

**CREATIVE INDUSTRIES OR INDUSTRIALISATION OF CREATIVITY? CRAFT  
LABOUR AND THE UNEVEN AND COMBINED DEVELOPMENT OF CAPITAL.**

**INDÚSTRIAS CRIATIVAS OU INDUSTRIALIZAÇÃO DA CRIATIVIDADE?  
TRABALHO ARTESANAL E O DESENVOLVIMENTO DESIGUAL E  
COMBINADO DO CAPITAL.**

**Daniel Roberto Vega Torres\***

**ABSTRACT**

The objective of this article is to demonstrate the spread of the classification of the so-called “creative industries” which conceals a neoliberal process of direct and indirect subordination of creative labour to capital. In this way, craft labour and its production and reproduction through the uneven and combined development of capital are used as an example of analysis. Consequently, in the first part the problematic is defined the neoliberal hegemonic term of creative industry, to differentiate it from a political and economic process of industrialisation of creativity, specifying the relationship with the craft labour. Then, the relationship of direct and indirect subordination of craft labour in Europe and Latin America is defined in a general way, in order to clarify their differences presented by the social division of labour. Finally, an analysis of the uneven and combined movement is made, to explain the relations and trends of distinction and equalisation between and within countries.

**Keywords:** Craft labour, Creative industries, Development, Capitalism.

**RESUMO**

O objetivo deste artigo é evidenciar a generalização da classificação das chamadas “indústrias criativas” que ocultam um processo neoliberal de subordinação direta e indireta do trabalho criativo ao capital. Desse modo, o trabalho artesanal e sua produção e reprodução através do desenvolvimento desigual e combinado do capital são usados como exemplo de análise. Consequentemente, na primeira parte, define-se problemático o termo hegemônico neoliberal da indústria criativa, para diferenciá-lo de um processo político e econômico de industrialização da criatividade, especificando a relação com o trabalho artesanal. Logo, é definida de modo geral a relação de subordinação direta e indireta do trabalho artesanal na Europa e na América Latina, com a finalidade de clarificar suas diferenças apresentadas pela divisão social do trabalho. Finalmente, é feita uma análise do movimento desigual e combinado, para explicar as relações e tendências de distinção e equalização entre e dentro dos países.

**Palavras-chave:** Trabalho artesanal, Indústrias criativas, Desenvolvimento, Capitalismo.

---

\* Professor Doutor da Fundación Universitaria Juan de Castellanos.

## INTRODUCTION

In a dynamic of cultural and economic globalisation, how can we see internationally the craft labour in relation to its social forms of classification, organisation and institutionalisation? This question represents an effort to understand how each proposal for the organisation and implementation of cultural policies in an international way can conceal a debate beyond academic formality, and it is included as part of institutionalisation political projects that respond to diverse forms of producing and living. It is outstanding that within each government or nation there are particular mechanisms that determine the production and reproduction of the cultural issue, understanding both practices, traditions and narratives, as well as culture as a patriotic or national project (EAGLETON, 2000). These forms of classification in a particular value system depend on the governmental power over the territory, meaning the hegemonic state of values in a period of time.

However, the question here is not to discuss the particular trajectories that allow social arguments for the institutionalisation of craft labour in each country, which is facing different cultural and economic policies of the groups that define and integrate that field. On the contrary, the problematic lies in the forms of global analysis of craft and cultural production that is not limited to literary translation, but can define international aspects that share the different systems of labour organisation in the world. In the case of craft labour, there have been international forms of organisation and definition, such as the case of UNESCO (1997), which defines activity in an openly way as characteristic to the cultural field, in addition the ways of classifying craft occupations in the ILO (ISCO, 2008), which technically defines the craft labour and consolidates similar measurement methods in different countries.

The previous forms of international classification are restricted to formal expressions, which constitutes a limit in the explanation of the transformations of craft activity in a process of globalisation. Though, there are forms of organisation and classification that have been articulated to the emergence of the so-called creative economies (HOWKINS, 2001), where craft labour is no longer defined as part of a patrimonial protection of the cultural traditions of a territory,

but rather it is presented itself as a mechanism of development and growth in different places, both economically developed and developing countries. In this way, it is described creative economy as a differentiated industrial field, derived from creative goods in the activities of design, audio-visuals, new media, performing arts, publishing, visual arts, and arts and crafts (UNCTAD, 2008, 2016).

Craft labour as a cultural expression is subordinated to a process based on innovation and creativity as the axis of production, especially in a global goods market with competence centred on quality and product differentiation (LUCKMAN, 2015). The problem here is to understand that this trend of homogenisation of craft production as an expression of creativity imposes different ways of thinking, without taking into account the contradictions and social inequalities that that activity brings. The supposed independence of the area only generates doubts about the real range of the classification and the way of understanding an international production process. Thus, an analysis is made of the creative economy and the creative industries, taking into account the capital/work relation, since it has tried to demonstrate that it does not come from the independent analysis of economic activities by areas, but the problematic of the division and subordination of labour over the dominant mode of capitalist production, as can be defined the tendencies of classification and organisation of craft labour.

Thus, the objective of the document is to obtain a generalized vision of the subordination of craft work in globalization, compared to the current characteristics of labor and the global market. Therefore it is necessary to understand the following sections of the document:

1. First, it must be stated what the creative industry means as opposed to cultural industries, it is a process of transformation from the “Fordist mode of development” to the “Postfordist development mode”, where creativity in the individual monopolizable ability primarily aimed at differentiation and innovation.
2. On the other hand it should also be understood that this mode of structuring craft work becomes hegemonic in terms of capital mobility, markets demand dis-territoriality forms of production. The second section is dedicated to this, where

the subordination of craft works to capital is explained taking into account several examples.

3. Next, it is exposed how the uneven and combined development generated by the capitalist domination system can clarify the differentiation and equalisation tendencies that characterise the labour worldwide.
4. Finally, a reflection of the craft labour in a neoliberal economy and the implications for counter-hegemonic projects is showed.

### HEGEMONY AND THE CREATIVE INDUSTRIES

The definition of creative industries in their context defines both an economic tendency and a form of subordination of innovation and creativity as a source of growth and market diversification, which requires the possible formation of a “creative class” (Florida, 2002) that supports a new form of social stratification of workers.

The concept of creative industries is trying to chart an historical shift from subsidized ‘public arts’ and broadcast era media, towards new and broader applications of creativity. This sector is taking advantage of (but is not confined to) the ‘new economy’ and its associated characteristics. Here, technological and organisational innovation enables new relationships with customers and the public that are not reliant on ‘mass’ models of centralised production (media) and real-time public consumption (the arts). Interactivity, convergence, customisation, collaboration and networks are key. Creative industries are less national, and more global and local/regional, than is typical among public broadcasting systems, flagship arts companies and so on. (CUNNINGHAM, 2002, p. 59)

There is a tendency to overcome the debate on cultural industries because cultural is no longer analyzed as a passive representation of the national but artistic and craft activities are defined by individual entrepreneurship and management skills in a global market (GARNHAM, 2005). So, this activity is defining as a global economic transformation and is projected as an international policy. Internally, the creative industries are also configured as a hegemonic project that allows the homologation of artistic and craft activities as a combined form of

artistic production such as: jewellery, ceramics, textile production, etc. And services such as: communication, cinema, broadcasting TV (JENNINGS, 2012). Despite the economic differences in the global “North” and “South”, this type of definition and classification is extended as a global discourse, because “the cultural and creative industries are naturally idiosyncratic, and benefit from the dynamics of imperfect competition. Yet, across all developing country settings, historical links, relationships and path dependencies are all crucially significant factors of success.” (UNDP, 2013, p. 26)

It can be defined as a hegemonic project in globalisation when trying to politically and economically integrate symbolic and material forms of labour organisation, a political definition of the market in different countries of the world. It is possible to appreciate the effort to identify the similarity of cultural and creative production experiences in different parts of the world in order to sustain a global process, creating a hierarchy of development from the economies of greater to lesser integration to this paradigm (UNDP, 2013, P. 54). However, their interest as a political project initiating a historical classification of cultural production, mainly in Australia and the UK, presupposes that any historical process can be summarised to the particular development of the cultural conditions of these countries.

An example of this is the way in which creative industries define craft labour and how it is indirectly presupposed that the way of classifying this type of production can be abstracted and generalised in other countries, which is criticisable both for them European countries and countries with a recent industrialisation and capitalist market formation. Thus, the way in which the process of industrialisation and organisation of cultural and creative labour should be understood should not be done from the particularity of the labour organisation system of a country or region - which implies reproducing a national hegemonic project - but from that common process that they share, in this case, the uneven development generated by the capital/work relationship in the world.

The integration of craft labour in the creative industries is limited to a series of forms of production with the artistic field, historically by the way in which the social movement of resistance to industrial production “arts and craft” was formed in the UK. It

is a pragmatic vision of artisan work, which its base is the instinctive capacity (VEBLEN, 1898), an ideal of labour or lifestyle (MILLS, 2009), or as “good work” (SENNET, 2008). However, in other parts of Europe itself, the same meaning is not obtained, since the urban middle class of retailers and artisans maintains its unity and strength the formation of the internal market of each country, which defined in the 20th century a creation of craft companies with greater integration to capitalist development in different sectors of industry and services.

The study by Mark Banks (2010) defines important trajectories for the analysis of craft labour in the creative industries, both because of the need to classify this activity as an industry, and because of the way craft labour unfolds in capitalism today, with consequences such as the problems of management, employment instability, the need for technological innovation, and individualisation. However, banks’ analysis is developed in some countries where the creative industries have the greatest institutional tradition (UK and Northern Europe, North America and Australasia), but leaves aside the explanation of other forms of institutionalisation in Europe, as well as others countries of the so-called third world. Therefore, the analysis can be expanded following the criticism on the forms of classification of craft labour in relation to the development of capital.

The discourse on the globalism of the term and classification of occupations varies considerably in each context, especially because it is not the simple translation of the word crafts, handmade or artisanal as R. Sennet (2008, p.20) does, but it is in the modern historical process of what artisan means in a capitalist society. The reason why steadiness in the terms cannot be presupposed is because they depend on the social organisation of work in a system of relationships, historically concrete, that defines the range of labour relations and their meanings. This does not mean that the local or global dichotomy must be resorted but rather emphasises is placed in the possibility of evaluating cultural processes as a dialectical relationship between the general of labour as a whole, the unique occupations and the particular contexts of politics organisation.

Then, the classification project of craft labour in the creative industries can be distinguished as a hegemonic projection, insofar as it is a political

tendency to organise local production and micro-business characteristics based on flexibility, innovation and change, as the axis of the neoliberal economic dynamics, meaning give back a company’s life (ALVES, 2008). It is intended to use a constant of microenterprise production as part of a “policy of successful”; when in general words are visualised the conditions of precariousness of the economic contexts where these activities are developed. So, the criticism towards the cultural and creative industries does not address precisely the “degeneration of cultural expression” within capitalism (ADORNO, 1991), but how all cultural and symbolic expression can be subordinated to capital and the consequences for life in society.

#### **DIRECT AND INDIRECT SUBORDINATION OF CRAFT LABOUR**

In order to better understand how craft labour is developed today, it is necessary to understand that its definition and classification depends on the relationship with the dominant mode of production, in this case the capitalist. Not all artisanal production is integrated into the capitalist production system, since there are conflict processes or forms of work organisation that are not defined by profit. However, being part of a capitalist dominant market, it is necessary to understand that their relationship can be direct or indirect to capital. By direct subordination it is understood as the process of real or formal transformation of the artisanal production of the activities in search of a wage-earning production of the employees (MARX, 2013). By indirect subordination it is understood as the development of activity in the reproduction or realisation of capital in the market, either commercially or by production for rent (GODELIER, 1974). This can be defined as a form of hybrid production or transformation, such as the trend of activities that maintain their autonomous non-capitalist local conditions, but that carry out or maintain their activity in the market.

The division of labour, in the case of craft production, can take place in different dimensions: the social division of craft labour, where the socioeconomic position of producers appears in their class relation as well as employers (retailers), salaried workers, informal workers. The technical division of



craft labour is related to the trade and occupation, the functionality and utility of production. Finally, the symbolic division of craft labour, where the subjectivities and particular meanings of the artisan's production and the artisan object are understood. Hence, when we talk about the social, technical and symbolic division of craft labour, reference is made to a system of relationships of power and the organisation of work in a specific territory.

The class relationship is important, since the definition of craft labour is usually attributed as usual process of the middle class, although it is remarkable that by understanding the transformations of the subjectivities and institutionalisation of craft labour in different countries it is possible to identify a much more diverse situation in relation to the class position. Those small owners of the means of production that defined Marx (2011, p.408, 2012) and those who take part of the middle class as the artisans and retailers respond only to a nineteenth-century analysis, it is a historically concrete system of relationships and it cannot be spatially and temporally inferred without clearly losing its meanings and determinations that validate it. On the other hand, class dynamics as the basis of the political and economic constitution of a society are historically redefined as social groups which are organised (WRIGHT, 2015), so the popular classes are also part of the political formation in the 20th century, as also of salaried workers in craft companies and their organisation.

In a general view, the economic process of production, the division of work and class relations are relevant categories to understand the way in which different trajectories of organisation of craft labour are distinguished. Here it can be exemplified in several trajectories, the first includes the situation of the UK, another includes the cases of France and Germany, and finally the formation of artisanal labour with a cultural base in Latin America. The references to these trajectories are given in a general way and are intended to be informative rather than analytical, since the objective here is to understand the general differences in the social organisation of the craft labour, and not of all the economic and social characteristics of that sector.

It can be mentioned, as a thesis, that the definition and classification of craft labour in creative industries from the UK is due to its historical situation

because of the early industrialisation process that allowed the growth of large industry and the reach of a large number of the population, and the response of the artisan movement as an artistic projection of production, which would no longer compete with the large industry in production, but for the aesthetic quality of the produced objects (BANKS, 2010, p.307). The liberal economic policy defined the possibilities of expansion of the commercial system to the detriment of the production of local character, because there was a joint process of proletarianisation that went through the reduction of the owners of means of subsistence. Thus a direct relation of the craft labour in the UK cannot be thought without defining that transition and resistance of the craftsmen in order to create an autonomous market of artistic tendency, mainly because they thought to compete for quality and aesthetic differentiation (STANKIEWIKZ, 1992; King, 2008).

The decreasing trend of artisanal producers contrasts with the growth of the urban population and the problems that industrial capitalism brought with it. The internal production of artisanal and artistic works is reduced in function of the country's commercial growth, which defines a clear trend of consumption, especially in the strengthening of the retailers as the middle class with the highest growth in the country. Trade and big industry define what for Marx is the disappearance of the artisan class, that is why his remarkable pessimism in the continuity of this activity in capitalism (MARX, 1980, p.377). In this trajectory there is a process of indirect subordination of craft labour to capital, to the extent that there was a direct resistance to the process of industrialisation and to the proletarianisation of artisans. However, it depended on the organisation of the market and the growth of wealth in order to maintain production; this is the realisation of capital through practices that are not directly capitalist that it does depend, as in this case, on classes and groups that buys products and services, especially luxury capitalist consumption (HARVEY, 1984, p.85). Therefore, the development of handicraft production in creative economies in the UK classification will be defined by its remarkable characteristic of relationship with art. Especially, there are changes in the way of production and recognition within the artisanal sector, such as traditional designers and craftsmen; however, their main base is still

maintained in artistic or luxury objects (McAULEY and FILLS, 2003).

On the contrary, these types of trajectories are not compatible with labour organisation processes in France or Germany. When there is a resistance to the proletarianisation of labour by the strong cultural and traditional organisation of the middle class, a process of direct subordination to capital is developed in the way that small businesses sustain production of the population and maintain forms of symbolic organisation as a different class from the proletarians and bourgeois (ZARCA, 1993, MUTHESIUS, 1998). It is important to find this class situation as a basis of differentiation that allowed maintaining privileges within government policies, thus rising to a protection of the internal market by means of artisans and the continuity of production of goods and services necessary for the population (PERRIN, 2007). The association and organisation of artisans as a cultural part of the organisation of production, both in the late nineteenth century and in the first half of the twentieth century, results in ways of classifying occupations with greater integration into the national market, in sectors such as construction, food, transportation and manufacturing (DECAS, 2001).

It is not the abstract result of what is artisanal that defines the classification and the organisation of labour, but the result of the organisation of workers and artisan producers who, in their political struggle to maintain their rights and privileges, determine the characteristics of the sector. It is noteworthy that there are similar forms of organisation between these two countries, mainly due to the fact that in France, with the annexation of the Lorraine and Alsace regions, the form of small industry organisation was integrated, which largely defined what artisanal enterprise is in the twentieth century (JORDA, 2006). The way in which the artisan enterprise is maintained as a base of economic organisation along with the big industry is fundamental to understand that the form of institutionalisation directly integrated to capital is organised according to the class tradition and not precisely the technique conditions (MAZAUD, 2009).

The main point here is the artisanal enterprise, which can be made up of salaried employees, as long as they do not exceed the number allowed in any legislation. The artisanal enterprise can develop a capitalist activity in such way that salaried work

exists, because even if it is paradoxical, it is not a contradiction (see COGNIE, 2010), taking into account that the forms of division and organisation of craft labour are related together in the social, technical and symbolic division of labour, and its institutionalisation depends on the groups or classes that have the power to influence the definition and classification of the sector in relation to other sectors. There is, then, a class separation between countries of the same European region, which prevents a clear process of homologation of what craft labour means (MICHELSONS, 2004).

On the other hand, in Latin American countries the process of institutionalisation of craft labour is defined by its ethnological or cultural character, mainly the object (handicraft) that defines the function of labour (LIMA, 2010). There is no direct continuity of the forms of urban organisation of the cities to business work in the national market, but a search and definition of the activity is carried out as a cultural fact among the different communities and local populations, where the artisan and crafts acquires a significant symbolic importance in social studies and in the forms of grouping and sociability (TUROK, 2001, MEJÍA, 2004). The ethnic and colonial basis of the subjectivities of the population defines artisanal production as the axis of local traditions and memories, which is integrated into the territory as a basis for practices, rituals, objects and beliefs.

The relationship of the local practices of the different communities and rural populations allows the definition of the artisanal object or handicraft, which especially through non-capitalist production practices were indirectly integrated into markets in their dependence on tourism. For this reason, the process of institutionalisation in general takes part of the definition of the object to link it with the producer subject, meaning the identity of being an artisan depends on the production of crafts (SAPIEZINSKAS, 2012). A trend towards the integration of cultural activities into capitalist production, in its process of urbanisation and industrialisation since the 20<sup>th</sup> century, is not representative in Latin America, but remains a specifically rural form of production.

However, with the growth of urbanisation in these countries, and the corresponding migration from the countryside to the city, the different regional and local techniques and practices are integrated into the

market, diversifying their production and enhancing territorial differentiation, then generate technically more specialised and individualised objects in the market thanks to the intervention of neoliberal design and business development (SCRASE, 2010). Thus, there is a form of indirect subordination to capital, because in the way that it does not develop itself in advanced capitalist societies, they obtain their growth and differentiation as a sector depending on the degree of urbanisation of the cities, where they begin to depend mostly on the flows of capital, work and merchandise as part of increasingly specialised and differentiated consumption.

There is a noticeable symbolic division between those people who produce handicrafts and those technical workers, mainly because it is not the formal educational or work institution which acquire importance, but belonging to a tradition or territory that identifies the values of handicraft production (QUIÑONES and BARRERA, 2006). This type of activities cannot be properly considered as similar trajectories in the indirect subordination to artistic labour, for example in countries such as the UK and Brazil, although many of the techniques such as ceramics, jewellery and textile industry can comprise a large part of the production of handicrafts; it is the ethnological character that determined its classification and its corresponding reproduction as a folkloric and traditional practice of the different people or social groups, which differentiates the forms of subordination of artisanal labour to capital. Following, in the ex-colonies, where the definition of race-ethnicity and class is distinctive and the symbolic division of labour will generate forms of organisation from the popular classes as the axis of identification of movements that do not take place directly into the relationship capital/work.

In general, the processes of institutionalisation depend on the way in which classes are organised, the division (social, technical and symbolic) of labour, which allows its relationship of direct or indirect subordination to capital. To specify why this process is dynamic, it is necessary to point out that it is not due to a simple definition of economic dependence, of developed and underdeveloped countries, but rather it is the unequal and combined development of capital as a process of accumulation and expansion that alters

the class positions and forms of institutionalisation of craft labour.

### UNEVEN AND COMBINED DEVELOPMENT OF CRAFT LABOUR

It can be understood that uneven development is part of the accumulation of capital, because capitalism is inequality of forms of production and appropriation of social wealth. In a general view, it is understood as the study of the unequal forms of historically produced spatial distribution of industry, banking, business, wealth, work relations, political configurations, etc. (COX, 2008, ASHMAN, 2009) The different relations of differentiation produce mechanisms of dependence and control between different social spaces and dimensions, both in urban and rural relations, between industrial regions and commercial regions, relations of imperialist struggle between countries, and regions of dependency in the localities of the same cities or regions within the countries, etc. (ROSENBERG, 2010) The process of capital accumulation and its corresponding inequality defines the possible forms of coexistence or combination between old and new forms of production; the combined development consists in understanding the dynamics of (vertical and horizontal) integration between non-capitalist forms of production and the development of capital in its expansion, concentration and accumulation (TYLER, 2015).

The uneven and combined development differs from the theories of dependence or the idea of the world system, insofar as it focuses its analysis on the dynamics of the relationship between the expansion and accumulation of capital, in the tendencies of differentiation and equalisation of the social and cultural systems that allow their reproduction (TAYLOR, 2014). So, it is understood as the process of concentration, accumulation and dispossession that realises the movement of capital geographically and historically, which allows to define relations of power and local production, nationally and internationally (DUNFORD and LIU, 2016). In this way the form of direct and indirect subordination of labour to capital that takes place in the production process has its correlate in the movement of expansion through the transformation between capitalist and non-capitalist production systems, being in the form of resistance,

in the horizontal form and in the vertical form of integration to capital (MÉSZÁROS, 2002, p.622).

Part of the uneven and combined development consists of the capacity for resistance or integration that can be generated between the forms of reproduction of the craft labour in front of the dominant social system. Thus, on the one hand it is understood that not every mode of production can be defined as capitalist, and that it has the capacity to resist the process of subordination of work to capital. The craft labour that takes place as a cultural expression can be defined as a resistance mechanism taking into account the territorial political capacities of the communities in terms of maintaining life forms that do not subordinate their production to the market (GARCÍA, 2009). Therefore, the activity of artisan production is derived from the socio-cultural organisation that allows a form of recognition of non-capitalist economies and derived from the territorial political power of its producers.

This condition of production on popular, ethnic or territorial social resistance can be analyzed taking into account that it is part of a social, economic and political group that allows a counter-hegemonic movement evident in Latin American and European countries (FRANÇA and LAVILLE, 2004). Anti-capitalist political practices can manifest a noticeable relationship here in relation to ecological movements, since in the craft labour the tendency against in mass and standardised production is evident. However, this type of handicraft production is limited to local production groups and networks of short dimension, which implies that it is not a general trend of artisanal production in the world, but it clearly identifies a contrary disposition of subordination of craft labour to the capital.

On the other hand, the vertical and horizontal integration of craft labour in reproduction and expansion of capital has characteristics that include not only the system of classification of countries but produces a general trend in the way that markets are organised, both in the capacity of vertical integration in the sectors of industrial production and services, and in horizontal integration, which implies especially the realisation of capital. Thus, on one hand vertical integration means the direct subordination of craft labour as part of the capital and work relationship, both in the form of salaried workers and small capitalists. This type of craftsmanship can be defined

as international considering the relationship as repair activities, manufacturing and services is a constant in different countries high and low industrialisation (BOUTELLIER, FOURNIER and PERRIN, 2015).

Horizontal integration has a movement that is not directly part of the production of capital but its realisation. It is the productive consumption of industrialised raw material that allows a reproduction of capital. Horizontal integration covers independent workers who do not depend on a direct cultural relationship with the territory. In the horizontal integration of craft labour, both artistic work and handicraft can be recognised. Artistic work, or in its several definitions in different countries (KLAMER, 2012), which share the identity of the individual artist and which determines a trend towards more individualised and independent production in the markets. The production of crafts (handmade or handicrafts) on the other hand seeks a form of urban female population occupation mainly, and are activities carried out for several purposes: family income supplement (RICHARD, 2007), hobbies or in a therapeutic way (HARRIS, 2008), among other reasons; not necessarily for the recognition of identities or patrimonial traditions.

In this way, the uneven and combined development that make up the craft labour, both in production and in reproduction, can be defined as a movement in two trajectories or tendencies: differentiation and equalisation (SMITH, 1988).

The tendency to differentiation lies in the search, or production, of the distinction based on the singularities of each population or territory. Hence, each region and producer is constantly required to distinguish commodities either ethnic criteria, cultural, religious, historical, etc., in order to obtain greater value for the income that is generated thanks to the rights of property (social, territorial, individual) on the distinctive characteristics of the products. The problem is not in the characteristics of the socio-environmental wealth that is generated by the cultural diversity of the population; the problem is specifically that this type of wealth is subordinated to the accumulation of capital. The craft labour subordinated directly or indirectly to capital currently produces the tendency to monopolistic income on that singularity, which is defined both in the brands and in the territorial patents that develop in a struggle for that “value



grabbing” (ANDREUCCI, GARCÍA , WEDEKIN and SWYNGEDOUW, 2017).

On the other hand, the tendency towards equalisation, as force that capital exerts in its globalisation, allows differentiations to lead to obtaining homogenous administrative policies and mechanisms for the organisation of craft labour.

a) The first way of equalisation is the tendency to organise a system of artistic and cultural work, understood as a creative industry; it is a form of cultural production based on the conditions of innovation and entrepreneurship of small cultural producers worldwide (KLAMER, 2012). In this case, there is greater integration between countries in the form of production based on techniques of an artistic nature, which shows different agents that work in production lines with homogeneous raw material, such as metal, mud, wood, leather, seeds, among others. In this way, a type of production, promotion and protection for similar artisan activity appears in each country, which may allow an expansion of international trade in the form of tourism or export, as is the case of craft labour in the creative industries sector.

b) The second way is the tendency of growth and integration of the working population of greater vulnerability in handmade activities of production of private consumption, such as crafts and technical services. In this way, the craft labour does not include a direct debate about its cultural interpretation, but it is developed as part of the continuous exclusion of workers from the productive sector, which translates into the increase of objectified labour and the reduction of living labour for the use of capital accumulation and development. This condition not only relates the growth of people who choose to work independently or on their own, but also represents the condition of vulnerability and instability of workers as a way to obtain temporary income, depending on the conditions of labour market integration (STANDING, 2011).

c) The government from the method of protection and promotion of craft labour, obtains and promotes a definition of homogeneous public policies in developed and developing countries, where there is a boost to microenterprise development policies that exert changes in the way of managing the companies (MAZAUD, 2009), as well as cultural policies of material and immaterial patrimonial protection. It is remarkable that the forms of protection and

promotion of craft labour in different countries can now coincide, maintaining the differences in the symbolic, technical and social division. This is how it can get a tendency to equalisation from the public power in the work organisation, which does not imply a global delimitation to an autonomous sector, such as the creative industries, but is a response to the global conditions of the relationship between capital and labour in a dominant political and economic development system.

## NEOLIBERALISM AND CRAFT LABOUR

Against the trend of a post-industrial era, it is asserted that the project of the creative industries constitutes a part of the expansion of capital in the “universal generalised industrialisation” that Ernst Mandel (1982, p. 271) exhibited, since the form of creative production, in this case of craft labour, is an integral part of the development of both raw materials, instruments and techniques used for production, which can be integrated directly or indirectly into the development of the capitalist market. Thus, the industrialisation of the creative labour gives a new approach of the craft labour, because at the moment the artisan activities are integrated to the dynamics of expansion of the capital in function of the technical industrialisation so much for the production as for the development of the capital.

This process of general industrialisation of production has been greatly expanded by the neoliberal political-economic project that seeks a greater market expansion on strategies of material and ideological subordination of all social activity. Globalisation as the axis of capitalist expansion allows the differentiation and equalisation of life in society to be reinforced, in this case of handicraft products, either by the consumption of the commodities or by the way of classifying labour. It is clear that historically and socially globalisation does not depend solely on the dynamics of capital, however it is through this process that capital can directly and indirectly subordinate the different forms of production and reproduction of life in society. Thus, in the liberalisation of markets there is both the possibility of homogeneity in consumption and the search for individuality as a means of differentiation.

A most important problem in the development of craft labour in a neoliberal system is to confuse social emancipation with the subordination of labour, as a creative activity, to the capitalist market. It is remarkable that economic theory gives as a basis to individual entrepreneurship a significant importance for the development of innovation; however, it is also prominent that this type of presuppositions of the capitalist system only includes a part of successful cases of entrepreneurship (UNDP, 2013). In general, the process of subordination and division of labour constitutes greater competition among individuals, which generates a search for individual capacity as the axis of identification, identity and authenticity that must prevail in this competition.

The imperative of authenticity (HAN, 2017), as the axis of subjective exploitation in neoliberalism, is the product of both the possibility of ideological domination and the material expression of the positions of workers in activities that are peripheral to advances in science and technology. Therefore, it is possible to find in the artisan workers a form of cultural and artistic identification that is more specialised in the use and knowledge of the market, which forces a trend of greater differentiation between the same sectors. The fragmentation of class as a product of this individualisation increases as it is intended to survive as an artist or craftsman in a dynamic environment that valorises more the exotics of labour.

The contingent of the subject, its environment and local context, as something immanent to its historical and geographical situation, becomes with the neoliberalism in a transcendent feature of the artisan worker, which must subordinate all activity. However, as mentioned above, the possibility of resistance and emancipation depends on the form of organisation of territorially determined workers that can re-signify labour in relation to social projects that seek unity of class, on a political platform of organisation that do not limit subjectivities to an industrialisation of creativity, but define politically and economically the importance of individuals on their job.

In consequence, creative labour could only have a significant value measured by the degree of freedom that individuals have to produce according to their aesthetic, ethical and material needs. In the same way that labour is understood materially for life and not life for work, ideologically the subject should

not be defined in terms of his job but the possibility of learning and having freedom of production based on the characteristics and social and personal interests. This does not mean literally assuming a denial of craft labour in general, but the re-significance of this work as a creative activity in a project of social emancipation. Labour produces the wealth that can be distributed in society, and in this case the particular and concrete forms of labour such as artisanal can be defined in political projects that do not reproduce the subordination to the uneven development of capital.

## CONCLUSION

Craft labour as part of the economic policies of the creative industries is limited to reproducing procedures of classification and definition of some countries as if they corresponded to a global rate. This is understandable if one takes into account that this classification is an expression of neoliberal hegemony, both by the subordination of craft labour to capital, and by the search for differentiation and individualisation of producers to obtain greater representation in the market. On the contrary, craft labour is presented here as part of the “struggles against classification”, derived from the class struggles that are evident in the relationship between labour and capital (TYLER, 2015). Thus, the problem is that artisan activities cannot be subordinated to the strictly artistic expression, or to a technical definition, but are social practices that are continuously institutionalised in relation to the economic and political group of society.

It is understood, then, that it is not only the emergence of a new sector that integrates craft labour, but as the uneven and combined development of capital is extended as a leading system, the way in which artisanal labour affects the tendency to the differentiation and equalisation in the industrialisation of creative practices. This type of criticism about the forms of development and transformation of craft labour does not intend to cover the whole activities that are proposed within the sector of the creative industries. However, it allows a particular analysis of the implications of the formation of relatively autonomous industrial sectors, and especially their problems regarding their political and economic use in different regions of the world.

## REFERENCES

- ADORNO, Theodor. **The culture industry: selected essays on mass culture**, London: Routledge, 1991.
- ALVES, Giovanni. **Trabalho e subjetividade: o metabolismo social da reestruturação produtiva do capital**. Marília: UEL, 2008.
- ANDREUCCI, D.; GARCÍA-LAMARCA, M.; WEDEKIND, J. and E. SWYNGEDOUW, "Value Grabbing": A Political Ecology of Rent, **Capitalism Nature Socialism**, v. 28, n. 3, pp. 28-47, 2017.
- ASHMAN, Sam. Capitalism, uneven and combined development and the transhistoric, **Cambridge Review of International Affairs**, v. 22 n. 1, pp. 29-46, 2009.
- BANKS, Mark. Craft labour and creative industries, **International Journal of Cultural Policy**, 16 (3), 305-321, 2010.
- BOUTILLIER, Sophie; FOURNIER, Claude and Cédric PERRIN (Dir.), *Le temps des artisans : Permanences et mutations*. **Marché et organisations**, vol. 24, 2015.
- BROPHY, Susan. An Uneven and Combined Theory of Law: Initiation, 28 **Law Critique**, v. 2, pp. 167-191, 2017.
- COGNIE, Florence. Artisanat et Salariat : une relation paradoxale, In : Jacquot, L. (Dir), **Formes et structures du salariat : crise, mutation, devenir**, Presses universitaires de Nancy, collection «Salariat et transformations sociales», 2010.
- COX, Kevin. Globalisation, uneven development and capital: reflections on reading Thomas Friedman's *The World Is Flat*. **Cambridge Journal of Regions, Economy and Society**, pp. 1-22, 2008.
- CUNNINGHAM, Stuart. From Cultural to Creative Industries: Theory, Industry and Policy Implications. **Media International Australia**, v. 102, n. 1, 54-65, 2002.
- DECAS (Direction des Entreprises du Commerce, de l'Artisanat et des Services) **L'artisanat en France, en Allemagne et en Alsace-Moselle. Etude exploratoire**. GATE - CNRS. Available from : <https://archives.entreprises.gouv.fr/2012/www.pme.gouv.fr/essentiel/etudesstat/pdf/arfrancealdec2000.pdf> (Accesses May 2017) 2001.
- DUNFORD, Michael and Weidong LIU. Uneven and combined development. **Regional Studies**, v. 51, 59-85, 2016.
- EAGLETON, Terry. **The idea of culture**. Oxford: Blackwell, 2000.
- FLORIDA, Richard. **The rise of the creative class**. New York: Basic Books, 2002.
- FRANÇA, Genauto and Jean-Louis LAVILLE. **Economia Solidária: Uma Abordagem Internacional**. Porto Alegre: Editora UFRGS, 2004.
- GARCÍA, Alan. **Forma valor y forma comunidad. Aproximación teórica abstracta a los fundamentos civilizatorios que preceden al Ayllu Universal**. La Paz: Clasco, 2009.
- GARNHAM, Nicholas. From cultural to creative industries: An analysis of the implications of the "creative industries" approach to arts and media policy making in the United Kingdom. **International Journal of Cultural Policy**, v. 11 n. 1, pp. 15-29, 2005.
- GODELIER, Maurice. **Racionalidad e irracionalidad en economía. México: Siglo XXI, 1974**.
- HAN, Byung-Chul. **La expulsión de lo distinto**. Barcelona: Editorial Herder, 2017.
- HARRIS, Emma. The meanings of craft to an occupational therapist. **Australian Occupational Therapy Journal**, v. 55 n. 2, pp. 133-142, 2008.
- HARVEY, David. **The Limits of Capital**. Oxford, Blackwell, 1984.
- HOWKINS, John. **The Creative Economy: How people make money from ideas**. The Penguin Press, 2001.
- INTERNATIONAL STANDARD CLASSIFICATION OF OCCUPATIONS (ISCO), 2008, ILO, Available from: <http://www.mtecbo.gov.br/cbsite/pages/home.jsf> [Accessed May, 2016].
- JENNINGS, Hilary. **Towards a Definition of Heritage Craft Creative and Cultural Skills**. 2012. Available from: <http://blueprintfiles.s3.amazonaws.com/1344600067-Towards-a-Definition-of-Heritage-Craft-finaldraft.pdf> [Accessed April, 2016].
- JORDA, Henri. Les recompositions de l'artisanat: des corporations à la « première entreprise de France », **Marché et organisations** v. 1, pp. 39-53, 2006.
- KING, Andrew. William Morris Arts and Crafts Aesthetic Rhetoric. **American Communication Journal**, v. 10, Special Edition. n.p. 2008.
- KLAMER, Arjo. **Crafting Culture: The importance of craftsmanship for the world of the arts and the economy at large**. Work paper. Erasmus University Rotterdam, 2012.
- LIMA, Ricardo. **Objetos: Percursos e escritas culturais**. São Paulo: Cadernos do Folclore, 2010.
- LUCKMAN, Susan. **Craft and the creative economy**. New York: Palgrave MacMillan, 2015.
- MANDEL, Ernst. **O Capitalismo tardio**. São Paulo: Abril Cultural, 1982.

- MARX, Karl. **Teorías sobre la plusvalía I, Tomo IV de El Capital**. México: FCE, 1980.
- MARX, Karl. **Grundrisse: Manuscritos econômicos de 1857-1858**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2011.
- MARX, Karl. **As lutas de classes na França**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2012.
- MARX, Karl. **O Capital, Crítica da economia política, Livro I**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2013.
- MAZAUD, Caroline. **Entre le métier et l'entreprise Renouveau et transformations de l'artisanat français**. Université de Nantes École doctorale Droit, Économie-Gestion, Sociétés et Territoires (ED 501) Doctorat de sociologie, 2009.
- MCAULEY, A and I. FILLIS. **Making it in the 21st century: a socio-economic survey of crafts activity**, Crafts Council, 2003.
- MEJIA, Diana. **La artesanía en México: Historia, mutación y adaptación de un concepto**. México: El colegio de Michoacan, 2004.
- MÉSZÁROS, István, **Para além do capital: Rumo a uma teoria da transição**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2002.
- MICHELSONS, Angelo. **L'artigianato in Europa e in Italia**. Osservatorio dell'Artigianato Regione Piemonte, 2004.
- MILLS, Wright. **Sobre o artesanato intelectual e outros ensaios**. Rio de Janeiro: Zahar, 2009.
- MUTHESIUS, Stefan Handwerk/Kunsth Handwerk, **Journal of Design History**, v. 11 n. 1, pp. 85-95, 1998.
- PERRIN, Cédric. **Entre glorification et abandon. L'Etat et les artisans en France (1938- 1970)**. Vincennes : Institut de la gestion publique et du développement économique, 2007.
- QUIÑONES, Ana and Gloria BARRERA. **Conspirando con los artesanos. Crítica y propuesta del diseño en la artesanía**. Bogotá: Editorial Pontificia Universidad Javeriana, 2006.
- RICHARD, Noëlla. **Handicrafts and Employment Generation for the Poorest Youth and Women**. Paris: UNESCO, 2007.
- ROSENBERG, Justin. Basic problems in the theory of uneven and combined development. Part II: unevenness and political multiplicity. **Cambridge Review of International Affairs**, v. 23, pp. 165–189, 2010.
- SAPIEZINSKAS, Aline. Como se constrói um artesão: negociações de significado e uma “cara nova” para as “coisas da vovó”. **Horizontes Antropológicos**, v. 18 n. 38, pp. 133-158, 2012.
- SCRASE, Timothy. Precarious production: Globalisation and artisan labour in the Third World. **Third World Quarterly**, v. 24, n. 3, pp. 449-461, 2010.
- SENETT, Richard. **The Craftman**. London: Yale University Press, 2008.
- SMITH, Neil. **Desenvolvimento desigual**. Rio de Janeiro: Editora Bertrand, 1988.
- STANDING, Guy. **The Precariat**. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2011.
- STANKIEVIKS, Mary. From the Aesthetic Movement to the Arts and Craft Movement. **Studies in Art Education**. v. 33, n. 3, pp. 165–173, 1992.
- TAYLOR, Nick. Theorising capitalist diversity: The uneven and combined development of labour forms. **Capital and Class**, v. 38, n. 1, pp. 129–141, 2014.
- TUROK, Marta. **Cómo acercarse a la artesanía**. México: Plaza y Valdés, 2001.
- TYLER, Imogen. Classificatory struggles: class, culture and inequality in neoliberal times. **The Sociological Review**, v. 63, pp. 493–511, 2015.
- UNCTAD (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development). **The challenge of assessing the Creative Economy: towards Informed policymaking**. United Nations, 2008.
- UNCTAD. (United Nations Conference on Trade and Development). **Creative economy outlook and country profiles: Trends in international trade in creative industries**, 2016. Available from: [http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/webditcted2016d5\\_en.pdf](http://unctad.org/en/PublicationsLibrary/webditcted2016d5_en.pdf). [Accessed October 2017]
- UNDP (United Nations Development Programme). **Creative economy report**. Special Edition. UNESCO, 2013. Available from: <https://en.unesco.org/creativity/creative-economy-report-2013> [Accessed September 2017]
- UNESCO. **Symposium “Crafts and the international market: trade and customs codification”**, 1997 UNESCO-ITC, Available from: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0011/001114/111488eo.pdf> [Accessed April 2016]
- VEBLEN, Thorstein. The instinct of workmanship and the irksomeness of labor. **The American Journal of Sociology** v. 4, pp. 187-201, 1898.
- WRIGHT, Erik, **Understanding Class**. London: Verso, 2015.
- ZARCA, Bernard. L'artisanat. La plus populaire des classes moyennes ? **Vingtième Siècle, revue d'histoire**, 37. Les classes moyennes. pp. 55-68, 1993.