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Abstract

Since the concept of “culture industry” in singular form was proposed by Theodor Adorno (1903-1969) and Max Horkheimer (1895-1973) in the 1930s, the industrialization of cultural activity has already experienced a transition from the investigation in philosophical terms to that in political and economic terms initiated by European academics and the governments of the members states in the 1970s. From then on, culture industries have become a main actor in the economic sectors both national and international. So is the case in China. Methodologically quantitative and qualitative, this article intends to pursue the developmental track of China’s cultural industries from the angles of both politico-economy and historical sociology by exposing the promotional factors, the developing logics and its characteristics as well, hereby to discuss the possibilities of their future development.
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Cultural Industries as Discipline and Industry

As concisely indicated on the web 2.0 knowledge producing platform *The Free Encyclopedia*, the term “culture industry” was coined by German critical theorists Theodor Adorno (1903–1969) and Max Horkheimer (1895–1973), both rather as philosophers spurred by the meditative impulse from the exiling experiences imbued in American popular culture, and was presented as critical vocabulary in the chapter “The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception” of the book *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1944), where they proposed that popular culture was akin to a factory producing standardized cultural goods, such as films, radio programmes, magazines, etc., which were used to manipulate mass society into passivity. In their enterprise, “cultural industry” rather serves as reflexive instrument targeting the rationalization of the humanity and its activities. In 1970s, French and English scholars Bernard Miège and Peter Golding have criticized the two theorists’ notion and proposed the term “Cultural Industries” in plural form in order to replace the philosophical perspective so as to describe the cultural activities in an economic perspective, still focusing on mass media and publishing industries. This concept of “cultural industries” was adopted in the same period by European official documents, Europe, a region in face of the invasion of popular culture from North America and also having invented the mobilizing term of “Americanization” in the 1920s.

French Scholar Armand Mattelart even thought this term “cultural industries” has nothing to do with the adorning term of “culture industry” because the plural form refers to the diverse categories of cultural democratizing vectors realized through markets with global traits (Mattelart, 2005: 57). It is difficult to give a comprehensive definition of “cultural industries”, but it is possible to summarize the main scope for the term by some specialists:

(a) the impact on the public of traditional means of cultural dissemination as compared with those of cultural industries; (b) the respective importance of the different production and marketing processes according to the different media: likely predominance of one or other of these processes; and (c) the place of cultural industries in the light of creativity, cultural identity and the cultural influence of a country: alternatives to the functioning of cultural industries (UNESCO, 1982: 15).

Since the term of “cultural industries” came into being, the related activities have not only been operated as principal economic activity for the national economy but also as discipline in the academic circles, especially in China when the project of “Reform and Opening to the outside world” went into its 25th anniversary and where have been mushrooming the academic institutions since the Ministry of Education ratified in 2004 the establishment of “Cultural Industries Management” as major for the undergraduates in four Chinese universities. And from then on, most Chinese universities and colleges followed suit because the country has put one of its developmental stakes on the imaginary industrialization. But the disputes over cultural industries have been more ostentatious in the economic domain than disciplinary. As economic activity, cultural industries have been exemplified by one of the main deadlocks in the global economic exchanges talks, especially in the negotiations between member states of WTO (World Trade Organization), mainly between European Union (EU) and the United States, the latter has always been criticized
either for its extreme support for neo-liberalism incarnated by “Washington Consensus” coined in 1989 by English economist John Williamson or having promoted this economic doctrine especially after the deregulation movement promoted by the administrations of American Regan and British Madame Thatcher in the 1980s. The movement has not only spread to other countries but also triggered off a worldwide wave of economic liberalization and political democratization with as climax the collapse of the former Soviet Union and Eastern European communist countries at the turn of the century.

That exist the deadlocks of negotiation in WTO is because of the exceptional status (Exceptionality) of cultural products which are claimed to be different from other merchandises and commercial services. Cultural information has become and been a strategic element in both socio-economic innovation, progress and governance in a country or international competitive games between nation-states in which for example, culture is equal to or part of the “soft power,” term coined by Joseph Nye, Jr. in 1990 to describe the persuading forces parallel to the military and economic forces as “hard power”. Especially when the digitization has become the main channel to diffuse cultural message or information, the enterprise of cultural industries has been more emphasized than ever. Cultural industries have their time in today’s world!

**China’s Cultural Industries and Its Characteristics**

“Cultural industries”, rather than “culture industry”, have been developed in China at the very beginning less as an intentional strategic program than side-product of the project of “Reform and Opening to the outside World”, which just tried to save the ravaged cultural (re)production from the pernicious consequences and impact of the rampage “Cultural Revolution” (1966-1976), of course in the cadre of the socialist and proletarian culture and ideology, glimpsed in the “Guiding principles announced for the development of arts and cultural institutions in reform area” delivered by Mr. Deng Xiaoping (1904-1997) at The Fourth Arts Workers Congress in October 1979. Only when the hesitating reform designer Mr. Deng made his southern tour of Shenzhen in 1992, the indecisive road of china’s development was then decided and the Chinese socialist market economy was instituted as the objective of economic reform at the 3rd plenary session of the 14th CCP (Chinese Communist Party) national congress (October 12-18, 1992) in the document “On the decision to establish the socialist market economy system”, and arts and cultural units were asked to become self-reliant.

With the development of market economy, the cultural system has gradually become an autonomous sector which is entitled with two main functions of ideological propaganda and economic development – even though always in a situation of “double bind”. At the 6th Plenum of the 17th Central Committee of the CCP (October, 2011) the cultural industries were defined as “pillar industry of national economy” in the “CCP Resolutions on some important issues in relation to deepening cultural system reform, promoting socialist cultural development and prosperity”, which would hopefully or rather predicatively be realized in 2016, according to CAI Wu (蔡武), then minister of Culture Ministry. In China, “cultural industries” and “cultural creative industries” have been always related to the cultural system, and almost all the transformations of these industries are reflected in the range of documents
formulated by various state organs as laws, regulations, rules, policies, measures, opinions, principles, guides, etc, among which the law is superior to the rest because it is stipulated by National People’s Congress and its Standing Committee and the rest is established by State Council and local executive or legislative sectors in line with different localities.

According to Han Yongjin, former chief of Department of policies and regulations of Chin’s Ministry of Culture, the cultural system reform started in 1978 – when was held the Third Plenum of the CCP 11th Central Committee and Mr. Deng Xiaoping was elected as the leader of the Second Generation of leadership, and the policy of reform and opening to the outside word was decided to put in practice – and has proceeded through three stages: 1) from 1978 to 1992, shift of cultural system from class struggle paradigm to that of economic construction, going back to the cultural regime before the Cultural Revolution, regime mainly characteristic of modeling on the former Soviet Union, adapting to the socialist planned economy and following the cultural system in the liberated areas before New China, but the cultural system was in contradiction with the economic reforming context; 2) from 1993 to 2002, major reforms occurred across all sectors – the emphasis in this period was on grouping and conglomeration of different cultural sections, but still in institutional nature; 3) from 2003, the focus shifted to the deepening of the transformation from institution to industry and enterprise – separation of the commercial elements from the cultural institutions, the introduction of private capitals – altogether with development of new financing and support models. These developments are summarized altogether with the progress of Economic reform agenda in Table 1, borrowed and modified from Table 1.1 (Keane, 2013: 23) made by Michael Keane.

After more than 30 years of reform, “cultural industries have become one of the economic contributions to the national economy,” and they have the following characteristics.

Confusing Definition and Categorization

The term “cultural industry” was first officially used in 1992 in an official document “Grand Strategic Decision and Policies – Accelerating the Development of Service Industries” issued by the General Office of the State Council of the People’s Republic of China, first formally used in plural form in a central government document “Recommendations of the CCP Central Committee: the 10th Five Year Plan for Economic and Social Development” in October, 2000, and officially defined in “Several Opinions to Support and Promote Cultural Industries Development” issued in September, 2003 by Ministry of Culture as “lucrative activities to produce cultural goods and offer cultural services. And in the same year, the term ‘cultural industries’ is proposed against that of public institutions and both are integral parts of the project of socialist cultural construction” (Wuqiao, 2013: 11).

In 2004, the National Bureau of Statistics defined the “Cultural and Related Industries” as “a collection of activities that provide cultural entertainment products and services for the public, as well as activities associated with such events, including news services, publishing and copyright services, radio, television and movie services, arts and culture services, Internet services, recreational services, the production and sales of stationery
and related cultural products, and other industry-specific categories”. With the continuous conception of this imaginary industrialization, in 2006 came another term of “cultural creative industries”. The term was first officially used in “The Outline of the Eleventh Five-Year Plan of Cultural Development” and defined in “Beijing Cultural Creative Industries Classification Standards” as “originating in creative industries and cultural industries, (it) refers to the assembly of intrinsically related industrial clusters which provide cultural experiences to the public by fundamental means of production, creation and innovation, take the cultural content and creative results as core values, and are characteristic of intellectual property or consumption,” including nine sectors: “1) culture and the arts, 2) press and publication, 3) radio, television and movies, 4) software, networking and computer services, 5) advertising exhibition, 6) the art trade, 7) designed to service, 8) tourism, leisure and entertainment, 9) the other complementary services.” Rather than replacing “cultural industries,” both terms are used interchangeably, almost all things called “culture” would be commercialized in China and turn into merchandises, for example, media industry in Euro-American sense (mainly media and publishing), creative industries in English sense (mainly intellectual property), cultural heritage, tourism, etc. Among them, the commercialization or industrialization of cultural heritages has always taken the lead.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Cultural system reform: key moments</th>
<th>Key document/conference</th>
<th>Economic System Reform</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>December 1978</td>
<td>The beginning of China’s reform and opening: a shift from class struggle to economic construction</td>
<td>The Third Plenum of the CCP 11th Central Committee</td>
<td>First Stage (1978-1984)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 1979</td>
<td>Guiding principles announced for the development of arts and cultural institutions in reform era</td>
<td>The Fourth Arts Workers Congress, speech by Deng Xiaoping, Beijing</td>
<td>the 12th CCP National Congress(1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1980</td>
<td>First announcements of cultural system reform</td>
<td>National Cultural Ministers Conference, Beijing</td>
<td>“maintaining the primary role of the planned economy whilst giving play to the supplementary role of market forces in economic regulation.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February 1988</td>
<td>Formal acknowledgement of the cultural market (wenhua shichang)</td>
<td>Notice to strengthen the work of management of the cultural market(MoC/SAIC)</td>
<td>Second Stage (1984-1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1992</td>
<td>The benchmark established for the next decade of reform: the Chinese socialist commodity economy instituted: arts and cultural units asked to become self-reliant</td>
<td>Deng Xiaoping’s southern tour of Shenzhen and special economic zones</td>
<td>the 13th CCP National Congress(1987) planned commodity economy on the basis of public ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>‘Economic development is the central task of the whole Party. Ideology and propaganda work should consciously be subject to and serve economic development’</td>
<td>Document: the main points of propaganda work</td>
<td>the 14th CCP National Congress(1992) to establish a socialist market economy in the report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>The necessity of cultural system reform raised to a new level in the central government documents</td>
<td>CCP Resolutions on important issues in relation to strengthening the construction of socialist spiritual citizenship.</td>
<td>Decision of the CCP Central Committee Regarding a Number of Issues Concerning the Establishment of a Socialist Market Economy” (1993) at Third Plenary Session of the Fourteenth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October 2000</td>
<td>First formal use of the concept of cultural industries (wenhua changye) in a central</td>
<td>Recommendations of the CCP Central Committee: the 10th Five Year Plan for</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Government Document</td>
<td>Economic and Social Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Conglomeration (jituanhua) is established as a strategy in the next stage of cultural system reform: issued by CPD, SARFT and GAPP China’s entrance into WTO.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Opinions concerning deepening Press, Publications, Radio, Film and Television Sector Reform.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>July 2003 First document to specifically use the term cultural system reform’ in respect to deepening the separation of shiyue and changye.</td>
<td>Notice of Opinions on Trial Work of Cultural System Reform.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2006 First clear definition of cultural industries.</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture and the statistics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>First definition of “cultural creative industries”. “Beijing Cultural Creative Industries Classification Standards”</td>
<td>People’s Republic of China 11th National Economic and Social Five-Year Plan Outline.</td>
<td>Decision of the CCP Central Committee on a Number of Issues Concerning the Improvement of the Socialist Market Economy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Cultural System Reform raised to a new level, ‘Deepening Cultural System Reform’ becomes an important part of the national plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Sept. 2009 The cultural industries become a key element of the national economic strategy.</td>
<td>Cultural Industries Revitalization Plan (State Council doc 30)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>April 2010 Document addressing financial support for cultural industries, issued by SARFT, CPD, MoF, People’s Bank of China, MoC, GAPP, etc.</td>
<td>Opinions on guiding financial support for cultural industry promotion, development and prosperity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>October 2010 5th Plenum of the 17th Central Committee of the CCP: formulating the plans for the next five years</td>
<td>Recommendations from the Central Communist Party for the 12th</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As witnessed, according to the “Annual Report of Chinese Cultural Industries” (2014), the dominant cultural industry is neither the media industry nor the creative industries, but the tourist industry (Creative Industries, 2014). Generally speaking, according to Chinese classification, the cultural industries could be exemplified in the Table 3, a categorization made by National Bureau of Statistics and other related departments in 2004, but this never has the final say in the interpretation of the concept.
Effectively, the terms of “cultural industry,” “cultural industries,” and “cultural creative industries” were introduced (or coined) into China with the translations by researchers of the so-called world master-pieces in the political economy of media and communication. They have been confused most probably because the researchers had built, according to their own understandings, their own academic blocks and the related researches in China are possibly more representative than creative and original. The cultural system and its commercialization as a component of the opening-reforming project was promoted by Deng Xiaoping’s leadership when the national development strategy turned from the shift from class struggle to economic construction stipulated in the Third Plenum of the CCP 11th Central Committee in 1978. In such context, were flourishing the translations of the so-called world masterpieces of communication and media studies works, and as a result, was produced the polysemy of the definition.

From Public Institutions to Industries

Since the founding of new China, the culture works as institutions rather than public goods because of the structuralist Marxist ideology in which the culture and its related reproducing apparatus (such as school, university, museum, etc) are the integral parts of the so-called super-structure in opposition to economic base as lower-structure. As main part of the “cultural industries,” for example, Chinese media system from 1949 to 1978 could be characterized as a continuity of the “Yan’an tradition” which was highlighted by highly politicized and centralized configuration. This tradition can go back to the embryonic journalism of Chinese communist party, i.e. The Youth, which laid the foundation for the model of partisan press systematized and institutionalized in Yan’an, cradle of Chinese communist regime and revolutionary base of the People’s Republic of China. This model was extended all over the country after the communist came to power.

In such situation, culture and its related units have been employed as instruments to manipulate people’s “heart and soul” in China, culminating in the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) where the culture became masochistic. One revolutionary and proletarian culture was used against and devastated, even destroyed another one, for example Chinese traditional culture with Confucian characteristics, or later would continuously fight against another alterity, for instance the western culture incarnated by the so-called western soft power including the western style democracy, in order to prevent the invasion of the so-called “peaceful evolution” symbolized by “bourgeois liberalization” and “spiritual pollution” in the 1980s and even up to now. Basically speaking, the status of culture in China has experienced a shift from institution to industry approximately with the death of Mao as watershed.

Only until the September, 2002 when the 16th CCP National Congress made the “Planification to deepen cultural system reform,” cultural industries and cultural institutions both were claimed so as to deepen the reform. But it is difficult to tell clearly one from another and this has lead to the “double bind”: on the one hand to promote the cultural industries by respecting the commercial logic to cater for customers’ tastes and on the other to work as propagandist dispositif and mouth piece of CCP and its government, particularly the case of media system. But it seems that both aspects have been in conflict, witnessed by the experience since the culture was considered as an economic element.
To be Pillar Industry of National Economy

Cultural industries have gradually become a main contribution to the national economy. It could be seen from the statistics collected after 2004, the year when the first statistic of national cultural industries development was realized, that up to 2013, the development of the industries has kept a growth rate of an annual double-digit: 2004-2008 with annual average growth of 23.28%, 2008-2010 with 24.19%, 2011 with 22%, 2012 with 16.5%, 2013 with 11.1%, as indicated in Table 4 by GAO Shusheng, then deputy director of the Office of Reform, affiliated with Central Propaganda Department (Shusheng, 2013). According to the national statistics, it can be seen that the cultural industries have been steadily progressing from the total value of 344 billion in 2004 to that of 2132 billion in 2013 that is 3.77 % of GDP. As indicated at a conference on cultural industries held on May 14, 2015 in Shenzhen, Liu Qibao, head of the Propaganda Department, called for efforts to make the pillar industry of national economy the cultural industries.

With the financial and policy supports, the media groups or conglomerations have been founded; the parks of cultural creative industries have been mushrooming all over the country; the tourists have been stimulated to crowdedly go out during the holidays; and more satisfyingly, “China brought in $650 million in box office revenue for February, 2015, surpassing sales in the U.S. of $640 million according to EntGroup, a Chinese entertainment research firm” (CNN, 2015).

But of course, because the different regions or provinces, even counties, have different resources and favorable or unfavorable policies, there exists the imbalanced development of the cultural industries or cultural creative industries in the country, as indicated in the following Plans A and B. Totally speaking, the eastern regions are more developed than the middle-western ones.
According to Jin Yuanpu, professor, director of Institute of Cultural Creative Industries Studies of Renmin University of China, there are three priorities to develop the cultural industries: first, to put the priority over the tourist industries because of the rich natural or historical resources, second, to promote the mass media industries in mage of so many groups of radio, press, television, film, etc. which are main vectors of cultural industries, third, to promote the so-called cultural creative industries which are characterized by high technology (mainly Internet) and globalizing context by multi-channel funding and being listed in the stock market (Yuanpu, 2015). In such analysis, cultural industries are strategically composed of “creativity first,” “content first,” “diffusion and channel first,” “e-commerce first,” “experience and leisure economy as anchor point”. All these strategies have probably adopted to push forward the industries. China is a country with large population; it is relatively easy to form the economy of scale.

Reading Grill of Cultural Activities: More Unity than Diversity

When French philosopher Michel Foucault (1926-1984) introduced the term épistémè in his famous book The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences (Les Mots et les choses: Une archéologie des sciences humaines, 1966), we know that the knowledge production and its consumption in a given period will be realized through a reading grill, because Foucault pointed out that in different periods in western society there existed different épistèmes that were considered as possible conditions for certain scientific discourses or different theories and debates; the knowledge production was organized around some principles concretized in discursive practices which altogether with these épistèmes could work as “reading grill” for the knowledge understanding and production. In China, because of the special national conditions, the cultural (re)production is operated through a certain reading grill which would lead to certain culture-producing conditions that are more unique than diverse.

This kind of grill could be reflected in the key ideas of each Chinese generation of leadership, each generation approximately corresponding to the three stages of cultural system reform: in the first generation (before 1978), “class struggle” was always emphasized; in the second (1978-1990) and third (1990-2002) generation, “reform and opening to outside
world" and “three Represents” respectively of the second and third generations were the possible culture-producing conditions and cultural activities were entangled in the distinction of cultural industries from cultural institutions; in the fourth generation (2002-2012), “scientific development and humanism” emphasizes liberating the cultural productive forces and cultural and cultural activities have been regarded as means of contribution to the national economy; in the fifth generation (2013), “China’s dream” and “Socialist core values” guide the cultural social and economic operation and more policies have been adopted to deepen the cultural system reform, the cultural operation following much more the commercial logic, for example in the year 2014, considered as “blowout year” of cultural industries according to the “China Cultural Brand Development Report” (2015), when took place 159 cases of merges and acquisition with total volume of 100 billion RMB in which 55 cases with 45% of the volume happened in the fields of films and mass media, Internets, education and training, tourism, games and animation.

With the rapid development of cultural industries, intensified are the control and censorship of the cultural production and diffusion on line and off line. Online high technologies and off line laws and regulation or mobilization are employed to censor and ensure the socialist cultural practices so as to found a unified Chinese socialist culture.

Cultural Industries as Vectors of Soft Power

To build China’s Soft power is another important stimulus to spur Chinese cultural industries. Soft power is a term used to describe the paradigmatic shift of power exercising after the Second World War from the physical forces (such as army) to the symbolic ones (such as values) with an appeal to audiences beyond the national frontiers in order to change their attitudes. “Soft power” was coined by Joseph Nye Jr. in his book Bound to Lead: The Changing Nature of American Power (1990), to describe the ability to attract and co-opt rather than coerce, use force or give money as a means of persuasion, it being composed of three resources: “its culture (in places where it is attractive to others), its political values (when it lives up to them at home and abroad), and its foreign policies (when others see them as legitimate and having moral authority)” (Nye, 2011: 84). Since this term replaced the propaganda as main component of public diplomacy, it has been appreciated by many countries or organizations which want to win out in the international competition games or build its popularity in the world.

This term has certainly been appreciated very much in China which hopes to recover its glory of the ancient times. Soft power, the term was introduced into China in the first years of 1990s and attracted the attention from both academics and government. In 1993, Mr. Wang Huning, now professor and member of CCP Political Bureau had ever claimed that soft power was a kind of diffuse power of such elements as political system, national spirit, economic system, sciences and technologies, ideology, etc. (Huning, 1993) Effectively, when China exercises its soft power, usually excluded are the political aspects by particularly laying stress on the cultural and economic aspects because the political or political system reform has been too sensitive to mention since the Tiananmen Incident in 1989. In such context, cultural industries, vectors of soft power, have been regarded as main channels to diffuse Chinese soft power, usually and emphatically specified as “Chinese cultural soft
power,” even though Chinese successful political system and its experiences could be borrowed by other countries. In consequence, “cultural industries” and “cultural creative industries” include everything that could be regarded as less political and less sensitive and have been promoted as channels of soft power in order to attract and influence other audiences’ attitudes. As indicated by GAO Shusheng, Cultural industries will serve the national strategy, for example, the strategy of “the Silk Road Economic Belt and the 21st Century Maritime Silk Road,” in simple terms “One belt and One Road” (OBAOR).

Limitations of China’s Cultural Industries

After more than thirty years of development, cultural industries have almost finished by forming an autonomous economic system, of course an integral part of the national economy. But there still exist some limitations. Chinese cultural industries have been mainly engaged in three domains: economic operation, public services, and political ideology. Effectively and correspondingly speaking, there are three limitations of different nature involved: cultural, economic, and political. Theses three-natured activities are not so rationally regulated and this has brought forth uncertain impacts on the cultural industries development.

One of the limitations comes from the undecided nature of cultural (re)production because even though in 2002 the categorization of the two activities was put forward, but actually it is still difficult to distinguish one from another. The logics of public services and commerce have always put the cultural industries in an embarrassing situation in which some historic relics or unrecoverable resources have been commercialized in order to cater for the economy of holidays, for example, the UNESCO immaterial heritage such as Shaolin Temple which now has almost become a commercial center. Additionally, the ideological function also becomes an obstacle to the commercial performance as mentioned above, especially in the media industry, because the mass media are the mouthpieces of the party and its government. If the media follows the commercial logic, this will certainly harness the ideological propaganda because the commercial logic is in favor of discursive diversity of liberal expression: either against the main tune of the ideological discourses or in contradiction to the positive energy advocated by CCP. How to make clear the relation between these three aspects challenges the intelligence of the academics, the government officials, and the think tanks, in other words, the de-politicization of cultural activities is relatively not easy.

Another limitation comes from the cultural (re)production as an economic activity. To develop the cultural industries and cultural creative industries implies to develop modern enterprise system and glocalizing strategies so as to be successful in cross-border exchanges. China is a new comer in the world economic games and is not yet too familiar with the games rules of cultural industries in contrast with other developed countries. The seeming boom of cultural industries is based more on its economy of scale than on the advanced management-performance and conceptions. As economic activity, the chain of conceptions, production, and distribution has to be improved, and additionally has to copy with the situation of global cultural industries. For example, as indicated in the book The Global Culture Industry (2007), Scott Lash indicates that one of the phenomena of global cultural industry is the “shift from
commodity to brand”: “If cultural industry worked largely through the commodity, global culture industry works through brands” (Lash & Lury, 2007: 5), Chinese cultural industries for the moment depend largely on the “mediation of ideas” in lashian sense and has lacked the creativity to build their own brands, for example, concerning the social media as part of Internet industry: Weibo, Reren, WeChat, and other video-websites (Youku, Tudou) come of age from the inspiration of Twitter, Facebook, WhatsApp, and YouTube which have been blocked in China. Until now, Chinese cultural industries are still not entitled with some internationally known brands so that some researchers have made their efforts to want to know why the movies with its elements borrowed from Chinese culture have successfully been made by western well-known film-makers not the Chinese, for example, the movies of “Mulan” and “Kung-Fu Panda”. According to GAO Shusheng, now inspector, deputy director of the Bureau of Cultural System Reform and Development affiliated with Central Propaganda Department, and deputy director of the Office in charge of Supervision and Management of State-owned Assets of National Cultural Enterprises, the largest contribution of Chinese cultural industries still comes from the arts and crafts, that is from the tourism, even though the industries include other important parts as mentioned above (Shusheng, 2015).

Third limitation comes from the unfinished project of economic and political reform. Since China carried out its strategy of “reform and opening to the outside world,” one of the necessary measure has been to separate the party affairs from the executive administration which, in its turn, should be separated from the commercial activities of state-owned enterprises. With the political reform lagged far behind, the economic development has developed quickly and been deepened, but the executive forces are still strong and diffuse in the commercial landscape because China is a socialist country with public ownership of propriety and its market economy is seemingly characteristic of state capitalism where the state-owned enterprises have enjoyed superiority of financial and policy supports and exercised a certain monopoly in the national economic life. The private capitals have fewer opportunities than the national except that the government is forced to open safe valves for them. More surprisingly, in Chinese urbanizing mobilization, some local governments have been in conspiracy with the real estate developers to dismantle the houses of local residents, and pushed the latter to take extremist action to defend their own proprieties either by killing themselves or by revenging the injustice, even though the central government takes a serious surveillance over the wrongdoings of low governments. When the government still puts its nose in the daily affairs of economic activities, there will exist the unjust competitive conditions for all the enterprises and the different regions, even in the research project funding. For example, in January 2001, the central government issued the “Opinions on Strengthening and Regulating the In Being Offices of Local Governments” to dispel some In Beijing Offices to their home town because they have exercised negative influences on the top officials in Beijing or caused the unjust distribution of national resources, etc. These offices have bad influences because one of their functions is to seek “Guan Xi” (relations with Chinese characteristics) in the central departments so as to let the financial or policy supports incline in their own interests. Additionally, because of the strong intervention of government, even the related scientific research can not be executed normally, for example, fewer
nationally-funding research programs or projects would be granted to the official-professors who have good “Guan Xi” in the officialeldom and in their turn will ask his/her subordinates to do the job.

**Perspectives as Conclusion**

From the above mentioned description and analysis, we can see there exist at least several necessary perspectives to meditate a sustainable cultural industry in China because of its own special political system, special culture, and particularly its special people who have the habitude to live with an enlightened authoritarian government, as chosen much more by its long history than by the global contexts.

In such situation, it is recommended to think the cultural industries and cultural creative industries definitely in the following terms.

Firstly, it is necessary to rationally coordinate the activities between the natures ideological, economic, and cultural. For the moment, public goods are less emphasized than propagandist instruments, and the disputes have always broken out in the identification between propagandist (or ideological) and commercial. These disputes harnessed and will harness the cultural industry development. This is a big obstacle for the government because the decision is of “double bind”: if loosing the control over the media in favor of commercial logic, the government will probably be afraid of losing the battle of gaining “hearts and souls” which is considered necessary in unifying the whole Chinese people to rejuvenate the nation. For a long time, it has rarely been seen that some brave measures are taken to depoliticize the cultural production, facilitate a healthy social development, and promote a diversified expression. The political reform intended to promote by the new generation of leadership will possibly make the landscape take a new look. It would probably help the industry escape from this double bind. What Chinese government is doing is an unprecedented project!

Secondly, modern enterprise system is inevitable. Even though China has a market economy with Chinese characteristics – but still in an preliminary form – Chinese enterprises are neither skilled nor familiar with the rules of international games, and furthermore, most of the players are state-owned companies or firms, heritors of those in the single-logic-following planned economy with less efficiency in performance and the taxpayers sometime have to pay their bills of loss through central government’s economic or financial leviers. As inalienable part of economic system, the cultural industries should take into consideration the modern enterprise system, because different type of cultural industries or creative industries will follow a different logic, for example, as indicated by Bernard Miège in his book *La société conquise par la communication. I. Logiques sociaux* (1996) in which the industrialized production of the culture and information is divided into three principal models: editorial model, flow model; and written information model. Each model distinguishably follows its own logic. Not all the cultural industries follow the same mechanism of production and distribution.

Thirdly, a sustainable development needs the corresponding reforms of economic system, cultural system, and political reform; the last one is necessary in order to dispel the
obstacles of the first two. For example, it is ridiculous for a movie to be submitted to the
discussion and censorship of a committee of more than 30 members who opinions are always
absurd and unreasonable, that is, it is unjust for one already successful movie to suffer from
some laypersons’ critics and wait for their judgment in 30 minutes (Chinese Economy Net, 2015).
Fortunately, the new generation of leadership has made their great efforts to push
forward the political reform even though it has encountered the counteraction from the people
with vested interests. As claiming ZHANG Xiaoming, deputy director of the Center for
Culture Studies attached to the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences (CASS), “The only way
to push into a new phase of Chinese cultural industries and elevate their quality and
efficiency is to have an open market” (Chinese Economy Net, 2015). The political power
should less interfere in the distribution of resources than the market. A diffuse and pervasive
political power in every field of social, economic, and cultural life, will harness the
development of cultural industries, of course the society as a whole.

Fourthly, a better relation between economic exploitation and cultural heritage
preservation is necessary. China is very rich in cultural resources; material and non-material
heritages have suffered from over-exploitation by local governments because the growth rate
of GDP has been regarded as a preferable index of the local government’s performances.
There should exist a dialectic relation between the exploitation and the preservation, but the
legitimacy of economic progress makes set light the preservation; every thing seemingly
gives its way to the economic development and the urbanization.

The development of cultural industries and cultural creative industries is not only en
economic project but also symbolic one. There are not only vectors of economic interests but
also of national collective memory!
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Notes
1 In January 1912, the Republic of China was founded in Nanjing and the Qing dynasty came to its end. The Youth was created in September 1915 in Shanghai and as a progressist magazine; it attacked the feudal ideology to promote “Science” and “Democracy” in the country. In 1917, the editorial office was moved to Beijing and became an organ to diffuse the Marxism against the feudalism and imperialism. And in September 1920, the editorial office was moved to Shanghai again and became an official paper of the embryonic communist party group where Chinese earliest communist group was founded in August 1920 in Shanghai and in the next year, July 1921, Chinese Communist Part was formally founded in Shanghai. The Youth became the first official paper of Chinese communist party.