

THEN: NOW

Reflections on a decade of collaboration between academia
and the creative and cultural sectors in London

Edited by Evelyn Wilson and Peter Mitchell

The
**Culture
Capital**
exchange

Inspiring Collaboration

CONTENTS

FOREWORD

EVELYN WILSON AND SUZIE LEIGHTON	2
----------------------------------	---

ORIGINS

BARRY IFE	HOW IT ALL BEGAN	4
KATHERINE BOND	PIONEERING ENGAGEMENT WITH THE ARTS & CULTURAL SECTOR AT KING'S COLLEGE LONDON	6
PETER MITCHELL	INTRINSICALLY INSTRUMENTAL: TEN YEARS OF THE CULTURE CAPITAL EXCHANGE	9

POSSIBILITIES

MARK GRAY	CONSUMING IDEAS: WHY THE ARTS NEEDS UNIVERSITY RESEARCH	12
SHAHIDHA BARI	BRACING FOR IMPACT	14
NADIA-ANNE RICKETTS	WHEN I.P. MET TEXTILES MET MUSIC: BEATWOVEN - A CASE STUDY	16

CHALLENGES

ALISDAIR ALDOUS	CREATIVITY-DRIVEN INNOVATION: THE ROLE OF THE CREATIVE AND CULTURAL INDUSTRIES AND H.E. IN THE UK GROWTH AGENDA	18
PETER CHRISTIAN	WHEN SMALL MEANS SUCCESSFUL	21
JOHN NEWBIGIN	KEEP IT SIMPLE	23

GEOGRAPHIES

HARRIET HAWKINS	MAKING SPACES FOR COLLABORATION: THE CRITICAL GEOGRAPHIES OF 'COMING TOGETHER'	25
RUTH CATLOW	THE NEW AVANT-PRENEURSHIP: ARTISTIC AND ACADEMIC COLLABORATION	28
ANTHONY BOWNE	CAPITAL	30

CONTRIBUTOR BIOGRAPHIES	32
-------------------------	----

FOREWORD

The Culture Capital Exchange (TCCE) is a network of Higher Education Institutions in London that was first established just over a decade ago as part of King's College London, as the London Centre for Arts and Cultural Exchange (LCACE).

When we officially launched in June 2005, we were a two-year funded university project with seven London-based university members, tasked with networking and connecting up the worlds of research, practice and policy for mutual benefit.

Our first decade has gone by incredibly quickly, and to mark this significant milestone we felt it was important to take time away from the usual day-to-day business of producing conferences, festivals, sand-pits, and networking activities to commission this booklet of short papers and essays. We are doing so to celebrate some of the really positive work that has been taking place, to encourage reflection on some key developments in this field in the last decade and also, of course, to shine a light on at least some of the challenges that lie ahead.

Networks are fascinating to grow and indeed to watch growing. They are also, of course, unpredictable and unruly, and they appear to thrive, persist and evolve in all kinds of conditions. Over the last decade, our network has also grown considerably, and often in unexpected ways. We have slowly but steadily grown into a membership-based organisation with thirteen core members

in and around London. Over that time we have been quietly establishing ourselves as a network that connects, brokers and curates relationships at the heart of an increasingly important niche: the interstitial space between Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) and the cultural and creative sectors, where two large and increasingly closely-related complexes of knowledge and creativity meet, talk and work together.

The existing scale and strength of our network, and the energy, trust and goodwill around it, was of key importance when one of our long-term partners, Queen Mary University of London, invited us to collaborate on a proposal to the Arts and Humanities Research Council to set up Creativeworks London. TCCE is a key delivery partner for this ground-breaking initiative which itself boasts an even wider partnership of over forty institutions. Crucially, its establishment has enabled us to support well over one hundred collaborations between academic researchers and small arts and creative companies, across three funding schemes, since 2012.

As I write, we are just launching a brand new initiative, entitled The Exchange, supported

by Arts Council England and Higher Education Funding Council for England. This will support the development of a new tranche of creative collaborations between universities and creative organisations in parts of England beyond the capital. In other words, TCCE is taking its first steps towards becoming a national network.

We are hugely indebted to the tremendous input, energy, support and goodwill of our colleagues, both current and former, as well as those individuals, institutions and organisations who have worked with us over the last decade. Ultimately, it is due to so many key individuals that TCCE has been able to grow and thrive as a network. We are yet further indebted to our colleagues who have so kindly agreed to write for this publication. By doing so, they help us in turn to reflect on the journey so far, speculate on the future, spark new conversations and questions, and, we hope, bring to wider attention some much-needed dialogue on the nature of networking, exchange and collaboration between academia and cultural and creative practitioners and institutions in London in the here and now.

Evelyn Wilson and Suzie Leighton
Co-Directors, The Culture Capital
Exchange

HOW IT ALL BEGAN

As The Culture Capital Exchange celebrates a significant anniversary, it's worth reflecting on the distance travelled by the arts and humanities since the dim, dark days of the late twentieth century; back beyond Higher Education Innovation Funding, back beyond the London Centre for Arts and Cultural Exchange, back even beyond HEROBC.

Remember HEROBC? Higher Education Reach Out to Business and the Community? That all seems so long ago (and so patronising), but the policy decisions that lay behind those initiatives have proven to be both enlightened and far-reaching.

In less than twenty years, 'third stream' funding, as it was then called, has gone from being an optional extra to a way of life, completely embedded in the psyche of higher education. And what is most satisfying is that something that started out as a way of leveraging economic value from STEM disciplines has transformed the way arts, humanities and social sciences work with their communities and stakeholders.

At King's College London, two key developments sparked this transformation during the mid-nineties. One was the setting-up of an enterprise operation under a visionary industry professional – Malcolm Sims. I remember asking Malcolm soon

after he was appointed what he was going to do for arts and social science in the College, and whether he'd thought of marketing teaching as well as research. It so happened that we had a big project ready to go – the chance to bid for the teaching contract for the new Joint Services Command and Staff College at Shrivenham. It was a great opportunity to start to put the A in STEAM, and Malcolm's input was vital to its success.

The other development was the embryonic 'cultural campus' that has since blossomed into the King's Cultural Institute under the inspirational leadership of Deborah Bull. Back in the mid-nineties, we kept noticing how often the South Bank referred to itself as a campus but hadn't thought to include its local university in the mix. So we went on the attack and made contact with every cultural institution within about a mile's radius. We met with a few blank looks, but many of those first contacts have led to world-leading partnerships. The King's / Globe MA in Shakespeare Studies is now

the highest-recruiting programme of its kind in the world. When I moved from King's to the Guildhall School in 2004 it was not just a sentimental attachment to the London Centre for Arts and Cultural Exchange (TCCE's earlier incarnation) that made me campaign to join the group. It seemed to me that a conservatoire and drama school ought to be a prime example of an arts-based partnership model. In many ways, Guildhall had been doing knowledge exchange with cultural institutions since it was founded in 1880. But, as with many other things it did – such as practice-based research – it had no real sense that it was speaking prose. Engaging with some of these more mainstream developments has really helped Guildhall to understand what it's trying to achieve through partnership, and how to manage the 'art of partnership' more effectively.

As a result, our partnerships with the Barbican Centre, its resident and associate orchestras – the London Symphony Orchestra and the BBC Symphony Orchestra – and its five international associate ensembles are widely regarded as world-leading. And two more recent initiatives with the Royal Opera House – a doctoral composer in residence and a Masters in opera making – have brought the best of academia and practice together to extend the art form and support the creation of new work.

So was it serendipity, strategy or simply an eye for the main chance that brought all this about? There was clearly a strategic drive at sector level, but it was important for the arts to get a piece of the action and some of the funding. Perceptions of the power of the creative industries have grown on the back of these developments – and that means hard economic power as well as the soft, reputational, sort. Having 'reached out', the arts, humanities and social sciences are now exchanging knowledge productively with industry peers. Together, we're developing a generation of creative entrepreneurs that would have been unimaginable twenty years ago.

Professor Barry Ife
Principal, Guildhall School of
Music and Drama

PIONEERING ENGAGEMENT WITH THE ARTS & CULTURAL SECTOR AT KING'S COLLEGE LONDON

In 2005 Prince Charles married his life-long love, Tony Blair was elected for an historic third term, the conservatives elected David Cameron as their leader and, no less significant, a new vision for higher education's engagement with the arts and cultural sector was emerging.

At that time, I was working in cultural diplomacy at the Canadian High Commission in London after fifteen years of engagement with the arts as a practitioner, a government policy adviser and educator. The idea of working in a university had not entered my mind: I was committed to the intrinsic value of making art, and to the cultural sector's development as a social, political, economic and creative force for the common good, and this was the sector in which I expected to stay.

However, eight years ago, my interests developed in unexpected ways: in 2007 I was appointed as Business Development Manager, Cultural & Creative Industries, at King's College London. My remit was to promote the university's interaction with the sector as part of a wider higher education effort to find new ways in which academic research and the intellectual capital it represented could inform policy, practice and production beyond the university walls.

At that time King's had a clutch of pioneering collaborations with arts organisations – the English Department's MA in Shakespeare Studies with the Globe Theatre being at the forefront of these – and a small portfolio of doctoral research projects jointly conceived and supervised with museum and heritage organisations. Perhaps inspired by these collaborations, my 'BDM' role was the first of the university's formal posts with a specific remit to identify and broker new interactions with the cultural and creative industries.

I was based in the university's enterprise office 'KCL Enterprises', which was principally science-oriented, being home to the health faculties' knowledge transfer, intellectual property and technology transfer operations. So, if I was not quite a fish out of water, I was certainly a new breed in a well-established pond: forget 'driving innovation in the cultural sector', this post was an innovation in itself.

Though my own already-established networks across London's cultural sector would stand me in good stead for the role, the world of academia was new to me.

I spent many months knocking on academics' doors to explore the potential of research at King's to connect with the cultural sector in new ways. Given the newness of my role, and its experimental nature, I often had to justify its existence and there was, understandably, a certain amount of suspicion about what I was doing, and why. This was, no doubt, largely grounded in a concern about the 'commoditisation of knowledge' and the disruption of the lone-scholar approach to research. However, over the next two years, through trial and error, and the commitment, vision and enthusiasm of key academic colleagues at King's, a new network of academics, artists and arts professionals grew, and a small portfolio of collaborative projects and programmes emerged.

Over this period, The Culture Capital Exchange's previous incarnation, the London Centre for Arts & Cultural Exchange (LCACE), provided a very welcome home for me in which to find peer support, share ideas and develop thinking about the central challenge of the job: how to encourage and support new interactions between academics and arts organisations, professionals and practitioners in a way

that would both enhance research and teaching on the one hand, and inform the development of the cultural sector on the other.

Intensive work brought increasing benefits, and in 2011 we founded the Cultural Institute at King's. Finally, in 2012, the university appointed the former Creative Director of the Royal Opera House, a world-class artist in her own right, to lead Culture at King's. Now Assistant Principal for Culture and Engagement, Deborah Bull has ensured that collaboration with the cultural and creative sector is a strategic priority for King's, sitting at the heart of its academic firmament, and led a further transformative step-change in the university's engagement with arts and cultural sector practitioners, professionals and politicians.

Today, the university's collaboration with the cultural sector is flourishing; dozens of partnerships are now in place with new connections developing every day. These range from relationships with established, national-level organisations such as Southbank Centre, Royal Opera House and the BBC, to newer mid-scale companies such as Roundhouse, Wayne Mc Gregor | Random Dance and Young Vic, to smaller, perhaps edgier enterprises such as Caper, Coney and Fuel: these organisations, and many more, are informing research and

teaching at King's and benefiting in turn from the wealth of new knowledge and expertise offered by the university. The foundation of the Cultural Institute's approach is to develop practical ways in which academic and cultural organisations can exchange their specialist knowledge. The notions of one sector leveraging value from another and vice versa; the university as a civic hub, the research power-house of a region; the imperative to ensure that publicly-funded research, art and culture is democratized by open access; the free flow of ideas and people between organisations and sectors; the need to ensure that the expertise in one sector is informing the development of another – all of this now seems a no-brainer, but in fact it represents, I believe, a seismic shift in higher education, and certainly in its relationship with the cultural and creative sector.

So what about the next ten years?

In the Middle Ages, universities did not have physical facilities to compare with the campus of a modern university. Classes were taught wherever space was available. A university was less a physical space than a group of individuals working together as a *universitas*, a community. My prediction is that over the next ten years, given the seemingly limitless potential for digital technology to connect individuals and communities, higher education will

have come full circle to the ambition – or perhaps necessity – of embedding the benefits of education, research and enquiry across the whole of society. In taking the first transformative steps towards the modern university, the 'ivory tower' is becoming the stuff of fairytales, and traditional knowledge hierarchies reinterpreted in favour of many more new and equal dialogues between academia and the communities that it serves.

Katherine Bond
Director, King's Cultural Institute

INTRINSICALLY INSTRUMENTAL: TEN YEARS OF THE CULTURE CAPITAL EXCHANGE

In 2014 I was lucky enough to secure a position as Creativeworks London researcher-in-residence at The Culture Capital Exchange. My brief was, essentially, to write a reflective history of the organisation as it approached its tenth anniversary; to do the kind of critical stock-taking that the directors of the organisation would have loved to do themselves, had they not been too busy making things happen.

And so I spent a happy few weeks dropping into the office high above Somerset House Courtyard, reading through ten years of meetings, conferences, panels, multimedia events, open views, networking fora and festivals; seminars for media training, career progression, culture industry skills and intellectual property; events in universities, theatres, hospitals, galleries, cinemas, music halls, conservatoires and streets. Around me, as I trawled through the online archive, TCCE's business went on: Evelyn, Suzie, Sally, Neha and George making phone-calls, rattling out endless emails, pacing the tiny floor of their eyrie as they thought and debated and plotted. Every so often I'd go through to the kitchen and be subjected to a convivial grilling by Evelyn, always coming back to some version of the same question: "what are we *doing*?"

Good question.

As I, very much an outsider, came to see it, TCCE had spent a decade making something quite abnormal become normal and being instrumental in the change by which collaboration across the university walls became essential practice for academics and arts practitioners.

Like all historical shifts, this one had a kind of inevitability about it: if TCCE hadn't existed, I kept saying, you'd have had to invent it. I was writing four years into a Coalition government. It seemed that certain assumed contracts about where art, education and academic research came from, and what and who they were for, were dissolving. A few years earlier I'd watched schoolkids and students, furious that their Education Maintenance Allowance had been taken away and their chances of accessing culture and education drastically reduced, fighting off lines of riot police

with polystyrene slabs painted as outsize copies of Fanon, Orwell, Marx and Foucault. Pontificate as we might over the decline of the *universitas* and the problem of selling the humanities to ever-less-indulgent governments, these young people wanted access to what we had badly enough to bleed for it. While we agonised decorously over how to articulate the age-old distinction between intrinsic and instrumental value, a generation was learning that those two concepts don't seem so far apart when a giant copy of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is, quite literally, the last best thing you have to interpose between your skull and a policeman's baton.

It was always like that, though. I work in the history of imperial government: the powerful white men whose letters I spend all day reading construed their education in Seneca and Plato as essential to their being able to steal half the world; they instinctively understood that culture can itself be the stick that cracks skulls. The idea that universities and the wider culture are separate spheres, peering over the academy walls at each other in mutual puzzlement and mistrust, is quite a recent fiction, and an ever more useless one at a time when higher education drives an increasingly generous slice of the economy.

The past ten years' sense of crisis, if nothing else, has at least forced both parties to

begin to tear down that wall, and opened the minds of academics and policy-makers to the kinds of sly and lateral interventions that TCCE, and organisations like it, have begun to make. What TCCE understands instinctively, I think, is that collaborative working not only gives both sides, the artist and the academic, the relative safety of new funding models and increased visibility, but makes the value of both parties' contribution to society – both intrinsic and instrumental – palpable in ways it may not have been before. Academics understand, now, that working extramurally is not so much a necessary outlet for the work they do in the library and seminar room as an intrinsic part of how that work gets done; practitioners in the arts know that universities can offer them not only the security of money or space (and certainly not the indulgence of traditional patronage) but new material, new insight and new ways of doing what they do. The exchanges, far from being linear and unidirectional, can be richly capillary: the lines between research and practice can be blurred without compromising the rigour of the one or the integrity of the other. The benefits, meanwhile, radiate outwards from an academy that's rediscovering its public mission, and a culture sector that's stronger, more secure, more connected and more confident in articulating its worth.

What TCCE knows, too, is that forging these kinds of connections takes enormous amounts of energy and grit. It takes the careful cultivation of networks and creative ecologies, the opening of spaces in which people can meet and break bread and learn to speak each others' languages. And for that to happen, we need organisations like TCCE, and people like the people who work there: pushy in the right places, conciliatory when it's needed; alternately urbane and awkward, as occasion demands; convivial, cheeky, wily and generous.

What happens next is anyone's guess. Organisations that effect structural change often create the conditions of their own obsolescence, but TCCE has proved itself remarkably adaptable thus far. As long as London has its rich creative ecology, TCCE and organisations like it will be pioneering new ways of working, new connections and new engagements.

Pete Mitchell
Postdoctoral Research Fellow,
Sussex University

CONSUMING IDEAS: WHY THE ARTS NEEDS UNIVERSITY RESEARCH

The Arts Council's 2006 document *Arts, Enterprise and Excellence: Strategy for Higher Education* was a short, spare, pithy document, but it articulated something of a revolution in the relationship between arts bodies and higher education.

Amid calls for the arts and higher education to make common cause in widening participation, creating “vibrant communities” and extending Britain’s international cultural impact, it noted that “knowledge transfer is an important part of the successful development of innovation and excellence in the arts and creative industries”.

As I write, one year on from the completion of a Research Excellence Framework exercise in which ‘impact’ played a large part, it may seem that the cautious meeting of minds between higher education and the arts over knowledge exchange, almost embryonic though it was a decade ago, has come to full fruition. Readers of the REF subpanel report for UoA34 will note their view that “art and design research has been very effectively converted into social and economic impact that has had [a] transformational effect across the UK and internationally”. Job, seemingly, done.

The ambition in 2006, though, went beyond simply transferring cognate knowledge and knowhow from higher education to the arts

and the wider community. It was to make knowledge transfer an engine for innovation within the arts – a means of spurring artists, publics and wider society to take risks with new ways of thinking, new technologies, new ideas. Has the progress made between 2005 and 2015 been positive on that front? Undoubtedly a start has been made on that more challenging task. Through the work of the Digital Catapult, for example, innovation in technology domains is crossing more readily to the domain of arts business, building new elements of the creative industries in the process. Innovate UK’s Creative Digital & Design Network even has a strand of activity entitled ‘Cross Innovation’. All of that, though, may be the easy part of using university knowhow to encourage innovation in the arts.

The real promise of knowledge exchange as a creative stimulus in the arts is as a disruptive influence as much as a conduit for new business opportunities. Universities, when at their most effective as part of the national ecology of thought, produce new ideas that draw upon and expand the *zeitgeist*. Take that most quintessential

phenomenon of the 21st century, the ‘flashmob’, as an example. Flashmobs, new academic research tells us, carry not only the potential of creativity but also, in some circumstances, the potential for violence and anarchy; they are forms of creative free expression on the one hand, but corporate advertisers’ tools in the form of ‘branded flashmobs’ on the other; they cross boundaries between the digital and physical domains easily, but not without consequences for the ‘mob’ taking part, or the temporal significance of the ‘flashed’ event. Academic research in psychology can help artists understand these subtle characteristics of the flash mob phenomenon, meaning that arts practice should be better able to incorporate that understanding effectively. In fact, a galaxy of new ideas and research-based understanding in the sciences, social sciences and humanities have the potential to transform artistic creativity, if only we can connect artist/creators with academic research in new and practical ways.

The Arts Council rallying cry of 2005 of using knowledge exchange as an instrument for innovation in the arts *should* seem unremarkable by 2025. If we have the vision to seize the opportunity and to open up university research and knowhow in new ways to artists and makers we ought to be able to stimulate new thinking undreamed-of without it. How about some of the new mathematics of nanostructures informing craft design? Or the social psychology of

community resilience affecting the way community art is presented? Or new developments in game theory influencing forms of cooperation between artists and the public?

It’s time for artist-practitioners to seek out, and for universities to offer up, new possibilities for knowledge exchange that will prove genuinely creative. Universities need to be alive to the potential of, say, current debates in philosophy or material science to strike sparks in the arts as well as in industry and public debate. It’s a lot to ask – of both sides. If artists become more demanding ‘consumers’ of the products of research and universities more effective and creative purveyors, the promise of that Arts Council call in 2005 can be achieved. We might, for the first time, use knowledge exchange as a means of creating an innovative revolution in the arts.

Mark Gray
Director of Knowledge Transfer,
Middlesex University London

BRACING FOR IMPACT

The general definition of the word ‘impact’ goes something along the lines of “the forcible contact of one object with another”. Its lively synonyms include crash, smash, clash, bump, bang, thump, whack, thwack, slam and smack.

They make for an oddly onomatopoeic collection of terms, redolent of a casual violence that could make a more timid academic wary. Certainly, my own ‘public engagement’ activities in recent years, as a reviewer and radio broadcaster, have not been without a few bumps and bruises. Benevolently enough, the AHRC offer a hazier definition to soften the blow: impact is the term we use to describe the “direct and indirect social and economic benefits” of research, and its purview extends from the immediate community of research specialists in a particular field of expertise to the wider audiences accessible through broadcast media. It’s a gentler definition, but hints at an obtusely instrumental sense of the purpose of scholarship.

So perhaps there is something truer in the force of that original, cruder crash-bang version of impact? Perhaps, in those various platforms and media by which we communicate our work, we ought to feel something like the shock of hitting cold water, a thunderbolt-ish sort of jolt by which we see our own thinking in context, in contrast, afresh, under a different light

and sky. Certainly, there is something to the idea that the articulation of our research is an activity that involves complex kinds of contact, particularly in the case of the creative arts – an interface of scholars, producers, events managers, practising artists, and general audience readers, listeners and viewers – each of whom, one hopes, parts from that encounter changed in different ways.

If there remains something discomfiting about the notion of research impact, it comes perhaps from a certain unease about the ways in which such a thing could be measured, and how the relative success (or lack thereof) of impact might be tethered to funding access or research quality assessment. We are certainly right to be on guard about the increasing external measures by which our work is apparently judged. And yet, this idea of the contact at the heart of impact seems to me undeniably valuable and important. In so many ways, that contact is an extension of our work as teachers and an elaboration of the pursuit of knowledge to which we are committed as researchers.

Our challenge, over and above ‘impact agendas’, is to continue to curate knowledge, stimulate curiosity and encourage understanding in ways that are important to the cultures in which we live. While ‘media academia’ might have its problems, many of us remain enthused by the prospect of speaking with people outside our disciplines – it’s almost certainly good for us, permitting us to travel beyond the gates of our institutions and compelling us to remember what is at stake in our research, why we teach and how. And that intersection at which academia meets a broader audience is critical in feeding specialist research and expertise into life, informing and elevating public discourse. Partnerships like those forged so deftly by TCCE are key here. Such partnerships are most successful when the various producers, event managers and curators with whom we work are curious and speculative, combining technical skill with expert advice. They provide platforms and clear the decks, allowing us communicate the most important things we know in the best way we can. Between us, research becomes a joint project which gratifies audiences and academics alike.

At the centre of this work is the careful negotiation of the idea of ‘accessibility’. If we are encouraged to leave aside jargon as we step out of the ‘ivory tower’, there is also a powerful case to make for the preservation of the kind of difficulty, detail and complexity that characterises

the best academic research. The most rewarding kind of public engagement is that which holds fast against reductions and simplifications, that credits its audience with curiosity and creates public interest as well as responding to it, opening up to broader audiences neglected or recondite areas of study. Perhaps the point is not to soften the blow of impact, but to throw ourselves in at the deep end, sharing our hard-won knowledge and persuading our audiences to care for it as we do.

Shahidha Bari
Lecturer in Romanticism,
Queen Mary University of London

WHEN I.P. MET TEXTILES MET MUSIC: BEATWOVEN – A CASE STUDY

When I established BeatWoven, I scarcely imagined that in such a short space of time it would evolve into the award-winning textiles label that it has become.

The concept is in many respects disarmingly simple: I develop luxury goods that fuse together woven design with music visualization. Mine is one of the first businesses to use the developments in digital technology that make it possible to carve out an existing resource for creative and commercial benefit.

I came across Creativeworks London a couple of years ago, and was awarded one of their Creative Vouchers. I was then lucky enough to secure one of their follow-on BOOST awards, which enabled me to develop what have become ongoing relationships with the Centre for Digital Music and the Centre for Commercial Law Studies (CCLS) at Queen Mary University of London. The task at hand required us to draw a variety of sub-sectors into collaboration together, including craft, design, music, digital technologies, and intellectual property and regulation.

In addition to producing a selection of fabrics that capture a variety of musical genres, the project is producing scholarly research into the complex intellectual property questions that surround creative freedoms in design and music copyright law. Such work is not only of benefit to my

company, but will also be of considerable potential benefit to future businesses that face similar creative and IP issues.

Since my collaboration with the CCLS began, the advantages of working in their safe hands has enabled my business to really grow. I have undertaken commissions with the Southbank Centre and the London Philharmonic Orchestra, and with Harrods on an exclusive collection for London Design Week last year. I also took part in the 'Future Heritage' feature at the Decorex International annual trade show, where I developed patterns created by jazz music to celebrate the centenary of Frank Sinatra's birth, and was picked out as their brand to watch for trends in design. This has also opened up a whole network of international sales leads in the USA, Hong Kong and elsewhere, and helped enormously with my market research.

I have also been featured in a new book by Lucy Johnson, *Digital Handmade Craftsmanship in the New Industrial Revolution* (Thames and Hudson, 2015); and this year I was delighted to receive one of the Crafts Council's prestigious 'Hothouse' awards, a gold-standard professional development programme for new makers. At present I'm

fielding interest from an interior design studio that works with high-end luxury residential properties.

What Creativeworks London has done for me, essentially, is to expose me and my work to a huge number of networks, and introduce me to researchers who have helped me to get on top of some of the major sticking-points in my projects. Dr Noam Shemtov from the CCLS helped me to solve the IP questions I had been bothered with, and Andrew Robertson and Adam Stark helped on the music side. Through them I also met with Becky Stewart, just one of Creativeworks London's cohort of amazing women entrepreneurs. Yet another of these is Ghislaine Boddington, who invited me to talk at Women Shift Digital and FutureFest 2016. The Arts and Humanities Research Council invited me to a Creative Commons research event at the Royal College of Art, where I met Simon Caine. Simon has since introduced me to the Museum of Science and Industry, who have a Jacquard loom I'm keen to use. Through these kinds of networks and multiplying connections I've also been lucky enough to meet Wendy Malem from London College of Fashion; and the list goes on. The invitations multiply, too: Creativeworks London have profiled me at events which connect UK entrepreneurs with businesses in China, and at the V&A as part of their ongoing 'Women in the Digital Economy and Culture' series; they also they put me forward to speak

at The Rooms Festival for the REACT Knowledge Exchange Hub in Bristol, and I was approached by Innovate UK to talk at Innovate 2015.

These are the kind of connections, and the kind of momentum, that creative entrepreneurs need when they start out with a new idea or concept. The help of brokerages and knowledge hubs like Creativeworks London and The Culture Capital Exchange can be indispensable in providing them.

BeatWoven is also stocked by Harrods and ABC Carpet and Home, New York

Nadia-Anne Ricketts
Founder and Creative
Director, BeatWoven

CREATIVITY-DRIVEN INNOVATION: THE ROLE OF THE CREATIVE AND CULTURAL INDUSTRIES AND H.E. IN THE UK GROWTH AGENDA

“...Our creative capabilities – one of the UK’s undoubted strengths – lie at the very core of our ability to compete. Technology that is not carried through into improved systems or successful products is opportunity wasted; enterprise that fails to be sufficiently creative is simply pouring more energy into prolonging yesterday’s ideas. Creativity, properly employed, carefully evaluated, skillfully managed and soundly implemented, is a key to future business success – and to national prosperity.” – The Cox Review of Creativity in Business: Building on the UK’s Strengths, 2005.

Reading this line from the Cox Review, it’s difficult not to feel disappointed that the promise it suggested has never quite come to fruition: and frustrated at how limited the public policy discourse has become on how the UK can tackle its economic, social and environmental challenges. The Cox Review, and the Sainsbury Review that followed it, were both convinced of the critical role of the UK’s world-class higher education (HE) and creative and cultural (C&C) sectors in supporting innovation in other industrial sectors and improving their

global competitiveness. However, as these public policy discourses have developed, there has been a distinct drift towards a certain technocentrism in policymakers’ understanding of innovation. This shift, I think, has had unfortunate effects on parts of both HE and C&C sectors, and on UK PLC – effects we now probably need to devote some energy to undoing.

Evidence of this shift was signaled early on by the naming of the UK’s national innovation agency as the Technology

Strategy Board. But where did this tendency take root? I’d argue that it was founded on a misperception that successful solutions to economic growth, and societal or environmental challenges, can rely solely on the deployment of the latest technological or scientific breakthroughs. In fact, their success is also highly dependent upon successfully understanding and influencing changes in human behavior – the kinds of processes by which people decide to buy certain products/services rather than others, change their diets, or reduce their carbon emissions.

This approach has meant that the lions’ share of public investment has gone into ‘technology push’: the strategy of developing new science and technology, and then trying to convince people to buy or use it. Much less has gone into strategies focused on ‘market pull’: conducting intelligent analysis of the complex human factors that shape our major areas of economic, social and environmental challenge, and then tailoring compelling solutions to these, in order to maximise market uptake and encourage behavioural change. Such solutions may include the application of leading-edge science and technology, or may not: but, done correctly, they should help us to better meet our societal challenges,

improve our global competitiveness and effectively tackle issues of market failure. If we do not take this human-centred route, we face major risks. Firstly, we may end up investing significant public resources in developing products and services that never find a market (invention rather than innovation); secondly, we risk simply creating new technologies to mitigate the damage caused by the poor adoption or deployment of previous technologies – a dangerous cycle to repeat.

This almost exclusive focus on ‘technology push’ has had a significant impact on both HE and cultural and creative sectors. Firstly, there has been a tangible marginalisation of the arts, humanities and social science disciplines within publicly-funded innovation programmes: funding instruments are invariably designed to favour a STEM-driven approach, and lack requirements to engage other disciplines. Secondly – perhaps due to the inexplicable absence of the high-performing cultural and creative sector in the UK’s overall industrial strategy – there is a lack of structural mechanisms for engaging it as a ‘horizontal enabler’ which can catalyse and facilitate innovation in other sectors. The consequences of this apparent marginalisation would be difficult to

measure. However, given the world class quality of our arts, humanities and social science knowledge base, and our position as a global leader in the creative and cultural sector, one can only conclude that the UK is missing a trick, and as a consequence new science and technology inventions are often missing their potential markets.

So what can be done to address this?

Firstly, we must maintain an education system that encourages creativity, cross-disciplinarity, effective communication, cross-cultural competencies, risk-taking and critical thinking. It is these characteristics that underpin and facilitate successful innovation.

Secondly, there needs to be greater recognition that contemporary citizens/consumers act in response to complex systems of values, signs and symbols and their inter-relations, and that it is our understanding of these dynamics (what we might call ‘culture’) that provides one of our most powerful means of achieving intelligent growth and change. Science and technology can be tremendously important in delivering human-centred solutions – but they will never deliver real change unless they are informed by a nuanced understanding of human cultures and behaviours.

Thirdly, public policy around innovation needs to encourage cross-disciplinary and cross-sectoral approaches, enabling companies to draw from the best of the diverse international academic and creative talent that we are so fortunate to have. This requires intelligent and well-informed brokering, and more effective advocacy of creativity-driven, human-centred, and culturally informed approaches to R&D and innovation. (InnovateUK’s ‘Horizons Tool’ and ‘Design Strategy’ suggest positive advances in this direction.) If the Government wants to derive more value from its investment in technology innovation, it might do well to heed the advice given by one of the most successful innovators of our time, Steve Jobs:

“Technology alone is not enough. It’s technology married with the liberal arts, married with the humanities, that yields us the results that make our hearts sing.”

Alisdair Aldous
Academic Enterprise Manager,
University of the Arts London

WHEN SMALL MEANS SUCCESSFUL

Seven years ago, after running three creative businesses in London, I joined the enterprise team at Kingston University. It was an unfamiliar environment for me.

To outsiders, which is what I was, academic jargon can sometimes seem impenetrable; even the term ‘knowledge exchange’ has little recognition beyond academia, and the long list of abbreviations and acronyms I was issued on my first day proved difficult to navigate. In a sense, this was a valuable lesson in itself: in order for fruitful collaborations to take place, we would need to forge a clear common language.

Since joining Kingston, I’ve overseen the development of twenty-one collaborative research projects through initiatives such as Creativeworks London and London Fusion. These modestly funded voucher schemes yielded some excellent outputs, and led to some long-lasting and impactful partnerships. Of course, there were challenges too: some beneficiaries became frustrated by the protracted business of negotiating IP and contracts. Most small organisations are lean, agile, and fast moving, but lack capacity; higher education, by contrast, is slow to change and innovate, and universities often tend towards the inflexible and risk-averse.

Another challenge is discrepancy in timescales and desired outcomes: in some collaborations one finds a mismatch of expectations between businesses that need quick solutions and academics who want to publish research papers. I’ve found how important it is to define parameters and desired outcomes right at the outset of any project. Researchers also need to recognise that collaborative projects might deviate from a linear path, so project plans should allow for multiple iterations.

Even the initial interaction with a university can be daunting for a small cultural organisation. There are so many potential entry points that it can be hard to know who to approach first. Many large and well-funded agencies – such as Innovate UK, the Knowledge Transfer Networks and the Technology Catapults claim to bridge the gap between universities and business, but the fact that they offer apparently very similar products and events can be confusing for small to medium-sized enterprises. More co-ordination and consolidation between these agencies might, I think, make it much easier for small, time-strapped arts organisations to engage

with the research community. The Culture Capital Exchange, by comparison, is a small, independent company, and instinctively understands the cultural differences between academia and business. By providing curated events in neutral spaces, it helps people from different sectors come together, and seemingly chance encounters often turn into collaborative projects. And it is through these encounters that academics are introduced to new areas of practice such as design thinking, hackathons, co-creation and crowd-funding; artists and curators, meanwhile, gain access to the rigour and insight that academic research can bring to their practice. Collaboration should always be a two-way process. Universities have expertise, but so do businesses, and universities should be prepared to learn from their external partners.

The research and innovation landscape is beginning to change. Arts and humanities research once favoured the sole-authored book, but now many funders are encouraging larger multi-disciplinary collaborative projects. Research impact is a key measure of academic success, so future researchers need to be trained in entrepreneurial and project management skills. TCCE have established a successful support network for early career researchers, and the TECHNE & LDoc doctoral training partnerships are providing the skills, knowledge and opportunities which will allow the next generation of arts

and humanities researchers to collaborate and innovate.

This subject does not want for the attentions of policymakers or strategy mavens: in the last ten years, thirteen major reviews have been written on the subject of collaboration between universities and business. The most recent of these, by Professor Dame Ann Dowling and the National Centre for Universities and Business, highlighted the situation as it now stands: while there are many examples of good practice, there are still severe obstacles to overcome. The task now is to rise to that challenge.

Peter Christian
Senior Manager, Executive Education,
Research and Innovation, Royal
College of Art

KEEP IT SIMPLE

Everyone is in love with universities; everyone wants a piece. But everyone wants a different piece.

In the past few months I've heard the CEO of Jaguar Land Rover say "we wouldn't be in business without the research relationships we have with dozens of universities", and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor of a university say "we're the last bit of the public sector left standing in our city". Meanwhile, the relationship between the university and its students is increasingly expressed as a brutally transactional exchange of debt for employment capital. The government's relationship seems to be equally transactional – they want 'creativity', and lots of it – to keep the national economy competitive. But how to define, fund, and reward 'creativity' seems to be beyond the wit of politicians and policymakers. The one thing everybody agrees about is that universities are our great hope for the future: underpinning a prosperous economy, contributing to a vibrant society and driving the individual aspirations of millions of students, they sit at the heart of public policy.

Universities have had to thread their way through this thicket of competing claims and find their own way of delivering the kind of creativity that they are best placed to foster – the free generation of new knowledge – so that it can manifest itself as insight and innovation in a way that benefits

the economy and society at large. Over the last 10 years that interaction has become infinitely more sophisticated, and, from the perspective of the universities, more confident. The rather simplistic notion of new businesses being spun directly out of academic research has metamorphosed into a much more varied array of programmes in which generous, open, cross-disciplinary and cross-sector partnerships have been fostered, analysed, shared, refined and developed. While in some senses those partnerships have become more complex, there's a growing recognition that, pared down to the bare essentials, they've become infinitely simpler. This paring down process, is exemplified by Fusebox24, a business development programme that partners the University of Brighton with Wired Sussex, a trade body for digital media companies. The report of their joint programme for 2015 speaks enthusiastically of "shared experiences with different sets of peers who are not defined by industry or sector but by a common curiosity about what fusion means."

The Fusebox process is as much about the innovators as about the innovation, as much about process as output. In a university system geared heavily towards rewarding the kind of tangible outputs that come

from traditional science and technology R&D, that in itself is a suspiciously slippery idea. But as universities strive to reposition themselves to meet the myriad of new demands being placed upon them, it's precisely in these 'slippery' areas that effective answers are most likely to be found. It's the collaborations that are taking place in the arts and humanities, in the disciplines that underpin the creative economy, in the relationships with creative clusters and with creative start-ups that address social and cultural needs by tapping into the resources of the digital world – that's where some of the most interesting and important redefinitions of universities' role in a 'knowledge economy' and a 'knowledge society' is happening. If universities are to confirm their central role as the powerhouses of the twenty-first century, the evolution of knowledge exchange, the ability to make the most innovative of today's practices the rule rather than the exception, and the need to find robust ways of identifying, enabling and rewarding those exchanges, will be even more crucial in the next decade than they have been in the last.

John Newbiggin
Chair, Creative England

MAKING SPACES FOR COLLABORATION: THE CRITICAL GEOGRAPHIES OF 'COMING TOGETHER'

Collaboration has become one of the definitive knowledge-making practices of our times, valued for the rich possibilities it offers for working across sectors, disciplines and practices. But while it's increasingly common in the contemporary academy, its dynamics and practices are less well understood than they might be.

If we want to support and develop cultures of collaboration in future, we need to establish an effective critical framework for thinking about it. Looking at the work of The Culture Capital Exchange, I'd propose that if we want to understand how the spaces of collaboration are made, its networks created, and its imaginaries populated, we could do worse than to think about it geographically.

Making Spaces

To think about the geographies of collaboration is to be concerned not only with what collaborations might produce – their outputs – but also the spaces that make possible these comings together of people with various skills, knowledge, technologies and cultural and social capital. We might conceive of TCCE's work, essentially, as the creation of spaces: spaces that gave us time as researchers, creative

practitioners and mediators to talk, to research, to work, to produce knowledge, to come together around problems and work together for solutions.

These spaces can take many forms. One of TCCE's outstanding methods has been the establishment of residencies through the organisation's associated Knowledge Exchange Hub at Creativeworks London. 'Residency' is a loaded term: it implies physical proximity over a substantial amount of time, bringing with it an exposure to new collections of ideas, practices and technologies. Within the art world, residencies are a much-valued mode of working, often privileged over faster and less durational modes of collaborating with people or places. Such a privileging of presence potentially overlooks the value of mobility, of more fleeting modes of engagement, as well as the potential of virtual communication.

Creating Networks

The long-term co-location involved in residencies, however, isn't the only way that collaborations can be supported and developed. Especially in their early stages, many collaborations benefit from the more evanescent and contingent spaces and connections provided by networks.

In maximizing the chances of a meeting of minds, problems and solutions and resources, networking is fundamental to collaborations' success. We might, indeed, conceive of TCCE as fundamentally a networking organisation. Besides bringing academic and arts and cultural sector organisations together through its portfolio of activities, TCCE has also targeted its initiatives at those for whom networking is crucial – the early career scholars for whom peer support, research development and impact are so essential. The current direction of HE suggests that extramural collaborations will only become more important as sources of these benefits.

As well as the formal networks that TCCE creates and supports, it's important not to overlook the value of informal networking, the kinds of serendipitous interactions that happen around the edge of events, in coffee breaks and lunches, in group work and over drinks. Just as much as formal meetings, these encounters build the kinds of organic foundations and connections that so often underpin good collaboration.

Geographical Imaginaries of Collaboration

We often reach for territorial metaphors when talking about fields and cultures of knowledge. Such metaphors proliferate when we discuss collaboration: we speak of 'bridging sectors', 'crossing knowledge boundaries', or 'occupying a space between'. This applies equally to the dynamics of collaboration in practice, or the resources needed to enable collaborative practices. We implicitly cast fields of knowledge and practice as often bounded territories, between which are borders to be negotiated or abysses to be bridged.

Often, these geographical imaginaries of collaboration are based on a sense of bringing together people across gulfs of difference: difference in skill sets, knowledge, technologies and practices. One of the really great things about collaborations is how they help different actors find things in common. TCCE makes space and creates networks in which people can come together and find a spark of commonality from which successful collaborations develop.

That said, differences can be productive too, and we should resist the temptation to efface their power while we noisily celebrate our affinities. Difference breeds complexity and points projects in new directions; overlooking it can lead to complications further down the line. It's important,

then, to pay attention to commonality and difference alike, and avoid making assumptions about each others' approaches, about the contexts from which we work, the sorts of time and resources we have, and the sorts of expectations that we bring to our collaborative projects. To remain sensitive to difference is perhaps to be more attuned to the possibility of mutual transformation that truly successful collaborations engender.

This sensitivity to difference as productive, finally, is key. If we can derive one thing from thinking spatially and geographically about the kinds of collaborative opportunities that TCCE affords, it is an attention to the space-times of collaboration, to their nature and scale. If collaboration is to become the 'new normal' in the academic and creative sectors, an appreciation of those sectors' different ways of knowing and different rhythms of practice (academic years, portfolio managements, the pace of work) is crucial.

Harriet Hawkins
Reader in Geography, Royal Holloway,
University of London

THE NEW AVANT-PRENEURSHIP: ARTISTIC AND ACADEMIC COLLABORATION

“Alas, we are all now content creators for the über alles context of all time. The age of the avant-preneurs is over. We now return to an age of the entrepreneur.”¹ - Kit Galloway and Sherrie Rabinovitz

Professor Raul Espejo, a participant in Salvador Allende’s prescient cybernetic government experiment during the early 1970s, advocates a shift in investment from information to communication entrepreneurship: from systems that extract profit from big data, to those that enable people to relate to each other and self-organise in new ways.²

We might imagine that communication entrepreneurship is exactly what Facebook and other social media platforms practice, as they grow mega-businesses around the facilitation of conversations and the sharing of media. However, their marketing-based business models are honed to elicit, harvest and sell on data about our social behaviours. We can opt in or out of their ‘free’ services – services for which, in reality, we pay with our data. We are not invited to reflect on the kind of world we create as we surrender our privacy.

Espejo identifies an urgent need for social, human-oriented communication infrastructures that encourage a proliferation of variety and inventiveness

in the ways we collaborate, cooperate, and organise. Such structures might enable us to participate in a more conscious co-creation of social relations and the economic models that underpin them.

Since our beginnings in the mid-nineties, our community of artists, techies, activists, thinkers and doers has created network platforms that take social relations as an intrinsic part of their materials: an international arts blog, a live online artist residency, a live online audiovisual mixing space, a campaign for emancipatory network practices, and a gallery and lab for workshops and exhibitions that address critical questions at the intersections of art, technology and society. The success of, our gallery, Furtherfield’s work stands and falls on the quality of collaborations we develop across cultures and disciplines.

Collaborations between artists and academics can involve both spectacular rewards and serious obstacles, and this is why intermediaries and facilitators like The Culture Capital Exchange are so important. Because they understand the economies

and agendas of both cultures, they are able to design events that foster affinities between people. Once such relationships are established, TCCE then follow up by guiding us across the turbulent waters of institutional protocols and economies, from research ethics to IP.

One example of this kind of work is the ‘Mobilising Play Your Place’ collaboration we undertook with the cultural geographer Dr Harriet Hawkins of Royal Holloway, University of London. ‘Play Your Place’ took the form of an open artwork, an online game and a series of events to draw, make and play online games about the future of particular neighborhoods. The diverse needs of people living in today’s neighbourhoods are not always addressed in current consultation processes. Older people feel isolated, young people disenfranchised, and people of all ages and backgrounds struggle to engage with rigid deliberation structures that can feel tokenistic, pre-determined, bureaucratic, and as difficult to access as to understand. Planners and residents alike recognise that current consultation processes are ineffective; ‘Play Your Place’ sets out to provide an alternative. Developed in consultation with partners, ‘game jams’ bring people of all ages and backgrounds together to share experiences, insights and local knowledge.

Our work with Dr Hawkins has reinforced and demonstrated what we already intuitively knew, triangulating theory, practice and public engagement to show that, as people negotiate scenarios for living together, they also arrive at an empowering expression of creative identity and shared values.

Kit Galloway and Sherrie Rabinovitz – creators of the satellite-enabled and ecstatically social artwork *A Hole in Space LA-NY* (1980) – coined the term “avant-preneurship” to describe experimental practices that generate a variety of social contexts the value of which are not determined by profitability alone. Working with Hawkins has strengthened Furtherfield’s ability to identify and articulate the values of ‘Play Your Place’, to build partnerships, to make it more effective and, yes, to grow the business model as well; thereby supporting a combination of activist artistic practices, and pragmatic organisational and business development, that we hope points the way to a new practice of avant-preneurship.

¹From Annmarie Chandler and Norie Neumark, *At A Distance: Precursors to Art and Activism on the Internet* (MIT Press, 2005), p.171.

²At the ‘Digital Bill of Rights’ debate with Cybersalon, at Lincoln University, 23rd October 2015, hosted by Threshold Studios and Furtherfield as part of the 2015 Frequency Festival.

Ruth Catlow
Co-Founder and Artistic Director,
Furtherfield

CAPITAL

/ˈkʌpɪ(ə)l/

noun

1. the city that functions as the seat of government
2. a place associated more than any other with a specified activity
3. a valuable resource of a particular kind

The Culture Capital Exchange's tenth anniversary is an opportunity to take stock. When one thinks of the work they've done, and do, within London's rich creative mix, the phrase that springs to mind might be: "if it didn't exist you'd have to invent it". But just how true is this? Are there geographies of collaboration and knowledge exchange that are intrinsic to, and stem from, the capital's creative ecologies? Is TCCE a product of, and necessary to, the special thing that is this creative city?

London isn't especially large as world cities go – there are twenty-one larger – yet it receives more international visitors than any other world city (half as many again as New York). It also receives more international students, and more students studying creative arts and design: and contains, moreover, more specialist higher education institutions in creative arts and design than anywhere else, with one third of all graduate start-ups in London emanating from these creative institutions. The infrastructure is equally impressive: London boasts a hundred and seventy-one museums, eight hundred and fifty-seven art galleries,

ten major concert halls and three hundred and forty-nine live music venues, with world leaders in all those categories.

The question you often hear asked, though, is: *why?* Why this density? As we've seen, it's a density that can't be explained simply by population size, and nor is it a result of any governmental initiative. Some governments do focus on the place of culture in social and economic development – Park Gyeun-Hee, for example, on coming into the presidency of South Korea in 2013, devoted a major part of her inaugural speech to a promise to "foster a new cultural renaissance" and "ignite the fires of a creative economy". By contrast, the UK government is unforthcoming with either action or rhetoric when it comes to acknowledging the cultural economy's central place in our national scene.

No: London's rise both as an economic powerhouse and as a world cultural centre has much more to do with the economic phenomenon known as agglomeration. Agglomeration economics, an area of study which certainly formed no part of

my economics degree of thirty-something years ago, is the study of the benefits of condensing people together. Put simply, when you cram people together in tight spaces, they become more productive. In London's case, thirty-five per cent more productive than the rest of the UK in terms of economic productivity.

There are three principal efficiencies cited as the reasons why clustering is so effective. The first two, effective labour markets and the presence of support industries, are obvious and apply to all industries, including the cultural industries. The third efficiency that agglomeration enables is known as "information spillover", where information and knowledge are shared and act as the catalyst for the development of new ideas and new applications, often in ways that were never anticipated initially. This has obvious significance for the creative world, and indeed for the concept of a cultural capital exchange. When we come together with others from like worlds we naturally engage in the three 'C's: we Copy, Compete and Collaborate. Seeing at first hand what a competitor is doing, we inevitably copy the best elements; being in close proximity encourages us to raise our competitive game; and thirdly, and most productively, our engagement with each others' work encourages collaboration.

Of the surprising paradoxes that agglomeration economics helps to explain, that of the high-tech industry is perhaps

the most famous. One might think that, by its very nature, the high-tech sector would be uniquely able to save costs through geographical dispersal, communicating with itself and the world through technology; but not a bit of it. London's 'Silicon Roundabout', where Old Street meets City Road, has an incredible density of small creative technology businesses. In 2014, the EC1Y postcode – an area barely two hundred metres across – contained 16,000 listed tech start-ups. Technology creatives like to be physically close to each other.

Agglomeration economics, in short – this combination of rational analysis, market competition and the human instinct for community – might help us understand why London's cultural capital is so rich, and why we might wish to exchange ideas and work together. But simply to be close is not enough: communities need spaces of contact and nodes of connection. They need their village pubs, their markets, their coffee houses and exchanges. And this, ultimately, is what The Culture Capital Exchange provides so well: a place where practitioners and researchers congregate, share, and talk with each other.

Anthony Bowne
Principal, Trinity Laban
Conservatoire of Music and Dance

CONTRIBUTOR BIOGRAPHIES

Alisdair Aldous is currently Academic Enterprise Manager at University of the Arts London, where he has worked at the interface of research management and industry engagement for the last 7 years. Before this he was involved in creative business support, public art commissioning, and consultancy on culture-led regeneration.

Shahidha Bari is a Lecturer in literature and philosophy at Queen Mary University of London, a regular arts reviewer and radio broadcaster.

Katherine Bond is Director of the Cultural Institute at King's College London. Following study at Cambridge University, she worked as a theatre and opera director for a range of arts organisations nationally; as Senior Policy Adviser (Arts Funding & Organisation) at the Department for Culture, Media and Sport; as Head of Performing Arts at the Canadian High Commission in London; and as a freelance arts development consultant. Katherine has been the stage director for the Royal Academy of Music's annual summer opera programme in Italy since 1999.

Anthony Bowne is Principal of Trinity Laban Conservatoire of Music and Dance and, in former lives, an economist and lighting designer.

Ruth Catlow is an artist who works with emancipatory network cultures, practices and poetics. She is co-founder/director, with Marc Garrett, of Furtherfield, a London-based international network and gallery for engaging with critical questions in arts and technology.

Peter Christian recently joined the Research and Innovation team at the Royal College of Art, London.

Harriet Hawkins is a Reader in Geography at Royal Holloway, University of London, researching the geographies of art works and art worlds. Collaboration with artists and organisations is a central part of her research practice, which has seen her make artists' books, contribute to participatory art projects and curate exhibitions as well as work alongside arts organisations on shared research themes. As well as creative outputs, Harriet has published over fifty books, papers, book chapters and catalogue essays.

Barry Ife is a cultural historian, specialising in Spain, and currently Principal of the Guildhall School of Music and Drama.

Suzie Leighton is a founding Director of The Culture Capital Exchange and Chair of the Board of Directors of Jasmin Vardimon Dance Company and Theatre Peckham.

Peter Mitchell is a postdoctoral research fellow at the University of Sussex School of Global Studies, and an occasional curator and journalist.

John Newbigin, OBE, is Chair of Creative England, Chair of the British Council's Advisory Board for Arts and the Creative Economy and an Honorary Professor at Hong Kong University. He is a member of the Oversight and Development Group for the AHRC's Knowledge Exchange programme.

Nadia-Anne Ricketts travelled the world as a professional dancer before studying textile design at Central St Martins and founding BeatWoven, producing innovative couture fabrics based on patterns generated by music.

Evelyn Wilson is a founding Director of The Culture Capital Exchange. She is on the Governing Council for Creativeworks London and is advisor to the Doctoral Training Centre in Media Arts Technologies at Queen Mary University of London.

www.tcce.co.uk

@InfoTCCE

The
**Culture
Capital**
exchange

978-0-9935368-0-9