**'What is Entrepreneurship?' – how entrepreneurship education may influence creative writing and how creative writing may change approaches to entrepreneurship in the university setting**

**Abstract** Entrepreneurship education is a growing part of all universities’ portfolio of subjects. As well as developing as a specialism which can be studied in isolation, all academic disciplines are being encouraged to include entrepreneurial ideas in their curriculums.

But what does the term ‘entrepreneurship’ mean, and how can a subject like creative writing embrace it and, bring new approaches to creativity to it?

**'What is Entrepreneurship?' – how entrepreneurship education may influence creative writing and how creative writing may change approaches to entrepreneurship**

Readers of a certain age, and students of the use of storytelling in advertising, will be familiar with the question ‘What is Cointreau?’ The answer is, of course, ‘inimitable chef d'oeuvre’, ‘a masterpiece that cannot be equalled’. More specifically, it contains ‘oranges ripened under the tropical sun.’[1] Of course, there are other definitions of Cointreau. Cointreau himself was confectioner, a fine example of mid-nineteenth century entrepreneur. Adolphe Cointreau put his sugar to good use by first combining it with wild cherries and alcohol to produce guignolet, a liqueur, and then mixing it with oranges and alcohol to make his special ‘triple sec’ brew. ‘Triple sec’ – ‘triple dry’ - doesn’t mean much, it alludes to dryness, but what exactly is ‘triple dry’? In the end Cointreau’s surname became his trade mark. Cointreau means Cointreau.

Beyond its meaning as a trade mark registration, a name, an indication of trade origin and a sign with global annual sales of over 13 million bottles, Cointreau has nuanced, alternative significations. From the outset, Cointreau’s advertising was ground-breaking. It was one of the first companies to embrace film as medium for selling. Its legendary adverts from the UK in the mid-seventies, combining seduction with a degree of existential *je ne sais qois,* play with the idea that hardly anybody knows what Cointreau is (like all good entrepreneurs, Adolphe Cointreau was careful to preserve his intellectual property – the recipe for Cointreau, first sold in 1875, is a trade secret).

The performances in the TV advert dating from 1974 are compelling. The intimate camera work and wryness of the script suggest that the woman who asks the question ‘What is Cointreau?’ knows the answer and is teasing the man; whilst his devil may care reply, in two languages, suggests that he is both sophisticated and making it up as he goes along. Which is exactly what the woman who asked the question wants to hear. She doesn’t want a man who’s going to tell the truth and do the right thing – this time she wants a storyteller with some drinks, someone French. The Cointreau campaign is a testament to the serious nature of certain jokes, they can be so attractive that we all agree it’s better to enjoy the fiction than the reality, whatever, that may be.

Bridge asks a similar question about the discipline of entrepreneurship. ‘Does ‘entrepreneurship’ exist?’ (Bridge, 2017). For creative writing teachers, this candour about the capacity of one’s own subject to disappear in the space of a few well directed existential questions may feel familiar, reassuring even.

As the subject of entrepreneurship appears more frequently in university curricula and directives from planners demand the inclusion of more entrepreneurial student experiences across disciplines, it is worth reflected that the term ‘entrepreneurship’ is, and always has been, in a state of flux. Within the academic context, different approaches to entrepreneurship education are advocated: ‘disciplined’ (Aulet, 2017), ‘phronetic’ (Jones, 2019) or ‘pirate’ (Allende, 2018). Bridge notes that, these approaches are not necessarily complementary. In fact, they may be competitive alternatives. Ahi and Marlow give voice to a demand for more female voices in discussions regarding the nature and application of entrepreneurship education.

So, despite the popular representation of entrepreneurship as an open and meritocratic socio-economic space which enables us to reveal our enterprising capacity, we suggest that two critical presumptions limit this proposition. First, the masculine discourse informing entrepreneurship is taken as normative; this invites universal subscription and represents those outside this norm as ‘other’. Second and relatedly, those—such as women—who cannot fit into this discourse require ‘fixing’ through specific interventions to address this assumed deficit. (Ahl and Marlow, 2012).

Their point is emphasised by a recent government report on the subject.[[1]](#footnote-1)

In the Cointreau advert the woman was the knowledgeable decision-maker, the man was the entertainment. Just as we know that Cointreau is ‘a masterpiece that cannot be equalled’, so we should understand that (amongst students of entrepreneurship) the well-known wobbliness of the term ‘entrepreneur’, which is perhaps best described as an Anglo-French co-production, means that before we can teach entrepreneurship, first we must understand what it might mean.

It is generally agreed that the term was coined by an Irishman who lived in London and Paris about 300 years ago. Richard Cantillon’s creation of the neologism ‘entrepreneur’ in his *Essai Sur La Nature Du Commerce En Général* was a formative moment in the development of economics (Nevin, 2013). By carrying the words ‘entre’ and ‘prendre’ and putting them together, then adding the suffix ‘eur’ – denoting a person, or perhaps an occupation Cantillon. created a word which means more than the sum of its parts.

Translators and historians are undecided both in respect of interpretations Cantillon’s term ‘entrepreneur’ and whether Cantillon’s posthumous publication (published in French in Paris in 1755, twenty one years after the author’s death) was translated from an English original or not. In his prefix to Chapter 13 of Cantillon’s *Essai,* Thompson describes Cantillon’s concept of an entrepreneur as something more fundamental than an approach or vocation, he was describing a state of being about which one has little choice.

Here Cantillon introduces, for the first time, the theory of entrepreneurship. Entrepreneurs are the prime directors of resources. Their occupations come with risks due to uncertainty, especially from competition and changing tastes. As a result, their income can be very large, but they also face the prospect of bankruptcy. The property owner is independent in having a large income (rent) from the land, and the capitalist, or large money owner, also can live independently on interest. Everyone else is ultimately dependent on the expenditures of property owners for their livelihoods. (Thornton, 2010).

Part of Cantillon’s contribution to the nascent subject of economics was to identify this bringer of things together and risk bearer as a representation of the inherent uncertainty implicit in capitalist processes. He described classes: farmers, merchants, wholesalers, manufacturers and those without capital - ‘entrepreneurs of their own labour’ (‘*les Entrepreneurs de leur proper traivail’*), and concluded that aside from ‘the prince and property owners, all the inhabitants of a state are dependent’. For Cantillon, anyone not on a fixed wage or excused from work is an entrepreneur.

He recognized that production and exchange involve uncertainty, producer entrepreneurs and exchange entrepreneurs scout around the markets, they sniff out potentially profitable ventures, they form hunches as to the likely consumer demand, and perforce, they react quickly if such h hunches prove incorrect – otherwise they go out of business. The entrepreneur is the highly visible hand that

Bridge suggests that (given the uncertainty of who or what entrepreneurs actually are, who they were, and whether entrepreneurship really made anything happen) entrepreneurship could be considered not to exist as a meaningful concept is bold, perhaps mischievous and is possibly even entrepreneurial. It is provocative because, as well assuming many (arguably) contradictory meanings, entrepreneurship has evolved a new one: it is a subject in the academic curriculum. It is an industry in the educational sector (Bridge, 2017). Entrepreneurs of entrepreneurship offer competing programmes, all advocating their efficacy as means to transforming willing, creative workers and students into successful business practitioners [2]. For Bridge, this neologism creep confuses students, teachers, governments and business, rigour needs to introduce to the meaning of entrepreneurship and, where there is none, especially in the context of entrepreneurship education, the term should be replaced.

It might be argued that, in the context of the use it was originally intended - the transport and delivery of goods and services by risk takers impelled by economic uncertainty - a lack of interest in the precise meaning of the term beyond that which Cantillon suggested doesn’t matter very much. As far as merchants are concerned, the term ‘entrepreneur’ as transporter, market opener and risk taker is well engrained in the public conscience (Miller and Breton-Miller, 2017). From the exploits of folk hero, Martin Krpan - as he illegally transported English salt into Slovenia, outwitting the authorities until he was successfully commissioned to take on Brdus, an invader, whom he defeated, to be rewarded with a legitimate salt business and the hand of the King’s daughter in marriage - to the exploits of Del Trotter in Peckham, the dubious, but well liked, qualities of people who deliver luxuries or necessities at some personal risk are traditionally respected by those who benefit from the transaction. Indeed, Cantillon’s own life as Jacobite refugee, peripatetic and successful banker and ground-breaking economic theorist seems to highlight the mercurial properties of ‘special’ entrepreneurs (Anderson and Warren, 2011).

But if entrepreneurship is to be introduced into creative writing curriculums, we must do more than proliferate mercantile myths. Bridge asserts that as ancient supply chains and old economic theories are analysed in detail, the idea that entrepreneurs brought anything more mysterious than a horse and a cart together is a capitalist fib. A bogus mythology has been created so as to cement our fetishistic faith in the consumption of more and more stuff. Our faith in the mystery of entrepreneurship as a means of wealth-creation is a form of deception.

The situation is further complicated by the jargon that permeates a subject obsessed with newness and charmed by neologisms. ‘Edupreneurs’ and ‘pracademics’ may contribute to an uncritical capitalist meta-mythology (Peneluna and Peneluna, 2009). If we accept Bridge’s observation that the term entrepreneurship is not well understood, then terms created and used to describe it, may be equally unclear (Anderson and Smith, 2007). ‘Ideation’, appears to mean something straightforward – the process of creating ideas. But in the context of entrepreneurship “‘Ideation’ is a course about generating, developing, and evaluating ideas for launching innovative and viable new ventures,” according to the Stockholm School of Entrepreneurship [3]. In other words, it is a means to an end. Yet, politically and philosophically, in the post Marx world (by that I mean the world after he died – not at some point after the Berlin wall collapsed, when he became less fashionable) theorists like Slavoj Žižek have continued to explore the view that capitalism isn’t really capable of ‘ideation’ at all. It produces a rather hazy effect in which all experience becomes a kind of ‘spectacle’ (Debord, 1994). In ‘*Simulacra and Simulation’* the same disquiet about true nature of symbols, products and experiences we create and how we digest them inspired Baudrillard.

Today abstraction is no longer that of the map, the double, the mirror or the concept. Simulation is no longer that of a territory, a referential being. It is the generation by modes of a real without origin or reality: a hyperreal (Baudrillard, 1981).

Indeed, the intersection of the ‘real’ and the ‘made up’ preoccupies contemporary, critical, creative thought in both arts and sciences (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987). Within a university, entrepreneurship might be seen as part process, part ideology, a political phenomenon, a socio-economic issue or, as Bridge suggests, nothing.

As well as being an active political and social concept, entrepreneurship can also be understood as a methodology which may have useful consequences in the field of education. It can be a utilitarian pursuit. The European Union’s ‘EntreComp’ Framework provides teachers of creative writing (and any other subject) a solution to the problem of introducing entrepreneurship into academic settings by creating rules. It identifies three ‘tightly intertwined’ competence groups, seeks to define, officially, what entrepreneurship is and to explain why we should teach it [4]. Competences such as ‘learning’ and ‘planning’ demonstrates entrepreneurship’s active ingredient, ‘creativity’ and ‘vision’ relate to its ideative core and ‘self-efficacy’, ‘motivation and perseverance’ exemplify student’s abilities to control resources.

The EntreComp framework defines entrepreneurship as follows:

In the context of the EntreComp study, entrepreneurship is understood as a transversal key competence applicable by individuals and groups, including existing organisations, across all spheres of life. It is defined as follows: Entrepreneurship is when you act upon opportunities and ideas and transform them into value for others. The value that is created can be financial, cultural, or social (FFE-YE, 2012) (Bacigalupo, Kampylis, Punie, Van den Brande, 2016).

The definition was predicated on eight key competences for lifelong learning, one of which was a ‘sense of initiative and entrepreneurship’. The principles of lifelong learning were defined by the EU in 2006 (European Commission, 2020). In the UK, the QAA guidance on entrepreneurship education confirms a competence led approach as the goal of educators in the field:

Entrepreneurship Education and the development of entrepreneurial capacity is not simply linked to employment. It provides competencies to lead a rewarding, self-determined professional life. Students will be well placed to add significant social, cultural and economic value to society through entrepreneurial activity throughout their careers.

Practical opportunities for gaining experience can be created both within the curriculum, and through optional extracurricular activity that complements learning within the curriculum, and recognises the value of extracurricular experiences for confidence-building, networking and student enterprise. Extracurricular learning in isolation is unlikely to provide a student with sufficient competencies or insights (QAA, 2018).

The guidance advocates the development of ‘an entrepreneurial mindset’ and identifies key roles for the entrepreneurship educators (QAA, 2018), acknowledging in its reference to the international policy context the importance of the EntreComp framework. It does not offer a competing definition of the word entrepreneurship. It concentrates on the definition of ‘entrepreneurial education’.

Entrepreneurship Education is defined as the application of enterprise behaviours, attributes and competencies into the creation of cultural, social or economic value. This can, but does not exclusively, lead to venture creation (QAA, 2018).

The definition strongly suggests that tutors and indeed subjects that are not used to teaching ‘venture creation’ do not need to start doing so.

Entrepreneurship applies to both individuals and groups (teams or organisations), and it refers to value creation in the private, public and third sectors, and in any hybrid combination of the three (QAA, 2018).

And the definition emphasises that entrepreneurial activity can be developed in projects which engage with the concept of ‘value’ in its widest sense.

All forms of entrepreneurship are embraced, and many new labels are evolving. For example, social entrepreneurship, green entrepreneurship and digital entrepreneurship are relatively new areas of focus, and the sustainability education agenda (see QAA and 8 HEA’s Education for Sustainable Development (2014) is reliant on the development and application of entrepreneurial competencies. Social entrepreneurship is where entrepreneurial ventures are driven by solving social or cultural issues, as opposed to financial gain or profit (QAA, 2018).

Crucially, creativity is seen as an entrepreneurial competence, which may be improved through participation practice-based learning.

If we consider that Simonton (1999) estimated that it takes around ten years to learn the ideas and skills that one needs to think of creative ideas, infrequent brainstorms, and similar "creativity exercises" may be a misdirected approach, ones that do not take account of current thinking that suggests that frequency is as important as the exercise itself; it has more in common with the continuous and developmental coaching of an athlete than a periodic attempt to practice something.(Peneluna and Peneluna – 2015)[[2]](#footnote-2)

The cyclical process of idea generation, reflection and development identified is further clarified in a recent journal article in which the creative facilitator is viewed is kind conducting ‘acedemagog’. (Jones, Peneluna and Penulana, 2019)[[3]](#footnote-3)

Andragogy

The opportunity for student self-directedness and autonomy vis-à-vis the educator’s learning objectives

Heutagogy

The opportunity for the student to determine the focus of their learning and to negotiate learning outcomes and the nature of assessment required to verify agreed learning outcomes

Pedagogy

What the educator independently does to support student learning vis-à-vis the educator’s learning objectives

Academagogy

The process through which the educator blends all three gogys to the advantage of the student’s learning needs

Here we can see that, by offering a benign definition of the term entrepreneurship, omitting Cantillon’s important link between *entrepreneur* and *risk taker* in uncertainty, then adding a reinforced definition of ‘entrepreneurship education’, the EntreComp and QAA publications present the implementation of entrepreneurship education as a challenging, but achievable ambition. Project based learning, taking students through a competence based educational framework, offering opportunities for students to excel creatively, practically and intellectually form the key thrust of the entrepreneurship educator’s agenda.

For creative writers, some of the assumptions that underpin this approach may seem surprising. The subjects of Creative Writing and Entrepreneurship share a similar trait. They are both called after ideas nobody really knows how to define. ‘Entrepreneurship’ and ‘creativity’ are terms we all believe we understand, but we don’t share our understanding, each have us has a carefully calibrated, personal, negotiated position in relation to the two concepts. In the discipline of creative writing, this lack clarity is not a drawback. Creative writing teachers are notoriously wary about generalisations around the idea of creative improvement. Their evidence is too subjective, exceptions to rules are too convincing and disagreements too unproductive to take the idea seriously. Creative writers speak of creative processes and personal journeys. They are revealed through the analysis of creative and discursive work. The tension between the fact that writers know that Dylan Thomas began to create his best poetry when he is was in what would now be described as Year 11, whilst Alexander Solzhenitsyn began writing *The Gulag Archipeligo* in a gulag, at great personal risk as an affront to those in authority, a celebration of those without it and reaction against appalling physical conditions, show that the point of the exercise can never be to emulate, it can only be to understand more. University degrees or well-appointed offices do not equal creativity: gulags and a school in Swansea may do just as well.

Creative writing teachers embrace the paradoxes surrounding the creativity at the heart of their discipline and the new approaches offered by entrepreneurship, often focussing on the planning and delivery of useful products, may complement existing techniques, encouraging writers reluctant to commit to publication to go ahead. For creative writers, the comfort blanket of reflection without commitment to publication is challenged by entrepreneurial urgency, whilst the entrepreneur’s desire for action may be tempered by writers’ desires not to under-think. For creative writing in particular, the development of entrepreneurial approaches offers a chance to improve the relationships between creative writers and markets in a practical sense (so that they may sell more successfully) and in a philosophical sense, so that they may explore how creativity’s relationship with markets is negotiated.

Entrepreneurs are familiar with the term ‘creative destruction’. It was coined by Joseph Schumpeter in *Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy* (Schumpeter, 1942). It refers to ‘the perennial gale’ that capitalist ventures must live in. Everything must change. Schumpeter’s use of the word ‘perennial’ echoes Cantillon’s identification of risk and ‘uncertainty’ as all pervasive aspects of economic life (Cantillon, 1755). Destruction creates opportunities for risk-takers. For Schumpeter, this instability was indicative of fundamental lack of stability inherent in capitalism. But for economists of the entrepreneurial kind, these gales are trade winds, constantly enabling new entrepreneurs to find niches for their new products, services and ideas.

As we prepare students for the ‘fourth industrial revolution’, with its emphasis on automated connectivity, human creativity, uncertainty and risk, industry is aware that it is not necessarily the ‘industry relevant’ that industry requires. It may be the apparently ‘industry irrelevant’, who are best adapted to contribute to the new interconnected economy of the future. The functional definitions, aligned, pre-conceived behaviours and measurable outcomes described in the EU/QAA frameworks may become a conceptual straight-jacket, inhibiting integral entrepreneurial behaviour first identified by Cantillon. In his introduction to *The Fourth Industrial Revolution*, Schwab writes:

The changes are so profound that, from the perspective of human history, there has never been a time of greater promise or peril. My concern, however, is that decision-makers are too often caught in traditional, linear (and non-disruptive) thinking or too absorbed by immediate concerns to think strategically about the forces of disruption and innovation shaping our future (Schwab, 2016).

Entrepreneurial approaches to creative writing must incorporate the fact that entrepreneurship is politically active and sensitive to radical interpretations. Its relative newness on timetables does not enable it to dodge old bullets. Schumpeter and, ultimately, Marx and Proudhon link the subject to contemporary debates surrounding, sustainability, individualism, collective creative projects and the manifestations of capitalism in the 21st century.

In the post war period, it could be argued that it was the beat poets, the second wave feminists, and the counterculture who embodied the need for ‘No’ in creative processes. Today, the distinctly un-entrepreneurial riots in Paris in 1968 are recalled almost is they were a performance. We forget that what the anarchists and situationists were saying was that everything else was a sham.

The more you consume, the less you live (Debord,1994).

Later in the twentieth century the negative force that freed creativity was punk. This time the revolution was entrepreneurial, with independent record labels taking on the corporate might of the big players. One side effect of the success of Anarchy in the UK was the concretisation of Virgin Records or Virgin, as it became, as one of the biggest brands of the late twentieth century. The Pistol’s first gig was at St Martin’s School of Art, now Central Saint Martins, part of the University of the Arts, London. It took place the year after the Cointreau couple went on their first date. Nobody could have predicted the economic benefit this jack-boot stomping, swastika-wearing bunch of spitters would have had on the creative industries that now depend on their innovations. Or that a potter with a penchant for transvestism would end up as Chancellor, describing UAL as ‘the world’s biggest factory for trouble’. Or that it is possible to interpret the policies of Johnson’s government as in some way inspired by the teaching of Malcolm McLaren.

Today we are searching for a new ‘no’, a creative counterculture that will enable us to invent ourselves out of an ecological and intellectual bind (Massumi, 2002). By separating entrepreneurship in bureaucratically and academically restricted pathways, the desired ‘magic’ implicit in entrepreneurial creativity may be lost. Michael Foucault created a novel phrase to describe the trajectory of entrepreneurial thought in the late 1970s. He described the ‘*entrepreneur de lui-même’* which may be translated into English as an ‘*entrepreneur of the self’* (Foucault, 2004). The term was used to describe the tendency of capitalism to burrow into everything and then enclose it, including our inner beings (Christiaens, 2019). It also chimes with Cantillon’s original concept. In Chapter 13 of is *Essai,* Cantillon lists categories of entrepreneurs: farmers, wine merchants, drapers, manufacturers, all of whom are customers and consumers of one another’s products. Foucault’s ‘*entrepreneurs de lui- meme’* appears to be a progression from Cantillon’s ‘*entrepreneur de leur proper travaille’* or ‘*entrepreneurs of their own labour’* as Thornton and Saucier translate it.

In his inaugural lecture to the University of South Wales in 2006, which was entitled *‘A Walk in the Abstract Garden: how Creative Writing might speak for itself in universities’*, Professor Philip Gross argued that ‘not knowing’ characterised the discipline. Gross has a poet’s eye for hidden truths and a predilection for ‘not’. This idea isn’t new. Another poet, John Keats coined a phrase when he wrote to his brothers in December of 1817, describing ‘negative capability’ as ,’ that is, when a man is capable of being in uncertainties, mysteries, doubts, without any irritable reaching after fact and reason’ (Keats, 1899). ‘With a great poet,’ he added, ‘the sense of Beauty overcomes every other consideration, or rather obliterates all consideration’.

Deekins and Freel write with regards the meaning of innovation:

Is innovation about being creative or is creativity about being innovative? I believe we are in what might be called a pre-Copernican period with regard to innovation. It’s as if we don’t yet know which heavenly bodies revolved around which others. We don’t even know where all the plats are located, more do we have a viable theory of planetary motion. We rely on metaphors and images to express an as yet imprecise and unsystematic understanding (Deakins and Freel, 2012).

Perhaps this is what Phillip Gross means when he talks about ‘not knowing’ and Keats refers to in ‘negative capability’. We are indeed, left with ‘imprecise and unsystematic understanding’ and it is upon these apparently rather flimsily pillars that all of the virtues concerned with creativity and the study of its outputs depend. ‘Doubt’, was central to Descartes’ creative process and, in the twentieth century, Karl Popper argued that scientific enquiry was similarly predicated on a negative – the requirement to disprove, through his doctrine of ‘falsifiability’ (Popper, 1963). Negativity is a creative quantum – it can be harnessed by people who explore contradictions and paradox. Perhaps the teaching of entrepreneurship should explore both the established practices of contemporary entrepreneurs and embrace the doubt and criticality that empower dissenters, minorities and alternative viewpoints.

Creative Writing is a subject that straddles idiosyncrasy, reason and trade. Reciprocal ‘creative’ approaches to entrepreneurship carrying the writer’s willingness to create, work and live in paradoxical circumstances into a creative context which focuses on delivering innovative, measurable outcomes. This may be a dynamic partnership, productive and relevant to our times.

The boundaries of entrepreneurship will evolve through ongoing process of debate, reappraisal, action, reflection and recalibration. The culture of entrepreneurship, its gender politics, its ethnographic characteristics, its ‘purpose’ are live issues as, environmentally, ethically and socially we move into a world in which change appears both instant (in the field of digital communication) and slow (in the field of carbon capitalism); positive in terms of wealth creation, divisive in terms wealth division. The ‘value’ of entrepreneurship, the nature of wealth and exchange, the relationship between individual and social enterprises, all require exploration and investigation by creative writers. And to get their ideas into digital circulation in markets across the world creative writers need to be become entrepreneurs. Bridge is right, we do not fully understand the meaning of the term ‘entrepreneurship’. That is because meaning is regenerative and, perhaps because Cantillon concealed his ‘eureka’ moment in a miasma of Anglo-French translation issues, it has never subsequently been used with any real sense of authority.

In the educational context De Corilis and Litzky argue that anxieties concerning the role and meaning of entrepreneurship and entrepreneurship education demand a ‘broadening of perspective’ concluding:

Studies that measure the success of entrepreneurship education will need to adapt dependent variable outcomes to include much more than whether graduates start companies…. Ultimately, crafting curricula around the broader definition of what it means to be an entrepreneur, coupled with the varying measures of successful outcomes will allow higher education to unleash the power of a new paradigm in entrepreneurship education (De Corilis and Litzky, 2019).

As governments seek to exploit creativity as a resource, encouraging the study of entrepreneurship as a form of mental preparation for life the creative industries, there is no guarantee that our next creative step will be as benign as the journey from hippy punk in future. The destruction implicit in the various negatives described by Schumpeter and Keats is uncontrollable. In the New Romantic-Grime period, it is possible to see that, notwithstanding (or perhaps because of) our technological progress and the expansion of markets, three acts of destruction characterise our times: the removal of the Berlin Wall in 1989, the falling of the twin towers in 2001 and Brexit in 2020 (the impact of the lock-down, during when this article was written, has yet to be assessed). Entrepreneurs’ roles in the carrying of creativity to this destruction may change these symbols from Dunkirks into D-days or from grand openings to final day sales.

Is there a moral dimension to this transformative process? The answer is: ‘yes’ (Anderson and Smith, 2007). The morality of markets, the nature of ‘value’ and the ethics of work, are important aspects of entrepreneurship. Funding terrorist organisations, enabling neo-fascist to prosper, promoting religious fundamentalism and inhibiting freedom all require specially motived entrepreneurs. Indeed, early century dramas from the USA, David Simon’s *The Wire* and Vince Gilligan’s *Breaking Bad* and Bill Dubuque and Mark Williams *Ozark* explore what happens when entrepreneurship goes wrong (Simon/Gilligan/Dubque and WIlliams 2002-date).

Schumpeter’s bon mots, when considered in conjunction with Cantillon’s neologism, and Schwab’s prediction constitute a warning: to avoid terminal creative destruction we must take a risk. The needs for of a monetised creative industrial sector, and a creative industrial sector, should not obscure the fact that some of the most important qualities universities can bring to entrepreneurship relate to its hinterland. An analysis of the culture of entrepreneurship in which today’s interpretations of the word are seen in terms of a succession of interlinked ‘movements’ through the lenses of a variety of different disciplines is required. Creative writers are well positioned to respond artistically, intellectually and economically to this challenge. We must examine and debate the morality of entrepreneurship and develop methods that encourage sustainable entrepreneurial creative practices and prepare writers for active, reflexive entrepreneurial practice.
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