« Tout Culturel »

A model for the creative economy in times of political chaos

Devyani Aggarwal
ANTH 431
Artisanal Capitalism
Professor Narges Erami
Spring 2018

Abstract

How has state law and policy treated creative industries in moments of political chaos? In this essay, I first propose to study state governance using "chaos theory," a model borrowed from physics. I then situate creative economies in this framework and reinterpret the theory to create a model based on "political chaos." I then apply this model to the case of post-revolutionary France. I identify the benefits of institutional and constitutional measures of French cultural policy, which I interpret as the state's "response" to "political chaos." Finally, I acknowledge that despite its limitations, the model is a useful lens to navigate the development of creative economies caught in different types of "political chaos."

To the physicist, "chaos theory" helps us predict the unpredictable. The model was initially developed to solve non-linear problems in wild, complex physical systems based on "sensitivity to its initial conditions." In his compelling PhD dissertation, Dimitrios Kantemnidis makes a daring yet reasonable argument, applying chaos theory to international relations. I extend his argument to the larger notion of political governance, irrespective of jurisdictional determination. Three assumptions allow us to use this approach:

1. The "chaotic" nature of politics, which has a history of sensitivity to initial conditions, complex long-term behavior and unpredictability.
2. Involved actors seek security.
3. The need for security leads to co-dependence and interaction among these actors.

At the risk of simplification, the above discussion helps us connect "chaos" and politics in a systematic manner. Political chaos, according to this interpretation, could take many forms but would fundamentally be characterized by the following description. A society is said to be chaotic when certain known factors of political life face irreversible disruption. This causes a state of uncertainty and affects every section of society in unique ways, depending on how this sub-group is defined. The response to such an event or series of events, henceforth, requires a response based on the central question of prioritization. An accurate response to chaos should address two central priorities: first, the revival and restoration of "known factors" and second, the risky but urgent move toward new ways of social functioning.

To address the challenge of balancing these two priorities, statesmen—knowingly and unknowingly—have often turned to the traditional hierarchy of human needs. The famed Abraham Maslow, ____ anthropologist of the ____, proposed a pyramid to classify the fundamental needs that motivate human action. Maslow's "hierarchy of needs" finds application in fields ranging from psychology and economics to management and political theory. In a descending order of superiority, human needs could be classified as follows:

1. Physiological needs
   Food, water, shelter, clothing
2. Safety needs
   Justice, law & order
3. Social-affectional or love needs
   Religious & social freedoms and institutions
4. Self-esteem or dignity needs
   Democratic organization
5. Self-actualization needs
   Unsatisfied wants

According to many political theorists and development economist, the need theory provides a useful path to the reconstruction of fractured political economies, which we will study from the lens of chaos theory. Based on our discussion of political chaos and Maslow's pyramid, my central interest lies in answering the following questions: how should states prioritize creative economies in times of political chaos?

Before we begin, it is important to define some terms that appear frequently throughout the essay. These definitions serve to provide the reader with specific points of reference in the context of our discussion. The terms "artisan" and "creative producer" will be used interchangeably. For this essay, we will use the following definition, based on an essay by Tadashi Sanaka:

> Artisans employ creative thinking and manual dexterity to produce their goods that may be functional or strictly decorative. It is well conceivable that manufacture by skilled hand and with hand tools imparts unique and individual qualities to artisanal products, in contrast to mass produced goods where every one is nearly identical.

Creative economy refers to the model of commerce and exchange of goods and services between artisans/creative producers and their clients.

We will begin our study of France with a brief look at the private patronage of creative producers in eighteenth century Old Regime France. We will then move on the phase of "political chaos" which, over here, refers to the period immediately following the French Revolution of 1789. The abandonment of guilds and novelty of a liberal, free market economy were key factors that most profoundly affected the life of the artisan. The specific "response" to chaos we will study here is the reshaping of French law and policy to accommodate the protection of creative producers.

State intervention in cultural domains traces its history back to ancient regime France. To occupy control over all "functional modalities" of society, the monarchical state chose to administer all "disciplines and institutions governing cultural production." Creative economies were dependent, thus, on two essential pillars — aristocratic patronage and cultural centralization. A historical survey of artisanal trade in eighteenth-century Paris, by Natacha Coquery, provides valuable insight. Coquery studies the economic and political dimensions of creative production through the patronage patterns of noble families. Artisans produced finely crafted luxury items that were status symbols, flaunted by Parisian aristocrats in royal residences called *hôtels*. A close study of legal documents, financial statements and other transactions reveals that

> …the sheer range of their expenditure meant that nobles provided a living for a large number of suppliers who were more than ready to profit from their extravagance.

The artisans involved in such "luxury trades," however, also submitted to "being ruled by credit" – in other words, their success in securing this loyal clientele only increased their dependence on patronage. The credit wars inevitably favored the ruling classes: the artisan was at the mercy of patrons who were not only financially but also politically more powerful. How would this dynamic change after 1789 when there remained, at least in theory, no ruling class at all?

The Revolution promised the French people a nation founded upon liberty, fraternity and equality. Our interest lies in examining how these lofty ideals were delivered to the artisan. According to William Reddy, the process was complex and unpredictable, adjectives that characterize our understanding of "political chaos."

The abandonment of social hierarchies was the the premise of post-revolutionary society. As William Reddy puts it:

> …political institutions, the social hierarchy, the day-to-day relationships between people at the street level, and the far-flung workings of ideological control and commercial dependence all had to undergo significant reconstruction in conjunction with this shift in thought about commodities.

Our previous discussion on artisanal products, or "commodities," and state patronage suggests that this change in "thought about commodities" inevitably led to a change in thought about those who produced them. A highly polarized marketplace and strictly regulated guilds — "known factors" of the past — had chained the artisan to the consumer before the Revolution. But in the absence of feudal regulations and binding rules, how did the state reorganize artisanal labor to comply with the Republicans' claims to justice? We will now evaluate the post-revolutionary response to what Reddy defines as a "cultural crisis": a situation in which the prospect of a new government altered "the center of gravity" for "millions of individual lives" — including that of the creative producer.

Cultural policy of the French state is what we seek to study as a response to this cultural crisis, understood here as a type of political chaos. For the purposes of our discussion, cultural policy refers to the legal protection of artisanal communities or creative producers through state-mandated institutional and constitutional guarantees.

Cultural policy in France has historically served the key functions of preserving cultural heritage, educating the public, and encouraging the independent organizations of artists. These functions emerged as a result of liberal values propagated during the Revolution and allowed the creative economy to combat chaos in its particular capacity. Across various stages of France's post-revolutionary period, the political leadership has maintained these founding principles through both institutional and constitutional reform. We will now look at how cultural policy upheld its historical foundations and proved to be a sustainable response to chaos. Our discussion will concern itself with twentieth-century and present-day politics, albeit with the acknowledgement of past influences. It is beyond the scope of this essay to conduct a highly detailed historical survey of the creative economy or account for the effect of radical ideological shifts in French political thought. The discussion is organized to respond to our pointed interest in studying French cultural policy as a "response" to "political chaos," terms that are clearly defined in the introductory pages.

Artisan & Education*:* An Institutional Approach

Creative industries have, for long, played a key role in the everyday lives of French citizens. The mandate of French cultural policy indicates that the state uses educational tools—at all levels—to create an organic presence for creative industries in social norms and customs. From schools and museums to cultural centers and public events, the state has heavily invested its resources in the public's awareness of cultural history and engagement with cultural activities. The institutionalization of cultural life has thus generated positive returns for the creative economy by blending the idea of cultural identity with that of a collective national identity. What are some of the institutions, then, that evoke public interest and investment in creative production?

The origins of this approach lie in the short-lived reign, between 1936 and 1938, of the left-wing Popular Front, which was crucial in the shaping of a *nouvelle politique culturelle* or "a new cultural politics." The goal of this strategy was to popularize and democratize *la culture savante*, that is, to make scholastic knowledge about creative fields more relevant and accessible to all sections of society. The reintegration of national heritage, as well as regional and local identities, into the nation's social fabric characterized the "response" of post-revolutionary regimes to the "political chaos" caused by the Revolution. It was a "defense of culture" that sought to not only protect but promote creative industries through public education. The Popular Front articulated its commitment to the educational project in explicit terms:

> L'éducation populaire devient le domaine des loisirs culturels tandis que l'activité artistique se popularise.
> [Public education becomes the domain of cultural recreation and promotes the popularity of artistic activity.]

To further investigate this principle, let us now turn to some examples from contemporary French politics that explain how the institutionalization of cultural life gradually helped creative producers secure an important place in public life.

The organizational chart of the Ministry of Cultural Life, from 1994, is useful in understanding the various channels of public influence identified by the state.

MINISTÈRE DE LA VIE CULTURELLE

Ministre
Cabinet du ministre

I – *Secrétaire d'État à l'Éducation nationale*

Trois directeurs de l'enseignement – premier degré ; – second degré ; – supérieur.	*Directeur de la jeunesse*	*Directeur des services administratifs et de la comptabilité*
Enseignement des beaux-arts ; enseignement professionnel et technique ; enseignement agricole ; enseignement de l'éducation physique et tous les enseignements qui intéressent les divers degrés ; même répartition pour l'outre-mer ; même répartition pour le corps de l'inspection générale.	Centre national de documentation professionnelle ; Fédération nationale des œuvres complémentaires de l'enseignement du premier et du deuxième degré ; œuvre en faveur des étudiants ; liaison interministérielle : organisation nationale de la jeunesse. – CNRS ; – Service de l'enfance anormale et de l'éducation surveillée.	Service des bourses et indemnités d'études ; services des constructions et de l'équipement scolaires.

II. – *Secrétaire d'État à l'Expression nationale*

Directeur des lettres et des arts	*Directeur des musées et palais nationaux*	*Directeur des archives et bibliothèques*
Lettres et édition ; arts et expositions ; théâtres nationaux et autres ; spectacles ; concerts ; *cinéma* ; *radio* ; *presse*[186] Caisse des lettres et des arts.	Musées ; architecture et palais nationaux ; mobilier et manufactures de l'État.	Archives ; bibliothèques de conservation et d'étude ; bibliothèques de centres de documentation ; bibliothèques de lecture publique ; + un service central de documentation des bibliothèques ; + 1 Centre national de prêt.

Directeur des services administratifs et de la comptabilité

Source : P. Ory, *La Belle Illusion*, Paris, Plon, 1994, p. 178.

A closer look reveals the methods and administrative tools that the State employs in order to organize "cultural life." To begin with, the Ministry divides itself into two core groups — *Secretaire de l'État à l'Éducation nationale* (Secretary of State for National Education) and the *Secretaire de l'État à l'expression nationale* (Secretary of State for National Expression). The very fact that cultural life in France was envisioned as a "national" project speaks to the government's attempt to create common platforms for the integration of cultural and national identities.

From the above chart, for instance, we notice distinct categories such as professional and technical education programs (*enseignement professionnel et technique*), youth development centers (*orgnisation nationale de la jeunesse*), and scholarships (*Service des bourses et indemnités d'études*), which indicate the state's willingness to protect, preserve and promote the knowledge of creative production through institutional support. This pursuit is aided by a nation-wide effort to archive and conserve information about the production process: the mandate clearly prioritizes the "documentation" and "reparation" of diverse classifications of cultural heritage. Furthermore, the establishment of *bibliothèques* (libraries) and museums ensures that public has affordable access to witness and learn about the history of creative production in France. While these institutions allow people to access the nation's cultural wealth from the past, events and concerts and media outlets such as cinema and radio — also under the same mandate — allow the public to keep up with contemporary developments of creative producers.

Several other kinds of institutions stemmed from this basic framework. A notable example, at the local level, is that of *maisons de la culture* (local cultural centers), which demonstrate the state's use of public forums to generate awareness about the value of creative production.

The establishment of *Maisons de la Culture,* in 1961, marks a key moment in the "collaboration between the State, local collectives and artists." André Malraux, the Minister of Cultural Affairs and responsible authority called them modern-day "cathedrals": historic spaces that engendered community through cultural activity. The object of the institution, as per Malraux, was to make works of art, the creative capital of humanity, accessible to the greatest possible number of French people (« rendre accessible les œuvres capitales de l'humanité au plus grand nombre de Français »). These centers would facilitate events related to arts and culture — from workshops and art exhibitions to seminars and theatrical performances. They were set up in centrally located and, often, historically important buildings in major cities across the country. The State funded 50% of both construction and maintenance costs. The decision-making committee for each *maison* equitably represented State and local interests. The main object was to decentralize cultural education by giving power to local actors in order and consolidating regional infrastructure for creative producers. Since these centers offered complimentary opportunities for entertainment and education to local citizens, they attracted a diverse audience of local community members and enabled the State to disseminate cultural education at a grassroots level.

Finally, how does institutionalization help the artisan navigate political chaos? We have learnt that French cultural policy addresses creative economies through the institutionalization of "cultural life." From the above discussion, we gather that cultural institutions accomplish two goals for the creative economy:

i. financial and technical support for skill training, documentation and other sub-processes that enable artisans to sustain production methods;

ii. open and accessible platforms for public engagement with "cultural life," which makes consumers – both local and international – more likely to value and demand the artisanal production of France.

Artisan & Commerce: A Constitutional Approach

As discussed in the introduction, the creative economy of Old Regime France relied upon a system of aristocratic and state patronage. Such a dynamic, which depended on fixed social and economic hierarchies, was ironically both secure and exploitative for the artisan. While on the one hand it guaranteed a demand for artisanal production, it also created opportunity for corruption and labor exploitation at the mercy of rich and powerful patrons. The Revolution eradicated the entire prospect of such a dynamic, which evidently violated its founding principles. Our interest lies in evaluating the set of laws that sought to replace this system and rescue the artisan from political chaos in a new free market economy.

Let us now turn to contemporary laws that protect France's creative economy by recognizing the ownership rights of each producer. We saw above how lawmakers, after 1789, aimed to create protectionist policies that created a thriving local market of artisanal goods and promoted self-sufficient creative economies. While this model mirrors, to some extent, the "guaranteed demand" approach of Old Regime France, it also upholds the revolutionary spirit by stressing on the individual authority of the producer over the commodity. A novel approach to the creative economy, based on the concept of intellectual property, thus characterizes the constitutional "response" to "political chaos."

Ownership of intellectual property, in the process of creative production, has a long-standing legal history in France. Tracing the evolution of a *marque (*which loosely translates to "label," "make" or "brand"), as per French law, is crucial to understand how cultural policy addresses intellectual property in post-revolutionary France. In Old Regime France, the medieval concept of guilds or trade associations was prevalent and controlled under a royal prerogative. The model of aristocratic patronage, discussed in the introduction, bears exhibits the restrictions to innovation and legal disempowerment of by the artisan. Towards the nineteenth century, however, as feudal privilege became contested and the revolution gained steam, innovators and industrialists broke away from the entrapments of these repressive economies. The knowledge of production, dictated so far by the tastes of wealthy patrons, had an undetermined owner after 1789. In this state of "chaos" and abstraction, the "response" of French lawmakers was founded upon the principle of right to property for all, including creative producers, as proclaimed by the *Déclaration des droits de l'homme et du citoyen* (Declaration of rights of man and citizen). The new model of creative production aimed to synthesize individual liberty with the needs of the nation. The first step in the process was to acknowledge the inventor or producer's legal right of ownership of innovation, through a patenting guarantee called the *brevet d'innovation*. The preamble of the law of *brevets*, of January 7, 1791, attaches the intellectual property to the owner of the property, that is, the producer:

> Ce serait attaquer les droits de l'Homme dans leur essence que de ne pas regarder une découverte industrielle comme la propriété de son auteur.
>
> [It would essentially be an attack on human rights, to not consider an industrial discovery as the property of its maker.]

Even after this initial law was passed, the National Assembly felt the need for more rigorous legal protection. And so, on May 25, 1791, the Assembly declared:

> Il sera délivré sur une simple requête du Roi, et sans examen préalable, des patentes nationales, sous la dénomination de brevet d'invention.
> [National patents, under the name of *brevet d'invention*, will be issued on a simple request of the King, and without prior examination.]

Finally, Article 357 of the Constitution confirmed the legal validity of these lofty declarations:

> La loi doit pourvoir à la récompense des inventeurs ou au maintien de la propriété exclusive de leurs découvertes ou de leurs productions.
>
> [The law must provide for the reward of inventors or the support of the exclusive property of their discoveries or their productions.]

The above law was the foundation of ensuing developments. In subsequent years, French cultural policy further consolidated the *exclusive* rights of producers in determining the terms that governed their process of innovation and production. Important to note, however, is that even though the State no longer regulated creative production, the artisan still had to comply with certain legal directives to qualify for the right to individual ownership. The example of Article 6 from the Constitution of 1780, , specific to the production of textiles, illustrates the details of this process:

> Tous fabricants ou marchands faisant fabriquer à façon auront chacun un coin ou marque sur laquelle seront gravés la première lettre de leur nom, et sans abréviation leur surnom ainsi que le lieu de leur demeure. Leur adjoignons d'apposer la tête et à la queue de chacune des pièces de toiles une empreinte de ladite marque avec de l'huile et du noir de fumée […]

> [All manufacturers or merchants who manufacture their own goods will each have a corner or mark on which will be engraved the first letter of their name, and without abbreviation their alias and the place of their dwelling. They should affix to the adjoining head and tail of each of the pieces of canvas an imprint of said mark with oil and black smoke […]]

As we notice from the above law, constitutional provisions building up to the Revolution were already responding to the need for explicit ownership criteria in the realm of creative production. This condition was further consolidated in subsequent Republican laws, such as the following from April 28, 1824:

> Quiconque aura soit apposé, soit fait apposer par addition, retranchement ou par une altération quelconque des objets fabriqués, le nom d'un fabricant autant que celui qui en est l'auteur ou la raison commerciale d'une fabrique autre que celui de la fabrication, sera puni des peines portées en l'article 423 du code pénal sans préjudice des dommages-intérêts s'il y a lieu.
>
> [Anyone who has affixed, or has affixed by addition, retrenchment or any alteration of the objects manufactured, the name of a manufacturer as well as the one who is the author or the commercial reason of a factory other than that of the manufacture will be punished by the penalties laid down in Article 423 of the Penal Code without prejudice to damages, if any.]

The additional element of criminal prosecution, to the terms governing creative production, made the *exclusive* nature of property ownership even more stringent. We conclude from the above that even though the artisan could claim complete ownership of the final product, this claim was contingent on fixed evidence that substantiated the validity of the original claim.

The roots of individual ownership in constitutional history help us identify the artisan's new identity as an independent agent of commerce. We will now evaluate laws, specific to the creative economy, that exemplify this notion and demonstrate the role of the constitution in safeguarding creative production. By doing this, we will be able to apply the ideas discussed henceforth to our central question about the creative economy and the French "response" to post-revolutionary "political chaos."

We will begin with two acts that enable individual ownership through geographical indicators or GI's: first, the law of 1905 that mandated called *Apellation d'Origine Controllée* (AOC), a GI for local agricultural products and second, the Hamon Act of 2015, which mandated GI's for locally produced non-agricultural products. For the purposes of this essay, the two classifications of products satisfy our criteria for "creative production" and we will, henceforth, treat the producer referred to in corresponding laws as artisans.

The AOC, which roughly translates to "protected designation of origin" was first introduced in the French Parliament to give local wine producers legal protection against market fraud. The AOC offered a much-needed constitutional guarantee to the producers: if they complied with a fixed set of criteria regarding production processes, they would possess full state-protected ownership of their produce. The criteria that determined their authenticity, however, depended on the concept of *terroir*. According to the *Institut National de l'Origine et de la Qualité*, the rules governing the issue of AOC labels depends on the producer's ability to justify the element of *terroir* in his production processes. The concept is fundamentally based on small-scale, localized economic models, focused on regional affiliations:

> A terroir is a specific geographical area where production takes its originality directly from the specific nature of its production area. Terroir is based on a system of interactions between physical and biological environment, and a set of human factors within a space which a human community built during its history with a collective productive knowledge. These are the elements of originality and typicality of the product.

The list of GI's issued, based on this criteria, include products such as wine, cheese, lavender, lentils, butter and honey that correspond to specific regional production methods in different parts of the country. The success of the model might be evidenced by its imitation by other nations and, on a global level, by the European Union in a 1992 ruling.

While the model was clearly effective, it was also limited to a sub-section of creative producers. Realizing the potential of the protective measures in other parts of the creative economy, France extended its applicability to other industries – most notably, the handicraft market, which trades in locally produced Quimper pottery, Limoges porcelain or Basque linen. In 2011, the market was said to contribute €300 billion to the nation's entire economy, employed 10 percent of the population and engaged one million companies' production and trade practices.

Recognizing the potential of the AOC model in this market, according to a report by the International Trademark Association,

> France enhanced its GI arsenal by issuing implementing decree no. 2015-595 on June 2, 2015, on "Geographical indications protecting industrial products and crafts and relative to trade mark aspects" under Article 73 of the newly enacted Consumer Protection Law No. 2014-344 of March 17, 2014 (the Hamon Act). By enlarging the scope of protected GIs to non-

agricultural products and non-foodstuffs, the Hamon Act gives birth to a new industrial property right: Industrial Products and Crafts Geographical Indication (IPCGI).

This law essentially expanded, to a large extent, the number of artisans eligible to rightfully claim exclusive ownership of knowledge and processes of creative production.

The above examples from recent history show us the continued legacy of constitutional safeguards for creative producers. In relation to our main discussion, these safeguards constitute the response of the State to political chaos in post-revolutionary French society. We gather, from this analysis, that the constitutional approach of French cultural policy handled the sudden disappearance of state patronage by replacing it with a regulated yet liberal and competitive market, which aimed to protect the artisan against further exploitation. The resulting laws achieved, for the French creative economy, two main goals:

i. State support for an efficient transition between feudal patronage and individual ownership of production knowledge and processes.
ii. a strengthened legal justice framework to acknowledge and protect regional producers against fraudulent practices.

Conclusion

In this essay, we studied societies faced with disruption and unrest – what we decided to call "political chaos" – and then tried to situate the artisan in the mandate of state governance. We inferred that the most suitable "response" to solve such political chaos would reconcile two opposing elements – the "known factors" of a society's "initial state" and the uncertainty of its future course. Post-revolutionary French society served as our model of political chaos. We studied the response to political chaos more specifically as "cultural policy" for the creative economy. To do this, we classified cultural policy into institutional and constitutional measures for the protection of creative producers. French cultural policy, we observed, was able to both sustain the relevance of traditional creative production and bring greater political and economic freedoms to the creative producer, by upholding the liberal promises of the Revolution. In its ability to reconcile known modalities of the past with unknown prospects of the future, French cultural policy thus gave birth to an innovative model of state governance for the creative economy. As acknowledged at the beginning of this essay, our purpose was to parse the positive lessons from French cultural policy and thus develop valuable models of studying response to political chaos. By virtue of this specific objective, however, many defects of the system were controlled for.

How, then, can this model advance the study of creative economies affected by political chaos? In the final comments of this essay, I will first identify the novelty of French cultural policy as a "response" to "political chaos" by arguing that this model reinterprets the role of creative economies in Maslow's hierarchy of human needs. I will argue this by turning the reader's attention to the ways in which political leadership implemented these institutional and constitutional strategies as a matter of national priority. This insight, I propose, could be useful to not only the theoretical study of the topic across various disciplines but also to the applied value of this model in the context of present-day political chaos.

In a long interview in *Le Monde* president Georges Pompidou, in 1972, expressed his thoughts on the connection between modernity and the arts:

> …Je ne cherche pas à créer un style « majoritaire » ! Bais c'est vrai, la France se transforme, la modernisation, le développement dans tous les domaines sont éclatants. Pourquoi n'y aurait-il pas un lien avec les arts ? Toutes les grandes époques artistiques sont des époques de prospérité économique et souvent de puissance politique. »
>
> [I am not trying to create a "majoritarian" style ! But it's true, France is changing, modernization and development in all areas are promising. Why should this not apply to the

> arts? All the great artistic epochs are epochs of economic prosperity and often of political power.]

Similar examples from recent French history reflect the sustained effect of cultural policy as a response to political chaos. Pompidou's recognition of the need for political attention for the arts is significant: creative production publicly received a high-priority status from the leader of the state. This belief not only percolated to other parts of the administration but also translated into the practical measures that governed French life, as demonstrated through the course of this essay.

« Tout culturel » was at the core of French cultural policy. Even the most liberal translation of the term, "everything cultural," would not do adequate justice to the spirit of the idea, coined in 1987 by the public intellectual Alain Finkielkraut. The principle is best explained by the decree of 1982 that established the mission of France's cultural ministry:

> Le ministère de la culture a pour mission : de permettre à tous les Français de cultiver leur capacité d'inventer et de créer, d'examiner librement leurs talents et de recevoir la formation artistique de leur choix ; de préserver le patrimoine culturel national, régional ou des divers groupes sociaux pour le profit commun de la collectivité tout entière ; de favoriser la création des œuvres d'art et de l'esprit et de leur donner la plus vaste audience ; de contribuer au rayonnement de la culture et de l'art français dans le libre dialogue des cultures du monde.
>
> [The mission of the Ministry of Culture is to enable all French people to cultivate their ability to invent and create, to freely examine their talents and to receive the artistic training of their choice; to preserve the national, regional and cultural heritage for the common benefit of the entire community; to foster the creation of works of art and of the mind and to give them the widest audience; to contribute to the influence of French culture and art in the free dialogue between cultures of the world.] (164)

Politics, in France, seemed to have the explicit mission of interweaving the citizen's political and social identity with his/her cultural and historical origins. As highlighted above, diverse forms of artistic expression – both regional and national – were crucial in achieving this mission. Corresponding measures, both institutional and constitutional, would then reflect the spirit of « tout culturel » by following the objectives articulated by France's political leadership. In the acknowledgement of arts and culture as essential to nation-building, French politicians valorized the influence of arts and culture on human life. In doing so, they also reinterpreted the role of creative production in Maslow's hierarchy of human needs.

The artisan's labor often receives a romanticized treatment in history. Law and policy often comply with this narrative by acknowledging the aesthetic value of the artisan's labor but not adequately addressing his/her social and political challenges that determine the production of such aesthetics. Our case study shows that the defense and empowerment of creative economies, in times of political chaos, is rooted in a "response" from state leadership that acknowledges creative production as a priority in the national mandate. This acknowledgement makes the arts and culture an essential influence on all "needs" of the society – from 1 to 5 in Maslow's proposed hierarchy. What follows is the enforcement of corresponding institutional and constitutional measures that seek to protect and promote the contribution of creative producers, for the overall benefit of the nation.

While I acknowledge that the example of French cultural policy corresponds to a specific time period, geographical position and historical context, I aim to make it useful for the study of other societies. Studies rooted in comparative law and politics could especially benefit from this approach by identifying common factors: first, through the definition of "political chaos" and then, through the study of creative economies in the context of the state's "response." For instance, the elements of political chaos we analyzed in post-revolutionary France – political upheaval, corrupt social hierarchy, et cetera – are the characteristic features of "chaos" in many societies in the modern day. Economic reconstruction in conflict zones, global trade monopolies in post-colonial societies and the eviction of small business-owners in the face of gentrification: these are all forms of "political chaos" that follow similar trajectories. Social order, in each case, begins with an "initial state," whose stability depends on certain "known factors." The society then takes a historically unanticipated course that renders it fractured – by means of violence, mistreatment of labor or commercial exploitation of urban environments. In such cases, if the "response" to chaos prioritizes the needs of the creative economy in its institutional and constitutional strategy – as did French cultural policy – there is much scope for each society to simultaneously maintain its cultural heritage and harness the innovative and commercial value of creative production. But if such societies do not recognize the social and political identity of creative producers, who might represent a significant proportion of the population, the society in question might be headed toward a future filled with even more chaos than anticipated.

References

Actimage. "PDO - AOC." INAO, www.inao.gouv.fr/eng/Official-signs-identifying-quality-and-origin/PDO-AOC.

Alain Beltran, Sophie Chauveau, Gabriel Galvez-Behar. *Brevets et des marques : une histoire de la propriété industrielle.* Fayard. November, 2011.

Coquery, Natacha. "The aristocratic hôtel and its artisans in 18th-century Paris: the market ruled by court society." *The Artisan and the European Town, 1500–1900*. Edited by Geoffrey Crossick. Aldershot: Scolar Press, 1997.

Davies, James Chowning. "Maslow and Theory of Political Development: Getting to Fundamentals." Political Psychology, vol. 12, no. 3, 1991, pp. 389–420. JSTOR, JSTOR, www.jstor.org/stable/3791750.

FRANCE: Decree Implemented on Geographical Indications Protecting Industrial Products and Crafts, www.inta.org/INTABulletin/Pages/France_7015.aspx.

Kantemnidis, Dimitrios. Chaos theory and international relations. Department of Physics, Naval Postgraduate School, Monterey, CA. December, 2016.

Philippe Poirrier, *L'Etat et la culture en France au XXème siècle*, LGF/Livre de Poche, series: « Le Livre de Poche références », 2000, 258 p.

Reddy, William M. "The structure of a cultural crisis: thinking about cloth in France before and after the Revolution," in The Social Life of Things : Commodities in Cultural Perspective. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013.

Reddy, William M. *The Rise of Market Culture: The Textile Trade and French Society, 1750-1900*. Cambridge University Press, 1984.

The Economist. (2018). Hierarchy of needs. [online] Available at: https://www.economist.com/node/12407919.

Yamanaka, Tadashi. An Economic Essay on Traditional Handicraft Industries. Bul. Hijiyama Univ. No.15, 2008.