

The International
JOURNAL
of the HUMANITIES

Volume 5, Number 3

The Arts, Governments and Money: Do the Arts
have any Value if they don't make Money?

Jo Caust

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF THE HUMANITIES
<http://www.Humanities-Journal.com>

First published in 2007 in Melbourne, Australia by Common Ground Publishing Pty Ltd
www.CommonGroundPublishing.com.

© 2007 (individual papers), the author(s)
© 2007 (selection and editorial matter) Common Ground

Authors are responsible for the accuracy of citations, quotations, diagrams, tables and maps.

All rights reserved. Apart from fair use for the purposes of study, research, criticism or review as permitted under the Copyright Act (Australia), no part of this work may be reproduced without written permission from the publisher. For permissions and other inquiries, please contact [<cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com>](mailto:cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com).

ISSN: 1447-9508
Publisher Site: <http://www.Humanities-Journal.com>

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF THE HUMANITIES is a peer refereed journal. Full papers submitted for publication are refereed by Associate Editors through anonymous referee processes.

Typeset in Common Ground Markup Language using CGCreator multichannel typesetting system
<http://www.CommonGroundSoftware.com>.

The Arts, Governments and Money: Do the Arts have any Value if they don't make Money?

Jo Caust, University of South Australia, South Australia, Australia

Abstract: Over the past two decades the notion that public sector support for the arts is naturally a 'good thing', has been challenged and in some cases rejected. Art itself has been subsumed into the broader framework of 'culture'. Williams and others promoted the rationale for government support of the arts as a way to support arts practices that were not market oriented (Williams 1989). However this notion has now been turned on its head. Arts practice that primarily focuses on the business of making money, is seemingly more likely to receive support from governments. In an age framed by the centrality of the economy (and one that embraces the concept of the 'cultural or creative industries), what value does arts practice have, if it has no 'commercial' value? This paper explores arguments around how the arts are framed and valued within current times and what this may mean for artists, consumers of art and governments.

Keywords: Arts, Value, Economic, Intangible Benefits, Government

Government and the Arts

IT HAS BEEN observed that support for the arts has become 'instrumentalised' in some Western countries such as the United Kingdom and the United States of America (Dorn 2004; Gray 2000; Selwood 2006). This means that arts activity is funded for political, financial or social objectives rather than for its intrinsic merit. So for instance, arts activity that is not commercially driven, that is breaking new ground, that is about community engagement, reflects a minority taste, or is 'art for art's sake', may not receive any support. This change to the underlying rationale for arts funding has had an impact on factors including: the evaluation of arts activities; the profile of those who make decisions about arts funding; the language that is used by both the funders and the arts organisations/artists; the expectations of both funders and arts organisations/artists; the ratio of the funding between earned income and subsidised income; and the performance measures for providing arts funding (Caust 2003, 2005). When government provides financial support for arts organisations/ artists, there is a need for accountability in the transaction. But it is the nature of that accountability, the way arts activity is assessed and the outcomes that this produces, that this paper addresses.

In Australia, government support for the arts became widespread in the 1970s with the establishment, at the federal level, of the Australia Council in 1972 and the state arts funding agencies through the seventies and early eighties (Stevenson 2000). Dr H. C "Nugget" Coombes, a critical force behind the establishment of the Australia Council and its first

Chair, noted in 1969, that 'The Council sees itself not as a source of direction, not as a source of artistic policy, but as a kind of enabling body...' (Stevens 1998:10). In the establishment of a national arts funding agency, there was a perception from the founders that the role of the agency was to 'facilitate' arts activity without providing direction as to what should happen or what art is. Yet, from the beginning, by their action of subsidising some work and not other work, the Australia Council defined what it values or believes is 'art'. Scholars have noted, for instance, that in the seventies the notion of 'excellence' was funded, then 'access' in the eighties, then the concept of 'industry' was introduced into the funding language in the nineties, accompanied by the necessity to be seen to generate income and broaden the audience, as well as make art (Anderson 1992; Brook 1995; Horne 2003; Stevenson 2000).

Since the nineties therefore, an economic framing of the arts has dominated the discourse about arts funding, combined with the use of a creative or cultural industry model (Stevenson 2000; Bennett & Carter 2001; Brokensha 1996). The impact of government on the sector has meant an expanded role in relation to the concept of accountability and performance indicators (Brokensha 1996; Gilhespy 1999; Throsby 2001; Turbide & Laurin 2003). The development of the 'cultural industry' or 'creative industry' model began to dominate public cultural funding discourse (Boorsma & van Hemel 1998; Greenhalgh 1998; Pick & Anderton 1999; Throsby 2001). The language of industry and business was introduced to the cultural sector (Anderson 1992; Pick & Anderton 1999; Tusa 1999). Managerial terms such as 'entrepreneurialism', 'market brand-



ing', 'performance indicators' and 'customer service' became commonplace (Caust 2003; Gray 2000; Palmer 1998). 'Bottom line' arguments were used by funders, governments and critics to argue the merits or otherwise of cultural activity (Holden 2004; Nugent 1999; Selwood 2002; Stevens 1996). Arts funding agencies were restructured to reflect a 'market' driven agenda rather than an 'arts' driven agenda (Kimbis 1997; Pick & Anderton 1999; Stevenson 2000).

The arts sector in Australia began to identify itself as an industry in the mid-1980s, ostensibly to maintain government support in a period where economic performance criteria were given ascendancy (Anderson 1992; Palmer 1998; Rowse 1985; Stevenson 2000). The notion that all arts organisations are in fact 'businesses', and should operate as such, has been part of this paradigm (Nugent 1999). This means that the arts are seen as creators of employment, producers of income and generally creators of economic benefit, if they are worthy to be funded. In addition they must operate from a viable business plan and be advised by business people. The evidence of the dominance of this approach can be seen at the highest level. The current and previous two Chairs of the Australia Council are business people. The present membership of the Australia Council is largely dominated by corporate individuals. All arts organisations are expected to have several business people on their boards, and to receive funding, must sign off on an agreed business plan (Caust 2005). So the arts are seen just like everything else. They need to prove that they are contributing to the economy if they are going to receive support from government to exist.

Previously government intervention has been justified for various reasons including ameliorating the impact of the marketplace, the intrinsic value of arts to society and for reasons of access and equity (Cummings & Katz 1987; Horne 1986; Rowse 1985; Stevenson 2000; Williams 1989). However, as the economic paradigm has become more dominant in the discourse of governments in western democracies (Hutton 1996; Putnam 2000), the arts sector has developed various methods to describe itself, so that it can be seen as an economic success (Anderson 1992; Bjorkegren 1996; Caves 2000; Throsby 2001). While this has been useful in arguing for arts activities in a climate that favours economic objectives above all, it has also been problematic because it naturally favours arts activities that can produce income as their major goal (Brokensha 1996; Glow & Johanson 2006). As the cultural economist Throsby (2001:163) has noted, an exclusive emphasis on the economic benefits of the arts skews the discourse and ignores the fundamental essence of what the arts are about. Increasing bureaucratisation (or adherence to rules)

and emphasis on income generation are seen as the critical performance indicators for the practice of art, not the quality of the art itself (Hall quoted in Brown 2001). The development of the concepts of the 'cultural industries' or the 'creative industries' has also influenced how the arts are viewed or even made invisible in the debate (Jeffcutt, Pick & Protherough 2000; Pick & Anderton 1999). Thus, the tendency to describe all cultural activity as an industry has meant that, at times, the term 'art', particularly in relation to arts organisations, is not mentioned in the discourse (Dorn 2004; Tusa 1999).

Economic versus Intrinsic Benefits Arguments

Timms (2004:54) argues that the 'quality' or 'success' of artwork is determined by the amount of money it can sell for, rather than its inherent value. He says that,

Today the relative importance of artists is determined not by the inherent quality of the work they produce, since nobody can agree what that is anyway, but on their availability to marketing - their ability to generate wealth. (Timms 2004: 57)

Cowen (2000:37) goes further in asserting that the US is the leader in contemporary art because it *relies* on the market place. The US has seen itself as representing capitalism at its most developed and everyone, including artists, has to be competitive in that marketplace (Cowen 2000). It is perhaps another reason, that the notion that government should provide support to enable artists to do their work, is not widely supported in the United States (given massive reductions in government support through the late eighties and early nineties during the 'Culture Wars') (Brustein 2001; Kimbis 1997).

This point of view contrasts with the rationale behind providing government support as espoused by Williams (1989). This rationale argues that government funding is there to 'ameliorate' the impact of the marketplace (Williams 1989:143). In Williams' view government funding is provided so particular arts activities can occur that the market place cannot or will not support. Mirza (2006) and Holden (2004) both believe that the arts are now framed instrumentally by governments in particular, with the outcome that any intrinsic value of the arts is seemed to be irrelevant or elitist, unless it can demonstrate a value adding benefit to other activities. Selwood (2006:40) comments that, in the United Kingdom, performance criteria for arts evaluation is based on meeting government objectives. In Australia, it has been observed that to receive government funding, there has been a shift from the ideology of public

support for the arts as a 'public good' towards proving that the arts provide tangible economic or social benefits (Glow & Johanson 2006).

Over the past decade or more, some cultural policy literature has promoted the notion of the economic value of the arts industry (Bennett 1993; Cunningham 1994). The focus of much of this research has been an analysis of the benefits of a market-driven cultural industries model which, it is argued, is democratic; secures government and public support for culture; bestows political power upon cultural creators; and represent a worthwhile national investment given the capacity for the highly exportable "cultural industries" to draw in profits (Bennett & Carter 2001; Pratt 2004; Roodhouse 2001; Smiers 2003). Goodall, while debating the positioning of cultural studies and the 'rejection' of high art in the cultural studies construct, notes that:

It is a matter of common observation that different texts or practices fill different roles in culture at different times, that the popular work of one period becomes the high art of another, and vice versa. For this reason it seems important that the categorisation of culture should not be reified. (Goodall 1995: 171)

Thus the debate about high or popular art according to Goodall's view, is always in a state of flux, and in his view, therefore, trying to draw boundaries and make definitions is not helpful. However, the intervention of the industry and a business paradigm into the discourse about the value of arts, the changing role of government towards the arts, the necessity for accessibility and the role of popular culture, are impacting on the way the arts sees itself (Caust 2003; Gray 2000; Pick & Anderton 1999; Protherough & Pick 2002). There has been an absence of a critical assessment of cultural (rather than economic) value within much of the literature about the cultural or creative industries. Several commentators have observed this absence, particularly its focus on framing the arts in an industrial model (Anderson 1992; Chong 2003; Horne 1988; Gray 2000; Pick & Anderton 1999, Tusa 1999). These writers resist a 'normalising' of the arts into an industrial framework, arguing that this approach is a highly problematic, if not a destructive approach, for arts practitioners.

What about the Artists?

Interestingly the views of artists in a discussion about arts policy, arts funding and arts activities are often not heard. Dorn comments in this context that:

The basic goal of artists and art institutions is to remain true to themselves and to honour no

art activity compromised by art objectives outside the purposes of art itself. (Dorn 2004: 146)

So in Dorn's view, 'art for art's sake' is central to the making of art. Recently the Australia Council published the results of a survey, *Don't Give up your Day Job*, reviewing the position of artists in Australia, (Throsby & Holister 2003). This report observes that despite the existence in Australia of federal and state funding for artists for over 30 years, and despite the existence of the industry framework in the sector for at least ten years, artists still remain at the very lowest end of income distribution nationally. It is noted,

Half of the artists in the survey had a creative income of less than \$7,300 in the 2000-01 financial year (Throsby & Holister 2003: 45).

Thus despite the 'industry construct' and the arguments for the capacity of income generation by the cultural or creative industries, most artists remain impoverished. So is something going wrong? Is funding being channelled in the wrong direction; is funding immaterial to the capacity of artists to make a living, or is the 'industry construct' not reflecting reality for the majority of artists?

The traditional approach for a visual artist to succeed is articulated by Bowness, a former Director of the Tate Gallery. He notes that,

There are four successive circles of recognition through which the exceptional artist passes on his path to fame. I will call them peer recognition, critical recognition, patronage by dealers and collectors, and finally public acclaim. (Bowness 1989:11)

This view essentially describes a cycle which ensures that the 'genius artist' emerges come what may. But does that happen? In the contemporary context there are many more graduates of arts schools, drama schools, dance schools and music conservatories than can be integrated or employed in the sector or 'possibly discovered' in the way Bowness describes. To make a living in the arts requires ingenuity and capacity for survival within an increasingly competitive and reducing field. One new artist comments that while her art school taught her techniques about art making, it did not tell her how to,

...get an individual exhibition or a studio, write submissions, apply for grants and cope with all the other factors that are part of an artist's daily professional life. (de Williams qtd. in Holt & Jones 2000:31)

Another artist notes,

The existing system is, however, one that places an unfair emphasis on the artist's generosity and allows other participants to be too passive (Bullock *qtd.* in Holt & Jones 2000:29)

So in this artist's view it is the artists who largely subsidise themselves (by taking other work outside the arts, by paying for all their upfront costs, by even paying to be seen) to get an exhibition or an audition, that may lead if they are lucky, to a commission or a job. Publishers are being asked by booksellers to pay for the privilege of selling their books, in addition to the profit made on the sale (Bourke 2007). Commercial galleries for instance often ask an artist to pay the costs associated with mounting and exhibiting their work, in addition to taking a 30-40% commission on any work sold. On a salutary note, Throsby and Holister also observe that,

Over the long term it is apparent that in financial terms the relative disadvantage of artists compared to other occupations has worsened rather than improved over the last 15 years. (Throsby and Holister 2003: 51)

Thus while Australian society in general has improved in terms of living standards and earned income, the situation for artists has continued to decline in relative terms. Does this mean that the practice and outcomes of art are given less value than in previous times?

Cultural Value

It has been documented that the practice of 'art' has been evident in human society for over 35,000 years (Morwood 2002). Donald Horne notes that:

In societies where a participatory performing culture survived, such as that of the Australian Aborigines, the people, in dance and song, in instrumental music, drama and recitation, and in painting, themselves perpetuated the meaning they gave to the world. The people made their own 'art' (although to them there was no distinction between 'art' and the rest of life). (Horne 1986: 5)

There is no separation between art and daily living in societies such as those of the Australian Aborigines or the Balinese in Indonesia, where art is central to the society's existence. Perhaps it could be said of western culture however that the commodification and separation of art from mainstream society over the past several hundred years, has produced a gap between the production of art and many people's experience of it. Schein, when talking about

the relationship between art and artists to society, notes that:

... art and artists stimulate us to see more, hear more and experience more of what is going on within us and around as ... Art does and should disturb, provoke, shock, and inspire ... the role of the arts and artists is to stimulate and legitimise our own aesthetic sense ... (Schein 2001: 81-2)

Schein sees the role of art and that of artists, as something that essentially has the power to educate us, as well as being an agent for change. In this context 'art' is seen as transformational, thereby taking the audience to somewhere new and different. Are there aspects of life that reflect an artistic practice but are not defined as such? Are conventional definitions of 'art' in the western model limited if they only include 'high' art experiences, such as the fine arts, opera, ballet, classical music and theatre? Why do 'contemporary' forms of art seem problematic and unproven, and transferring definitions of 'art' into the everyday experience, even more controversial? Contrary to the concept of art for art's sake or cultural practice having any value, John Carey proposes that the arts have no value at all, with the exception of his own field of literature (Carey 2005). In fact he says,

Anything can be art if we think it is. (Carey 2005: 167)

Is part of the problem therefore related to the arts not having any recognised value or even being seen as anything special within a contemporary context? If anything can be seen as art, and anyone therefore by definition can be regarded as an artist, then is there likely to be no respect or value given to both artists and their work (unless the work can attract a high market price of course)?

Previously Berger, referencing the work of Walter Benjamin, noted how art in Western society, is the preserve of those in power, whether it be the church, the ruling classes or, in contemporary society, the corporation and the state (Berger 1972: 32). Bourdieu also made the point that appreciation of the arts, is itself completely subjective and dependent on education, class and culture (Bourdieu 1993: 217-27) (and I would add, gender). So if the making, appreciation and valuing of art previously in Western society, was linked to those in power, then if the making and appreciation of art are more democratic and value free processes in a contemporary industry context, does this also have the potential to devalue it in real terms?

Holden (2004) describes a present scenario in the United Kingdom where cultural activity is there as a means to an end and not an end in itself. The

funding of arts activity then is done in the context of what conforms to the government agenda of the day. This is, of course, quite different to the notion of 'arm's length funding', but instead, is more reactive to government priorities and potentially servicing of a government decreed agenda. In a democratic society it could be concluded that this is highly problematic because it does not allow for pluralism. So it would follow that if you want to do artistic work which is critical of a government's agenda or not in agreement with its protocols, then it is unlikely you will receive any government funding to support your activity. As Holden notes,

Outcomes are not in reality separate from the processes or from the systems that produce them. (Holden 2004:51)

So it could be concluded that if arts activity is entirely contextualized in an economic paradigm, then only arts activity that supports this model, is likely to be funded or promoted.

Holden uses the notion of assessing arts in terms of their cultural value to call for a change in the way public funding for art is argued and understood. Holden defines 'cultural value' as a range of qualities - historical, spiritual, aesthetic, symbolic and social-which arts practice embodies (Holden 2004:35). In his definition of cultural value, Holden (2004: 10) emphasises the 'affective elements' of cultural experience which promote a 'strong' culture, that is, one which is 'confident in its own worth instead of a weak culture dedicated to the production of ancillary benefits'. He argues that,

By according status to cultural values, taking into account professional expertise, and seeing that institutions gain legitimacy through public

support, the recognition of Cultural Value will enable the cultural sector to achieve a working concordat between funders, funded and the public (Holden 2004:60).

Holden's overall aim is to ensure that,

...culture is seen as an integral and essential part of civil society. (Holden 2004:11).

In this way, Holden argues, cultural value asserts the necessity of a 'new relationship between funders, funded and the public' - a consensus that helps to build a notion of culture as 'an integral and essential part of a civil society' (Holden 2004: 11).

So if both the tangible and the intangible benefits of the arts are acknowledged and addressed, than an evaluation model that considers the full capacity of arts activities can be developed.

Conclusion

This paper addresses the current framing by governments in particular of the arts in an economic model. This approach is considered in relation to its limitations. There is comment that the economic and industry framing has not benefited individual artists who are mostly still at the bottom of the economic pile. Is there a way therefore that the arts can be valued and evaluated to incorporate other values beside their selling price? Holden has attempted to do this but his model needs much further development to make it functional within the constraints of any evaluation model dealing with public funding. If there is a will to provide government support for the arts, then approaches that allow for recognition of core values should be encouraged.

References

- Anderson, Peter (1992) "The arts industry: economic arguments for arts subsidy-research issues and critical debate", *Australian Journal of Arts Management*, 4 (Summer 1992).
- Bennett, T. and D. Carter (2001) *Culture in Australia: Policies, Publics and Programs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.
- Bennett, T. (1993) "Useful Culture" in V. Blundell, J. Shepherd & I. Turner, *Relocating Cultural Studies: Developments in Theory and Practice*, London, Routledge
- Berger, John (1972) *Ways of Seeing* British Broadcasting Corporation and Penguin Books, London England
- Bjorkegren, D (1996) *The culture business*, London, Routledge.
- Boorsma, PB, van Hemel, A eds (1998) *Privatization and culture: experiences in the arts, heritage and cultural industries in Europe*, The Netherlands, Kluwer.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (1993) *The field of cultural production: essays on art and literature*, edited and introduced by Randal Johnson, Cambridge, England, Polity Press
- Bourke, Emily (2007) "Probe urged into book store 'blackmail'" in *ABC News Online* accessed on 10.8.07 at <http://www.abc.net.au/news/stories/2007/08/08/2000147.htm>
- Bowness A. (1989) *The Conditions of Success : How the modern artist rises to fame* Thames and Hudson Great Britain
- Brokensha, P. (1996) "Steering clear of the economic numbers game: the need for qualitative performance indicators", *Culture and Policy*, Vol. 7, No. 3, Australian Key Centre for Cultural and Media Policy, Brisbane.
- Brook D (1995) "The Artist and the Industry" *Artlink* Winter/ Spring 1995 Vol 15 No 2 & 3 Australia.
- Brown, S (2001) "Council 'is failing artists'", *The Australian*, Sydney, 31 August 2001.
- Brustein Robert (2001) *The Seige of the Arts Collected Writings: 1994-2001* Ivan R Dee USA

- Carey, John (2005) *What Good Are The Arts* London, Faber and Faber
- Caust, J. (2003) "Putting the 'art' back into 'arts policy making': how arts policy has been 'captured' by the economists and the marketers, and if this can change", *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 9, No. 1, April, United Kingdom.
- (2005) "Does it matter who is in charge? The influence of the business paradigm on arts leadership and management." *The Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management* Vol 3. Issue 1 Australia October 2005
- Caves, Richard E (2000) *Creative industries: contracts between art and commerce*, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press.
- Chong, Derek (2003) *Arts management*, London, Routledge.
- Cowen, T. (2000) *In praise of commercial culture*, Harvard University Press, USA
- Cummings, MC Jr & Katz, RS eds (1987) *The patron state*, New York, Oxford University Press.
- Cunningham, S. (2006) *What Price a Creative Economy?* Platform Papers No. 9, July 2006, Sydney, Currency House
- Cunningham, S. (1994) "Willing Wonkers at the Policy Factories", *Media Information Australia*, No. 73, August.
- Dorn, C. (2004) "The Deterritorialization of Art" in the *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* Washington, Vol 34, No 2, Summer 2004
- Evans, G. (2000) "Measure for Measure: Evaluating Performance and the Arts Organisation" *Cultures, Organizations and Societies* Vol 6 No 2 United Kingdom
- Gilhespy, I. (1999) "Measuring the performance of cultural organisations: A model", *International Journal of Arts Management*, vol. 2, no.1, Fall.
- Glow H. & Johanson K.(2006) "Looking for cultural value: Critiques of Australian cultural policy" *The Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management* Vol 4. Issue 2 Australia, December 2006
- Goodhall, P (1995) *High culture: popular culture: the long debate*, Sydney, Allen and Unwin.
- Gray, C. (2000) *The politics of the arts in Great Britain*, London, Macmillan.
- Greenhalgh, L (1998) "From arts policy to creative economy", *Media International*, Australia (87):84–94.
- Holden, J. (2004) *Capturing Cultural Value; How culture has become a tool of government policy* London, Demos
- Holt R. & Jones B. (2000) *Artists Talk: Issues Facing Australian Artists* West Space, Melbourne
- Horne, D. (1988) *Arts funding and public culture*, Southport, Queensland, Institute of Cultural Policy Studies, Griffith University.
- Horne, Donald (1986) *The public culture: the triumph of industrialism*, London, Pluto Press.
- (1988) *Arts funding and public culture*, Southport, Queensland, Institute of Cultural Policy Studies, Griffith University.
- (2003) "Industry in name only", *The Australian*, 1 April, p.15, Sydney.
- Hutton, Will (1996) *The state we're in*, London, Vintage.
- Jeffcutt, Paul, Pick, John & Protherough, Robert (2000) "Culture and industry: exploring the debate", *Studies in Cultures, Organizations and Societies*, Vol. 6(2).
- Kimbis, TP (1997) "Surviving the storm: how the national endowment for the arts restructured itself to serve a new constituency", *The Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society*, 27(2), Summer.
- Mirza, Munira ed. (2006) *Culture Vultures Is UK arts policy damaging the arts?* Policy Exchange, London.
- Morwood, M.J. (2002) *Visions from the past: the archaeology of Australian Aboriginal Art* Crows Nest NSW, Allen and Unwin.
- Nugent, Helen (1999) *Securing the future*, Canberra, Department of Communications, Information Technology and the Arts.
- Palmer, Ian (1998) "Arts managers and managerialism: a cross-sector analysis of CEOs' orientations and skills", *Public Productivity and Management Review*, 21(4):433–52.
- Pick, John & Anderton, Malcolm (1999) *Building Jerusalem: art, industry and the British millennium*, The Netherlands, Harwood.
- Pratt, A. (2004) "The Cultural Economy: A Call for Spatialized "Production of Culture" Perspectives", *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, Vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1, 117–128.
- Protherough, Robert & Pick, John (2002) *Managing Britannia: culture and management in modern Britain*, Harleston, Edgeways.
- Putnam, Robert (2000) *Bowling alone: the collapse and revival of American community*, New York, Simon & Schuster.
- Rowse, Tim (1985) *Arguing the arts: the funding of the arts in Australia*, Melbourne, Penguin.
- Roodhouse, S (2001) "Have the cultural industries a role to play in regional regeneration and a nation's wealth" *Proceedings AIMAC 2001*, Brisbane, Australia July 1-4 2001
- Schein, EH (2001) "The role of art and the artist", *Reflections*, Vol. 2, No. 4, MIT, Boston.
- Selwood, Sara (2006) "Unreliable evidence" P.38-53 in Mirza, Munira ed. (2006) *Culture Vultures Is UK arts policy damaging the arts?* Policy Exchange, London.
- Selwood, Sara (2002) "The Politics of Data Collection" in *Cultural Trends 47* London, Policy Studies Institute
- Smiers J (2003) *Arts Under Pressure* Zed Books, London.
- Stevens, I (1998) "Australia Council 30 years old", *Artforce*, 99, Winter, pp.9–13, Sydney.
- Stevenson, Deborah (2000) *Art and organization: making Australian cultural policy*, St Lucia, University of Queensland Press.
- Throsby David & Holister Virginia (2003) *Don't Give Up Your Day Job* Australia Council, Sydney
- Throsby, David (2001) *Economics and culture*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Timms, Peter (2004) *What's Wrong with Contemporary Art?* Sydney University of New South Wales Press.

- Turbide, J & Laurin, C (2003) "Strategy and performance in the arts sector", *7th International Conference on Arts and Cultural Management*, Milan, July 2003.
- Tusa, John (1999) *Art matters: reflecting on culture*, London, Methuen.
- Williams, Raymond (1989) *The politics of modernism*, London, Verso.

About the Author

Ass. Prof. Jo Caust

Dr Jo Caust is the Associate Professor of Arts and Cultural Management at the University of South Australia. She previously worked in the arts sector for over twenty years as an arts practitioner, arts manager, and consultant. She is also the managing editor of the *Asia Pacific Journal of Arts and Cultural Management* and guest editor in 2005 of an edition of the *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society* focussing on Australasian cultural policy.

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF THE HUMANITIES

EDITORS

Tom Nairn, RMIT University, Melbourne.

Mary Kalantzis, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

EDITORIAL ADVISORY BOARD

Patrick Baert, Cambridge University, UK.

David Christian, San Diego State University, California, USA.

Bill Cope, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA.

Mick Dodson, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia.

Hafedh Halila, Institut Supérieur des Langues de Tunis, Tunisia.

Ted Honderich, University College, London.

Paul James, RMIT University, Australia.

Moncef Jazzar, Institut Supérieur des Langues de Tunis, Tunisia.

Eleni Karantzola, University of the Aegean, Greece.

Bill Kent, Monash Centre, Prato, Italy.

Krishan Kumar, University of Virginia, USA.

Ayat Labadi, Institut Supérieur des Langues de Tunis, Tunisia.

Greg Levine, Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia.

Fethi Mansouri, Deakin University, Melbourne, Australia.

Juliet Mitchell, Cambridge University, UK.

Nikos Papastergiadis, University of Melbourne, Australia.

Robert Pascoe, Victoria University, Melbourne, Australia.

Scott Schaffer, Millersville University, USA.

Jeffrey T. Schnapp, Stanford University, USA.

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, Columbia University, USA.

Giorgos Tsiakalos, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece.

Siva Vaidhyanathan, New York University, USA.

Hortensia Beatriz Vera Lopez, University of Nottingham, UK.

Chris Ziguas, RMIT University, Australia.

Please visit the Journal website at <http://www.Humanities-Journal.com> for further information:

- ABOUT the Journal including Scope and Concerns, Editors, Advisory Board, Associate Editors and Journal Profile
- FOR AUTHORS including Publishing Policy, Submission Guidelines, Peer Review Process and Publishing Agreement

SUBSCRIPTIONS

The Journal offers individual and institutional subscriptions. For further information please visit <http://ijh.cgpublisher.com/subscriptions.html>. Inquiries can be directed to subscriptions@commongroundpublishing.com

INQUIRIES

Email: cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com