

# Creative economy in the face of the complexity paradigm

## *A economia criativa diante do paradigma de complexidade*

Romilson Marco dos Santos<sup>1</sup> 

### ABSTRACT

**Objective:** To discuss Creative Economy based on the complexity paradigm. Therefore, thinking about creative economy, based on this paradigm, is part of the search to establish convenient principles of intelligibility in order to apprehend the complexity of the way ideas are organized. **Provocations:** However, it would be possible that, at the end of this journey, something like dissent on the part of conservatives could be seen. Conservatives not because they are concerned about preserving traditions, but above all because they are concerned about refuting any possibility of the emergence of a new tradition. **Conclusion:** The complexity paradigm, thus, shows the emergence of deviant creativity in its possibilities of autonomy. In such autonomy, a dialogical game of pluralisms, of the multiplication of gaps and ruptures is intrinsic in the existing creative determinations. Therefore, deviant creativity can point out the emergence of new creative paradigms, which can destabilize institutionalized creativity.

**Keywords:** Creative economy. Creative industries. Complexity. Cultural management. Deviant creativity.

### RESUMO

**Objetivo:** Discutir a economia criativa com base no paradigma de complexidade. Pensar a economia criativa por esse paradigma se insere na busca por se estabelecer princípios de inteligibilidade convenientes a fim de apreender a complexidade do modo de organização das ideias. **Provocações:** Poderia ser, todavia, que, ao termo desse percurso, se deixasse entrever algo como uma dissidência por parte dos conservadores. Conservadores não por estarem preocupados em preservar as tradições, mas, sobretudo, por estarem preocupados em refutar qualquer possibilidade de emergência de uma nova tradição. **Conclusão:** O paradigma de complexidade, assim, evidencia a emergência de uma criatividade desviante nas suas possibilidades de autonomia. Nessa autonomia está intrínseco um jogo dialógico dos pluralismos, da multiplicação de brechas e rupturas nas determinações criativas existentes. Logo, a criatividade desviante é capaz de apontar a emergência de novos paradigmas criativos, os quais podem desestabilizar a criatividade institucionalizada.

**Palavras-chave:** Economia criativa. Indústrias criativas. Complexidade. Gestão cultural. Criatividade desviante.

---

<sup>1</sup>Roma Indústrias Criativas. E-mail: romilsonmarco@gmail.com

Received on: 02/01/2023. Accepted on: 05/08/2023.

## INTRODUCTION

A displacement from an industrial society to a post-industrial society is foreseen. Therefore, existing management models, work theories and methodologies collapse, considering certain aspects, due to this new paradigm. However, it is not a surprise that it also brings about transformation in the mode of production, circulation and consumption of symbolic goods. “Indeed, the passage from Fordism to post-Fordism can be seen as the passage from a logic of reproduction to a logic of innovation; from a regime of repetition to a regime of invention” (CORSANI, 2003, p. 15). Therefore, the valorization of innovation rescues the importance of creativity, and, consequently, the creative intellectual capital.

It is important to mention, in effect, the complete transformation in the way of communicating and *creating* in this atmosphere. According to Van Dijck (2016), with the arrival of the internet, and especially the 2.0 web platforms, the industrial logic of mass reproduced cultural goods went through a dramatic transformation. The ecosystem of connective media does not consist of a mere sum of microsystems, but instead, of a dynamic infrastructure that is able to influence the culture and be influenced by it. This shows that this path is opened to a new way of thinking culture, creativity itself and, above all, creative economy.

Connectivity, Velocity and Intangibility — products deriving from time, space and mass — are making the rules indistinct and redefining our companies and our lives. They are destroying what used to be standardized work solutions, which were efficient in a relatively slow and unconnected industrial world (DAVIS; MEYER, 1999, p. 6).

It is observed that this scenario is established based on uncertainty and unpredictability. In this sense, it requires new management models, work theories and methodologies. Such a perspective leads to other theoretical explorations, as well as new investigative instruments that are able to insert creative economy in complex management and creativity, being incorporated to what can be called complexity of the contemporary society. It is important to mention the impacts of this complexity on traditional cultural industries, which are part of the creative economy framework. How can we think about theater, cinema, television, design, publicity, fashion, publishing companies, games, software, music, and culture based on such complexity?

Therefore, this theoretical essay aims at discussing creative economy based on the complexity paradigm. Such a perspective is seen as critical in a transitional culture.

In the moment we are living in, we barely see the emerging modes involved in the turmoil of change. If the limit of the intellectual operation to which we are capable of is the refusal of paradigms and ideology, then we are left with the role of critics of transition, or critics of the transitional culture (ABRANCHES, 2017, p. 17).

So, the objective is to encourage the discussion, despite a preliminary examination that is able to show that the “change which we are going through is not linear, nor is the amplified continuity of what we have. It is disruptive. Chaotic. We are at the threshold of chaos, between the order that fades away and what appears as random. We are in the borders of maximum complexity (ABRANCHES, 2017, p. 25).

From the perspective of this study, this focus shows the discovery of concepts that make us change our view of what is accepted. That is, the question is up to what point the traditional culture industry requires a movement towards creative industries. In other words, there is a need to revise management models, the concept of creativity itself, the processes of production, circulation and consumption of symbolic goods, in order to integrate that complexity. In this sense, would traditional culture industries leave an economy of culture to be inserted in creative economy? The goal here is not to conclude the matter. Nonetheless, it is observed that this path would lead to other theoretical explorations, able to think about new investigative tools. These investigations involve three stages in the critical practice of a transitional culture, according to Halévy (2010):

First of all, the *deconstruction* of the structures that have become obsolete, such as the nation-state, the speculative capitalism, the rationalist and laic education, the Cartesian methodologies etc. Secondly, the *refoundation* of the new paradigm pillars; these bases, for us, are the cognitive, the creative and the qualitative (all three in the broader and richer sense of the word). Thirdly, *construction* of structures that are radically different from the previous ones, both in nature and in architecture and level of complexity, which will be much superior in relation to the fairly simpleton and simplistic world where we live in today (HALÉVY, 2010, p. 245, emphasis in the original).

It is worth to notice that this essay fits the *deconstruction* stage. That is, it aims at analyzing the need for an effective deconstruction of the framework that composes creative economy. Therefore, in terms of methodology, the work is divided as follows:

- The complexity paradigm;
- Creative economy;
- The traditional culture industry facing the complexity;
- The emergence of creative economies;
- Final considerations.

## **COMPLEXITY PARADIGM**

The pandemic has shown the complexity that is intrinsic to society. By revealing the illusion of an orderly, predictable, linear world, it collapsed to its effective configuration, the complexity paradigm. According to Waldrop (1992), complexity refers to a type of dynamic behavior that is eternally surprising and unpredictable. “To understand what happens and what will happen in the world, it is necessary to be sensitive to ambiguity” (MORIN, 2013, p. 9). Therefore, this topic aims at discussing what the complexity paradigm is and the urgency of creative economy adjusting to it.

In fact, its apprehension shows that it can determine a complete revision of management models, creative processes and work activities. Therefore, it is possible to observe the need for a principle that can explain the world, society, culture, the ordinary social practice not so much of a principle of simplification, but mostly of a complexity paradigm.

It is clear there is no “complexity paradigm” in the market. But what appears here and there, in the science field, is a problematic of complexity, based on the consciousness of non-eliminability of what was eliminated in the classic conception of intelligibility; this problematic should encourage a search for the adequate modes of intelligibility for this conjuncture (MORIN, 2005, p. 331).

Therefore, one evidence of this complexity problematic can be explained by the consequences of modernity. One of the consequences is “the clear rhythm of change that the modernity era sets in motion [...] the speed of change in modern conditions is extreme” (GIDDENS, 1991, p. 15). Another evidence is “*the scope of change*. When different areas of the globe are interconnected, waves of social transformation virtually penetrate through the surface of the Earth” (GIDDENS, 1991, p. 15-16, emphasis in the original). According to Appadurai (2003), it only takes a first contact with the facts of the modern world to notice that it is now an interactive system in a surprisingly new sense. Yes, the world today involves interactions of new order and intensity.

It is an urgent task for cultural philosophy to develop a conceptual model that allows to comprehend the current cultural dynamic. The hybrid “in-between” concept of Bhabha in fact liquefies the essentialist concept of culture to a certain level. But it is still excessively motionless, dialectic, for the description of the cultural, hyper cultural process of today (HAN, 2019, p. 51).

This perspective becomes clear, especially as a result of the influence of reflections about disruption, in which hyper culture includes the entire society. Hyper culture, in the condition of deinteriorized, rootless and relocated culture, is related in multiple rhizomatic senses. There are rhizomatic passages between subcultural and cultural structures, between margins and centers, between temporary concentrations and renewed dispersions (HAN, 2019, p. 54-55). This is how the concept of complexity emerges — “the challenge of globality is a challenge for complexity” (MORIN, 2013, p. 13). It is observed that this rise is given by extreme and fast changes that are not only local, but especially global. Therefore, “complexity, that is, multiplicity, confusion, disorder mixed with order, the increase of singularities, all that is just appearance” (MORIN, 2005, p. 211).

Therefore, the complexity paradigm investigates what is involved in that appearance and its consequences. “I call complexity paradigm the set of principles of intelligibility that, connected with each other, could determine the conditions of a complex vision of the universe (physical, biological, anthroposocial)” (MORIN, 2005, p. 330). Then, inside it new data stand out and make us change our vision. Because

of that, we will be led to finding new restructuring principles about how to think and act. "I believe complexity favors the action, since it provides the measure of true risks and real opportunities" (MORIN, 2013, p. 26). In this paradigm, the combinations are somehow multiple. So, being established in it requires configurations of management, which are gathered so they do not assimilate themselves as anachronic. "The great transition marks an era of uncertainty and vertiginous change, without a defined direction. It can at most capture incipient virtual trends, which will or will not become concrete in the future" (ABRANCHES, 2017, p. 29).

The word *complexity* comes from "*complexus* — what is 'composed' together. The universe of phenomena is inseparably composed of order, disorder and organization" (MORIN, 2005, p. 215). Therefore, it is not a surprise that these elements are part of an inevitable game of the context which we live in. So, the pandemic should have been thought as part of that game; however, the difficulty of a complex view in an industrial society is a fact. "With it [complexity], the society of knowledge and creation will replace the old industrial, capitalist society, now dying. It is not about an ideological aspiration, but radical overcoming" (HALÉVY, 2010, p. 20).

In fact, in this industrial society the frontiers and demarcation of existence are constantly learned as being accurate and organized, thus obstructing the perception of companies, professionals and governments for the idea of complexity itself.

Therefore, we see the idea of complexity emerge more. It does not reside in the replacement of ambiguity, uncertainty and contradiction with clarity, certainty, determination and coherence. It resides in its need for coexistence, interaction and mutual work. (MORIN, 2015, p. 430).

In this sense, previous learning succumbs to that era. "Nowadays the door opens to a new field, which asks for new tools, new methods, new concepts so that men can fully take over this real and native complexity of the world which they know, today, they are a part of" (HALÉVY, 2010, p. 54-55). And, so to speak, to the need for eco-organization.

Thus, the supreme virtue of eco-organization appears: it is not stability, but the aptitude to build new stabilities; it is not the return to balance, but the aptitude of reorganization to reorganize itself in new ways, under the effect of new disorganization. In other words, eco-organization is able to evolve under the disturbing irruption of the new, and this evolutionary aptitude is what allows life not only to survive, but also develop itself, or develop itself for survival (MORIN, 2015, p. 51).

According to Morin (2015), the context of this complexity paradigm contemplates: freedoms, great autonomy of individuals, doubts, questions, multiple communications, tolerance to disorder, detours, major evolutionary possibilities and decentralization. In this context, it is necessary to acknowledge, however, the disturbing irruption of the new and the diversity. "Let's remember that diversity, which causes horror to all homogenizing rationalizations, is a source of evolution, development and complexity" (MORIN, 2015, p. 454).

In fact, the obligatoriness of now thinking based on the consequences of order and disorder stands out. According to Morin (2005), the consequence of order is stability, regularity, repetition, coherence, predictability. By the way, this is how industrial society was established. The author assumes, however, that when the consequences of disorder are apprehended, new management models come up and are obligated to them, joining the complexity paradigm, since disorder, according to Morin (2005), involves: irregularities, inconstancy, instability, agitation, dispersion, collision, accidents, possibility and chance. In this sense, order and disorder structure the configuration of an organization, in which one does not rule out the other. On the contrary, one is promoted by the existence of the other.

Creative economy, according to the complexity paradigm, aims at apprehending, therefore, that the world of ideas does not only bear the orderly and linear organizational nucleus, which rules and controls its production modes. The world of ideas needs to be thought taking complexity into account.

I mean, above all, that the simplest idea also needs a formidable bio-anthropological complexity and sociocultural hypercomplexity. Talking about complexity is, as we have observed, talking about simultaneously complementary, concurrent, antagonistic, recursive and hologrammatic relationship between these instances that are co-generators of knowledge (MORIN, 2011, p. 23).

The democratization of access to modes of production, encouraged by the web 2.0, prescribes the dialogic of opinions and individual creativities. So, the axiomatic domination of traditional culture industries is retracted. The dialogic of individual creativities introduces the anarchic and the unpredictability of plurality. "The conjunction of plurality, trade, conflict, dialogue, heat, constitutes high cultural complexity (MORIN, 2011, p. 35). This causes agitation and disorder to traditional industries. Therefore, it disrupts its functioning, weakening and changing the modes of production and the consumption of symbolic goods, even if in an incipient manner.

In this transitional world, as if the increase of economic, social and political complexity were not enough, with its profound destabilizing effect, we are also at the first stage of a long and transformative scientific and technological revolution. This revolution will cause several disruptive effects, but with unpredictable direction, in our entire economic, social and political life (ABRANCHES, 2017, p. 39).

So, breaches and detours in that industrial production mode begin. "There are situations in which detours are recognized [greeted] as 'originality, and then, despite being an exception to the rule, they benefit from an elitist statute that rises it above the rules" (MORIN, 2011, p. 38). Then, it would be as if individual creativity, of the ordinary social practice, could take on the role of a recognized and greeted *creative detour*, thus reaching the *status* of a new creative paradigm. Therefore, creatives that are extrinsic to that traditional

cultural industry assume as much (or more) influence as those creatives in traditional culture. So, individual creativity would be able to use the validity of these new technologies as a potency for autonomy, beyond its ordinary social practice. "More and more, the possibilities of motion for collective attention are diversified and more fluid. [...] The negative, the rest, the disgust, the forbidden, all we did not want leaves the shadows [...]. Everything ends up being expressed" (LÉVY, 2000, p. 117).

Therefore, it is not a surprise that such a fact encourages ruptures and detours that may evolve to radical contestation, capable of resulting in the engendering of new modes of production, circulation and consumption of symbolic goods.

The onset of concepts of complexity and cosmic evolution, conjugated with the development of [technologies of information and communication] TICs, causes the germination of the noosphere, this new "layer" that covers the Earth with knowledge and spirit. This germination, then, promotes the noetics revolution, which is the passage from the "modern" era to the noetic era, from the industrial society to the knowledge society. This revolution leads to deep questioning in all areas of human intellectuality (HALÉVY, 2010, p. 318).

It is important to mention, in effect, a new symbolic creative order. "Sometimes, a small breach in determinism is enough, allowing the emergence of an innovative detour, or caused by a crisis abscess, to create the initial conditions of a transformation that may, eventually, become deep" (MORIN, 2011, p. 39).

Then, it is necessary to assume that the complexity paradigm manifests itself in the imminence of disruptive innovation. So, a creative economy that can integrate a management model that also promotes such innovation is necessary. The complexity paradigm is established as an *atmosphere of rising differences*, therefore, of potential deviant creativities, which rebel themselves in their creative ways.

The permissiveness of cyberspace empowers the exchange of ideas while refuting institutionalized ideas. "The softening of the norm enables the expression of spirits that were already secretly autonomous and allows the potential detours to be updated" (MORIN, 2011, p. 36).

Therefore, it is an atmosphere according to which instability and mutation prevail. So, the rigid creative determinism collapses to such detours, instabilities and mutations. Therefore, it is observed that complexity enables experimentation of several insertions. "The exchange of ideas leads to the weakening of dogmatism and intolerance, which results in their own growth" (MORIN, 2011, p. 34). In fact, the diversity of points of view inhibits a creative pattern of establishment and institutionalization. The complexity paradigm, therefore, shows the emergence of a *deviant creativity* in its possibilities of autonomy. In this autonomy, a dialogical game of pluralisms, of the multiplication of breaches and ruptures in the existing creative determinations is intrinsic. So, the deviating creativity is capable of pointing out to the emergence of new creative paradigms, which can weaken the institutionalized creativity.

Our human world has reached such a size, volume and complexity that we are faced with a terrible threshold effect: either we change our way of living and overcome it, or we do not change enough and disappear into a random cataclysm. It is no longer about reform, progress, improvements or corrections. It is about radical rupture, deep mutation, metamorphosis (HALÉVY, 2010, p. 163-164).

In this context, creative economy must be reflected upon. That is, new ways of thinking are involved, as well as new work models, new languages and the engendering of unprecedented formats. "It is no surprise that current human languages have so much difficulty translating the complexity of real!" (HALÉVY, 2010, p. 195). Therefore, the framework that composes creative economy is inserted in a pressing *deconstruction*.

We live in a period in which events take place in a non-linear manner and growing acceleration. The occurrences are mostly unpredictable. The examination of these mutations informs us that society from the XXI century, in all aspects, will not only be an update of the society in the XX century, a linear evolution from it. It will be a radical rupture with history from the XX century. Nothing will stay the same (ABRANCHES, 2017, p. 342).

Therefore, we rescued the first stage of criticism towards a transitional culture, listed in the introduction, this being the stage of *deconstruction*. In it, the objective is to analyze the need for an effective deconstruction of the creative economy framework in order to check the existence of traces of obsolescence. Despite its prelude character, it shows that such a perspective will embrace further studies.

## **CREATIVE ECONOMY**

The research and encouragement of creative economy are seen as power to the nations, whose goal is to promote social, economic and cultural development in the local, regional, national and international scopes. "The object of creative economy ends up including elements that are connected to creativity in its broader sense, going through publicity, technologies of information and communication (TICs), and even some areas of scientific evolution" (VILIATI; CORAZZA; FLORISSI, 2022, p. 141). Therefore, this conception proposes a privileged articulation between the principles of creativity, innovation, and complexity.

Knowing that complexity generates a dense and inextricable mesh of interactions that are often imperceptible, which connect everything to everything and found concrete solidarity and fraternity between everything there is. It favors the onset of new complexifications in all layers of life. To dare working with every combination, miscegenation, all possible harmonic arrangements, to generate the new, the unprecedented, the unheard-of (HALÉVY, 2010, p. 167).

As stated by Hartley (2005), creativity will be the vector of social and economic change in the next century. However, it is important to mention that "when we talk about creative economy, we do not mean the economy that suddenly becomes creative, but that original forms of creativity take over an important place and could

ensure future development” (GREFFE, 2015, p. 17). Such creativity behaves as strategy, which is better integrated with the complexity of society.

In *Culture, Economy and Politics: the case of New Labour* (2015), the group of researchers emphatically wrote about the importance of relationships established between the identification of a sector assigned as “creative economy” and the ambitions of economic growth within the policies of the “New” Labor Party after the late 1990s. The association between the investment in creative industries and economic growth proved its resilience in the following years, so the development of industrial strategy, after 2017, was explicitly based on much evidence and many arguments developed in the late 1990s and early 2000s. (SHIACH, 2023, p. 15).

Therefore, this conception proposes an articulation between creativity, innovation and complexity, which allowed companies and governments to give fast responses to contemporary uncertainties.

So, creative economy appears as a new way to face the sources of economic development, displaying a unifying problematic that surpasses the purely sectoral interpretations and points out the role of a cross-sectional value: the aptitude for creativity (GREFFE, 2015, p. 15).

To complement this definition, the Creative Economy Report from the **United Nations** Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (Unesco) determines creative economy as

a concept in evolution based on creative assets that are potentially generators of economic development. It stimulates income generation, the creation of jobs and revenues of exportation, while promoting social inclusion, cultural diversity and human development (*apud* VILIATI; CORAZZA; FLORISSI, 2022, p. 140).

Therefore, the artistic activity imposes itself as a management model for economy. It is important to mention, in effect, that the symbolic modes of production, circulation and consumption start being managed with the support of art, technology and innovation. “The artistic activity is, by excellence, an activity of creation, a laboratory in which the artist can identify challenges, looking for ways to respond to them considering their cultural heritage, proposing a solution and trying to legitimize it” (GREFFE, 2015, p. 34).

It is observed that this scenario puts the market of symbolic goods in a management model that is open to apprehending the chaos and the disorder as a creative emergence. With that in mind, “in 2016, there was the publication *A Strategy for Creative Scotland*, which represented a distinct involvement with nature and the potential of creative industries in Scotland” (SHIACH, 2023, p. 19). In it, they expressively changed the taxonomy about what the creative industries are. They argued that creative industries have the ability to create value for other entrepreneurial sectors. It is worth mentioning the claim of generating broader forms of cultural and social value while increasing the reach of creative economy itself.

The classic means of communication and cultural industries prior to cyber-culture already structured, in their own manner, a dynamic organization of ideas, images, emotions and indicators of group attention. But this was a gross, worn-out organization, with too much circularity, closure and sterile self-reference (LÉVY, 2000, p. 116).

In fact, digital economy, evoked by post-industrial society, leads to new dynamics in the process of production, circulation and consumption of symbolic goods. According to Zuboff (2021), the belief of digital innovation soon became the language of disruption and an obsession with speed, with campaigns conducted with the thematic of “creative destruction”. This famous and fateful expression, coined by the evolutionary economist Joseph Schumpeter, was appropriated as a way to legitimize what the Silicon Valley calls, as an euphemism, “innovation without permission”. It is observed that such a *creative destruction* guides us to that critical stage of *deconstruction*, in a transitional culture, evoked by the complexity paradigm. The objective is criticism regarding the necessary transition towards the complexity paradigm of the industry models, which compose the creative economy framework.

## TRADITIONAL CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

These preliminaries sketch the framework of traditional cultural industries:

The definition of the [Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport] DCMS distinguishes thirteen industries that constitute creative functions: 1. publicity; 2. architecture; 3. arts and antiques; 4. craftwork; 5. *design*; 6. *fashion design*; 7. film production; 8. *leisure software engineering*; 9. music; 10. *performing arts*; 11. editing; 12. *Software engineering*; 13. Radio and television. It is important to mention that this definition uses an industrial classification, and not by professions. This approach was widely resumed and enabled the support for recent reflections about the role of cultural industries (GREFFE, 2015, p. 19).

It is possible to observe that such a scenario is configured based on a management model of an industrial society. Apparently, its characteristics present themselves as follows: standardization and rationalization of cultural forms; work/product as an exchange value; pre-established formulas; stereotyped themes; exclusion of the new to prevent risks. The observation is that these traditional culture industries are much more inserted in a cultural economy. “Currently, Unesco, in its ‘Creative Economy Report’, defines culture economy as: [...] the application of economic analysis to all creative and performing arts, heritage, cultural, public or private industries” (VILIATI; CORAZZA; FLORISSI, 2022, p. 140). It is worth mentioning, therefore, the establishment based on already consolidated formats, besides an industrial organization, which implies protection against disorder and chaos. It is indispensable to consider that such a configuration justifies itself so that it can be contemplated with cultural policies and governmental and private investments.

In other words, organization and order result in a principle of selection that reduces the possible occurrences of disorder, increase in space and time their possibilities of survival and/or development and allow to build, under the form of diffuse and abstract general improbability, a local, temporary, concrete and concentrated probability (MORIN, 2016, p. 107).

The description of the scenario in which work methodologies are managed by organization and order fits a perspective of annulling any possibility of disorganization and chaos. Therefore, such a perspective completely ignores the complexity paradigm. In fact, it is observed that the industrial management model is configured by predictability, linearity and repetition of its activities. "The prevalence of repetitive order smothers any possibility of internal diversity and translates itself in the poorly organized and poorly emerging systems" (MORIN, 2016, p. 147). In this sense, creative processes enter an innovative ostracism. "Whereas emergencies make the phenomenal qualities of systems blossom, organizational constrictions immerse the inhibited, repressed and compressed characters in the level of parts in a world of silence" (MORIN, 2016, p. 159).

This perspective becomes clear especially because of the influence of reflections around products, which are engendered for consumption. In fact, when audiovisual is observed, the products that arouse surround the same genres, shapes and themes. In television, new products are rarely shown. "Simplification reifies, that is, hides the relativity of system, subsystem, suprasystem notions etc. Simplification dissolves the organization and the system" (MORIN, 2016, p. 179-180). Therefore, the regulation, functionality, rigid control, internal programming and the production of copies follow pre-established models. It is necessary to assume, then, that such a simplification establishes itself as a requirement of the industrial model.

These aspects refer to what, in biological or social organization, is founded in the division and specialization of work, in the regulation, functionality etc., excluding and hiding everything that is "noise", disorders, "freedoms", all that is non-functional and excludes any type of creativity (MORIN, 2016, p. 220).

As opposed to the belief that any organization and order engenders a status of progress, thinking about complexity requires to meddle in the disorder and chaos, and mostly, in contingent events. Therefore:

The mass production of professional content, which is laborious and expensive in the case of the Hollywood model, requires high and planned investment considering excessive uncertainty. Nowadays, creative contents are more diversified and often produced by amateurs: they are freely available, sometimes at no cost, and define a new productive model that can be described as Hollyweb (Grefe and Sonnac, 2008) (GREFFE, 2015, p. 56-57).

Therefore, here we see the Hollywood model as one of an industrial society, and Hollyweb as one of a post-industrial society. It is important to mention, in effect, that this quote shows the Hollywood model slowly collapsing in the complexity paradigm.

While the Hollywood model mostly depends on the attempted and tested organic approach, the Hollyweb model depends on an ecological and multimodal approach. While Hollywood spectators consist mostly of consumers, Hollyweb viewers consist mostly of artists, designers, game crea-

tors, trend makers and spectators in general. While the Hollywood model tends to present a concrete and unified product, the Hollyweb prefers “leaner”, “disentangled” contents that can be customized or adapted by the user himself. While it is difficult to develop diversity from the perspective of Hollywood, it is an intrinsic trace of the Hollyweb model. Besides, while the Hollywood model is subjected to the tyranny of best-sellers and blockbusters, the Hollyweb model stimulates the distillation and dissemination of microcultures, originating a cybereconomy that will enable anyone to be a consumer, if not systematically a producer, of anything they want (GREFFE, 2015, p. 57).

The complexity paradigm leads the traditional culture industry to overcome the industrial management model to assume a displacement towards a management model that is more integrated with the contingencies of complexity. By circumscribing in its bulge, in an ever more intense manner, it is possible to see that the traditional culture industry needs to rethink its mode of production, circulation and consumption of symbolic goods.

The post-pandemic world will be deeply challenging in this sense: to understand how short-term changes caused by the crisis will be transferred as socioeconomic changes for life, defining the new normal. It is a fact that the winning parties of cultural and creative industries that compose the environment of cultural economy and belong to the “old normal” will resist any change. [...] Would this be the time when arts and culture can take a central position in the strategies to develop the “new normal”? (VALIATI, 2022, p. 16-17).

The complexity paradigm shows that the industrial model provokes a managerial anachronism facing the contemporary uncertainties. “All of that can lead to specific ways to manage, as emphasizes the usual expression, *new business models*” (GREFFE, 2015, p. 85, emphasis in the original). Well, it is clear that the warning for such a traditional cultural industry has been consolidated with the pandemic. It is worth mentioning that the field that concentrated more creatives was the most affected one by the uncertainties of the pandemic. This perspective becomes clear when management itself must be creative. “Creativity is clear in the invention of an institution or innovative reorganization with its own emergencies” (MORIN, 2020, p. 59).

It is worth noting that we are not at all questioning the quality of the products created by those industries. It is important to acknowledge, however, the consequences caused by the pandemic in that same industry. That is, up to what point does the configuration of production, circulation and consumption of the symbolic goods of these industries subsist to the consequences coming from complexity? It would mean, then, to be aware that we are inserted in a new social, economic and cultural configuration.

## **CREATIVE INDUSTRIES AND COMPLEXITY**

From the perspective of this paper, there is the need for an evolutionary process from traditional cultural industries to creative industries, so that creative economy can be established through the complexity paradigm. The industrial management

model has succumbed to the uncertainties caused by the pandemic. When society dislocated from an industrial to a post-industrial paradigm, the need for this industry to start its transformation also seems to be important.

In this topic, we aim at apprehending the configuration of creative industries and outlining up to what point they coadunate with the complexity paradigm. Therefore, we start with the origin of the expression *creative industries*.

The term creative industries came with the arrival and victory of the New Labour Party in the United Kingdom, in 1997. To reactivate British economy, the Blair administration points out to the strategic importance of these industries, which, at first, are pretty close to cultural industries, but will be rapidly defined by its capacity of producing intellectual property, considered as the new motto of global economy (GREFFE, 2015, p. 18).

Then, it is necessary to assume that creative industries are different from cultural industries in the sense that they no longer just produce culture, but begin to *create culture*. In practice, they start to engender inedited formats. “‘Creative industries’ is a new analytical definition of the industrial components of economy in which creativity is an input, and the content or intellectual property is the result” (POTTS; CUNNINGHAM, 2023, p. 109). The trigger of creative industries is the innovation in the field of arts and culture, and, therefore, in other segments.

The economic value of creative industries can go beyond the manifest production of cultural goods or the employment of creative people, thus playing a more general role by boosting and facilitating the process of change in the entire economy, as shown by its dynamic parameters and level of incorporation in the broader economy (POTTS; CUNNINGHAM, 2023, p. 109).

In fact, when inserting innovation, the possibility of dilating the field of comprehension of culture and art itself, but especially of creative economy itself, is established. Therefore, “in the beginning, it was the mobilization of cultural talents. Then, it was the acknowledgement of intellectual property, because all of these activities had the common characteristics of producing copyrights, or, in rarer cases, patents” (GREFFE, 2015, p. 18).

It is imperative to clarify the ongoing evolutionary process of cultural industries towards creative industries.

It is essentially about cultural industries that mostly knew how to make progress in any conjuncture, and to which the almost cultural industries can be added, that is, industries in which the cultural goods are not mobilized to produce cultural goods per se, but products whose cultural dimension is beside its traditional, functional or utility dimension, such as fashion, architecture, games, publicity etc. And finally, to that we add software production, which then broadly surpasses the previous field of reality and provides essential amplitude to this movement (GREFFE, 2015, p. 17).

It is important to highlight that this movement can be ratified by the emergence of creative industries such as YouTube, Facebook, Instagram, TikTok, WhatsApp and

Netflix. In this sense, they amplify the very own range of creative economy, thus inserting creativity in an economic perspective. Then the expression *creative economy*.

The economic perspective of creativity is deeply marked by the vision of Schumpeter. For him, innovation is the central concept, that is, the ability to put new ideas, products or processes in the market. This discussion about innovation has emphasized the role of a strategic party – the entrepreneur – as someone who simultaneously take risks and organizes (GREFFE, 2015, p. 43).

Then, it is no surprise that the challenge of traditional cultural industries, of turning into creative industries, is in their ability to innovate. In other words, up to what point can the theater, the television, the cinema etc. create innovative and disruptive formats? How can publicity create patents for new publicity formats, which escapes the formats offered by means of communication?

If it is important to highlight the development potential of industries who directly produce intellectual property – because their payment will increase with the use of goods who are incorporated to it, and not only its first sale –, it is hard to tell that these are the only creative industries (GREFFE, 2015, p. 20).

So, creativity in creative industries is not only about content production, but especially about intellectual property and patents. In this sense, the very concept of creativity is resignified. This transformation not only adjusts to a post-industrial society, but also establishes itself as a strategy that fits the complexity paradigm, whereas new creative explorations are shown, which are capable of dealing with contingency events of such a complexity.

Therefore, creative industries can be understood as a type of industrial entrepreneurship which operates on the consumer side of economy. And, in that case, we are dealing with an evolutionary model of creative industries. [...] Specifically, this is the same model proposed for the effect of science, education, and technology in the approach of national innovation systems. Creative industries, according to this view, originate and coordinate changes in the base of knowledge of the economy (POTTS; CUNNINGHAM, 2023, p. 117-118).

Well, these changes would not take place only based on the knowledge of economy, especially transmutations in the base of cultural knowledge and creativity itself. Then, it would be the case of creative industries configuring themselves through the trace of disruption. However, it could be possible that, at the end of that path, something like dissidence from conservatives would be observed. Conservatives not for being concerned about preserving traditions, but mostly for being worried about refuting any possibility of the emergence of a new cultural tradition.

The nature of major transitions is undetermined and non-deterministic. There is margin for society to fail and for structural collapse. The possibility of conservative reactions, which prevent the emergence or the conso-

Validation of more creative and innovative options for the crisis-crisis cycle of transition, is real and may constitute one of the greatest risks of this structural transformation process (ABRANCHES, 2017, p. 375).

It is really not only about acknowledging the challenge that complexity brings to creative economy. It is also necessary to try and establish *principles of intelligibility* that are convenient for this complexity. From the perspective of this study, therefore, creative industries, based on the complexity paradigm, require *complex thinking* as a *principle of intelligibility*. In the immediate context, complex thinking apprehends the *ecology of action*. "It means that every human action, when initiated, escapes from the hands of its initiator and enters the game of multiple interactions that is part of society, which deviates it from its objective and, sometimes, gives it an opposite destination in relation to what was expected" (MORIN, 2005, p. 128). So, attentive thinking for deviations not as a flaw, but as this deviating creative autonomy can create innovation for creative economy itself.

This is how complex thinking requires *assimilating plurality*, which is established as essential context for such an objective of complex thinking. It is observed that plurality promotes disorder and chaos, which compose a field of possibilities for creative detours. "The richer the organizational complexity, the more possibilities, so, there is the danger of crisis, and the system becomes more capable of overcoming its crisis, and even of taking advantage of them for its development" (MORIN, 2016, p. 154). In a complex and extremely diversified ecosystem, as established in contemporary society, a management of creative industries configured by this complexity and diversity is required. Well, such a complex and diversified ecosystem is lacking in traditional culture industries, especially in the scope of management. In fact, this configuration potentializes uncertainty. At the same time, "uncertainty is stimulating because it summons chance and strategy" (MORIN, 2013, p. 27).

Uncertainties and risks are not only gaps and void in knowledge; they are their stimulators; they stimulate attention, surveillance, curiosity, restlessness, which stimulate the fundament of cognitive strategies, that is, ways of knowing through the uncertain, the imprecision, the risk. They are exactly the uncertainty and ambiguity, and not the certainty and univocity, which favor the development of intelligence (MORIN, 2015, p. 81).

Therefore, creative industries cannot be apart from uncertainties nor from the risks of the multiplicities of society, culture and ordinary social practice. A space for dichotomy, ambivalence, heterogeneity, which is configured by decantation, with deterritorialized flows. An open, connectable and mutable territory. A territory of detours.

The *deviant anarchy* also composes the framework of such a *complex thinking*. "Anarchy is not non-organization, but the organization that is made based on synergic associations-interactions between computing beings, without the need for command or control to come from a superior level" (MORIN, 2015, p. 352-353). Therefore, complex thinking does not reject diversity, autonomy, freedom, ambiguity nor uncertainty, under penalty of becoming anachronistic thinking. Sennett (1996)

states that we need to apprehend a new context of disorder and diversity because excessive order paralyzes individuals. The incorporation of anarchy, diversity and disorder causes a response for that individual to deal with changes and the complexity of life.

Then it is important to understand that rationalization prevents the flow of creative detours, and, therefore, the emergence of the new. "The innovative individual is, inevitably, a lawbreaker, willing to break barriers and frontiers, to be placed at the margin of what is established, of hegemonic thinking" (ABRANCHES, 2017, p. 95). For the same reason, normalization obstructs the strange, the chaos and the disorder from being investigated, preventing them from revealing the news that is intrinsic to its configuration. "For that, we need to understand that the revolution of today happens not so much in the field of good or real ideas, which are opposite in a fight of life or death against bad and fake ideas, but in the field of complexity in the way of organizing ideas" (MORIN, 2011, p. 292). Therefore, thinking about creative economy based on the complexity paradigm means to establish convenient principles of intelligibility for that complexity, in order to apprehend complexity in the way of organizing ideas.

## **FINAL CONSIDERATIONS**

The study shows that creative economy, by the complexity paradigm, starts with the criticism towards a transitional culture. For that, our analysis is in accordance with the three stages proposed by Halévy (2010), which are *deconstruction*, *refoundation* and *construction*. Such an incorporation reflects the ratification of a promising path concerning the perception of creative economy through the complexity paradigm. The *deconstruction*, focus of this essay, tries to become apart from anachronic practices.

These preliminaries outlined some points to be deconstructed, without covering everything about the matter. Among them, the industrial management model and the understanding about creativity and the creative process. So, it could verify if the very understanding about creativity, from industries and traditional culture, has become obsolete in face of such a complexity; or if it is urgent to revise what a creative process means. Then, generalities through which the deconstruction of traces of obsolescence may appear were searched for. So, while creativity lets go of the ties and oppression from an analogical communication ecosystem and inserts itself in unpredictable mechanisms, insubordinate to a digital communication ecosystem, the very concept of creativity is reconfigured. Then, it is important to understand the need to go deeper and the extension of the *deconstructing* process of the framework that composes creative economy.

By circumscribing in its bulge, in an ever more intense manner, it is possible to observe the passage to the stage of refoundation in cognitive, creative and qualitative pillars, in a character of complexity. The search for new theoretical explorations around the creation of a creativity in complexity and a cultural and creative management in complexity is noted. In effect, we reach the stage of construction, which will

engender creative economy by being integrated with a complexity paradigm, with the *construction* of structures that are radically different from the existing ones.

## REFERENCES

- ABRANCHES, S. **A era do imprevisito**: a grande transição do século XXI. São Paulo: Companhia das Letras, 2017.
- APPADURAI, A. **Modernity at large**: cultural dimensions of globalization. Mineápolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003.
- CORSANI, A. Elementos de uma ruptura: hipótese do capitalismo cognitivo. *In*: COCCO, G.; PATEZ, G.; SILVA, G. (org.). **Capitalismo cognitivo**: trabalho, redes e inovação. Rio de Janeiro: DP&A, 2003. p. 15-32.
- DAVIS, S.; MEYER, C. **Blur**: a velocidade da mudança na economia integrada. Rio de Janeiro: Campus, 1999.
- GIDDENS, A. **As consequências da modernidade**. São Paulo: Editora da Unesp, 1991.
- GREFFE, X. **A economia artisticamente criativa**: arte, mercado, sociedade. São Paulo: Iluminuras/Itaú Cultural, 2015.
- HAN, B.-C. **Hiperculturalidade**: cultura e globalização. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2019.
- HALÉVY, M. **A era do conhecimento**: princípios e reflexões sobre a noética no século XXI. São Paulo: Editora da Unesp, 2010.
- HARTLEY, J. (org.). **Creative industries**. Oxford: Blackwell, 2005.
- LÉVY, P. **Filosofia world**: o mercado, o ciberespaço, a consciência. Lisboa: Instituto Piaget, 2000.
- MORIN, E. **Ciência com consciência**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2005.
- MORIN, E. **Conhecimento, ignorância, mistério**. Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2020.
- MORIN, E. Entender o mundo que nos espera. *In*: MORIN, E.; VIVERET, P. (org.). **Como viver em tempos de crise?** Rio de Janeiro: Bertrand Brasil, 2013. p. 7-27.
- MORIN, E. **O método 1**: a natureza da natureza. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2016.
- MORIN, E. **O método 2**: a vida da vida. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2015.
- MORIN, E. **O método 4 as ideias**: *habitat*, vida, costumes. Porto Alegre: Sulina, 2011.
- POTTS, J.; CUNNINGHAM, S. Quatro modelos de indústrias criativas. *In*: VALIATI, L. (org.). **Economia da cultura e indústrias criativas**: políticas públicas, evidências e modelos. São Paulo: Itaú Cultural; WMF Martins Fontes, 2023.
- SENNETT, R. **The uses of disorder**: personal identity and city life. Londres: Faber and Faber, 1996.
- SHIACH, M. Um “acordo setorial” e um precariado criativo: moldando a política de economia criativa no Reino Unido desde 2010. *In*: VALIATI, L. (org.). **Economia da cultura e indústrias criativas**: políticas públicas, evidências e modelos. São Paulo: Itaú Cultural; WMF Martins Fontes, 2023. p. 13-31.
- VALIATI, L. (org.). **Economia da cultura e indústrias criativas**: fundamentos e evidências. São Paulo: Itaú Cultural; WMF Martins Fontes, 2022.
- VAN DIJCK, J. **La cultura de la conectividad**: una historia crítica de las redes sociales. Buenos Aires: Siglo Veintiuno, 2016.
- VALIATI, L.; CORAZZA, R. I.; FLORISSI, S. O marco teórico-conceitual da economia da cultura e da economia criativa: uma revisão de contribuições selecionadas e de seus pressupostos. *In*: VALIATI, L. (org.). **Economia da cultura e indústrias criativas**: fundamentos e evidências. São Paulo: Itaú Cultural; WMF Martins Fontes, 2022. p. 113-161.

WALDROP, M. M. **Complexity**: the emerging science at the edge of order and chaos. Nova York: Touchstone, 1992.

ZUBOFF, S. **A era do capitalismo de vigilância**: a luta por um futuro humano na nova fronteira de poder. Rio de Janeiro: Intrínseca, 2021.

### **About the authors**

**Romilson Marco dos Santos**: PhD in Communication and Semiotics at Pontifícia Universidade Católica de São Paulo.

**Conflict of interests**: nothing to declare – **Funding**: none.

