Good morning everyone. I'd like to begin by thanking Rod for organising this event and inviting me to talk to you today.

I spoke here a few years ago, but for those of you who don’t know me I am John Holden. I am a visiting professor at City University in London and I used to be Head of Culture at the think-tank Demos. Demos is a not for profit educational charity, and although, unlike many think tanks, it is not politically aligned, it is politically connected. It exists in a space that brings academia, politics, the third sector, and business together to find better ways of doing things for everyone. It is therefore a pretty unusual space, where we’ve had the leaders of all three of our British political parties at events, and where you get some juxtapositions of people who might well not meet in any other context.

I think it is important to explain that context, because the theme of my talk this morning is Cultural Diplomacy, and what I have to say about the subject is based on research that we undertook at Demos that resulted in this pamphlet [slide].

Even before it was published, we realised that we were on to something important, because of the interest that the pamphlet was generating. On the day of the launch, which was held here [slide], in the Raphael room of the Victoria and Albert Museum in London, we had the UK’s Secretary of State for Culture on the platform alongside the Director of the British Museum, and a capacity audience of diplomats and cultural professionals. TV crews turned up, and the next morning I was interviewed on the Today programme, in discussion with the former Foreign secretary Malcolm Rifkind, and the rather more glamorous Hollywood actor Jessica Lange.

This is not the kind of coverage that policy pamphlets about culture normally receive. And it didn’t stop there. A couple of months later the pamphlet was heavily referenced in a debate about Cultural Diplomacy in the House of Commons, and also became the subject of debate in the House of Lords. Both were rare occasions of cross-Party agreement about the analysis and prescriptions that the pamphlet contained. Again, this is unusual.

Since then I’ve been invited all over the world to talk about cultural diplomacy, and have encountered record low temperatures in Canada and record highs in Australia.

The pamphlet has had more than 100,000 downloads from the Demos website, though admittedly it is downloadable free. Here is the address that you can find it on: www.demos.co.uk/publications/culturaldiplomacy
So why all this interest in Cultural Diplomacy? I think it can be explained in part by the fact that people are looking for solutions to the problem of the failure of hard power. When the pamphlet came out Iraq and Afghanistan were even worse than they are now. With every passing day it was obvious that military solutions were at best unpredictable and unbelievably expensive, both financially, and in terms of human lives prematurely ended or blighted. And at worst the bullets and bombs were making the problems more intractable, perpetuating cycles of violence, and storing up conflict for the future. By contrast, in place of WMDs, Cultural Diplomacy offered something that the magazine Monocle called weapons of mass seduction.

But I think there was, and is, more to it than that. Cultural Diplomacy has become interesting not just because of problems with hard power: more significantly, there is something about culture itself that is changing, and that’s one of the things I will be concentrating on this morning.

So what did readers find in this pamphlet? The first thing to say is that they got something from a cultural perspective – and that is unusual. Most treatment of the role of culture in international relations comes from people who have spent their lives in academic disciplines or practical jobs that are primarily concerned with Foreign relations and diplomacy. That tends to mean that culture is seen by them as a subset of public diplomacy tools, alongside education, aid and trade. By contrast, our research was funded by a group of major cultural institutions in the UK – the British Museum, British Library, British Council, the Royal Opera House, the Royal Botanic Gardens, the Natural History Museum and the Victoria and Albert Museum – so it came from, and I come from, a cultural standpoint, rather than a foreign affairs or trade-related background.

Just how radically different our approach was became clear to me in a discussion I had about the pamphlet with a diplomat. He told me that it was he and his colleagues who opened up the possibility for culture to operate on the international stage. Without embassies and agencies, there would be no international tours by musicians and actors and hence no role for culture. Politics came first, and culture came afterwards, and quite a long way afterwards at that.

But I had to tell him that I thought he was completely wrong. His viewpoint was probably correct fifty years ago, but not now. Somehow, over the past half-century, the horse and the cart have changed places, so that rather than politics creating the space for culture to happen the opposite is now true: it is culture that provides politicians with their licence to operate, and culture that creates the world in which politics take place.

Well, people always like to think that what they do is far more important than what anyone else is doing, so perhaps I shouldn’t have been surprised at how upset and angry this diplomat became. He took a very dim view of the proposition that actors are more important than Ambassadors in the formation of international relations. But a moment’s thought tells you that people
gathered around TV screens in Pakistan and Bolivia are not watching debates at the UN – they get their view of the West from Rambo and Baywatch, and come to their own conclusions.

To explain the shift in what’s been happening in the relationship between culture and diplomacy we need some historical perspective. So let me begin with traditional view of what Cultural Diplomacy used to mean, which is in fact a view that many people still hold.

If you think about diplomacy itself, historically, in the pre-modern world, relations between different nation states were conducted through formal ambassadorial channels and international gatherings of monarchs, religious leaders or their representatives. Added to this were the trading relationships that brought business finance, and indeed cultural elites into contact with each other. We should not underestimate the ability of people and goods to travel relatively freely in the pre-modern period. For example the blue colouring in this ninth century manuscript made in Ireland [slide] contains lapis lazuli from Saudi Arabia. And from Herodotus to Marco Polo to Ibn Batuta we have accounts of scholars, merchants, and just the plain curious travelling many thousands of miles to visit distant lands.

Having said that, the lot of the vast majority of people was to live their lives in a very narrow geographical space. Foreign pilgrimages to Jerusalem, Santiago or Mecca were a once-in-a-lifetime experience for a tiny minority. Mostly, people stayed within walking distance of their fields, and went only as far as their local market town. So in that world, diplomacy was essentially a matter of elites having direct contact with each other. In this pre-modern era, cultural diplomacy was about the exchange of artworks as gifts that displayed strength, sophistication and power. Examples of this are such things as the gifts exchanged between the Pope and Kublia Khan, or the Doge of Venice sending the painter Gentile Bellini to the court of Sultan Mehmed the second as a diplomatic favour.

In the modern era elite to elite contact continued but another layer was added. Newspapers, books, radio and TV broadcasting meant that people began forming their opinions through common media. Nation states responded by inventing the concept of Public Diplomacy; in other words, the idea that governments could and should transmit messages directly to the populations of other countries. This was done in some very crude ways, like the leaflets dropped into combatant nations in wartime; and in some more subtle ways, like establishing radio stations to beam news and other programmes abroad. These types of communication are called propaganda when produced by your enemies, and ‘winning hearts and minds’ when you produce them yourself.

One way in which Governments sought to project their values was through culture. Starting with the French in the 1880s, European governments of all persuasions, including democracies, and fascist and Communist states, set up formal agencies to undertake cultural relations. Our own British Council was founded in 1934. In the 1950s we find the Soviets backing ballet and opera tours to show how civilised they are, and the CIA covertly funding jazz
and Abstract Expressionist art in order to demonstrate American values of freedom. This proxy war was at least a lot cheaper and more harmless than the real thing.

So in the modern era we move from contact between nations and peoples being restricted to conversations between a few people in elite groups at special, and often quite formal, moments; to a situation where elite groups in government additionally attempt to communicate with whole populations. In modern times then, we have both elite to elite communication and elite to mass communication.

This elite to mass communication is often referred to as soft power, a term famously invented by the American academic Joseph Nye. Soft power, and its recent fashionable successor smart power, says that it makes sense for governments to think in terms of pursuing their interests through a mix of force, broadly conceived to include sanctions and the threat of force; and through means of persuasion and influence. But persuasion and influence only work on an audience that is receptive, and in the soft power view, culture then steps in because it increases the chances of that audience being receptive.

Here, Cultural Diplomacy is a tool of government that uses the arts and culture in a number of ways. First, culture can ease the meeting of different nations. When relations are frozen it can act as act as a door-opener: think of the New York Philharmonic’s 2008 visit to North Korea. When relations are difficult it can ease the tensions - remember the meeting of British and Iranian politicians at the British Museum during the great Persian exhibition a couple of years ago. And it can provide a setting in which meetings can take place on relaxed ground outside the business forum or the summit gathering. The most recent example I can think of is the visit that Hu Jin Tao paid earlier this year to Stratford upon Avon to see Shakespeare’s birthplace – he is, apparently, a big fan of Shakespeare.

A second way that culture is used is as a means of demonstrating the qualities, standing and values of a nation through the display of its heritage and traditions. This is what India and China have been doing over the last decade with a whole series of loan exhibitions right across Europe and the United States.

And third, culture is used as a means of sending messages to whole populations through music, art, film and so on – which is why China has been setting up the culturally focused Confucius Institutes, with their message of harmony, around the globe. They are now in over sixty countries from Belarus to Nepal and from Chile to Kenya, and there are more than 1,000 Confucius Institutes planned by 2020.

Those are the strategies used by governments and there are several points to stress about this soft-power model. As I’ve said, at a very basic level, it assumes that politics creates the space in which the arts and culture can operate. The belief is that political agreements and political relations enable
cultural exchange and artistic expression; because taxes and governments fund the 'culture', and diplomats and government agencies operate the systems of cultural diplomacy.

The next assumption is that the point of cultural diplomacy is to exercise power: cultural relationships exist in to advance your own aims, it's just that it is done in more peaceful and subtle and cost-effective ways than other forms of diplomacy.

Finally, there is the assumption that governments can manage this activity – either directly or through arm's-length agencies.

My argument is that all three of those assumptions are incorrect. Rather than politics creating the space for culture, we should think of culture as creating the operating conditions for politics. Rather than thinking about culture as a tool for exercising power, we should be thinking of culture in terms of mutuality and respect. And finally, we must also accept that governments have very little control over what happens in the cultural world, and what control they still have is eroding before our eyes, as China recently found out when it imprisoned Ai Wei Wei and prompted a global protest.

In this new model, rather than thinking of Cultural Diplomacy as a subset of Public Diplomacy, we should think of it as a subset of Cultural Relations. And in the field of cultural relations, we have seen a radical transformation over a very short period of time.

To explain why that has happened we need first of all to look at the way the meaning of culture itself has changed over the last half century.

There was a time, back in the twentieth century, when a spade was a spade and not a postmodern designer implement with the embedded potential to deconstruct earth, but even then, we had a lot of trouble with this word culture, the reason being that the same word was used, and still is used, to describe several different things. Sometimes culture is used to mean the opposite of nature – anything made by humankind; sometimes it's used to mean the common practices adopted by groups of people, as in a national culture or an organisational culture. But right now, I want to look at culture in a familiar but more restricted sense. When I use the word culture I am referring to creative work that generates meaning and helps us to understand the human condition.

Let me wind back the tape a little to the days when most of us were growing up – that is, any time between 1945 and 1995, and look at cultural assumptions then, and cultural realities now, and chart just how much things have changed.

Back in the day we had three things going on under the banner of culture. First of all we had the arts, an established list of art-forms including theatre, ballet, opera, painting and so on, each of which had it's own canon of work. These art-forms were enjoyed by a relatively small social group of the better
educated and the better off, who in fact defined their own social status partly through their enjoyment of, and support for, the arts. Partly because of their narrow appeal, the arts were considered not just to be different from other forms of culture, but inherently superior to them. By a process of circular logic, the enjoyment of inherently superior culture made you an inherently superior person; while the culture enjoyed by inherently superior people must itself be superior to other forms of culture.

In order to exist, the arts needed to get money from philanthropists or the state, because they suffered from something called market failure – not enough people were prepared to pay enough money to support the arts through the market place; either that, or support was needed to reach those sections of the community who it was thought would benefit from the arts but could not directly afford them. So much for the arts.

By contrast the next type of culture - commercial culture – did pass the test of a mass market of people willing to pay for it. Commercial culture was stuff like TV and popular novels, film and rock and roll. In the traditional view, the reason why commercial culture thrives is because it appeals to the basest instincts of humankind and gives people exactly what they want.

You can see that, through this analysis, an antagonistic relationship between the arts and commercial culture is emerging. A mass market for the arts becomes both a logical impossibility and anathema to the arts crowd. In a wonderful piece of false logic it seemed that a) the worse commercial culture got the more it prospered, therefore b) the only way that the arts could appeal to more people is by lowering standards; and hence c) if three thousand people see a show rather than three hundred, it must have been dumbed down. The arts seem to be one of very few areas in life where it is argued that you if you have more customers you must have made a worse product. I can’t imagine the Directors of Mercedes Benz or BMW sitting round the table saying ‘Lots of people seem to buying our products – what have we done wrong? Oh I know, we must have produced a really rubbish car ‘.

Another piece of false logic went like this: step one: the arts are high quality. Step two the masses cannot appreciate quality; step three therefore if the masses like something it cannot be art. QED. This of course means that the arts end up not as popular culture but as unpopular culture.

So that’s the way we were: the arts and commercial culture in two separate camps: one high, the other low; one refined the other debased; one needing subsidy, the other thriving through the marketplace.

But: you will note that in spite of that, and however much they may be in opposition, the arts and commercial culture had, and have, one thing in common, and that is that they come into being through the decisions of gatekeepers. In both cases, someone stands between the artist and their potential audience.
In funded culture, a public official or a private philanthropist decides to give an artist or an organization the money they need. Who gets funded to do what, and how a society decides to allocate the power to make funding decisions becomes an intensely political question. It matters whether these decisions are taken in the boardrooms of corporations, or by national or city politicians who are accountable though the ballot-box, or by arm's-length expert agencies. Choose one and you get the US, choose another and you have France. But in all cases, the point is that funded culture exists as a result of grant-making decisions, not because of some a priori theory. This means it is pragmatic and expandable, which is why it now includes not just traditional art-forms but also things like puppetry and street theatre.

Commercial culture is equally pragmatically defined: if someone thinks a song or a show will sell, they back it. Success or failure is market driven, but crucially access to the market — the elusive ‘big bucks record deal’ that Bruce Springsteen sings about in *Rosalita*, or the stage debut, or the first novel — those are controlled by a corporate elite who are just as powerful as the decision-makers of funded culture. The really important thing here is that both in funded culture and in commercial culture there are gatekeepers who define the meaning of culture through their decisions. In both cases, if you are an artist you have to overcome an obstacle in order to get your work in front of an audience.

But alongside funded and commercial culture, there was a third type of culture as well – homemade culture, that didn't depend on anyone putting up the money for a recording studio or a printing press because you did it yourself. So here in homemade culture we have no gatekeepers, and we also have low entry costs to creativity when we want to make our own music, do craftwork, sing in a choir and so on. For ever, back into the mists of antiquity, people have always been doing things for themselves and it still goes on today. Sometimes it is not recognised by the more official types of culture. There is a story that in the 1980s the Crafts Council in Britain mounted a campaign to get a piece of craftwork into fifty percent of British homes. When they did a survey, they discovered that ninety seven per cent of the population thought that they already had a piece of craftwork in their homes. That of course is the home-made culture gap – the creative work being done everywhere that doesn't register in official perceptions and definitions, and again the reason it doesn't figure is because of an expectation of lower quality.

But, and it is a big but, this neat hierarchy of quality, placing opera at the top and am-dram at the bottom as it were, began to break down a long time ago, although it wasn't very noticeable at the time. For example, looking back it seems obvious that the single best cultural response to the Vietnam War – and by ‘best' I mean the response with the greatest expressive meaning that could bear the weight of history – that didn’t happen at the Met or in a fine artist’s studio or even in literature; it happened when Jimi Hendrix took to the stage at Woodstock. When it came to Vietnam, rock music trumped classical; journalism trumped literature, and film trumped fine art. But at the time there would have been many people who defended the notion that an electric guitar was of necessity inferior to a symphony orchestra, and that a historic object in
a museum must by definition be superior to a piece of mass-produced design. Maybe there are still people who would try to keep those barriers in place, but I think that nowadays we have to debate quality in niches and ask, not, is Otello better than the West Wing?, but is that a good piece of theatre, is that a great pop song, what does that painting do for me? And so on.

So this is one of the big cultural shifts that’s happened that affects the attitudes of audiences: people now see good quality and bad quality right across their cultural lives. And on top of that they are much more willing to make judgements about quality for themselves, rather than trusting the received opinion of experts. People no longer take it for granted the official culture and the arts are somehow ‘better’ or even ‘good’, and, while often still wanting to access expert knowledge, they don’t like being told what to think.

Let’s summarise the argument so far: I’ve been saying that we can think about culture taking place in these three spheres of the publicly or philanthropically funded, the commercial, and the home-made.

What is interesting, I think, is that the relationship between these three spheres has been radically transformed over a very short period of time. We are living in a profoundly different cultural world to that which existed even a decade ago, because technology has done two things: first it has put the tools of cultural production into the hands of almost everyone. Musical instruments cost less and are better; cameras are cheap and easy to use; new software means you can edit sound recordings to professional standards in your own bedroom. Second, the internet has enabled anyone and everyone to communicate their work, to collaborate with others, and to monetise their songs or their poems, or whatever it is they are making.

It’s no exaggeration to say that this is revolutionary, and it has completely changed the rules of the game in all three spheres of culture that I mentioned.

One obvious consequence of the changes is that the business models of parts of the commercial cultural world, such as the recording industry and publishing have been pretty much destroyed. When the Beatles started out they had to get a recording contract from a record company, which provided very expensive equipment in a studio operated by expert trained technicians. They then produced a physical record in a factory, that had to be packaged, and transported in a lorry to a record shop. You or I had to travel to the record shop in the hope that they had the disc, and if they did, then we could buy it. Now of course a band like Radiohead or an outfit just starting up like Captain Phoenix can post stuff on the web either for free or paid-for download, and you and I can get it with the click of a mouse. This has only really been possible for a decade – the first i-tune was downloaded in 2001; Tower Records went out of business in 2006. The next development, I predict, will be niche local record shops springing up to curate the huge amount of work that’s out there.

The direct connection of artists and would-be artists with their real and potential audiences has had other consequences beyond the commercial
world. It has enabled established artists to communicate and collaborate with each other, and to produce new art-forms, but the most significant development is that it has given rise to a huge explosion of activity in the area of home-made culture. Everyone under the age of twenty-five is in a band, or is a DJ or a dancer or a film maker. And even if they are not producing, everyone, of whatever age, is a curator of their own cultural preferences.

We are living at a time when the possibilities for us all to produce and consume culture have profoundly changed; we are taking those opportunities, and because of that culture is becoming more important to us as individuals, and by extension therefore, more important at the level of society and the economy. Because more people are making music and films and so on, and can share them, social and economic relations are changing.

In turn, this has enormous implications for the way that governments deal with culture, not least in the area of international relations.

Under the old model of culture, each of the three spheres could be dismissed as unimportant: the arts were elitist, commercial culture was mere entertainment, and homemade culture was hopelessly amateur. But put all three together and you have what Barcelona’s Jordi Marti calls ‘the second ecosystem of humankind’ because we are all living in a world where we increasingly define ourselves and are defined by what we read, watch, wear, look at and listen to. Our cultural choices aren’t just about a good night out any more, they go to the heart of who we are. We now define ourselves not so much by our jobs – because those come and go – and not so much by our geography – because we commute and move around – but by our cultural consumption and production. I am who I am, and you are who you are, because of what we watch, read, listen to, write and play.

Again, this has a global aspect. Identity formation through culture no longer means adopting a narrow set of cultural forms and inherited traditions. We can now have access to, become enthusiasts for, and start to play with cultures from all over the world. This is true not just in cosmopolitan cities, where on any night of the week it is possible to watch Katha dance, listen to reggae, and see the work of a Chinese artist. It’s happening everywhere. For example, I will never forget ten years ago sitting round a camp fire in Central Madagascar, four days’ walk from the nearest road and the closest electricity. A group of musicians appeared with home-made instruments and started to play, and in among their songs was a Jackson Five number.

The upsurge in cultural activity is reflected in the fact that culture is becoming more and more important economically – the creative industries now account for 7% of UK GDP, something that would have been unthinkable twenty five years ago. This strikingly successful performance in things like film, fashion and music has created enormous prosperity and huge economic spin-offs, but the culturally driven industries are having not just economic but social impacts right across the planet. Think how fashion connects art schools in Europe to factories in Bangladesh, and how magazine photography links Milan with Mumbai. These economic relationships are now a part of cultural diplomacy,
and are governed by everything from Intellectual property treaties to visa regulations. The UK is currently shooting itself in the foot by making it so difficult for artists, musicians and even museum curators to travel to this country. One world-class pianist, Grigory Sokolov has vowed never to visit the UK again.

This is just one small example of the way in which the world has become more interconnected. Over the past decade mass tourism, 24-hour news, cheap flights, internet blogs and citizen journalism have combined to shrink the world. Because of these changes we are all having much more interaction with and exposure to other people and other nations. We encounter difference at every turn, and what happens on the streets of New York one minute can lead to riots in Islamabad the next. In these circumstances we understand each other, and misunderstand each other as well, through the medium of culture. This has a number of implications for international relations and indeed, for the nature of artistic production.

To begin with, no longer do we have relatively separate artistic cultures, developing in isolation within their own traditions; instead we have cultures that mix, mingle, and morph to create something new. Artistic exchange of course is not new – you only have to look at the history of the Silk road, or read Orhan Pamuk’s book My Name is Red to realize that – but the capacity of artists to work together and to share what they do more widely has grown over the last ten years in a way that marks a fundamental shift.

On top of that, the way that cultures encounter each other has essentially changed. I described the history of cultural relations earlier in this talk as starting with one elite getting together with another, and then having an additional dimension of an elite giving cultural messages to mass audiences. Both of those things still happen, but we have now shifted, fundamentally and irrevocably, to a new model where we also have mass peer-to-peer cultural contact. The statistics about peer-to-peer contact are telling. When we wrote our pamphlet in the September of 2006, Twitter was one month old. At the end of 2006, Facebook had twelve million active members – it now has 500 million. International air flights and international tourism have also increased, in spite of the biggest global economic downturn since the 1930s.

And the fact of mass peer-to-peer contact increases the importance of culture as a factor in how nations relate to each other. For example, the way that a museum in Germany deals with objects from, just as an example, Turkey, the way that it interprets, respects, or fails to respect that country’s culture, matters. Because when millions of Turkish visitors or migrants see their own culture valued, that provides one of the building blocks that gives the German government a certain license to operate in the world. And it also means that the way that Ancient Persians are portrayed in a Hollywood Film like 300, becomes significant in a way that goes way beyond questions of aesthetics, artistic quality or entertainment. To take another example, it means that a British Prime Minister, landing in India for trade talks, can find his agenda hijacked by a remark made in the big brother house
I would argue further, that in cultural relations, because of mass peer to peer contact, we are moving away from the idea of soft power exercised by one party upon another, and towards one of mutuality based on equal cultural respect. The arena of culture is one where nations can meet on equal terms, regardless of their economic wealth or military capability. It is a sphere in which the small, the poor and the marginalized can stand tall and proud, a place where, if you like, Bob Marley and Bob Dylan can look each other in the eye.

I want to move on to think about what all this might mean specifically for Jersey, but before I do that, let me summarize the argument so far. Basically I have been saying that as far as culture is concerned we live in revolutionary times. Culture has become much more important, economically, socially and politically, in the relationships between states for very cogent reasons. At the same time as there has been a massive increase in cultural activity and cultural interaction: culture has become more and more difficult for nations and politicians to control, because it has shifted from being an elite-to-elite subject affecting a few people and become a mass peer-to-peer activity. Essentially, that means that we have to move from a model where cultural diplomacy is the concern of elites, artists, politicians and professionals, to a model where we are all involved. Because, as we put it in our Demos pamphlet: ‘We are all diplomats now.’

And if we are all in this together, to coin a phrase – what does that mean for Jersey? Well first, people outside Jersey will judge you by what they think of you culturally. That said, you must recognize that you don’t have control over what people think of you culturally. A cultural brand is not something you can impose, it is something that others project onto you from the impressions that they receive. According to a friend of mine Simon Anholt, who has created something called the Anholt Nation Brands index, those cultural perceptions change very slowly, and they are based on substance not image.

So cultural substance is what matters, and building Cultural substance involves long-term commitment. It means supporting the culture of the past, like heritage and museums, that embody and interpret historic identity and it also involves supporting the culture of the present – those working artists and amateurs who are creating the culture of the future.

One crucial point in all this though, is that the support must be given to what the cultural professionals want to do, rather than to what government wants them to do. When I and my colleagues at Demos wrote Cultural Diplomacy we were accused of suggesting that governments should dictate what artists do, but that’s the opposite of our view. In fact, if governments do try to exercise control it completely undermines their chances of success. The British peer Lord Carter put it like this when talking about the broadcast media when he said: ‘If the BBC World Service were to carry a by-line stating “Working in a manner consistent with governmental medium and long-term goals then its international credibility would be fatally undermined.”
Building Cultural substance is going to be important if you want Jersey’s next generation to operate successfully in a culturally globalised world. In turn that means paying more attention to their cultural education. Once upon a time giving a thirteen year old schoolchild the opportunity to visit a museum was simply a nice-to-have experience that brought a civilizing influence to bear on a young mind, but now a visit to a museum is an essential part of plugging that young person into the network of culture. And that will affect that young person’s job prospects, their ability to operate in a globalised world, and their sense of their individual and communal identity. Those young people should have the right to know about and explore art of the highest quality that has survived around the globe; the right to be exposed to the artistic practice of artists at work today; and the right to make the culture of the future.

Let me finish with this image. I’ve been talking a lot about how globalised the world has come, but although we are obviously far more interconnected than we used, we should realize that globalism is not about homogeneity and making everywhere the same. When Cheryl Cole was dropped as a member of the X Factor jury in the US because no-one there could understand her accent, it was a reminder that, however internationalized we have become; we should be aware of our local cultures, what makes us special, and the differences between us. So, Jersey needs to be plugged into the rest of the world culturally as well as economically and socially; but it should also treasure its own distinctiveness and authenticity.

Thank you.