

Creativity

It's been more than 3000 years since creativity was first mentioned: already in the Chinese book of divination, 'I Ching', the first of the sixty-four hexagrams presents the person of Kienn, the creative. The definitions of the term creative and creativity are almost infinite; Matoussek affirms that almost four hundred meanings for this term have been proposed so far.

Creativity is and will always remain, anyway, a controversial term: for its many meanings, for the different opinions about the fields in which it is legitimate to use it, and for the persons to whom the title of 'creative' can be given. The main ambiguity of the verb 'to create' is due to the impossibility to re-conciliate in a definitive manner the dissension between the two principal meanings of the verb: the one that refers to the work of God and the one that refers to the activity of humans.

'To create' ethimologically, in Latin, means to produce, to give birth to, or to grow something; in the pre-Christian roman world, creation is human growth per excellence. Later on, in Christian days, the idea of creation moved towards a different meaning and received a theological connotation: creating becomes a superior privilege, divine, it becomes creation ex nihilo, without any pre-existing material. The concept of drawing out, of making something grow out of nothing, is referred to a skill attributed to God and excluded for man; creativity in the sense of producing, building, establishing, composing, or inventing, devising, modelling, is, on the other hand, an attitude that can be attributed to man. The two different meanings correspond, according to Pier Luigi Amietta¹, to two antithetic Weltanschauungen²,

¹Amietta Pier Luigi, La creatività come necessità. Il nuovo manager tra creazione, complessità e carisma, ETASLIBRI, May 1991.

one typical of the contemplative man, whom Amietta defines as 'eastern', and the other of the homo faber. Each of these visions of the world corresponds to two opposite ways of facing life and experiences, that is, to different attitudes, and has characterised for centuries very distant civilisations. The different visions can be synthesised in two human archetypes: the fatalist-contemplative and the man of ingenious. While for the first archetype the verb 'to create' can't be legitimately used, it can, in the pre-Christian meaning, be correctly used for the homo faber, who, starting from data and phenomena commonly known, produces unforeseeable (new), repeatable events, aimed at the situation or at the problem to be solved. However, the real creative, that is, the 'genius' gifted with *creative intelligence*, beginning from data and phenomena that were unknown before, produces unforeseeable, unrepeatable events aimed at the solution of the situation or the problem or totally gratuitous.

The act of creating of the genius is, therefore, a verb than can be referred back to the first meaning, that of the divine creation: it corresponds to the deepest necessity of man: to give life for love and with love to something, and to make it the object of love in common with others. An artist, in the moment in which he/she creates his/her artwork, is pursuing his/her interior, undeniable, definitive truth, and he/she is undoubtedly creator in the sense nearest to the 'divine' signification. And, because the artist makes his/her artwork the object of his/her own love and of others' love, love and creation become a communication field.

Some authors believe that creativity is the process of fusion, the route of thought, based on imaginative processes, that leads to find a solution to a problem, to give it an answer for which all the necessary elements were available. Those elements, considered singularly, had no meaning, but, as soon as they were merged in

²Visions of the world

a new synthesis, they produced a new reality, the nature of which could not be seen examining separately the various fragments. Other authors have perceived creativity as a complex and inseparable unity, of an importance that could also be clinical, in its moments of halt in front of an obstacle, of empty prolongation and of suffered latency, at the end of which the new product flows. Human creation is seen, in this case, as the answer to an obstacle, answer that doesn't limit itself with overtaking it or annulling it, but gives birth to something new. The aim of creativity would therefore be the affirmation of human specificity and its meaning should be understood in the residual excess of the answer ³. In the history of the psychology of the unconscious, Jung has an original conception of creation as a symbol, autonomous and never definitive fruit of the psyche that has to be accepted as the original unconscious product with its own value, and that cannot be translated in anything else. The symbol constitutes, according to Jung, the best realisable ever representation of a reality that cannot be described otherwise.

A unique definition of creativity cannot, by the way, be given; however, in the majority of the definitions proposed up to now there are some common traits: originality, richness in invention, flexibility, extraordinary intuition, capacity to discover new things, intelligence. In this work we'll accept the definition proposed by Landau, who states creativity as *the capacity to find relationships among experiences formerly not connectable to each other that show up in the form of new schemes of thought and give birth to new experiences, ideas or radically new productions*. And this meaning is quite near to Amietta's definition.

After having taken a position as regards the meaning, we can ask ourselves where creativity comes from, what are its origins in man. Many authors agree in saying

³Luigi Zoia, 'Creazione come eccesso di risposta all'ostacolo', in: Creazione e Mal-essere, Guerini e Associati, 1990.

that behind 'behind each creation lies an emotion'⁴, that is, that the difficult passage among violent emotions leads the artist to the creative elaboration of his/her condition, to the alchemy of a state of weakness in an universal expression project. The artwork is the means to communicate one's own existential state and the internal research that originates from it, the existential inquietude and the problematicity of existence itself. From solitude and inquietude, the possibility of discovering the interior and affective world and the uncountable creative forms that can derive their form and matter from it are born. From these primary fonts the works of exceptional men and women are born, that is, artworks.

1. ART AS A MEANS OF COMMUNICATION

Art as the product of creative activity is an expression of feelings, of belonging to a culture, of ideas or thoughts, etc., and as such, it needs a medium, an expressive medium that is recalcitrant and that the artist has to tame, to bend to his/her will. To render the medium, be it colour, graphite, marble, cloth, word or other, ductile to the artist's will, it is necessary for him/her to have mastery over it, acquired through studies and experience, even if, because of the differences existing among the different artists, it is not possible to make generalisations in matter of studies of the medium.

The expressive capacity of the artistic product is often mentioned, in the sense that each simple combination of sounds, forms and colours seems to express some of the characteristics of life, and for a lot of people it is impossible to conceive art as a simple succession of sensorial stimuli. Therefore, emotion, the message that the artwork expresses, must be somehow intrinsic to it, but it must also be transmitted to the public to which the artist wants to convey it, therefore it must be understandable.

Therefore, analogies or similitudes must exist between the traits of the artwork

⁴Marco Manzoni, *'Introduzione'*, from: *Creazione e Mal-essere*, Guerini e associati, 1990

and the characteristics of the feelings that it raises or the information that it wants to transmit, for the public to be able to perceive them. In other words, a code, a knowledge shared by the transmitter (the artist) and the receiver (the public) must exist, for the first to be able to create a message that is clear to the second. This code specifies the significant and the rules according to which these entities are selected and combined in the construction of a signified shared by the artist and his/her public, that is, of an effective means of communication. The code is, nevertheless, not shared uniformly by the entire population: all population members have a better knowledge of some parts of the code; some of them know better the entire code than others and, finally, some people have a better knowledge of a particular part of the code than the rest of the public. These hypotheses lead us to face the discourse of style and of the different styles in the art.

1.1. *Style in the arts*

The world style, too, as creativity, resists a unique and direct definition. It can simply point at a mode or a form of artistic production, or it can indicate traits that help in the task of putting a date on, grouping and attributing artworks to particular authors, and so on. The confusion that derives from it when talking about style in the arts is often believed to be excessive, because it causes uncertainty. Still, one can always resort to the principle, expressed for the first time by Aristotle, that each study has its own degree of uncertainty and that a man of culture will never require a degree of uncertainty inadequate for that study.

Being this study only a brief essay aimed at identifying the relationship between arts and industry and its evolution over time, it is not necessary to reach an absolute degree of certainty in the definitions of terms connected to philosophical speculation. We will be satisfied of finding the most adequate meaning for our

purpose.

The use of the term style in the arts can legitimately be considered a discovery or an invention of a surprisingly recent time. Until 1600, in fact, style was never mentioned in music and the reference to visual arts is of even more recent days. In the different definitions that followed over time and that co-exist in any period, one can think that there's always, or almost, a common characteristic: the existence, in the most important and world-wide recognised styles, of recurrent traits, which can be extracted and combined in such a way that they can represent a model of style, a sort of meta-style, which can be used critically to identify new etiquettes, new styles.

These recurrent elements can be grouped and considered as value aspects, poetical aspects⁵, morphological or formal aspects, metaphorical aspects of a style. As regards the value aspects, style gives the artist the pleasure to be recognised without the necessity to sign his/her own artwork. In linguistics terms, styles can be considered as parts of the code, the same parts that result as the most known by a part of the public than the others, or, in the language of the theory of information, they help obtaining an invariant output from a variable input. Styles are necessary also to preserve in the years the memento of a particular artist, whose ideas can lose their fascination over time. As for the poetical or creative aspects, it can be stated that style is the part of the creative act that represents the deviation from a norm and that, as such, is evident enough to make the stylist recognisable, keeping in mind that the norm can be affirmed, more or less arbitrarily, from the observers themselves, or be imposed from a recognised authority or by social pressures. Last, there are rules, called supernorms, dictated in any form of art by materials used, instruments, etc...

Style can be, at this point, reasonably, even if with a certain incompleteness, be defined as a *combination of constant formal elements and the result of their*

⁵creative, from Greek *poiesis*

combinations. In fact, a style is always generated by the manipulation of variables that can be arranged in such a way as to be a recognisable deviation from the given (or assumed as such) norm. For a style to be recognisable it is necessary that this happen repeatedly, in an identical manner or with variations that can be traced back to the original deviation. It must become comprehensible for the public to which it turns, it must be the selection of a certain set of significant that can be combined so as to obtain a significate that is divisible from artist and public to which he/she turns. Style is a part of the code. A style is always, when perceived in its morphological aspects, rather familiar: what was unexpected, surprising in the creative act, becomes expected in terms of form. And this is what can be defined as the formal or morphological aspect of style.

Last, the metaphorical aspect of style remains to be examined. Of some styles it is normally observed that they are characteristic or expressive. An aesthetic deviation, repeated a sufficient number of times, can be transformed in a form and become recognisable. The result can be described as a manifestation of the personality of the author. However, almost any style is a metaphor, and as Aristotle underlined, each good metaphor implies an intuitive perception of similarity in diversity, and functions catching evident similitudes and refusing differences; this can be manifested, e.g., in the form of common traits in different objects.

But, if the problem of style in the arts is of recent study, even more recent is the debate on the industrialisation of style: how to reconcile a production on an industrial basis, massified, with the creative capacities of the artist and his/her style? In the following paragraph we'll try and answer this question.

1.2. *Industrialization of style*

Freely generalising, we can divide goods into two categories:

- Useful goods, which have a specific function and are created to absolve their duties;
- Ephemeral or superfluous goods, which satisfy needs that overtake the necessary or the useful, that is, exigencies of beauty and of pure aesthetic enjoyment.

Once upon a time all the production, both that of useful goods and that of ephemeral goods, was executed on an individual basis. The majority of it was totally free of artistic value but responded perfectly to daily necessities, it had its own practical function. Only a part of the produced goods was of the superfluous type and, above all, of high or highest artistic value. Those goods were works of famous artists or refined products of artistic handicraft, in the majority of cases without any practical destination, pure objects of esthetical enjoyment. In them the artistic talent was usually extenuated, a typically individual expression.

Analysing the evolution of the relationship between useful and ephemeral goods, until the actual production of luxury goods, that unite functionality and aesthetic value, is interesting; and it is also interesting to try and understand how a synthesis of industrial production and creativity could be done, that is how artistic talent could be inserted in a business like organisation, up to becoming a distinctive competency in structures of business, and not only a style that identifies the person of the artist. And this analysis will be the object of the following paragraphs, in which we'll also try and individuate exemplar experiences of the possibilities of synthesis of art and handicraft and art and industry.

1.2.1. Useful goods: from craft production to industry.

Daily use objects were, until last century, created by craftsmen who produced single pieces, in the majority of cases without any aesthetic value, more or less decorated according to the buyer's economic power.

If the craftsman was of notable ability in exercising his job, he could become somehow famous and acquire a certain number of orders, which allowed him to widen his shop, hiring apprentices or help. Work was always aimed at the production of single pieces, but at this point it was executed by a collectivity of people coordinated by an independent master, who had to be registered in one of the existing Arts. Arts were, in the origin, associations of joint autonomous entrepreneurs. In the shops part of the Art the master was the owner of his own time and he could choose the technical and artistic means he thought the best for his job, because the Arts, even if they had very restrictive statutes, limited themselves with prescribing the technical degree to which the functions were to be absolved/granted.

For many centuries this was the modality of production that dominated and, sometimes, the only one. Only with the Industrial Revolution we arrived to a turning point, even if it did not concern all sectors and co-inhabited for a long time with typically artisanal modalities of production.

With the advent of industrialisation, mass production and division of labour imposed themselves, and their results were absolutely identical, without original decorations that an artisan could have created instead. Objects were produced in a very high number from a collectivity of persons, each of which was in charge of a specific aspect of the manufacturing and couldn't bring any personal changes to it, i.e. coming from his/her oestrus, or his/her will.

1.2.2. Ephemeral goods: from the renaissance Artifex to the Michelangelo Genius.

In the fifteenth century art still had a character that Hauser⁶ defines 'artisan-like': there's still a great affinity between art and handicraft, between pure artwork and simple tool and the artist produces also tools to decorate the house.

The Humanism-Renaissance Artifex is a craftsman elevated to the condition of free intellectual worker; he reposes himself a more refined artisan than others and he still is subject to the rules of the corporation he belongs to, and it is only the apprenticeship done in the prescribed manner, not his talent, that gives him the right to exercise the craft. Artistic Education is based on the common rudiments of craftsmanship, and it takes place within the shop, where education is mainly practical and begins with manual works of all sorts. The apprentice later becomes an assistant and, if his talent allows for it, he becomes an independent master and works creating single pieces of high artistic content. Those objects are normally produced on a commission of wealthy people, in particular of clergy.

Next to the single Artifex, in Renaissance artisan shops started to gain favour, lead by an independent master who took with him apprentices and assistants, the wider his fame as an artist, the larger their number.

From the frequent co-operation among master, assistants and disciples on the same artwork, single artworks were born with very high level aesthetic results, produced by a group of persons co-ordinated by the more famous Artifex, who signs the artwork, result of common efforts that often cannot be resolved on from the other.

In the renaissance shop the collective spirit of the construction site and of the corporation, the artwork is not yet the expression of an independent personality that

accentuates his originality and closes himself to all that is extraneous to him.

Very often the shops of artists still assumed assignments of modest craftsmanship and could produce shields, flags, marquetry, models for upholsterers and embroiders, etc., that were works reputed not worth of an artist.

A fundamental change in the evaluation of artistic work is visible only starting from Michelangelo's epoch. According to Vasari, assignments of artisanal type can't be anymore reconciled with the dignity of an artist. This means the end of the subjection of artists to corporations and, in 1959, it was decided that the statutes of the Arts were not binding for the artist who didn't have a workshop, and the clauses of the contracts that tied him to the client became less severe. An idea of the artist as an isolated genius, who creates only in moments of artistic inspiration, alternate with periods of apathy, and who does not produce tools or useful and decorated objects, started to gain favour.

With the advent and the reinforcement during the following centuries of the idea of genius, on one side, and the taking over of industrial production, on the other, we face an apparently irremediable conflict between art and industry, between ephemeral and useful, worsened during the nineteenth century from the diffusion, in the industrial world, of the principles of American pragmatism and of the scientific organisation of labour proposed by Taylorism.

The first reaction to this contrast happened in 1800 with the first attempts at operating a synthesis between useful goods and ephemeral goods, made by William Morris, who, however, refused industrial production.

⁶Arnold Hauser, *Storia sociale dell'arte*, vol. 2, Piccola Biblioteca Einaudi, Turin, 1979.

1.2.3. From William Morris to the Bauhaus

In the thirties of last century, the critic John Ruskin and the poet-artisan William Morris opposed themselves to the neat distinction existing between the apprentice for applied arts and education for Fine Arts. Morris⁷ thought that this separation would create, on one side, designers who would project standardised schemes for objects produced on an industrial basis and, on the other hand, artists who would not be able to create common use objects, which could make aesthetically pleasant the environments of everyday life. He tried to fill in the gap that existed emphasising the importance of a high quality craftsmanship applied to common use objects that would be functional to their purpose.

As a result of his teaching, in England many schools were born do give once again vitality to the most elegant craftsmanship and to make applied arts nearer to fine arts. Towards the end of last century, those efforts gave birth to the Arts and Crafts Movement, which in 1896, the year in which William Morris died, established the most successful school, the London Central School of Arts and Crafts.

That movement stressed a good design for all objects of daily use and emphasised their individual execution, as luxury objects, single pieces produced according to the best tradition of an elegant craftsmanship.

After 1900, the leadership of the movement to reform education in the field of arts passed from England to Germany, where Walter Gropius, already famous as architect, was called to manage the School for Applied Arts in Weimar, which, after the war, in 1919, he merged with the School for Fine Arts, establishing the Bauhaus (State School of Architecture). In 1925 the Bauhaus moved to Dessau. Its ideal was to merge all Arts to create a new architecture that could destroy the false schism

⁷William Morris, "Art, Wealth and Riches", 1883, in Works, 1985

between applied arts and fine arts, between ephemeral and utility, functionality; Gropius wanted to grow a generation of artists educated to the possible artistic contents of an industrial design.

Contrarily to the rejection of machines from William Morris, the Bauhaus tried to make reality the aesthetic possibilities of objects produced on a large scale and to create a new architecture, refusing the emphasis posed from the Arts and Crafts Movement on luxury objects produced as unique pieces. Gropius addressed the philosophy of the school towards the production of mass objects.

The too leftist political opinions of the artists that in the years managed the school brought to frequent contrasts between the Bauhaus and the authorities of Dessau, until when, in 1933, when manager was Ludwig Mies Van der Rohe, the nazis regime imposed the closing of the school.

In spite of its short duration, the Bauhaus exercised an inestimable influence on artistic education and on the entire development of modern art and architecture. The products of its experimental labs were reproduced on a large scale and the general acceptance of functional and aesthetically pleasant designs for daily use objects produced on a large scale owes a lot to the teaching and to the examples of the Bauhaus.

1.2.4. The creative groups in Europe: Thonet, Bloomsbury and the Wiener Werkstätte.

In the various historical epochs organisations existed dedicated above all to the production of ideas and marginally to that of material goods. In the period in which industry conquered its social hegemony and gave itself a scientific organisation, next to Gropius and the Bauhaus, in Europe many other creative groups were born that practised original modalities to organise the creative work done in a collective form. Even if in the first times this type of organisation was a loser if compared to the overpowering advance of the American industrial models, their efforts and their examples re-emerge today as a precious wealth and as a model for the new groups that are busy in the creative fields.

Michael Thonet represents the best example of individual creativity that appears during the first industrial revolution. Starting from his personal experience and from the local tradition, he tried, through a process of simplification and reduction, to make the form of his products more and more adherent to their function. He had great creative capacity applied with extreme rigour to the necessity of the materials, to its intrinsic qualities, through the utilisation of the technical possibilities offered in that historical moment, exemplifying perfectly the fusion of artisanal practice and the rising industrial production. Thonet, with his inventive capacity, gave a notable technical input and an important stylistic contribute to the production of his epoch, showing that he could possess the technical means, using it to reach formal results of the highest level.

At the Great Exhibition in London in 1851, in the central moment of the strong debate about the role of industry, that of craftsmanship and their reciprocal relationships, Thonet emerged for being one of the few who had favoured the integration of industry and the arts through the synthesis, in a single man, of industrial

organisation and creative subject. He had, in fact, adopted rational methods of organisation of labour and he had chosen the site of his firm in a manner favourable to the provision of raw materials and to the finding of labour; his production was of an industrial type, as the fact that there was no possibility of a personal change, entrusted to the oestrus of the executor, on the characteristics of the product.

However, his production emerged for quality and good taste, for the originality of the design of the object and the accuracy of the final intervention, where the artisanal oestrus dominated, without, anyway, forgetting that aesthetics could not overshadow utility in objects destined to the bourgeoisie that had only recently reached the social leadership. Michael's Thonet's example is a borderline example, but emblematic, of the synthesis of industry and art, of useful good and ephemeral good, of aesthetic form and peculiarity of the material. The production of plied beech of Thonet factory united the most interesting aspects of American pragmatism and the most stimulating indications of the European experience and debate of those years.

The Bloomsbury Group was established in 1899 in Cambridge from a heterogeneous group of intellectuals. It was an artistic and literary phenomenon, a cultural movement in which writers like Leonard and Virginia Woolf co-existed with painters like Duncan Grant and Vanessa Stephen.

Common denominator was the faith in Reason, the research of Truth and the contemplation of Beauty. The fundamental spirit that dominated the attitude of the group and its meetings was the critical approach to all traditions and habits and to any subject of conversation. No subject was considered to be a taboo and everything was discussed in the meetings. Each of the members worked in his/her specific area of interest and many of them reached great fame and success. The Bloomsbury group represented and facilitated the diffusion of art and its fruition. Among its components, Roger Fry emerged for his conviction that it was necessary to

do something for young artist who didn't have the means to survive and, being unable to sell their pictorial works, could use their art painting furniture or applying decorative style to them. He decided to make his idea real and he created a number of artistic workshops that he grouped under the name of Omega. In these workshops, the young artists produced tables, chairs, pottery, carpets, curtains and, later on, also clothes, painted with the styles of Cézanne's and Gauguin's paintings, creating an avant-garde of applied arts. At the same time, in Charleston, Vanessa and Virginia Stephen opened painting workshops that supplied the clients also with decorators and wall painters and that produced dishes and pottery decorated from painters, realising a sublime synthesis of craftsmanship and arts.

Similar experiences were made also in Austria at the beginning of the twentieth century and more precisely in Vienna, the last offshoot of a by that time agonising Austro-Hungarian empire and avant-garde of the rising post-industrial society. Vienna represented in those years the highest concentration of genial minds that existed in Europe after the renaissance Florence. In this large town in 1903 a co-operative of production of artisans-artists, the Wiener Werkstätte, was established. Its purpose was that of promoting the economical interests of its members through their education in the field of artistic craftsmanship, the production of all the artisanal genres according to the artistic designs prepared by the members of the co-operative, and via the opening of workshops and the sale of produced goods. One of the fundamental principles of the co-operative was to have healthy and aesthetically pleasant work environments, with workshops with toilets, that is, environments favourable to the artistic creation. The spirit of the creators determined the physiognomy of products, but machines weren't missing, and each object expressed the maximum level of technical and artistic capacity, of technology and creativity. Production covered all the sectors with artistic possibilities, shops were opened and the new departments of fashion, jewels and lace were developed. In the workshops artisans who mastered

particular techniques and artists gifted with individual creative initiative worked together, combining in a harmonic way the technical competency and the creative geniality. The fundamental principle was the reciprocal association and patronage of people genial in different fields to enhance each one's qualities and to come to the total masterpiece, to which should correspond as much as possible a total intellectual capable of working with brains and hands.

The Wiener Werkstätte, like the Bloomsbury Group, represented an attempt to unite art and craftsmanship, forming a new artistic craftsmanship, following the wave of the former Morrisian experience, while Michael's Thonet's experiment was nearer to the problematic of industrialisation of creativity, succeeding in his intent in an admirable way.

Thanks to the teachings of the Bauhaus in the first decades of the twentieth century and thanks to the experiences, between 1850 and the thirties of '900, of many European creative groups, amongst which we have chosen and described three examples that we repute meaningful, the artistic talent started to be inserted in a business-like organisation, moving from a typically individual expression to a distinctive competency of a company, a collectivity of people and machines. To succeed in giving a sense of temporal continuity to the different experiences considered, we chose to present the cases in a chronological order, but the experience of Michael Thonet and of his heirs, who continued his work, diffusing Thonet's production all over the world, is for sure the most interesting one for the purposes of an analysis of the processes of industrialisation of creativity. This analysis will be done first on a theoretical and general level, after the theme we'll be approached in the context of the area we're interested in: the sector of the luxury prêt à porter.

1.3. Companies based on artistic creativity

The industrialisation of style had two main consequences: first of all, the use of creative capacities in a business organisation opened new forms and new opportunities to express the individual artistic talent. Secondly, the company in its activity is no more only the location where a specific culture is formed, the firm culture, but it becomes also the place of production of artistic and cultural objects. In fact, the effects of the activities of companies modify people's living ways, they have a great influence on the social context in which they're inserted, and therefore it can be stated that they produce culture.

The companies, making the talent of the artist theirs, faced the opportunity to take ownership of a new competency translating it into a production of an industrial type, and to establish on it their own competitive advantage over the competitors. Because that distinctive competency rises from a long process of learning in different functional areas, from the creation of a suitable culture and a suitable business climate and from the designing of ad hoc business structures, it resulted as being not easily imitable, at least in the short term.

Moreover, industrialisation of style created new opportunity of consume that were totally unknown and impossible before, contributing to a general improvement of the quality of life at all levels.

At the basis of the process of insertion of the creative element in a business structure was the meeting of creative capacities with entrepreneurial capacities that were capable of understanding the economic potentialities inherent in the first ones, giving birth in this way to a new integration of heterogeneous capacities in a single economic activity. The artist, bearer of technical-aesthetic capacities and of capacities integrative of the environment (because, as we saw above, the artwork is

also a means of communication) integrated with the classical entrepreneur, bearer of industrial management capacities. It was a revolution from above: the artist, tied to the ephemeral world, became an entrepreneurial engine.

Our study will go on analysing the two key personalities of key functions of companies based on artistic creativity: the creative and the creative function and the entrepreneur and the entrepreneurial function; those qualities can. However, sometimes be found in a single person, or in a multitude of different persons.

1.3.1. The Creative Function

The activity of the creative is eminently of a speculative kind, very similar to the traditional artistic production, linked to the world of the pure ephemeral, and requires, of course, individuals gifted with great artistic capacities and, to be integrated in a business activity, specific organisational systems. It is a process both of forecast and of proposition of aesthetic tastes in continuous becoming and of general acceptance, a continuous process that often can be confused with artistic production. It's the element of union between the social sphere and the enterprise.

The creative has progressively unhooked itself from the ephemeral world and has taken on a different attitude and availability towards the socio-cultural phenomena that surround him/her, and this is an element of fundamental importance to explain the approaching of the artistic talent to the world of the enterprise. He/she adopted a new way to link to a society and to an epoch: he/she's become interpreter and bearer of culture, not only creator of the beautiful, but also expression of an aspiration that is the translation of the need of an epoch.

The artistic-creative activity in the company has, therefore, a cultural connotation: proof of this and of the acknowledgement attributed to the creatives of companies are the frequent requests for collaboration that arrive to them from other

protagonists of the contemporary cultural and artistic world (e.g., many fashion creations are displayed at the Museum of Modern Art in New York and some designers are always asked to display in permanent exhibits or temporary ones). The artistic talent of a company is at a very high qualitative level, so high as to be considered as one of the expressions of contemporary art.

In the cases of industrialisation of quality, creative capacities assume a central role within the structure and the activities of the company, and its centrality, in the cases of success, that is a potential point of vulnerability if they should become missing. The use of creativity influences the execution of many functional activities and the basic definition of the business activity itself.

The creative expresses his/her capacities not as standalone, but within technological, economic and commercial constraints; at the same time it is important the role of contribution and stimulus that his/her capacities have to and can carry out towards the same constraints, in particular, the technological ones.

Company creativity, therefore, has affinities with the cultural and artistic expression, but it also has an organic and inseparable link with technological innovation and industrial design phenomena.

Moreover, given that the contribution of the creative function, far beyond being a simple proposal, is often the anticipation of evolving tastes, and constitutes, therefore, the link between the company and the social, the design or creative activity has as a constraint the marketability of its own result. It originates in the creative, who becomes the reader of the needs of the public and tries to satisfy them. The awareness of the necessity of the marketability of the product determined a great attention to the situation of use and to the differences in the needs of consumers, leading to a great diversification in the models, in the functionality and in the practicality. The instance of marketability is an essential aspect of the relationship

between creative capacities and business world.

In the processes of industrialisation of creativity the artistic-creative talent is the trait d'union of company and public, it refers to and must refer to the relevant needs of the market to the service of which the company operates and it cannot be completely detached from it.

The relationship creativity-needs of the market is to be understood in a bi-unique direction: the ensemble of the needs limits the field of research for the creative and, at the same time, it stimulates him/her; the creative foresees, anticipating them, the needs yet unexpressed or unconscious of the market, making, with his/her effort of creative synthesis, their explicitation and translation in a model or product possible.

We can therefore synthesise the contributes brought from the artist to the company's structure. He/she, first of all, introduces an innovative push: with his/her presence, next to occasional radical innovations, there are constant and frequent minor innovations, under the form of new lines, new products, new colours or designs, etc... The result of the co-operation of industry and creative is always an innovative synthesis.

As a second point, the creative is the ideal point to accumulate polifunctional experiences and synthesis competencies of such wealth.

Last, he/she guarantees the consonance between product innovation and evolution lines of the environment, thanks to the relationship, existing between creative and consumer, of prevision and anticipation of market needs, emerging from the influences of particular events of social, cultural or economic nature. Thanks to these interpretation capacities, the company finds its continuity in the long term, in the evolution of the environment in which it operates, elaborating or re-elaborating its own initial concept in the new productions.

We can therefore induce that the creative talent contributes to the realisation of the industrialisation of creativity, putting itself in relationship with the socio-economic-cultural environment to which it refers, with the industrial production system and with the market system, so as to receive, from each of them, stimuli and enrichments in exercising its own capacities and offering, on its side, pushes towards improvement and evolution or elaboration of new solutions.

1.3.2. The entrepreneurial function

In the cases of industrialisation of creativity, the initial and fundamental contribute of the entrepreneur is the intervention to stimulate the approach between company and artist. To the one who interprets the entrepreneurial role belongs the task of designing and realising a business formula fit to the creative capacities, so that it optimises them and welcomes their stimuli and suggestions. In the cases in which the creative qualities and the entrepreneurial ones are in the same person, this person has to play two distinct roles that require completely different capacities, but that must necessarily integrate in an harmonic way.

In the research led by Pietro Mazzola ⁸ on the processes of industrialisation of creativity, from the examined cases it emerges that in the "creative" companies some common characteristics exist, typical of the entrepreneurial role: customer, design and differentiation oriented entrepreneurship.

- Customer Oriented: the entrepreneurial systems realised focus their attention on the needs of their market and to the facets they can assume. They're structures designed in such a way as to recognise the importance of the market answer as the last judgement on their work, reducing in this way the tendency of the creative to

⁸P. Mazzola, *I processi di industrializzazione della creatività*, in *Le imprese basate sulla creatività artistica*, Santa La Rocca and Pietro Mazzola, Franco Angeli, Milan, 1991.

verify him/herself and his/her work only or mainly on the artistic level, confronting him, in contrast, with the results in economic and market terms. Moreover, there's particular attention and sensibility in understanding the intangible components of the product system: image, cultural messages, elegance of the treatment reserved to the customer, the personal charm of the creative, the symbolic component, etc... The entrepreneurial definition, innovative in comparison with those existing in the sector they belong to, has often determined a change in the rules of the game of the competitive system and has guaranteed to these companies a meaningful competitive advantage.

- Design Oriented: it becomes explicit mainly in the building of systems fit for the development and the realisation of the artist's activity, limited, however, by the technological constraint and by that of marketability. The Orientation to design influences the definition of the business formula and the development of the distinctive competencies of the structure: above all, the capacity to interact with the creative and the subsequent engineering of the creative synthesis, the true company's core competencies, are taken care of.

- Differentiation Oriented: the basic strategic choice that emerges from all the cases studied in the research is oriented to the achievement and maintenance of a clear differentiation and all actions undertaken are coherent with such basic choice. Differentiation is maintained independently of the production and sale volumes and of dimensions: the company's growth is due to the involvement and the appreciation of larger and larger segments of the market. The characteristics of the entrepreneurial role in this context make clear some of its peculiarities: first of all, the entrepreneur is the one who first has the idea of a new possibility to satisfy in a better and more economic way necessities and needs present in the environment he/she refers to. In a later time, he he's the first engine of the design and the realisation of a company's

structure moulded on the needs of the artistic and creative talent, functional to it.

The contribute offered by the entrepreneurial role to the realisation and the functioning of the formulas of industrialisation of creativity makes even more delicate a particular aspect typical of these con harmonically integrate them. In most of the cases there's an outstanding cultural closeness or affinity between entrepreneur and creative, but there's anyway always a neat separation of the two roles: the business capacities allowed the artistic ones to express themselves on an industrial scale and they inserted them in a strategic vision; at the same time, the creative competencies are the main source of the competitive advantage in the cases of industrialisation of creativity.

1.3.3. Conclusions on the process of industrialization of style.

The beginning of the process of industrialisation of creativity is linked to two main factors:

1.the capacity of the creative talent to express itself within constraints and opportunities posed by the technological and productive structure of a company and by the conditions posed by the market (marketability constraint);

2. the presence of an entrepreneur open to new stimuli and new ideas and capable of optimising the creativity resources.

Learning assumes here a fundamental importance: learning of the artist, on one side, in learning how to behave outside the scope of a purely individual and unconstrained expression; learning of the entrepreneur, on the other side, in learning how to emphasise and optimise the creative capacities in a business context.