrelevant to music, or have been 'grandfathered' into the business through money or influential connections. For example, Winston Marshall (Mumford and Sons) is the son of wealthy investor Paul Marshall, the founder of Marshall Wace LLP (worth £8 billion), one of the largest hedge fund groups in Europe. The elder Marshall co-edited 'The Orange Book' in 2004 with David Laws (the Minister of State for Schools and the Cabinet Office), and currently serves as the Chairman of the Liberal Democrat Business Forum. At an estimated worth of well over £100 million, Marshall was one of the five original backers of Liberal Democrat leader Nick Clegg, whom he later served as an adviser (Cohen, 2011, para. 4). Regardless of how talented or capable the band actually is, the wealth Winston has obtained from his father has certainly contributed to the success of his music career.

Still, the real question being raised in regards to today's music industry is not about privilege or wealth, but about access to instruments, rehearsal spaces, and training. While previous musicians could use art school as a time to "develop creative and non-

lateral ways of thinking" while honing their craft, today's musicians are forced to either seek menial types of employment or pay exorbitant university fees while pursuing music careers (Aitkenhead, 2011, para. 20). Needless to say, it is questionable whether or not musicians such as Keith Richards, Pete Townshend, John Lennon, and Jarvis Cocker would be able to make it in today's creative sector if they were required to pay their way into the art schools they once attended. In fact, Cocker has been extremely vocal in expressing the importance of providing both low cost education and low cost housing to underclass musicians who wish to pursue careers in the music industry. Ultimately, Cocker believes that such measures are important because "experimental bands such as Pulp [developed out] of a particular era when aspiring musicians could go on the dole, live in a council flat, study for free at art school, and [take the time to] develop their craft" (Aitkenhead, 2011, para. 20).

Needless to say, Cocker feels that the time he spent studying film at St. Martin's College played a crucial role in Pulp's creative development because it allowed them to try out new ideas and concepts without having to conform to an industry prototype. Because of higher tuition fees, Cocker believes that this type of creative development will soon disappear because no one will want to spend large quantities of money on an art education. As a result, the Pulp front-man feels that it is important for fees to be exempt from art schools so that all individuals can take advantage of art education and be free to pursue the creative careers of their choosing. Ultimately, creating a tiered system where only the wealthy can obtain a creative education has the potential to "stop creativity coming from [underclass] artists," who Cocker argues, "have the most vitality" (Aitkenhead, 2011, para. 21). Needless to say, this type of society will begin to produce

art that is disconnected from real culture because the majority of it will be made by the very wealthy for the very wealthy. Thus, we need to question whether or not we want a culture that is produced by a few wealthy artists, or a culture that is produced by artists who have something interesting to say because they have something to fight for.

The Creative Society

In 2009, Martin Bright wrote an article in The New Statesman that suggested that the cultural elements of the Works Progress Administration (WPA) could be adapted to help current individuals pursue careers in today's creative sector. Originally introduced by US President Franklin D. Roosevelt during the 1930's, the WPA was created to provide unemployed individuals with jobs and income throughout the Great Depression. As a result of its efforts, the program was able to support individuals such as Jackson Pollack, Willem de Kooning, and Saul Bellow, and was able to create 3,500 branch libraries and 4,400 musical performances every month (www.thecreativesociety.co.uk). In many ways similar to the Enterprise Allowance Scheme, the program sought to help artists, writers, actors, and musicians in ways that would support their artistic endeavors. For example, during its years of operation, the WPA created the Federal Art Project in order to recruit hundreds of artists to develop more than 100,000 paintings and over 18,000 sculptures. According to Willem de Kooning:

> *"The Project was terribly important [because] it gave us*
> *enough to live on [so that] we could paint what we wanted.*
> *It changed my attitude toward being an artist [because]*
> *instead of doing odd jobs and painting on the side, I*
> *painted and did odd jobs on the side. My life was the same,*

but I had a different view of it. I gave up the idea of first

making a fortune and then painting in my old age."

(www.theartstory.org)

Needless to say, Bright's vision of re-creating the scheme in Britain struck a chord with politicians in all parties so that The Creative Society was quickly established to "recognize the urgency of protecting, nurturing and investing in the arts to prevent a generation of creative talent [from] being lost to the recession" (www.thecreativesociety.co.uk). By utilizing aspects of the WPA and the EAS, The Creative Society has been able to successfully lobby for the return of the Enterprise Allowance Scheme and push for government policies that encourage self-employment and freelance opportunities. Understanding the role that subsidized arts programs can play in restoring and upholding the social and economic health of a nation, The Creative Society seeks to boost employment in Britain's creative sector, while enhancing the well-being of its citizens. According to the program's website, The Creative Society has chosen to focus on the immediate unemployment crisis in the creative sector because it believes that it is "in the best position to react to and benefit from the recession, while creating national wealth" (www.thecreativesociety.co.uk). Ultimately, the program seeks to place young unemployed individuals seeking Job Seeker's Allowance into creative jobs that allow them to fulfill their creative and entrepreneurial talents, while earning a steady income.

According to the Creative Society's "Make a Job, Don't Take a Job Report" (Gunnell and Bright, 2010b), the Enterprise Allowance Scheme was an important starting point for many creative entrepreneurs who later went on to achieve global success in the

creative sector. In a segment entitled "What Thatcher Did for Heavy Metal," the report

explains how the structure of the EAS allowed many of Britain's brightest creative minds

to accomplish their entrepreneurial dreams and reach their full potential. Needless to say,

the Federation of Small Businesses has urged the government to re-launch a version of

the EAS for the 21st century because it believes that the scheme can have a beneficial

impact on employment in the creative sector. In fact, a 2009 report by the Creative

Society on Self-Employment suggests that "creative businesses should join forces with

the Federation of Small Business to build a coalition that can lobby for the introduction

of the EAS" (Gunnell & Bright, 2009, p. 6). Ultimately, the Creative Society argues that

using the benefits scheme to boost creative entrepreneurship can "encourage people to

become employers of other people [instead of expecting other people] to employ them"

(Gunnell & Bright, 2010, p. 32).

The Importance of Locality: Tech City Funding vs. Local Music Funding

While there is no question that the creative sector can play an important role in

regenerating Britain's economy from a global perspective, it is essential to examine the

role regional clusters can have on developing the talent and skills needed to support local

businesses within the creative industries (Oakley, 2006). In fact, it has become

increasingly vital to recognize the value of creative clusters and the importance of

encouraging creative growth at the regional and local level. According to John

Newbigin, it is imperative that policymakers understand the significance of creative

clusters because what occurs at the regional level has become more important than what

occurs at the national level (Newbigin, 2010). Thus, one of the key factors that will

determine what happens in the creative industries within the next ten years will be

determined by what occurs at the city level. Ironically, this harks back to the creative

clusters of the 1980's and the success they had in regenerating regional areas affected by

the changes of deindustrialization and privatization. Needless to say, it is important to

examine these areas in greater detail because it sheds light on the ways they were able to

contribute to the creative sector on the regional, national, and global level.

Ultimately, it could be argued that "one of the strong and consistent features of

[the] creative industries [is the fact] that many of them [are] place-specific [and are

therefore unable to] be relocated from one country to another" (Newbigin, 2010, p. 37).

As a result, cities need to develop a rich and varied cultural atmosphere that will provide

a fertile environment for creative businesses to cultivate creative talent, production, and

employment. According to the 2008 government strategy paper Creative Britain – New

Talents for the New Economy, strengthening creative clusters is important because

Britain's local economies will be run entirely by creativity in the year 2018 (DCMS,

2008). Needless to say, it has become more important to focus on ways to develop

creativity at the local level so that regional economies can foster national growth.

According to David Cameron, England needs to be a country where people

believe they have the ability to start up their own businesses and sell their ideas to the rest

of the world (Cameron, 2011). Specifically, the coalition believes that supporting local

creative entrepreneurs can be seen as a long-term investment that can help rebuild

Britain's economy by making it the most successful cultural hub in the world. In order to

foster such entrepreneurship, the Cameron government has unleashed an ambitious

Regional Growth Plan that aims to provide hundreds of small businesses with £95 million

to invest in new capital assets that will create an estimated 4,000 jobs by unlocking

around £500 million of new investment (Cameron, 2011). Despite the fact that "British SMEs [have] already [been] doing incredible things," Cameron argues that these measures are necessary because it is time for more entrepreneurs to follow the boldness of Britain's most successful businesses so that the nation "can come out first in the world's race to the top" (Cameron, 2011).

While the government has claimed that it wants to support all areas of the creative sector, it has become evident that much of the funding provided by the Regional Growth Fund has gone to areas that specialize in digital technology. More specifically, the Cameron government has set aside significant funding to help regenerate Old Street Roundabout "into Europe's largest indoor civic space [for] start-ups and entrepreneurs in East London" ("PM Announces £50m funding to regenerate Old Street Roundabout," 2011, para. 2). Since becoming a sanctioned creative cluster in 2010, London's Silicon Roundabout has received a lot of attention from the government because its hopes to rebrand the city as the Digital Capital of Europe. Under the moniker "Tech City," the area has become a major hub for technology conglomerates who wish to "support local technology development, inspire innovation, and provide expertise and guidance to those [who possess] new and innovative ideas" ("PM Announces £50m funding to regenerate Old Street Roundabout," 2011, para. 4). Ultimately, the government hopes to transform London's East End (the site of the Olympic Park) into a vibrant technology center that can create a cultural environment for start-up companies that can push technological advancements and attract foreign investment.

Needless to say, the increased emphasis the government has placed on technology has resulted in a desire to "push forward [Britain's] digital communications sector [so

that the nation can] gain a substantial and long-lasting competitive advantage" in the future ("At a Glance: Digital Britain," 2009, para. 3). Evidently, the beginnings of this drive for technological innovation can be seen from the 2009 Digital Britain policy document, which was drawn up to suggest possible strategies to secure Britain's place as a global leader in the digital economy. Thus, the goal of the Tech City project has been to provide Britain with a competitive advantage against highly ranked technology hubs (e.g. Silicon Valley, the U.S. technology hub in Southern California) all over the world.

By fusing technology and economic growth with innovation, the companies of Tech City have been able to transform the way individuals think about 'creativity' in terms of art, entertainment, and music. According to Ian Burrell, Tech City has become 'the global center of music technology' because a number of British companies (e.g. 7 Digital, Songkick, WhoSampled, etc.) used the area to fashion a new "music ecosystem" completely devoted to digital music (Burrell, 2012). In fact, musician Adam Perry (The Bloodhound Gang) has gone so far as to claim that he launched his startup in Tech City because he felt that being "the CEO of a tech startup [was] equivalent [to being] a 60's rock star" (Kingsley, 2011, para. 3). According to Perry, "technology [has become] the new rock and roll" because today's technological innovators have "had a lot more to say than most bands [in the last few decades]" (Kingsley 2011). As a result, Perry has dubbed Tech City as the King's Road of the twenty first century because he feels that the Steve Jobs and Mark Zuckerberg of tomorrow are "the rock stars [of the future]" (Kingsley, 2011, para. 4).

According to Claire Wiggins (executive of Moshi music), music that utilizes technology has the potential to "outmuscle conventional record labels [because] working

at a record label right now is like being in California after the gold rush" (Kingsley, 2011, para. 7). In fact, Wiggins claims that technology based companies have the ability to save "the ailing music industry" because conventional forms of music have run out of ideas (Kingsley, 2011, para. 7). Ultimately, Wiggins believes that digital companies have the means to re-invent physical media so that traditional corporations will eventually be driven out of business. Needless to say, this type of mentality explains why more funding has been put into developing creative clusters that focus on technology rather than traditional forms of art, culture, and music. As a result, it is important to examine how traditional record labels have been hindered by a lack of government funding and how technology companies have begun to transform the production of commercial music with the additional government support they have received.

Consequently, an example of this transformation can be seen by examining the British company Mind Candy, which was developed by Michael Acton Smith in 2004 as an entertainment company that could provide children with a virtual community to adopt and care for 'Moshi Monsters.' Despite the fact Mind Candy had no intentions of expanding the brand to music, its overwhelming popularity resulted in a partnership deal with Sony Music in 2012 that led to the creation of its own music label (Moshi Monsters Music). The company, which uses a music team to develop its tracks, incorporates its cartoon characters into its albums so that every song features a different one of its Moshi Monster characters. Surprisingly, the company's 2012 debut album Music Rox was able to beat out established artists such as Madonna, David Guetta, and Jessie J in the British music charts and reach gold status without any conventional airplay. However, it is

questionable whether or not the economic benefits of this type of music outweigh the cost and perceived risk of creating traditional, more creative forms of music.

Arguably, what is most disturbing about this scenario is the fact that additional funding has been going into this type of music, rather than traditional forms of music production. While minimum efforts have been made to fund local musicians, significant attempts have been made to ensure the growth of technological companies such as Moshi Music. In fact, in December of 2012, David Cameron announced that the government plans to invest £50m into Tech City so that the area can flourish by recruiting companies such as Microsoft, IBM, and Alert Me ("PM Announces £50m funding to regenerate Old Street Roundabout," 2011). While there is no doubt that this support will create jobs for major corporations and technology startups, it is evident that supporting an area like Tech City does little to generate employment for local musicians. In fact, the funding that has been set aside to help musicians has been difficult for them to access, because more than half of the money that has been allocated has been given to individuals in 'less risky' industries (Sweney, 2011). Needless to say, this type of mentality sheds light on why so much funding has been given to Tech City and why the government has felt the need to focus on technological growth rather than the growth of the music sector.

Needless to say, this lack of funding can be illustrated through the example of the Enterprise Finance Guarantee Scheme, which was developed by the Business Innovation and Skills Committee to encourage banks to lend money to 'risky' industries (Sweney, 2011). While the initial goal of the EFG was to drive investment into creative industry SMEs, recent reports have indicated that banks are refusing to lend money to musicians because they feel that the industry is too risky to invest (Sweney, 2011). According to

Brian Message (co-manager of Radiohead and Kate Nash), securing funding from the

scheme has been difficult because he has been turned down repeatedly when he has asked

banks for money to help finance his artists' albums and tours. In fact, Message has cited

his trouble in obtaining the funding needed to support The Rifles' third studio album and

accompanying tour as particularly troubling because the lack of funding has resulted in

the band having to drop two of its members. In addition, the remaining members have

had to limit the number of gigs they can play during the year and have had to change any

scheduled electric shows to acoustic ones because that is all they have been able to

afford.

Ultimately, Message believes that this lack of funding has occurred because "too

many executives within the banking sector [perceive] music and artists as high risk

[investments] [that are] not suitable for lending" (Sweney, 2011, para. 4).

Unsurprisingly, Message was rejected in 2009 when he sought the £200,000 to fund The

Rifles album, and again in 2010 when he attempted to lower the loan to £100,000

(Sweney, 2011). Evidently, it was the 'risky nature' of the music industry that made

banks leery of lending money to The Rifles, who were told that if they had wanted to

open up a Domino's pizza franchise, they would have gladly been given the money the

first time they had asked (Sweney, 2011). After nearly two years of failed attempts,

Message was able to convince RBS in 2011 to lend him £45,000 so that the two

remaining members of The Rifles could finally begin recording their album (Sweney,

2011).

Consequently, only one of two music sector loans have been successful in

securing funding in more than two years, and even that was only after the successful

applicant made nine attempts at obtaining the money. According to research done by

music lobbying group UK Music, almost nothing out of the £1.4bn that has been lent out

under the EFG has gone to music, which has resulted in a growing concern among

musicians who want to access external finance (Sweney, 2011). Ultimately, this has led

many to ask Ed Vaizey (the UK Minister for Culture, Communications, and Creative

Industries) when he plans to improve the EFG so that it can begin to support local

musicians and the creative sector (Sweney, 2011). What is most disappointing about this

lack of finance is the way the government has addressed the issue, by not only failing to

acknowledge the need to support local music, but also failing to cite it as an important

factor in determining the success of the EFG. In fact, government research has claimed

that individuals in the creative industries have had no problems securing finance for

creative endeavors because they have been able to easily access the fund through the

EFG. However, it should be noted that in terms of the music industry, no one relevant

was interviewed for this research because the government made sure to include an

admission that claimed that a "music business or record company could not be

interviewed for [the] research" (Sweney, 2011, para. 11). Needless to say, access to

funding remains a challenge for British music entrepreneurs because it does not appear

that any significant changes have been made to improve the schemes that provide

available funding to musicians.

Consequently, it is important to remember that the creative heart that beats life

into wondrous new products of digital technology is the art that has been produced by the

(often ignored) creative and cultural industries (Majek-Akisanya, 2012). According to

Majek-Akisanya, that it would do David Cameron well to examine the roots of Tech City

in a more critical manner so that he can recognize how important the creative sector is to the growth of technology (Majek-Akisanya, 2012). While it is true that technology can bring significant benefits to the economy, it should be recognized that many of the inventions that drive innovation would not be possible without the creativity behind them. For example, it is hard to imagine what use one would have for an iPod if music ceased to exist. Similarly, what use would we have for television if it were not for the creative actors, directors, or writers who thought up the entertainment we enjoy watching in our spare time. Ultimately, technology alone cannot broaden our ways of thinking or contribute to our knowledge of the world and ourselves. Needless to say, without the creative minds behind culture, there would be less of a drive to develop new technologies that can enhance the way we shape our identities, learn new skills, and live our lives.

Case Study – Manchester's Northern Quarter in the 21st Century: The Cultural Strategy Plan

In 2003, Manchester's City Council created the ten year Cultural Strategy Plan to develop a framework through which "local authority, universities, cultural agencies, private and voluntary sector partners in the arts, sports, tourism, heritage and media [could] work together towards common objectives" (www.manchester.gov.uk). According to the plan's executive summary, the city has the proper infrastructure to rebuild its reputation as a cultural capital, but needs greater support from government and national cultural agencies in order to fulfill this potential (www.manchester.gov.uk). Ultimately, it is the aim of the Cultural Strategy Team to increase the participation of the

people of Manchester in their culture and to use the region's culture as a way to improve the profile of the city.

The Cultural Strategy Team has a group (The Policy and Performance Team) that solely focuses on the changing agendas that affect how culture is delivered and developed in Manchester. In addition to its research, the group is also responsible for directing funds from central government to local organizations that deliver cultural projects through the partnership of The Neighborhood Renewal Fund Culture Program. Ultimately, it is the job of the team to "monitor all projects within the Cultural Partnership Action Plan and [turn] that data into intelligence [that can be made into] strategic decisions and recommendations [that will] identify gaps and trends [in the regeneration process]" (www.manchester.co.uk).

While it does appear that Manchester's City Council is committed to developing and preserving the culture of the city, there does not appear to be any strategies devoted to the cultivation of popular music. With the rich history of the city's music, one would assume that this would be a major agenda on the regeneration efforts developed by the council. However, the opposite seems to be the case in terms of supporting local music that does not fall into categories associated with classical music or music education. In fact, the council recently voted to turn the legendary Twisted Wheel club into a budget hotel despite a campaign that was drawn up in an attempt to save the venue. After receiving nearly 140 letters of objection, the council finally acknowledged that, the Twisted Wheel club played an important and pivotal role in developing Manchester's cultural and musical history (Manchester City Council Planning and Highways Committee, p. 3).

According to the Manchester City Council's Planning and Highways Committee proposal for the construction, some of the local residents objected to the proposal because "the Twisted Wheel is an iconic part of Manchester's rich musical heritage" and that "it should be celebrated to promote for its contribution to Manchester's culture" (Manchester City Council Planning and Highways Committee, 2012, p. 3). In addition to these sentiments other individuals suggested that "alternative brownfield sites could be used [that did not] demolish a venue of cultural interest" and that the economic contribution of the venue could significantly boost the city's level of tourism (Manchester City Council Planning and Highways Committee, 2012, p. 4). Unfortunately, the council's decision to demolish the building is a bit unsurprising considering it also decided to turn the legendary Hacienda nightclub into a series of apartments in 1997. Arguably, the decision to transform these historical buildings into other establishments reflects the attitude the council has toward the city's historical music scene.

While it appears that local music receives insufficient attention from the city council, there is hope for Manchester's local venues in terms of producing new talent and offering more chances for unsigned bands to develop their craft. For example, New Order bassist and former Hacienda owner Peter Hook has recently opened up a new nightclub titled FAC251 that gives new bands the opportunity to play more live gigs. In keeping with the original concept of Factory Records and the Hacienda, Hook aims to keep the spirit of Tony Wilson's venue alive while looking for new talent that can sustain the rich history of Manchester's music scene. According to the club's website, it is the club's goal to discover new talent in the city because there are "statistically more rock stars per capita of population from Manchester than any other city in the world"

(www.factorymanchester.com). While it is true that this statement is said with tongue in cheek, it does demonstrate the level of pride and initiative that needs to be taken for regions to develop local music talent. Needless to say, this enthusiasm needs to be felt not only by both those within the scene, but by those who help establish the infrastructure that can allow for growth in the music sector.

From the above examinations, it becomes evident that David Cameron has a very different perspective on popular music and Britain's creative sector than that of previous governments. While it appears that the Prime Minister strongly backs creativity and the British music industry, he has remained inconsistent in his support for funding that can help local musicians and creative entrepreneurs. In particular, the current coalition has opted to support technology and other areas of the creative sector that provide economic benefits without the risky costs that come with music industry investment. Despite showing a true admiration for bands such as The Smiths and Radiohead, David Cameron has ultimately shown less support for music than Blair, despite claiming to embody the same populist attitude as the former Prime Minister. While it is true that Blair's approach toward the music industry had significant flaws, one has to question whether or not Blair's attempt to support popular music actually ended up benefiting the industry more than anything the current coalition has done since it entered office in 2010.

Conclusion

From the above analyses we can conclude that more emphasis needs to be placed on the development of local infrastructures in the music sector so that a stronger relationship can be built between regional workers, city councils, and central government. By examining the convergence of work schemes, social inclusion, and economic development, it is evident that tensions exist between the economic development of the creative sectors and the rights and opportunities of creative workers. In fact, "the stated aims for creative industry development have been twofold [because of the government's desire to] increase jobs and GDP, while simultaneously [trying to] ameliorate social exclusion and counter long-standing patterns of uneven economic development" (Oakley, 2006, p. 1). Needless to say, the cultural policies implemented by Blair and Cameron could be classified as social policies that inevitably "exacerbate rather than address patterns of economic inequality" (Oakley, 2006, p. 1).

Because economic growth in the creative sector is dependent on a healthy and diverse talent pool, it is imperative to reexamine cultural policies so that they can be adapted to fit political, social, and cultural changes. By examining the flaws that have emerged as a result of particular policies, it is easy to see where improvements can be made to increase the number of opportunities available to creative workers in Britain. Consequently, it is important to critique how certain polices are structured and to consider whether or not government initiatives have influenced the eventual outcome of these policies. For example, this paradoxical relationship can be seen in the way the New

Deal for Musicians was structured to facilitate economic growth and social inclusion at the expense of appropriate musician training. Instead of developing a group of policies that would help establish regional growth in the local music sector, Blair's government chose to use creative employment to achieve a variety of other agendas (e.g. economic, political, social, etc.) that should have been considered in conjunction with workers' rights. Thus, by taking a deeper look at the greater implications of this scheme, we can see how economic objectives were placed ahead of ensuring quality employment conditions. Needless to say, assessing both past and present policies can help us evaluate what changes need to take place in order to achieve the goals necessary for improving creative labor.

Ironically, the decision Cameron's government has made to repeal the 2003 Licensing Act (which was implemented by Blair) illustrates that some improvement is being made toward recognizing the need to cultivate an environment where regional music can develop. Despite the fact Blair proclaimed that the country's best musicians needed to be free from unnecessary bureaucracy, he was quick to administer the Act in order to "modernize archaic licensing laws that had been in place since the First World War" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 53). Prior to the administration of the Act, those wishing to stage live music were expected to abide by the 'two in a bar' provision, which allowed "pubs and other venues to provide public entertainment without having to have a public entertainment fee (PEL)" if they were not planning on providing customers with alcohol (Cloonan, 2007, p. 53). Under the previous regulations, PELs were considered additional licenses that needed to be purchased only if a venue had arranged to serve alcohol during a live music event. Needless to say, these provisions prevented venues from having to

purchase separate licenses if they were not planning on staging a live music event that included alcohol of any kind.

In an attempt to simplify the Act, the new regulations aimed to "replace the need for a separate PEL with a single license that included alcohol and the provision (or not) of entertainment" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 53). In other words, all venues and promoters would now be required to purchase a more expensive license that included a fee for alcohol, regardless if it would be served or not. Understandably, this worried small-scale promoters and musicians because they felt that the new requirements would lead to a decline in the number of venues that wanted to put on live music. Additionally, some critics believed that the Act was unfair because it lumped live music and alcohol reform together, was too costly, and discriminated against live music in the way it exempt some forms of recorded music from the licensing fees (Cloonan, 2007, p. 54). On the flipside, the government claimed that streamlining the fees actually made it easier to stage live music, and even published a press release (titled 'We Can Work it Out') that claimed to answer "20 myths about public entertainment and the Licensing Bill" (Cloonan, 2007, p. 54).

After a meeting between the Music Union and then Culture Minister Kim Howells in March of 2003, the government established the Live Music Forum to monitor the impact the Act would have on encouraging live music. Here, it should be noted that this is not the same Live Music Forum that will be discussed later on in this section, as that particular group was not established by the government, but rather individual music campaigners. The government forum was set up to run for two years and consisted of representatives from organizations such as the British Beer and Pub Association, the

ACE, the National Foundation for Youth Music, the Music Union, the NMC, and the National Assembly for Wales (Cloonan, 2007, p. 54). Ultimately, the forum was designed to bridge the gap between the creative sector and the government so that the industry had more of an influence on proposed government policies. However, the research reports that were published by the forum failed to present results that provided an accurate portrayal of the live music scene because (among other things) it chose to focus more on the effects the Act had on private events as opposed to gigs (Cloonan, 2007, p. 56).

According to The Live Music Forum's official website, The Live Music Act has the potential to "dramatically broaden the circumstances where live music can be presented without the requirement of a special license from a local Council" (www.livemusicforum.co.uk). The forum (a group of independent live music campaigners) formed in 1993 to "oppose restrictions on the presentation of live music" in Great Britain (www.livemusicforum.co.uk). Ultimately, the forum was established to evaluate the impact the 2003 Licensing Act had on live music in the UK, and to call on various music industry personnel (e.g. lawyers, lobbyers, managers, musicians, etc.) to draw attention to places where improvements needed to be made. Because of its deregulatory nature, the Live Music Act will make staging live music easier and cheaper for venues all across the UK because it will no longer require venues with an audience of 200 and under to possess an entertainment license for staging live music.

As the first "true deregulatory Act affecting licensing in years," the Live Music Act can be seen as a step in the right direction in "ensuring [that] new talent, the lifeblood of the future industry, continues to break new ground and gain new fans in venues all

over the UK" (Dipple, 2012, p. 1). According to Jo Dipple (CEO of UK Music),

"playing live music is fundamental in the development of new bands [because practice

and audience engagement are] vital building blocks in a musician's career" (Dipple,

2012, p.1). Unlike previous attempts to develop creative talent, it appears that this move

can help establish the environment needed to cultivate new talent free from government

constraint.

       In an attempt to show the government the true advantages of this deregulation,

UK Music intends on performing research on the success of the Act every year.

Currently, this has included commissioning a survey of a nationally representative sample

of bars, pubs, and clubs across England and Wales (all with a capacity of under 200) "to

establish how many currently stage live music for their customers" (Dipple, 2012, p. 6).

According to the 2012 report, the results indicate that the UK is "a nation of grassroots

music lovers [where] more than half of small venues (licensed by their local authority)

[hold] live music in their premises" (Dipple, 2012, p. 7). In fact, it has been estimated

that this "could lead to an additional 13,000 venues staging live music in their premises

for the first time, and another 20,400 venues increasing their current provision of live

music" (Dipple, 2012, p. 7). With possible benefits such as these, it is no wonder that

"the Musician's Union will [also] be producing a 'Live Music Toolkit' [to] ensure [that]

venues know how best to benefit from the Act" (Dipple, 2012, p. 3).

       Ultimately, the purpose of the legislation "is to encourage more performances of

live music by deregulating the performance of live music so that it is [no longer

considered] a licensable activity" (Dipple, 2012, p. 9). Thus, "the Live Music Act

[ensures that] premises will no longer need to apply to their local authority for a license

to provide live music, so long as [it] takes place between 8am and 11pm [before an] audience of no more than 200 people" (Dipple, 2012, p. 9). According to former South Hampton music producer Larry Darminin, in the days of The Beatles and The Rolling Stones, bands would first develop a local following before embarking on tours that could lead to national recognition (Dipple, 2012, p. 22). With these thoughts in mind, it is evident that recognizing how important local venues are in the development of local music is a move in the right direction for the Cameron government. Judging from the research that has been done on cultural clusters, cultivating infrastructures to support regional creative development is crucial if we want to see growth in the music sector.

However, while this is definitely a step in the right direction, it is important to realize that there are factors other than specific policies directed toward culture that impact the progression of music and creative employment. Thus, while these measures have been made, a broader examination needs to be done in regards to policies that are relevant to the lives of musicians and creative entrepreneurs. Clearly, past examples indicate that more collaboration needs to be done across government departments to ensure that all areas of policy are geared in ways that benefit both the economic health of the country, and the social well-being of creative workers. Consequently, there needs to be a healthy relationship between central government, local councils, and regional musicians/entrepreneurs. While the DCMS has attempted to establish such a relationship through a Creative Industries Council, little work appears to have been made toward developing a system that pinpoints where improvements need to be made in the development of regional music. In fact, after examining the minutes from all four meetings the Council has held since September 2011, there has been very little focus on

the music industry regarding access to finance (e.g. the Enterprise Finance Guarantee Scheme), skill development, and live music. Unfortunately, a look into how the Council may change under the direction of new Industry Chair Nicola Mendelsohn and new Culture Secretary Maria Miller has yet to be determined as the group's next scheduled meeting will not take place until January 2013. It should be noted however, that as of January 20, 2013, no such meeting has taken place.

Unfortunately, when one looks at the attitudes and actions the DCMS's past Culture Secretaries have had toward the music sector, it becomes evident why insufficient moves have been made to address some of these issues. For example, previous Secretaries Tessa Jowell and Jeremy Hunt failed to take into account the complaints that were mentioned by local music SMEs in the DCMS' 2006 SME Music Business: Business Growth and Access to Finance Report. Based on an open ended questionnaire, music related SMEs were asked to describe (in no more than 100 words) what central and local government could do to help them in the areas of business support, information and advice, regulation and competition, and taxation (DCMS, 2006, p. 51). Among the responses, some participants expressed concern with the funding that was available for music ventures and voiced frustration with the difficulty of gaining access to such funding.

In fact, one response mirrors the current displeasure bands such as The Rifles have had with the EFG, which illustrates how little has changed since this report was published in April of 2006. According to the 2006 respondent, central government should make an attempt to "massively simplify the business loan guarantee scheme, [because they] were the only successful applicant that Barclays Media Centre in Soho

Square had ever had (out of about 100) [during their] my manager's time there" (DCMS, 2006, p. 51). To sum up his experience with the scheme, the individual wrote that it was a "long and tortuous process" (DCMS, 2006, p. 51).

In addition, the responses from this report also echo the recent cuts that have been made to art programs, the lack of sufficient musician training, and equal finance support for all of industries in the creative sector. For example, one respondent suggested that the government should "make it more clear what incentives and schemes are available to record labels," and that there should be easy access to the services that were supposed to be offered to entrepreneurs running music related SMEs (DCMS, 2006, p. 53). Furthermore, one individual wrote that he would like the government to "take a more industry focused approach [so that] all the creative industries [do not end up] lumped together" (DCMS, 2006, p. 57). According to this respondent, "music is a completely different area to that of film or TV" when economics are involved (DCMS, 2006, p. 57). Needless to say, these statements sum up the paradoxes that have resulted from converging policies within the past three decades.

After examining the examples illustrated in this thesis, it becomes clear that we have to study the broader landscape of the economy in order to understand the effects relevant policies have on local musicians and creative entrepreneurs. In fact, analyzing how these policies have affected the opportunities available to certain individuals is essential for realizing what changes and alterations need to be made to create equal opportunities for all individuals in the music industry. Because Britain's economy has changed so much in the last three decades, it has become crucial for politicians to rethink how future policies can be adapted to suit creative labor in modern society. Ultimately,

Parliament must now recognize that previous policies need to be reworked so that they can accommodate the changing economic, political, and social landscape of Britain.

According to the results presented in this study, it appears that Parliament's current policymaking approach has not taken into account how greater urbanization has impacted the lives of British citizens in the 21st century. While it is true that new innovations and technologies have emerged during the creative age, it is also true that a greater divide has developed between the wealthiest and poorest individuals in Great Britain. Most likely, this growing inequality has been the result of changes that have occurred since Britain shifted from a labor force built on manufacturing to one built on service sector jobs. As a result of these changes, more emphasis needs to be placed on the development of local infrastructures in the music sector so that a stronger relationship can be built between regional workers, city councils, and central government.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aitkenhead, D. (2011, October, 16). Jarvis Cocker: 'Music Has Changed. It's Not as Central, It's More like a Scented Candle.' *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/music/2011/oct/16/jarvis-cocker-interview>.

"Alan McGee: The Alternative Music Man." (1999, November 26). *BBC*. Retrieved from: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/537881.stm>

Assinder, N. (2007, May 10). How Tony Blair Recreated New Labour. *BBC News*. Retrieved from < http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/6129844.stm>

At a Glance: Digital Britain. (2009, June 16). *BBC News*. Retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/technology/8103351.stm>

Battsek, J. (Producer), & Dower, J. (Director). (2003). *Live Forever: The Rise and Fall of Britpop* [Motion picture]. UK: BBC.

Beech, A. (2009, May 22). "The Closure of Channel M Is a Wakeup Call: Manchester's Music Scene Is Dying." *NME.COM*. Retrieved from <http://www.nme.com/blog/index.php?blog=121>.

Bennett, T. (1995). *The birth of the museum: History, theory, politics*. London: Routledge.

Beresford, P. (2011, July 11). From 'no Such Thing as Society' to 'big Society'. Spot the Difference. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/society/joepublic/2011/jul/11/big-society-no-such thing-as-society>

Berlinski, C. (2008). *"There Is No Alternative": Why Margaret Thatcher Matters*. New York: Basic.

Blair, T. (1997). General Election Victory Speech. 10 Downing St., England. Retrieved from <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=222>

Blair, T. (1999). Leader's Speech. Bournemouth, England. Retrieved from <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=205>

Blair, T. (2000). Leader's Speech. Brighton, England. Retrieved from <http://www.britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech-archive.htm?speech=206>

Bolton, M. (2008, October 2). "Class War on the Dancefloor." *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/music/2008/oct/03/popandrock.foals>.

Botta G. (2009) The city that was creative and did not know: Manchester and popular music, 1976-97 *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, *12* (3), pp. 349-365.

Brown, A., O'Connor, J. and S. Cohen (2000) "Local Music Policies within a Global Music Industry Cultural Quarters in Manchester and Sheffield." *Geoforum 31.4*: 437-51. doi.org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/10.1016/S0016-7185(00)00007-5.

Burrell, I. (2012, May 7). How London Turned into the Global Centre of Music Technology. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/media/opinion/ian-burrell-how-london turned-into-the-global-centre-of-music-technology-7718764.html>

Cameron Urges Overseas Investors to Back UK Arts. (2012, July 30). *BBC News*. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-politics-19051220>

Cameron, D. (2011). Prime Minister's Speech on Exporting and Growth. 10 Downing, St., England. Retrieved from <http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/prime ministers-speech-on-exporting-and-growth/>

Cameron, D. (2009). Making Progressive Conservatism a Reality. Speech to Demos, 22 January. Retrieved from <http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2009/01/David_Cameron_Maki ng_pro ressive_conservatism_a_reality.aspx.>

Cameron, D. (2010). Transforming the British Economy: Coalition Strategy for Economic Growth Number Speech. 10 Downing St., England. Retrieved from <http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/transforming-the-british-economy-coalition strategy-for-economic-growth/>

Cloonan, M. (2007). *Popular Music and the State in the UK: Culture, Trade or Industry?* Hampshire: Ashgate.

Cloonan, M. (2002). Hitting the Right Note? The New Deal for Musicians. *Journal of Vocational Education and Training, Volume 54, Number 1, 2002.*

Cloonan, M. (2003) The New Deal for Musicians: Teaching young pups new tricks? *Music Education Research 5*:1, pages 13-28.

Cohen, D. (2011, March 7). Hedge Fund Star: My Plan to Turn Around London Schools. *London Evening Standard.* Retrieved from: <http://www.standard.co.uk/news/hedge-fund-star-my-plan-to-turn-round-london schools-6574459.html>

Collin, M. (1998). *Altered State: The Story of Ecstasy Culture and Acid House*. London: Serpent's Tail.

Davis, R. (2011, October 30). Are Britain's Art Schools in Crisis, as Fees Stifle a Creative Generation? *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/education/2011/oct/30/art-and-design-students college-fees>

Dellheim, C. (1996, July 1). Thatcher's Self-Employment. *Inc.com*. Retrieved from <http://www.inc.com/magazine/19960701/1725.html>.

Dickson, N. (1999, September 27). What is the Third-Way? *BBC News.* Retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/458626.stm>

Dipple, J. (2012). Live Music Act 2012 Baseline Report. *UK Music*. Retrieved from <http://www.ukmusic.org/assets/media/UKMUSICLive%20Music%20Baseline 20Research.pdf>

Evans, S. (2010). 'Mother's Boy': David Cameron and Margaret Thatcher. *The British Journal of Politics & International Relations* 12.3.

Fahmy, E. (2008). Tackling Youth Exclusion in the UK: Challenges for Current Policy and Practice. *Social Work and Society International Online Journal, Vol. 6* (2). Retrieved from < http://www.socwork.net/sws/article/view/59/361>

Flew, T. (2011). *The Creative Industries: Culture and Policy*. Los Angeles, CA: SAGE.

Florida, R. L. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How it is Transforming Work, Leisure, Community, and Everyday Life. *New York: Basic Books.

Garnett, M. (2008). *From Anger to Apathy.* London: Vintage.

Garratt, S. (2011, April 14). "How Rave Culture Changed Britain Forever." *The Times Online*. Retrieved from <http://entertainment.timesonline.co.uk/tol/arts_and_entertainment/music/article 40863.ece.>

Gunnell, B. and Bright, M. (2010a). Creative Survival in Hard Times Report. *Arts Council England.* Retrieved from <www.thecreativesociety.co.uk >

Gunnell, B. and Bright, M. (2010b). The Creative Society – Make a Job, Don't Take a Job: Building the Creative Society Report. *Arts Council England.* Retrieved from <www.thecreativesociety.co.uk>

Gunnell, B. and Bright, M. (2009). Do It Yourself: Creative and Cultural Self Employment in Hard Times Report. *Arts Council England.* Retrieved from <www.thecreativesociety.co.uk>

Harris, J. (2004). *Britpop!: Cool Britannia and the Spectacular Demise of English Rock.* Cambridge, MA: DaCapo.

Harris, J. (2012, June 22). "Uncool Britannia: How British Culture Turned Tory." *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/2011/feb/03/british culture-tory conservative>.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford, England: Oxford UP.

Haslam, D. (199). *Manchester, England: The Story of the Pop Cult City*. London: Fourth Estate.

Hayward, K. (2006). The 'chav' Phenomenon: Consumption, Media and the Construction of a New Underclass. *Crime, Media, Culture*.

Henry, C. (2007). *Entrepreneurship in the Creative Industries: An International Perspective*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.

Hesmondhalgh, D. and Pratt, A. (2005) Cultural industries and cultural policy. *International journal of cultural policy, 11* (1). pp. 1-14. Retrieved from DOI: 10.1080/10286630500067598

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2007). *The Cultural Industries*. London, England: SAGE.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2005). "Media and Cultural Policy as Public Policy." *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11.1: 95-109.

Hesmondhalgh, D. (1997). The Cultural Politics of Dance Music. *Soundings Issue 5.*

Higgins, C. (2011, November, 25). National Music Plan Unveiled with an Ensemble of Cuts. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/culture/2011/nov/25/nationalmusic-plan-unveiled cuts>

Higgins, C. (2012, July 28). "What Danny Boyle's Olympics Opening Ceremony Said about Britain's Cultural Landscape." *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/culture/charlottehigginsblog/2012/jul/28/olympics 2012-danny-boyle>

Hollowell, J. (2003). *Britain since 1945*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Horten, M. (2010, May 4). "David Cameron: Music Industry Is More Important than Democracy." *Ipintergrity.com* Retrieved from <http://www.iptegrity.com/index.php/digital-britain/515-david-cameron-music industry-is-more important-than-democracy>.

Jessie J Shows Support For Music Is Great Week. (2012, April 27). *MTV UK*. Retrieved from <http://www.mtv.co.uk/news/jessie-j/353930-jessie-j-music-is-great-week adele-spicegirls-queen>.

Jones, O. (2012, January 13). "David Cameron: The Master of Cynical Propaganda." *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2012/jan/13/david-cameron-cynical propaganda>

Jones, O. (2012). *Chavs: The Demonization of the Working Class*. London: Verso.

Jones, O. (2012, June 2). It's Time to Demolish the Myth about Tony Blair. *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/opinion/commentators/owen-jones-itstime-to demolish-the myth about-tony-blair-7808282.html>.

Kent, N. (2006, October 19). The Saints of Sin City. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/music/2006/oct/20/popandrock.killers>

King, P. (2011). *The New Politics: Liberal Conservatism or Same Old Tories?* Bristol, UK: Policy Press.

Kingsley, P. (2012, June 22). Tech City: The Magic Roundabout. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2011/nov/27/tech-city digitalstartups-shoreditch>.

Kureishi, H. (2009, April 10). Acceptable in the 80's. *The Guardian.* Retrieved from: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/books/2009/apr/11/thatcher-and-the-arts>

Levitas, R. (1999). "New Labour and Social Exclusion," paper presented at the Political StudiesAssociation Conference, Nottingham, England. Retrieved from <http://www.psa.ac.uk/cps/1999/levitas.pdf>

Majek-Akisanya, (2012, February 27). T. Cuts Could Undermine Creative Industries' Contribution to the Economy. *The Guardian*. N.p., 27 Feb. 2012. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/cultureprofessionals-network/culture-professionals blog/2012/feb/27/arts-creative-industries-cutsopportunity>.

Manchester City Council Planning and Highways Committee. (2012, June 26). *Motel One Hotel Development.* Retrieved from <http://www.manchester.gov.uk/egov_downloads/15__Motel_One_Hotel_Devel opment.df>

Mason, R. (2012, February, 27). A4e Fraud Allegations Known Before David Cameron Picked 'Families Champion.' *The Telegraph.* Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/9106936/A4e-fraud-allegations-known before-David-Cameron-picked-families-champion.html>

McAnulla, S. (2010). Heirs to Blair's Third Way? David Cameron's Triangulating Conservatism. *British Politics 5.3*: 286-314. Retrieved from doi: org.ezaccess.libraries.psu.edu/10.1057/bp.2010.10

McGuigan, J. (1996). *Culture and the public sphere*. London: Routledge.

Mendick, R. (2012, December, 20). "Coalition Recreates Cool Britannia 15 Years On." *The Telegraph*. Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/culture/film/oscars/9106009/Coalition-recreates Cool-Britannia-15-years-on.html>.

Middles, M. (2009). *Factory: The Story of the Record Label.* London: Virgin Books.

Miller, T, and Y´udice, J. (2002). *Cultural policy*. London: Sage.

Morris, N. (2009, March 16). "Labour's Love Affair with Rock Hits Sour Note." *The Independent*. Retrieved from <http://www.independent.co.uk/arts entertainment/music/news/labours-love-affair-with-rock-hits-sour-note 1645741.html>.

Nehring, N. (2007). Everyone's Given Up and Just Wants to Go Dancing: From Punk to Rave in the Thatcher Era. *Popular Music and Society. 30.1*

Newbigin, J. (2010). The creative economy: an introductory guide. *The British Council*. Retrieved from <http://creativeconomy.britishcouncil.org/media/uploads/resources/GuideToolki _30_w hCover_LR.pdf>

Newbigin, J. (2011). What is the Creative Economy? Speech to Russian-British Creative Economy Forum. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pnh7sc2_k3s>

Oakley, K. (2006). Include Us Out—Economic Development and Social Policy in the Creative Industries. *Cultural Trends, 15*(4), 255-273. Retrieved from doi: 10.1080/09548960600922335

Oakley K. (2004). Not so Cool Britannia, The Role of Creative Industries in Economic Development. *International Journal of Cultural Studies*.7.5-7: 67.

Oakley K,, Lee D., and Naylor R. (2011) The Public Gets What the Public Wants? The Uses and Abuses of 'Public Value' in Contemporary British Cultural Policy. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*.17.3: 289-300.

Parsons, R. (2012, February 9). Government Starts £125m "GREAT" Britain Campaign. *Marketing Week.* Retrieved from <http://www.marketingweek.co.uk/government starts125m-great-britain-campaign/3033956.article>

Peacock, L. (2012, May 23). Welfare to Work Fraud Scandal. *The Telegrapgh.* Retrieved from <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/politics/9286323/Welfare-to-work-fraud scandal.html>

"Pinochet death 'saddens' Thatcher." (2006, December 11). *BBC.* Retrieved from: <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/uk_news/politics/6167351.stm>

PM Announces £50m funding to regenerate Old Street Roundabout. (2012, December 6). *10 Downing Street.* Retrieved from <http://www.number10.gov.uk/news/50m-to regenerateold-st/>

Powell, M. A. (1999) *New Labour, New Welfare State?: The "Third Way" in British Social Policy.* Bristol: Policy Press.

Prideaux, S. J. (2008). The Welfare Politics of Charles Murray Are Alive and Well in the UK. *International Journal of Social Welfare*.

Rave on (and on) - We're Still Riding a Madchester Wave (2012, June 14). *Manchester Evening News Business Week.* Retrieved from <http://menmedia.co.uk/manchestereveningnews/news/business/s/1581824_rave on-and on----were-still-riding-a-madchester-wave>

Sawyer, M. (2012, April 21). How Madchester Put the E into Enterprise Zone. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/music/2012/apr/21/madchester-manchesterstone roses>.

Seltzer, K. & Bentley, T. (1999). The creative age: knowledge and skills for the new economy. Buckingham. *Demos*. Retrieved from <http://www.demos.co.uk/files/theCreativeage.pdf?1240939425>

Smith, P. (1997). *Millennium Dreams: Contemporary Culture and Capital in the North.* New York: Verso.

Stevenson, D., Rowe, D., & McKay, K. (2010). Convergence in British Cultural Policy: The social, the cultural, and the economic. *Journal of Arts Management, Law, and Society, 40*(4), 248-265. Retrieved from doi: 10.1080/10632921.2010.500926

Sweney, M. (2011, July 2). Anger at Failure of £2bn Fund to Help Bands. The Guardian. Retrieved from < http://www.guardian.co.uk/business/2011/jul/02/failure-fund help-bands>

UK Department for Culture, Media, and Sport. (2008, February 22). *Creative Britain: New Talents for the New Economy* [Brochure]. Retrieved from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http:/www.culture.gov.uk/images/ publications/CEPFeb2008.pdf>

UK Department for Culture, Media, and Sport. (2006, April 5). *SME Music Businesses: Business Growth and Access to Final Report.* Retrieved from <http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/+/http://www.culture.gov.uk/images/ publications/MusicBusinessSurvey.pdf>

UK Department for Culture, Media, and Sport (2012, December). *Creative Industries Council Access to Finance Working Group Report*. Retrieved from: < http://www.creativeengland.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/12/CE ReportDec2012b.pdf>

White, M. (1999, January 15). Blair Hails Middle Class Revolution. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from <http://www.guardian.co.uk/politics/1999/jan/15/uk.politicalnews1>

Wiseman-Trowse, N. (2008). *Performing Class in British Popular Music*. Basingstoke England: Palgrave Macmillan.

ACADEMIC VITA

Michelle Karth
21 Ridgewood Way
Harleysville, PA 19438
mmk5184@psu.edu

Education

B.A., Media Studies (Society & Culture), 2013, Pennsylvania State University, State

College, PA

B.A., Psychology, 2013, Pennsylvania State University, State College, PA

Honors in Media Studies

Thesis Title: A Different Class: Transforming Creative Employment under New Labour

Thesis Supervisor: C. Michael Elavsky

Honors and Awards

- Dean's List (Fall 2008 – 2012)

- Dean's List (Spring 2009 – 2013)

- President's Freshman Award (Spring 2009)

- President's Sparks Award (Spring 2010)

- Evan Pugh Junior Award (Spring 2011)

- Evan Pugh Senior Award (Spring 2012)

- 2010 – 2011 "Andrew and Beatrice Schulz Trustee Scholarship"

- 2011 – 2012 "Douglas & Claudia Anderson Trustee Scholarship"

- 2011 – 2012 "Roy C Buck Scholarship"

- 2012 – 2013 "Schumacher Honors Scholarship"

- 2012 – 2013 "Chaiken Trustee Scholarship"

- 2012 – 2013 "James Wiggins and Christine Fleming Honors Scholarship"

- Golden Key (inducted Fall 2010)

- Phi Kappa Phi (inducted Fall 2011)

- Phi Beta Kappa (inducted Spring 2011 in Junior year)

Professional Experience

- Spring 2011 Undergraduate Research Assistant in Social Psychology (Dr. Theresa Vescio)

- Spring 2011 Undergraduate Teaching Assistant for PSYCH 105: Psychology as a Science and a Profession (Dr. Andrew Peck)