The integration of cultural and creative industries into local and regional development strategies in Birmingham and Marseille: Towards a more inclusive governance?

Lauren Andres (1) and Caroline Chapain (2)

(1) School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK, L.Andres@bham.ac.uk

(2) Birmingham Business School, J.G. Smith Building, Pritchatts Road, Edgbaston, Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK, c.a.chapain@bham.ac.uk

Abstract

This paper explores the nature of the integration mechanisms of cultural and creative industries (CCI) into local and regional strategies and policies in Birmingham (England) and Marseille (France) over the last 30 years. Using the typology developed by Smith and Warfield (2008) with regard to the integration of CCI into local policies, the paper compares the type of private cultural and creative actors involved in policies based on either a culture-centric approach or an econo-centric approach, and their degree of collaboration and inclusion. The paper concludes that the culture-centric approach is more exclusive than the econo-centric approach, and tends to lead to restrictive governance arrangements involving only some key CCI actors. The inclusion of these key CCI private actors relies on their ability to sit and use multi-level networks to develop their activities and build their reputation, providing them with some advantage to enter win-win relationships with different public actors. Finally, our analysis highlights the importance of national policies in these dynamics by setting up wider local and regional governance arrangements and by influencing

the type of policies and funding available to support the CCI at the local and regional levels. These national influences are also balanced by the availabilities of European funding to support these industries directly or indirectly as well.

Introduction

The last 30 years have seen an increasing academic and policy interest in the development of cultural and creative industries at local and regional levels in Europe and beyond. As a result, the European Commission launched a consultation paper entitled "*Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries*" in 2010 asking which specific tools and partnerships need to be put in place to better integrate cultural and creative industries (CCI) into strategic regional/local development in Europe (European Commission, 2010). Answering this question is not straightforward despite previous researches on the use of CCI in local cultural policies, urban regeneration and economic development (see for example Kong, 2000; Miles and Paddisson, 2005; Lorenzen, Scott and Vang, 2008; Currid, 2010; Leriche and Daviet, 2010)..

There has been limited comparative, comprehensive and longitudinal perspective on the various ways and means CCIs actors have been integrated into local and regional development strategies in different European cities since the collection edited by Bianchini and Parkinson (1993). As such, we suggest that a comparative reflection on the governance mechanisms - i.e the modes and practices of the mobilisation and organisation of collective action (Cars et al., 2002) - associated with the growing integration of CCI into local and regional development strategies during the last 20 years would be particularly useful. A recent international survey shows that the dominant policy and strategy rationale linked to the development of CCI in cities is related to economic development and employment (Evans, 2009). However, other objectives such as infrastructure development, regeneration, education and training,

tourism/events and city branding, heritage or social inclusion, usually complement this economic policy rationale. While highlighting this co-existence and related potential tensions between these various policy objectives and strategies, Evans (2009) does not provide a detailed discussion on the various integration mechanisms of CCI private actors into these strategies in different cities.

Various authors have tried to provide an understanding of what Markusen (2010) has called the cultural and creative "ecology" as called by distinguishing between public and private actors. In addition, a distinction can be made between for-profit and non-profit CCI activities and the community, informal or unincorporated cultural and creative sector (Markusen 2010). As such, in this paper, CCI private actors will comprise non-statutory public organisations, individuals (or collectives of) artists, cultural actors and creative workers and entrepreneurs. Contrary to statutory public actors (i.e institutions) these private actors do not usually have a decision-making power in terms of public policies. However they can interfere and influence the shaping process of public policies and strategies. Such modes and practices of mobilisation and organisation of collective action can include a limited number of stakeholders or be more open to wider participation. Some authors argue that this depend on the policy objectives considered.

Discussing the Canadian context, Smith and Warfield (2008) argue that CCI have been used in urban development based on two different orientations with distinctive values, aspired results and policies and governance implications. First, the culture-centric approach is embedded in an 'historical conception of arts, culture and creativity as things 'beyond' or 'better than' the marketplace' (ibid., p. 291) and, as

such, is based on strong public support. The objective is to foster places of diverse and inclusive arts and culture resulting in imaginative, transparent and democratic governance as well as inspiring, imaginative, inclusive, attractive and adaptable cityscapes. This approach is connected to policies based on direct public support to art organisations, collaborative governance and place making. In contrast, the econo-centric approach is based on 'strong innovative, creative, and competitive CCI and economically sustainable artists and arts organizations.' (ibid., 292). The objective is to foster strong and diverse local arts and culture expressions as well as strong creative workforce, industry, networks, connection and competitiveness. This approach is linked to policies based on supporting networks, partnerships and collaborations sympathetic to the growth of CCI as well as facilitating free-market expansion of these industries (ibid.). Smith and Warfield (2008) demonstrate that these two approaches can be both accommodated and coordinated within local development strategies using the example of Vancouver. However, it is not clear in their work whether these local policy approaches meant involving similar or different private CCI actors and whether the culture-centric approach resulted indeed in a more collaborative and inclusive governance.

Adopting the broad framework developed by Smith and Warfield (2008), this paper aims to explore this assumption in two distinctive European cities by looking at the integration mechanisms of CCI into local and regional strategies and policies based on culture-centric and/or econo-centric approaches. Both Birmingham in England and Marseille in France play the role of second cities in their respective national context and have experienced important economic restructuring and regeneration processes in which CCI have played an important role in the last 30 years. However, both the

culture-centric and econo-centric approaches have been extremely important in England in the last 15 years whereas the culture-centric approach is still dominant in France; this has had impacts with regard to local and regional development strategies put in place in the two cities. On this basis, comparing the governance trajectories associated with cultural and creative policies in both cities should help shed some light on the type of private CCI actors involved in each approach as well as their degree of collaboration and inclusiveness in this process. We consider that a form of governance is collaborative and inclusive if it involves a wide range of public and private actors, from different backgrounds and different interests. As such it should not be limited to a small number of private actors that are considered as representatives of other similar individuals or collectives. It implies also that a wide range of private actors are effectively able to influence decision and policy making processes either by integrating their projects, objectives and needs in broader strategies and policies or by being considered as catalysts for further strategy development.

To explore these issues, our paper is structured as follows. The first section discusses the evolution of the role given to CCI to support urban development in relation to our two main approaches and their related governance principles in England and France. The second section details our research methodology. Section three presents the cultural and creative policies implemented and the role of private CCI actors within these in Birmingham whereas section four presents the case of Marseille. Section five compares our two case studies and concludes the paper.

1. Cultural and creative industries policies in France and in England: two distinctive approaches

France and England are good examples of the different roles given to CCI to support urban development with a dominant culture-centric approach in France and a mix of culture-centric and econo-centric approaches in England (see Figures 1 and 2). The roles given to the arts and cultural and creative industries in both countries have varied based on different political philosophies (more influenced by Marxism to formulate broader cultural strategies and vision in France – see Bianchini, 1993) and governance arrangements.

In Britain, with regard to CCI, emphasis has been put initially on Heritage activities (i.e. museums, libraries, archives and galleries) and Arts activities (i.e. painting, sculpture, architecture, music and poetry, drama and dancing), then in the 1920-30s, on Audio-visuals activities such as film, TV and radio and more recently on New media (software, video games…), Creative Services (advertising) and Design as defined by UNDP/UNCTAD (2008). 'The English (…) have traditionally been more uneasy than continental Europeans with the terms "culture" and "cultural policy" (Bianchini 1993: 3). As such, support to CCI has long been categorised as support for the arts or arts policy. Public support to these activities was initially based on a culture-centric approach i.e. civic duty exercised by some local authorities from the end of the 19th century and after World War II on the idea that individuals would increase their welfare by developing their knowledge and tastes with regard to artistic activities (Peacock, 2000). This initial objective was enlarged in the 1970s-80s with the rise of urban social movements and alternative cultural activities which fostered

local public support to community building and social participation (Bianchini, 1999). The mid-1980s marked a shift with the role given to arts and cultural facilities passing from social and political to economic with CCI seen as supporting urban development, regeneration, local economic growth and city-marketing (Bianchini 1993; Griffiths 1995, Evans, 2001; Gray, 2002; Aitchison et al, 2007; Tallon, 2010; Vickery, 2007). The end of the 1990s sealed the complete adoption of this econo-centric approach with the introduction of the 'creative industries' concept and its rhetoric by the Labour Party (DCMS, 1998). The emergence of the term was linked to a willingness to reconcile the distinction that was made between mass, popular or commercial entertainment and the high, elitist and often public funded fine arts in the 1930's with the introduction of the term cultural industries (Garnham, 2005; O'Connor, 2008). The related objective was to focus on the economic contribution and functions of these activities, especially the raising software and new media industries.

Local governments have always played a role in terms of cultural policy in Britain since the end of the 19th century (Lord Redcliff-Maud 1976:102). In 1948, these discretionary powers were enlarged permitting (but not requiring) local authorities to support the arts and entertainment activities in their areas up to a certain proportion of their council tax (ibid.). These powers were given to complement the increased national support for Arts with the establishment of the Arts Council of Great Britain in 1946. Few local governments actually used these statutory powers to a great extent up to the 1970s and from the 1940s to the 1960s UK cultural policies were mostly driven by the national government (ibid.). Despite a general centralisation trend under the Thatcher government, the 1970s and 1980s saw an increase in local cultural

expenditures to support urban development and regeneration as discussed above. The 1980's brought an important change with a national expectation that the funding and management of arts and cultural activities should involve the private sector. In addition, some cities and regions started receiving money from the European structural fund and/or from the European capital of culture (ECOC) scheme.

Sub-national public support to CCI became very important in the 2000s period with the confluence of the decentralisation process put in place by the Labour Party and both culture-centric policy objectives (participation, education and quality) associated to Arts and culture and econo-centric policy objectives (economic growth and exports) associated to the creative industries - some CCI being targeted by both types of objectives due to an overlap in definitions (DCMS 2004). On the creative industries side, the DCMS in conjunction with the Department for Trade and Industry (DTI) adopted strategies with an economic focus, providing information and access to business support and training, and fostering creative exports. Newly created regional development agencies (RDAs) were expected to support this national agenda in partnership with local authorities through various business support initiatives including the development of regional creative clusters (DTI 2001, DCMS, 2008; HM Government, 2009). On the arts and culture side, the DCMS, through the Art Council regional offices continued to provide financial support to arts and heritage organisations to increase access to and engagement with culture, arts excellence and cultural dissemination to various communities[1].

---

[1] See
http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20100407120701/http://www.culture.gov.uk/about_us/culture/default.aspx

The newly elected Conservatist-Liberal Democrat appears to want to conserve this dual agenda as part of its support to the 'creative ecology' defined as 'an alliance between the subsidised and commercial arts; the professional and the voluntary arts; and the arts and the creative industries' (Ed Vaizey's speech, 17/02/2011). As such, its cultural agenda is promoting both public funding for the arts and philanthropy as well as innovation and cultural education (ibid). The abolition of regional development agencies and regional arts councils' offices on the one hand and the creation of local economic partnerships bringing together public and private actors at the local level (House of Common, 2010) and of a national agency to support the creative industries (Creative England[2]) on the other hand have modified the public governance of cultural policy. In addition, the new government intends to foster more public-public and public-private partnerships to support both the arts and the creative industries (ibid.).

"INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE"

In France, a lot of emphasis has been placed on the broad term of "culture" which include Heritage, Arts and cultural activities as defined by UNDP/UNCTAD (2008) - with the cultural activities corresponding to the media, i.e. activities related to edition, press, music and audiovisual (cinema, television), multimedia (DEPS, 2008).

Connections between different levels of government and public-private partnerships are a key characteristic of the overall creative governance of the French culture-centric approach. Powers in terms of cultural and economic development have been

---

[2] See http://www.creativeengland.co.uk/faqs

progressively shared between national government and local authorities in France during the last 50 years. In the last few years, whereas national funding has tended to decrease, the role of (and financial pressures towards) local authorities have increased. Historically the national government has been in charge of main cultural and heritage facilities considered of national public interest (referred to as "Culture") whereas local authorities - through their cultural policies and the promotion of "culture"– have taken care of more specific local cultural facilities and events supporting their socio-cultural and economic development ambitions. This has led to a differentiation as well as complementary between "Culture" whose policies and project are shared between a limited number of key national cultural institutions (Ministry of Culture, key Museums and Operas) and "culture" characteristic of local socio-cultural strategies. As such, the latter is characterised by close relationships between local authorities and local cultural actors (often structured in associations) and a subtle balance between professional and amateur practices (Djian, 1996).

In addition to their role as representatives of the national public interest or 'Culture', some cultural facilities (including museums, concert halls…) have progressively been used to support local entrepreneurial regeneration strategies (creation of new business districts, image renewal of some urban areas, attraction of new businesses and jobs) since the early 1990's. Compared with England, less attention has been given to culture economic output due to a strong tradition of national heritage protection and artistic creation support as explained previously (Djian, 1996). While the perception of culture as a public/merit good and not as a profitable economic activity has remained prevalent at a national level, culture started to be associated with tourism and economic development at the local and regional levels following the

decentralisation of the political system in France in the 1980's. Councils, regions and departments have increasingly valorised their local and cultural activities and heritage to support their territorial development and branding. In the second half of the 1990's cultural development started been acknowledged as a broad and key component of local economic development participating in the economic, social, educational and political life of people (Djian, 1996; Moulinier, 2001; Suzanne, 2006; Leriche *et al.,* 2008). Simultaneously, due to their socio-cultural nature, cultural policies can also be connected to urban and social policies. In this configuration the amateur nature of cultural activities prevails and the collaborative governance scheme essentially sits within private actors (associations) partnership supported by local authorities through funding. Typically, such policies have been conducted in deprived social housing estates as part of urban renewal policies (Taliano des Gariets, 2002). Finally, as in England, some French cities were able to benefit from the ECOC initiative (i.e. Lille).

With regard specifically to CCI, the term "creative activities" has only started replacing the word "culture" in local policies/initiatives in France since 2000 (Stiegler 2006; Liefooghe 2009; Pignot and Saez, 2010). As the term "industry" relates mostly to manufacturing in the French context, "creative industries" are usually translated as "creative activities". This late consideration of the "creative discourse" is partly explained by the slow diffusion of key theories and concepts such as the "creative class" from Richard Florida due to language barriers. It is important to note that this change in terminology has come from local and regional governments and has been happening while reductions in national cultural interventions and budgets were implemented (Saez 2008). "Creative activities" are not recognised nationally and there is no official definition. This can also be explained by the fact that CCI belong

to "culture" and not "Culture". They are encompassed in the economic dimension of culture essentially addressed by local and regional authorities.

"INSERT FIGURE 2 HERE"

In summary, following global trends, the understandings of the role of the Arts and more widely CCI in local and regional development have evolved from a purely "culture-centric approach" to include an "econo-centric approach" as defined by Smith and Warfield (2008) in both England and France in the last 50 years. In England, this shift has been characterised by a strong national push based on a recognised definition and including both economic objectives and wider social and regeneration aspects. In France, this shift has come from the bottom with cities and regions increasingly importing foreign concepts and ideas and applying them to their development strategies based on distinctive sets of activities and objectives depending on place. Hence, whereas urban and economic development ambitions are devoted to culture and specifically CCI at local and regional levels in France, less economic ambitions are attributed to traditional cultural facilities that are still perceived as national assets with clear social outcomes.

Despite this difference of approaches towards CCI in France and England, we can argue that similar public institutions have played key roles in their development in both countries: the European Union, the national government, and regional and local authorities. In addition, there has been an increased focus in using CCI to support local and regional development. In both countries, questions can then be raised in terms of the CCI private actors involved in these local and regional initiatives and

their associated governance mechanisms. More specifically, do culture-centric and the econo-centric approaches generate similar governance arrangements and degree of collaboration and inclusion of CCI private actors or is the culture-centric approach more collaborative and inclusive as suggested by Smith and Warfield (2008) due to its objectives?

2. Methodology

Studying comparative urban policies and governance across different countries raises a number of issues with regard to a lack of existing comparative urban framework, the balance between scope versus depth, differences in contextual meaning, contextual parochialisms and the availability of comparable data (Kantor and Savitch, 2005). "*Cities are permeable, and as such they are both dependent upon and influenced by national and regional political economies. Permeability, then, deeply affects local decisions* (ibid., p. 136) Based on this recognition, our research focuses on two cities in two different countries favouring a depth of understanding in terms of the integration of CCI into local and regional policies and associated governance mechanisms. While the two countries have been chosen for the different contextual meanings and national governance contexts with regard to the understanding of CCI and related national policies as discussed in the last section, the two cities have been chosen for their similarities in terms of economic situations and histories. As such, we adopt the relational comparative approach recommended by Ward (2010: 480) i.e. a '*comparison of cities that recognises both the territorial and the relational histories and geographies that are behind their production and (re)production*.' Birmingham and Marseille have the same size (approximately 1 million inhabitants), occupy the

same place in their national urban hierarchy (2nd cities) and severely suffered from the impact of deindustrialisation in the 1970's and 1980's. In addition, both have struggled to recover their status of major metropolitan areas as their images were particularly affected by their socio-economic and urban declines. Major economic development and regeneration strategies based on cultural and creative industries have been put in place to launch and foster the revival and recovery of these two cities.

To account for the difficulty of applying a rigid comparative framework when looking at urban policies across cities, we based our comparison on a loose approach with regard to the concepts of CCI private actors, governance and collaborative and inclusive governance as discussed in the introduction. Our analysis is also based principally on qualitative data gathered from distinctive research projects looking at the development of CCI at the local and regional level in Birmingham and Marseille over the last 30 years. This qualitative material allows us greater flexibility in applying our key theoretical concepts through a thematic analysis (King, 2004b). Data collection in Marseille included both secondary and primary data in the form of documents (academic papers, reports, planning guidance) and 40 interviews with public actors and CCI actors conducted between 2005 and 2010. The research material in the case of Birmingham comes from secondary data (statistics, academic and practical publications, etc.) and primary data in the form of 45 interviews with local and regional policy makers and cultural and creative managers/freelancers in Birmingham and the West Midlands from 2006 to 2010.

Our key research focus will be to compare the degree of collaboration and inclusion of the governance mechanisms (i.e. modes and practices of mobilisation and

organisation of collective action) associated with the integration of CCI into local and regional strategies across cities between distinctive or similar approaches. While in Birmingham, these strategies have been characterised by both culture-centric and econo-centric approaches, in Marseille they were mainly associated with a culture-centric approach involving both socio-cultural and socio-economic ambitions. The longitudinal element of our comparison will also enable us to examine whether the degrees of collaboration and inclusion of governance mechanisms put in place have varied either within a similar approach or following a change in approach in a city over time.

3. From cultural regeneration to creative industries policies in Birmingham

Strong growing economic centre based on engineering and automotive manufacturing in the 1950's and 1960's, Birmingham was strongly hit by the downturn in industrial production in the 1970's (Spencer et al., 1986; Cherry, 1994). This process of economic restructuring triggered important regeneration initiatives from the 1980's onwards in which CCI have played a role. Today, creative industries represent 5.6% of the local employment which is slightly below the British average of 6%. The most important creative sectors in terms of jobs are architecture, arts and antiques and software. Spatially, Birmingham has two recognised creative quarters: the Jewellery Quarter a centre for jewellery production and retail and architecture and media firms; and Eastside/Digbeth with the Custard Factory (centre for multi-media activities, graphic design, visual arts and music production and performance) at its heart.

Based on Smith and Warfield (2008)'s framework, we can distinguish three periods in the city redevelopment. The first period (1980-1998) is initially characterised by a Council-led regeneration process based on a culture-centric approach which subsequently triggered private cultural development initiatives. The end of the 1990s marked a shift with the implementation of a strong second econo-centric approach to the development of CCI (influenced by the national government) supported by public-public partnerships between local and regional actors and with an important financial input from the European Commission up to 2008. With the end of the European money in 2008 and the election of the new Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government in 2010, the end of the 2000s period has been characterised by a mix approach with a return towards a more culture-centric approach at the local level and a continuous econo-centric approach at the regional level up to 2011.

1980 – 1998: local development based on a culture-centric approach

Like some other UK northern cities which had experienced economic restructuring during the 1970s, Birmingham implemented a large development project based on a culture-centric approach - in the 1980s. This initial strategy was based on a public-private partnership with some key actors and major cultural institutions. The city, however, opened up the debate on its redevelopment strategy to a wider audience at the end of the 1980s, fostering the emergence of informal cultural and creative private actors' initiatives.

As such, despite the national centralisation and privatisation processes promoted by the Conservatist government at the time, Birmingham City Council played a key role in the re-development of the city in the 1980's and the beginning of the 1990's

(Smyth, 1994) by initiating a large cultural led-regeneration project near the City centre (Carley, 1991; Smyth, 1994; Barber, 2001). This project aimed to "promote Birmingham as a centre for financial and service industries as well as a centre for leisure and tourism" (Carley, 1991, p.101) and included a conference/symphony hall (funded by the Council), a four star hotel and a sport venue. While led by the City Council, the project was managed through a mix public and private partnership (including the Chamber of Commerce) and was funded by public and private funds as well as the EU structural fund. This flagship redevelopment was complemented by large public investments in public art and sculptures and an important cultural policy in support to major art institutions such as theatres, the symphony orchestra, etc. (Hubbard, 1995). These initiatives aimed to improve the local quality of life and the international image of the city rather than to directly impact its economic growth (Lister, 1991). Parallel to this, the city also experienced some form of cultural activism through visual arts and film during that period (King, 2004a) as in other UK cities.

This initial strong local public impulse in the regeneration of the city based on a small group of actors triggered major developments funded through a mix of private developers, European funding and/or the national Heritage Lottery Fund (Barber 2001) in the 1990s. These developments were attracted by the important strategy put in place by the City Council to market Birmingham as the "Europe meeting place" as a follow-up to the Highbury Initiative – a symposium bringing together local, national and international public and private actors to rethink the development of the city at the end of the 1980's (Barber, 2001; Berg *et al*., 1999). The latter opened up the discussion about city development to non-traditional actors and some of them invested

in private cultural developments with or without the support of public money. A couple of these private initiatives took place in the eastern part of the city centre (Eastside/Digbeth) establishing the premise of the development of the area into an organic cultural quarter. The most influential project was initiated by a developer of space for creative and artistic enterprises – in 1990. Having been contacted by local artists in need of cultural spaces, he acquired a vacant set of factory buildings and started renting them to theatrical groups and young artists. Within a few months, 70 artists had set up their workshops there (King, 2004a). A mix of City Council funding, European (EU) fund and private money lead to the restoration of some of these buildings and the initiative developed successfully under the name of the Custard factory[3] (Porter and Barber, 2007). This informal development will play an important role as a focal point for cultural and creative businesses in Birmingham in the following years.

1998 – 2008: cultural and creative industries as motor of economic growth

The end of the 1990's marked a shift towards the use of CCI based on an econo-centric approach with a direct support for CCI ventures to foster their growth. This shift in focus was strongly influenced by the new Labour government creative industries' agenda discussed in the previous section and was concomitant with the development of a more complex local and regional multi-level governance and an enlargement of the role of CCI actors in local and regional policies.

Building on EU and national funding, the city and the region put in place various initiatives to support the growth of the CCI. This was made possible by the arrival of a

---

[3] http://www.custardfactory.co.uk/

new City Council leader - Albert Bore, a former city economic development chairman with good relations with the business community and highly connected to European networks (Barber, 2001) - and by the creation of new regional and sub-regional actors (with the decentralization process launched by the new Labour government in 1997). In 1999, the newly created regional development agency - Advantage West Midlands (AWM) - identified elements of the creative industries as priority economic sectors for the region in its regional economic development strategy and started developing some creative clusters initiatives from 2001 onwards (BCC, 2002; Brown *et al.,* 2007; Chapain et al., 2010). Parallel to this sectoral regional focus, Birmingham City Council put in place an important business support package (a £9 million grant) to support the CCI in partnership with local and regional public organisations including AWM, Business Link[4], the Learning and Skills Council[5] and the Arts Council (BCC, 2002; Urban communications, 2004; Zahir, 2010) – representatives of these organisations and creative industries experts formed the *Creative Birmingham Partnership Board.* This business support was provided along four main axes: 1) business development and programmes to support individual firms through advice; 2) sectoral development through networking activities; 3) feasibility studies to assess market potential and start-up grant; and 4) workspace subsidies.

It is interesting to note that parallel to this economic strategy, the city continued to finance local key cultural organisations as part of its cultural policy. This distinction between its economic and cultural strategies was very apparent with the creation of a distinctive cultural partnership: the *Birmingham Cultural Partnership* bringing

---

[4] Organisation in charge of providing business support in the city and region.

[5] Organisation in charge of secondary, higher and further education.

together the city council heads of cultural services and representatives of key local and regional cultural agencies and non-departmental public bodies (Brown *et al.* 2007). These two partnerships also operated in a different way with the creative partnership opened to non-traditional creative actors - '*Birmingham City Council involves informal attempts to bring creative sectors together. I attend the Birmingham Creative Partnership Board.*' (Manager, independent TV Company) - whereas the cultural partnership tended to restrict participation to flagship organisations - '*Birmingham City Council is a very important source of support to cultural organisations but the majority of its funding goes to the very big flagship companies*' (Director, Dance Company). This distinction was characteristic of that period with the development of a multitude of local and regional initiatives towards the CCI covering both econo-centric and/or culture-centric objectives and different sets of actors: this was the case of Culture West Midlands, the regional cultural consortium, whose aims was to bring together a wide range of local and regional public bodies with voluntary sector and private organisations to champion the regional cultural sector (Lutz, 2006; Brown et al., 2007; 2010).

The local and regional economic strategies put in place to foster the creative industries were strongly influenced by the notion of clustering and networking promoted nationally. As a result, the city and its partners supported various networking activities between creative businesses and/or higher education and/or research institutions. One example was the development of the *Creative Hub* initiative located at the Custard Factory in Birmingham which supported the networking and clustering of over 300 businesses. Another example was the support given by the local council to the creation of the *Creative Republic* whose objectives were to bring together creative

and cultural people to represent, lobby, network and commission research for the sector. These top down initiatives were echoed by bottom-up ones from the industries with the emergence of local cultural and creative leaders such as Maverick TV – an independent TV and media production company – or informal initiatives from CCI actors to support the development of their activities in Birmingham. This was the case, for example of *Created in Birmingham*[6]. This project developed by independent creative artists since 2006 consists in a daily weblog as well as bespoke activities/events promoting cultural and creative activities taking place and originating from Birmingham. The popularity of the site and its activities has grown over the years with more than 2,000 followers on related social media platforms such as facebook and twitter. Another initiative was the *Creative Alliance*, a "group of experienced arts professionals working collaboratively to develop, support and train new and emerging creative talent"[7] created in 2007.

As such, the strong local and regional economic policy support given to the CCI over the period 2001-2008 generated and fostered the creation of an identity for these industries, and helped their maturation and the emergence of creative leaders outside the more traditional local artistic institutions. Nevertheless, this process was not exempt of difficulties as demonstrated by the lowest concentrations of these industries in Birmingham compared with the British average and the low level of visual identity experienced by the sector in the city (Brown et al., 2007; 2010): "*you do have within Birmingham a very fragmented kind of set-up and it's very hard, you know, these companies are all over the place for example in the creative sector*." (Development

---

[6] http://www.createdinbirmingham.com/about/

[7] http://www.creativealliance.org.uk/

officer, Birmingham City Council, 2010) This is partly explained by a lack of strong connection between the built environment and policy fostering the CCI in the period 1998-2008 and the difficulty for local and regional policy makers to completely understand the need for more flexible, multidisciplinary and informal governance arrangements necessary to accommodate the development of CCI: "*it's very much a top down approach, because I think it's the labyrinthine nature of, you know, the largest council in Europe and I don't think they know how to do light touch*." (Creative entrepreneur, 2010)

2008-2011: a balance between econo-centric and culture-centric approaches?

The year 2008 marked a change in the local approach to the CCI in Birmingham with a return towards a more culture-centric policy. However, the region still conserved a strong economic approach in support to the CCI up until 2011 when RDAs were abolished by the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition government. This was due to the almost disappearance of EU money to support local initiatives with the enlargement of the European Commission, a mainstreaming of local and regional organisations and initiatives and the shock of the 2008-2009 economic crisis. This change resulted in a reduction of the role of CCI actors in local and regional policies.

While CCI were still seen as an important component of the local economy, their dedicated business support was cancelled in favour of a generic business support package put in place by the City Council to booster the local economic recovery: "*our remit is much broader now. It's more business and enterprise and also innovation. Not just creative industries. Creative industries will be covered within that broad category*" (Economic development officer, Birmingham City Council, 2010). As a

consequence, the inclusion of the CCI in the city's strategy return to a more traditional culture-centric approach with local financial support provided to major cultural institutions, festival and community activities through its cultural strategy[8] or CCI activities targeted for their regeneration potential. As such, the city focused on the CCI in its new single spatial strategy ("the Big City Plan") to specifically help regenerate two city centre quarters: the Jewellery quarter and the Digbeth area. These strategic intentions were based on existing concentrations of creative activities in those quarters which had "experienced stagnating or declining economic activity" (BCC, 2008, p.14) and built on earlier regeneration attempts to develop the Digbeth area as a cultural/digital media quarter around the Custard Factory (Porter and Barber, 2007; Barber and Pareja-Eastaway, 2010). The Council's point of view was that CCI were "well suited to making use of old converted buildings that can not be viably redeveloped for mainstream commercial use." (BCC, 2008, p. 19) These regenerative ambitions were supported by bespoke economic contributions from the Council and the RDA through the redevelopment of some buildings and the provision of incubator spaces up to 2011 when the RDA were abolished.

This change in the local strategy away from direct economic support to creative industries and back to more traditional cultural policies has left a kind of void in terms of public creative leadership: "*I have to say, my experience since last year is I don't see the vision and leadership from anyone in the public sector*" (creative entrepreneur, 2010). This change also resulted in a return to a more restrictive contribution of CCI actors to local policies with the dismantlement of the *Creative Birmingham Partnership Board* and some creative network initiatives such as the *Creative*

---

[8] http://www.birmingham.gov.uk/cs/Satellite/arts?packedargs=website%3D4&rendermode=live

Republic having to function without public funding. This change in governance was also echoed at the regional level with the abolition of Culture West Midlands – the regional cultural partnership - in favour of a more restricted executive group of regional cultural public organizations breaking existing links with voluntary, not-for-profit or third sector cultural organizations (Brown et al. 2010). Nevertheless, the regional development agency continued to support the CCI based on an econo-centric approach during that period through its creative cluster strategies for Film, Video, TV and New Media; and as such retained independent private actors' involvement in those strategies such as Channel 4. With the abolition of the regional development agency and the creation of new Local Enterprise Partnerships in the region, the question remains with regard to the integration of the CCI into local development strategies over the longer term.

4. From cultural initiatives to creative industries policies in Marseille

From the 1960s Marseille was affected by deindustrialisation and its correlative impacts: unemployment, loss of population, impoverishment, and decrease in public funding (San Marco and Morel, 1988; Donzel, 1990; 1998). The City Council was not able to implement any relevant economic or urban re-development policy until the arrival of external financial support in 1995, through the launch of the project Euroméditerranée, a multi-public partnership scheme partly supported by the national government. The programme of 313 hectares (broadly covering the city centre and the waterfront) is managed by a specific public planning agency (*Etablissement Public d'aménagement Euroméditerranée* – EPAEM) and aims to renew the economy and the image of the city. Marseille is ranked third for the number of jobs in the cultural

sector (INSEE, 2008), welcoming around 17% of the cinema production in France (Euroméditerranée, 2005). The city is also well known for its artistic and cultural places and national and international events. Since 1998, CCI have started to be of main interest for the city despite the fact that there is no local creative/cultural quarter. However, the creative ambition of the city is more a policy narrative than a practice: recommendations rather than concrete initiatives are mainly characterising planning (Ville de Marseille, 2009) and 2002-2012 cultural strategic plans with regard to CCI (Ville de Marseille, 2002).

The integration of culture and CCI in local and regional policies and strategies in Marseille has varied across the years. Although this integration has been essentially related to a culture-centric approach, this approach has been declined according to different objectives over time and the nature of the partnerships between public and private actors has evolved accordingly. Three periods can be identified from the 1980's onwards: 1/ the development of temporary public-private coalitions and the use of informal cultural initiatives as an alternative to urban decline with strong socio-cultural aims; 2/ the development of a formal local and regional urban regeneration and re-branding strategy based on steady public-private partnerships with the involvement of a small number of key cultural and creative actors acknowledging the benefits of culture for economic and urban development; 3/ a broader economic and regeneration strategy with a focus on both "Culture" and "culture" and a multiplication of public actors.

Cultural initiatives: an alternative to urban decline (1986-1995)

From 1986 to 1995, the use of CCI in Marseille was limited to the local and/or even neighbourhood levels and aimed to foster socio-cultural development and impact the image of districts affected by deindustrialisation. As such, this period can be defined as a stage of soft renewal as there was no formal regeneration project and no policy targeting economic redevelopment. Culture was use for its ability to impact local communities and to improve the overall image of the city.

In 1986, with the arrival of a new mayor, some substantial funding was allocated to create new cultural facilities[9] (e.g the creation of temporary and alternative cultural projects on urban brownfields). This policy was developed with the idea of attracting new artists and cultural actors; it relied on the intensive networks of key local leaders (particularly the city mayor, and the deputy mayor in charge of culture). This policy also took benefit of the historic cultural dynamism of the city as "a cultural place of independent, popular production" (Peraldi and Samson, 2005) including independent radios, numerous cultural associations particularly in social housing estates as well as socio-cultural organisations. This appealing environment attracted cultural actors with a substantial track record of developing socio-cultural projects and fostered the creativity of a set of others, already settled in Marseille. Not only were these actors encouraged by this favourable political context, but also by the overall image of Marseille as a proletarian, cosmopolitan and multicultural city (Lorente, 2002). In the early-mid 1980s, Marseille was the only city of such size where buying spaces for developing cultural projects was possible and where finding adequate derelict sites for interim uses was not difficult.

---

[9] The International Centre of Poetry of Marseille (CIPM) in 1990 and the Museum of African, Oceanian and Amerindian arts in 1992.

A set of key projects based on closed public-private partnerships was developed. For example, the first yearly event of the "Fiesta des Suds"[10] took place in 1992 on some derelict docks just bought by a developer who contacted two professionals in socio-cultural projects with the idea of launching the symbolic revival of the area. Another key project, elaborated by two national companies of Street Theatre (Generik Vapeurs and Lieu Public) consisted in building a Street Arts Community project (Cité des Arts de la Rue). The now flagship project *La Friche* was launched in 1991, on a derelict tobacco factory. The project relied on a win-win arrangement between the local authority, cultural actors and the owners of the factory. On the one hand, the owner whist authorising these uses considered them as interim occupations to prevent vandalism and anticipated positive reversal of the real estate market. Cultural actors, on the other hand, took benefit of such flexible and free spaces, thus participating in the intended renewal process through cultural activities put in place by the City Council (Andres, 2008, 2010 and forthcoming). As argued by one cultural actor, "*there was a deal (...) Plus, immediately the idea of the collective utility of the project was raised*" (fieldwork March 2006).

These initiatives/projects contributed to a progressive re-branding of Marseille. As noted by a former cabinet member "*Marseille that was then considered as the French Connexion city (known for its drug and tobacco trade and its mafia) became an artistic city. Brownfield lands played a crucial role in this policy*" (fieldwork, Jan. 2007). The overall cultural policy conducted in this period highlights the use of culture as a small scale factor of economic and social (re)development (whose

---

[10] Which is now on of the most well-know yearly music festival in Marseille

influence is by essence limited and not part of a broader regeneration project) with the additional purpose of shaping a new city image for professionals in socio-cultural development. This strategy involved a limited number of public actors (as it essentially concerns the city council) but was much more inclusive from the private side. Professional or semi-professional cultural actors and artists were positioned as potential drivers for a soft and bottom-up renewal whereas amateurs benefited from a wide range of socio-cultural initiatives. This configuration started evolving in 1995 when a strategy of urban regeneration emerged with the *Euroméditerranée* project.

Cultural and creative industries: a catalyst for urban and economic development (1995-2008)

This period marked an enlargement of Marseille's culture-centric approach to CCI with the beginning of a specific strategy for these industries as well as the use of cultural projects as drivers of economic and urban renaissance not only at a neighbourhood and/or local level but also at the local and regional levels. As such, the economic outcomes of culture were no longer limited to soft renewal strategies but to in-depth regeneration with culture used for branding, place-making and marketing. This new dimension was complementary to the sustained role of culture as a factor of social cohesion. This period was also characterised by a shift in governance arrangements specific to the culture-centric approach. More formal forms of partnerships started to be put in place between public actors and some of the CCI private actors, now divided in two groups: those involved in activities participating in local economic development and the others in initiatives still aiming to promote socio-cultural development.

On the one hand the use of culture for socio-cultural development was driven by the City Council. Between 1995 and 2001, the key priority of cultural policies was the reduction of the cultural fracture between the city centre and the other districts (Ville de Marseille, 2002). This priority was correlated to a set of urban policies programmes (Grand Projet de Ville, Grand Projet Urbain…) towards socio-economically deprived neighbourhoods. Two conventions (one with the State and the other with the Region) led to a partnership to support a set of cultural facilities (the main library and the Street Theatre project for example) in 1998. The aim was to foster the development of cultural associations or ensure their survival and to sustain existing cultural projects and valorise artistic creation. Such ambitions remain at the core of the current cultural development strategy aiming to support the associative milieu and the cultural economy (particularly book fairs and festivals). "*The associative world ensures the link between the city and its inhabitants". It has a mission of public service in the social field*" (Ville de Marseille, 2002, p.9).

On the other hand, the project Euroméditerranée started including culture to foster local economic development within its urban regeneration strategy. As part of the contractual agreement forming the EPAEM not only the City Council was involved but the Region and the Department as well. The European Union also had a small involvement through punctual funding supports (the structural fund for example). Substantial partnerships between public actors and a limited number of key cultural actors with rising networks and the ability to demonstrate their inputs to the renaissance of Marseille (Andres, 2011b) were put in place. Three main actions characterised this policy objective: 1/ the decision to build key cultural flagship

projects including a new museum (MUCEM) and a new concert hall on the waterfront; 2/ the decision to sustain temporary informal cultural initiatives over the longer term (particularly *La Friche*); 3/ the creation of a creative industries cluster to foster economic development.

Whereas the perspective of building new cultural facilities relied on re-branding and redevelopment ambitions as part of a vast regional regeneration strategy, the interests towards CCI were incorporated into the existing initiative of *La Friche* which, in 1995, was inserted in the Euroméditerranée's perimeter for strategic reasons. As explained by the former head of Economic Development of the EPAEM, *La Friche* is a tool to demonstrate that "*economic activity could be produced through artistic and cultural activities*". (…) In addition *"it also relates to the overall ambition of creating a district of cultural industries which will be a start-up to develop the sector of creative industries in Marseille*". That is why, in addition to *La Friche* (managed by cultural actors) and to the realisation of new facilities related to heritage/conservation (led by the City Council), a creative cluster was launched by the EPAEM in 1998. This cluster focused on new media, television, films and videogames, which were perceived as an expanding regional niche market. Further to this initiative, the City Council started acknowledging cultural industries as part of its cultural policies from 2002 onwards. The council identifies edition, music, plastic art and cinema audiovisual as CCI priority sectors. However the strategy of the City Council towards CCI essentially remained a narrative one; more attention (and funding) was still given to socio-cultural activities.

Consequently, the perspective of regenerating Marseille, at different levels, using CCI was shared by all actors. However, as regard to *La Friche* their sustainable participation in this type of partnership rested on the way they managed to drive their project through innovative and entrepreneurial strategies and practices, as well as their ability to continue building networks and to participate in local and regional strategies (Andres, 2011b). This configuration was also valid for other initiatives not included in Euroméditerranée but in the overall cultural strategy of Marseille such as the Street Arts Community, whose construction began in 2007 in partnership with the City Council, the Region and the national government (Andres, 2010). In both cases, such cultural intermediaries acquired a progressive and decisive power of decision and action. However, alternatively, all other cultural actors were progressively excluded from local and regional strategies as urban authorities' objectives evolved. This evolution in the types of multi-level governance has been partially re-questioned from 2008 onwards with the success of Marseille/ Provence to become European Capital of Culture in 2013.

2008 onwards: a wider economic and regeneration strategy based on a more integrated governance?

The attention given to the integration of CCI for economic development and regeneration prospects (within a culture-centric approach) has evolved due to the selection of Marseille (and of 129 other communes) as 2013 European Capital of Culture (ECOC) and to new regional policies in the last few years. This has contributed to strengthen existing public-private partnerships and enlarge public-public partnerships between the local authorities part of Marseille Provence 2013. In

addition, broader considerations of economic regional and sectoral development have been included in the overall vision of urban renaissance and culture-led regeneration.

Marseille Provence 2013 is and will be an essential component of the current regeneration programme of Marseille (Grésillon, 2009; Latarget, 2010; Andres, 2011a). The Chamber of Commerce estimates that €1 invested will generate €6 of income (Latarjet, 2010). However the existing multi-level governance of Marseille Provence 2013 is fragile. The respective understandings of the role of ECOC tend to oppose local authorities which perceive the scheme as an opportunity to foster their economic and tourism development (Aix en Provence for example) and those using ECOC a part of their cultural regeneration strategies (Marseille essentially). This has created huge tensions between the different local authorities. Toulon, one of the initial partners of the bid, has withdrawn from the consortium while Aix en Provence, after long hesitations, has finally confirmed its participation.

Looking at the degree of inclusion of these governance arrangements, it seems that the ECOC application has again fostered existing public-private partnerships with actors of *La Friche* and the Street Arts Community particularly. Besides playing a key role in the application process, both projects have been used as flagship initiatives (Marseille Provence 2013, 2008). As expressed by one representative from *La Friche* "*Marseille 2013 it's us! Without such projects, noting would have been possible*" (field work, December 2008).

Complementary to this overall strategy of cultural regeneration, CCI have been inserted into the broader regional economic development strategy (the Département

and the Région had previously launched a couple of policy/programmes to support CCI but none of them concerned Marseille). In 2008, the Region decided to fund creative clusters (PRIDES) including one in Marseille promoting creative sectors such as cinema, television, animation, video game, and edition. This initiative – as small as it can be – potentially highlights a turn in the existing multi-level governance as the regional dimension might bring a more integrated local and regional development framework.

Finally, socio-cultural initiatives led by the City Council as part of its 2002-2012 strategic plan are still part of the cultural landscape; however financial pressures on these activities have increased especially with the reduction of national aids given to some cultural facilities (the director of theatre Toursky, denounced their difficulties in 2009 by starting a hunger strike). The inclusion of (socio) cultural actors in local governance arrangements is now limited. This to a certain extent could announce the beginning of a shift from a culture-centric approach to an economic-centric one.

5. Discussion and conclusion

Our comparative and longitudinal analysis of the integration of CCI into local and regional policies in Birmingham and Marseille has provided contrasting examples of how the culture-centric and econo-centric approaches can lead to different forms of governance arrangements between public and private actors. While Smith and Warfield (2008) suggested that the culture-centric approach would be based on a more collaborative and inclusive governance due to its objectives, our analysis demonstrates more subtle governance patterns depending on wider factors such as

local and regional governance frameworks and leaderships and the extent of CCI private actors' resources.

On the one hand, the case of Birmingham displays a fluctuant pattern of policy approaches towards CCI: from culture-centric, to econo-centric, to both (see Figure 3). This pattern was strongly influenced by both national visions and policies as well as local leadership and strategic approach with regard to European funding up to 2008. While the 1980s local culture-centric approach to CCI (based on culture-led regeneration) was initially led by the City Council in partnership with some key private actors and major cultural institutions, it was then enlarged to some more informal creative entrepreneurs' initiatives – with some bespoke support from the City Council - in the 1990s. The shift to an econo-centric approach from 1998 to 2008, fostered by national policies and access to EU funding, continued this process of enlargement and inclusion by allowing various creative entrepreneurs to be involved in network or cluster development initiatives as well as to access financial support. This enlargement process was reinforced by the decentralisation process implemented by the Labour Party at the end of the 1990s resulting in the creation of various regional bodies – and as such multiplying the points of policy access to creative entrepreneurs. Overall, the econo-centric approach contributed to the maturation of some creative sectors as well as the emergence of new creative leaders and lobbies in the city outside of traditional cultural institutions. The end of the EU money, the 2008-2009 economic crisis and the election of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition have, however, marked a return towards a more culture-centric approach at the local level and a mix approach at the national level but with a reduction of funding and the abolition of regional actors. This new policy environment raises some

questions with regard to the degree of inclusion of CCI actors in local policies in the future with a possible return to a more restrictive type of governance based on the most 'visible' CCI representatives.

On the other hand, Marseille displays a clear pattern of development from a soft strategy of urban redevelopment based on a relative inclusive number of cultural actors up to the mid 1990s to a more selective use of cultural actors within its cultural regeneration and economic development strategies during the 2000s - slightly enlarged recently by the introduction of policy support for the creative economy (see Figure 3). These degrees of collaboration and inclusion have varied with an evolution in the types of local objectives given to the CCI but also with an increased complexity of the governance process involving regional and national actors. Indeed, the inclusion of cultural and creative actors has varied depending on the local development paths they were involved in with a greater degree of inclusion when CCI role in urban policies was limited to community development with a strong socio-cultural dimension Their inclusion was much more limited and selective when cultural and creative actors were involved in broader strategies of urban regeneration in which culture was clearly used for local and regional branding purposes. In this case, only a very limited number of organic projects were able to sit in the more elitist spheres of local and regional governance.

<INSERT FIGURE 3 HERE>

In summary, our analysis has highlighted that, in our two cases, the culture-centric approach has actually been more exclusive that the econo-centric approach. However

both approaches have been inclusive to a certain extent depending on a set of enabling and limiting factors. These enabling and limiting factors sit within broader debates on the role of CCI in urban and economic development, the nature of the creative and cultural milieus and the .types of policies and funding devised to support them. Indeed, in Marseille and Birmingham the degree of inclusion of cultural and creative actors into local and regional development strategies has been related to their ability to sit and mobilise different networks and resources and to defend their projects and strategies within different spheres of influence on the one hand and on the other hand to the policy philosophy of local and regional initiatives put in place (bottom-up versus top-down, sectoral versus territorial, etc.).

The ability of cultural and creative actors to sit and use multi-level networks to develop their activities and strengthen their projects have been stressed by Markusen, (2006), Markusen and Johnson (2006) and Currid (2007), who noticed the critical role that artists' centres and networks play in generating and sustaining vital cultural scenes. The importance of local and regional networks to foster the creation of creative milieus has also been pointed by various scholars (see for example Florida 2002; Kadushin 1974; Piore and Sabel 1984; Saxenian 1994; Storper 1997; Uzzi 1996, Neff, 2005). In Birmingham and Marseille, we can argue that CCI actors have used both sectoral and geographical networks – local and regional networks having been more important in Birmingham and national networks in Marseille. As noted by Neff (2005), the geographic proximity of firms within neighbourhoods, districts, and cities can foster a "recurrent collaboration and mutual interdependence of money and ideas". In Birmingham, regional networking around specific CCI sectors was combined to a wider local networking leading to both physical (i.e. the Custard

Factory/Digbeth seen as a new media cluster/quarter and the location of the Creative Hub) and virtual representations of the CCI for the city (i.e. Created in Birmingham). On the other hand, sectoral networking at the national level, similar to "networked individualism" (Wellman 2001, 238)" has enabled la Friche or La Cité des Arts de la Rue to be recognised as key cultural projects within Euroméditerranée (for la Friche) and 2013 ECOC.

In addition, we can argue that the decisions took by local or regional authorities to include CCI actors in their economic development or urban regeneration policies usually relied on win-win relationships between the different public and private actors involved. This was typical for La Friche in Marseille (see Andres, 2008 and 2011b) but also for the Cultural Partnership and the Creative Partnership Board in Birmingham giving visibility and decision making power to cultural and creative actors on the one hand and legitimacy to the City Council on the other hand. We can also argue that the focus on CCI and their inclusion as motor of urban development was dependent on local public leadership – particularly in the first stages (both the mid-80s) in Marseille and Birmingham. This is actually significant of innovative cultural planning which as noted by Markusen and Gadwa (2010: 8) "requires an advocate at the top—a mayor or a city council member who sees arts and culture as an important urban economic and community development domain."

In addition to their ability to sit within strategic networks, the set of economic and human resources (Andres, 2011b) that some CCI actors were able to use, for example, a more or less formalised cultural action plan as the "cultural project for an urban project" at La Friche or having a successful business (such as Maverick TV in

Birmingham) put them at an advantage to be included in local and regional policy decision making process. As such, to guarantee their inclusion, some cultural and creative actors have actually adopted a very market-oriented strategy not only to demonstrate the value of their project to other actors (local and regional authorities) and customers/clients but also to build their reputation and foster the recognition of their activities into local and regional strategies, for example as flagship projects (La Friche in Marseille; the Custard Factory in Birmingham). Consequently, in both cities, but particularly in Marseille, there has been a scission between resource-skilled and non resource-skilled CCI actors. While the formers have sustained their influence within the culture-centric policies the others have not been able to engage with urban regeneration and planning priority objectives. This actually is not typical of Marseille but is a general feature of the weakest CCI actors, named "the community cultural groups" who due to financial, personality conflicts, delays, and managerial deficits find very difficult to sustain their existence and consequently are too busy to be engaged in city or regional cultural policy and are excluded from most advocacy organizing efforts" (Markusen and Gadwa, 2009: 23). However, this can also be the case of less economically successful CCI firms in the case of economic development strategies given the need for local and regional authorities to be seen to foster economic growth.

The ability of some CCI actors to be included in sometimes restrictive governance arrangements and to influence local and regional strategies may generate jealousy and resentment from those who are not part of these arrangements. This has been significant in Marseille particularly between CCI actors who were able to get involved in wider urban regeneration strategies versus those whose role was limited to local

community development (for example between actors from La Friche and other cultural projects in the Belle de Mai district). In Birmingham, similar phenomena occurred between traditional cultural institutions funded by the City Council money and other more alternative CCI activities not being able to receive funding. Tensions between CCI actors are a common feature as noted by Markusen and Gadwa (2009:21): "The arts and cultural sphere is balkanised into competing commercial, non-profit, and community segments, and often there is little solidarity within each group. Although artists cross over these sectoral divides all the time (Markusen et al., 2006), the organisations at the helm of each sector rarely work together on common problems or policy agendas (Ivey, 1999; Arthurs et al., 1999; Pankratz ,1999).

Overall, the differentiation made between different cultural and creative actors within the culture-centric approach is actually significative of the social and urban segregation issues raised by cultural regeneration processes and, particularly, the use of mega-events such as the development of cultural quarters or the ECOC scheme. Looking at previous ECOC cities, Jones and Wilks-Heeg (2004) have stressed that strategies that tend to prioritise tourists over and above residents negatively impact local cultures. Boland (2010) assessing the impact of ECOC in Liverpool has stressed how local culture has been politicised, manipulated and sanitised in order to stimulate urban regeneration and construct a spatial re-branding of the city leading to specific exclusion strategies of the most deprived communities. In Marseille, the exclusive inclusion of La Friche as part of Euroméditerranée 'facilities of excellence' (Bertoncello, Rodrigues Malta, 2001) was more or less disconnected from other local needs. Such use of entertainment projects, including stadiums, convention centres, entertainment districts, and festival malls in the USA (Eisinger, 2000) or Europe

(Coaffee, 2008; Couch et al., 2003) has been typical of the little attention given to the political and social implications of building a city for visitors rather than for local residents. In contrast, local and regional econo-centric policies usually involve some form of clustering and/or networking activities between various CCI actors and/or between CCI actors and actors from other economic sectors, universities, etc. to support their creative milieus (Scott, 2006) at various geographical scales. Despite their more restricted economic objectives, these approaches may actually lead to a greater openness to and inclusion of various types of actors in local and regional strategies as demonstrated in the case of Birmingham.

Finally, our comparative analysis has shown the importance of taking into account national contexts and policies both in terms of local and regional governance settings and recommended national approaches to support CCI (econo-centric or culture-centric or both) as they may constrain local and regional authorities in terms of funding. The spread of the creative economy discourse in Europe also seemed to have had an effect in these dynamics with both cities using CCI both as a tool for the regeneration of specific derelict areas as well as for broader local and regional urban and economic development at some point. Beyond this discourse, in both cities, EU initiatives such as the European Capital of Culture programme and the structural fund have played an important role in supporting the use of CCI to foster urban development. It will be important to examine how the integration of a more econo-centric approach into future EU initiatives to support the development of CCI – as expressed in the 2010 Green Paper (EC, 2010) will influence future local and regional policies across Europe, and more particularly, if it will result in greater inclusive governance.

References

AITCHISON, C., RICHARDS, G. and TALLON, A. (eds.) (2007) *Urban transformations: regeneration and renewal through leisure and tourism*, Leisure Studies Association, Eastbourne

ANDRES L., (2010), Friches et mutabilité précursive. Retour d'expériences franco-helvétique sur le rôle des acteurs transitoires dans la reconquête culturelle de territoire délaissés, *Méditerranée*, 114, pp. 51-64

ANDRES, L. (2008) *La ville mutable. Mutabilité et référentiels urbains : les cas de Bouchayer-Viallet, de la Belle de Mai et du Flon*, Thèse de doctorat sous la direction de M. Vanier, Institut d'urbanisme de Grenoble, Université Pierre Mendes France, Grenoble.

ANDRES, L. (2011a), Marseille 2013 or the final round of a long and complex regeneration strategy? Town Planning Review, 82(1), pp. 61-76

ANDRES, L. (2011b) Alternative initiatives, cultural intermediaries and urban regeneration: the case of La Friche (Marseille), *European Planning Studies* (forthcoming, May 2011)

ARTHURS, A., Hodsoll, F. and Lavine, S. (1999) For-profit and not-for-profit arts connections: Existing and potential, *Journal of Arts Management, Law & Society*, 29 (2), pp. 80–97.

BARBER A. and M. PAREJA-EASTAWAY (2010) "Leadership challenges in the inner city: planning for sustainable regeneration in Birmingham and Barcelona." *Policy Studies*, 31(4), pp. 393-412

BARBER, A. (2001) *The ICC, Birmingham: A Catalyst for Urban Renaissance.* CURS, University of Birmingham.

BERG, L. v. d., J. v. d. MEER, and A. H. J. OTGAAR (2000) *The Attractive City - Catalyst for Economic Development and Social Revitalisation. An International Comparative Research into the Experiences of Birmingham, Lisbon and Rotterdam,* Rotterdam, The Netherlands, Euricur.

BERTONCELLO, B. and RODRIGUES MALTA, R. (2001), 'Euroméditerranée : les échelles d'un grand projet de régénération urbaine', in A. Donzel (ed), *Métropolisation, gouvernance et citoyenneté dans la région urbaine marseillaise*, Paris, Maison-Neuve et Larose.

BIANCHINI, F. (1993) Culture, conflict and cities: Issues and prospects for the 1990s in F, BIANCHINI. and PARKINSON, M. (Eds) *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience* ,: Manchester University Press, Manchester, pp. 199-213.

BIANCHINI. and PARKINSON, M. (Eds) (1993) *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience* ,: Manchester University Press, Manchester.

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL (2008) *Birmingham Big City Plan. Work in Progress*. BCC

BIRMINGHAM CITY COUNCIL (BCC) (2002) *Birmingham Creative City. Analysis of Creative Industries in the City of Birmingham*. Birmingham.

BROWN J., C. CHAPAIN, A. MURIE, A. BARBER, J. GIBNEY and J. LUTZ, (2007), *From a city of a thousand trades to a city of a thousand ideas*. Birmingham, West Midlands. Pathways to creative and knowledge based regions. ACRE report 2.3. Accommodating Creative Knowledge – Competitiveness of European Metropolitan Regions within the Enlarged Union. AMIDSt, University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam.

BROWN J., LUTZ J., GIBNEY J., BARBER A., CHAPAIN C., A. MURIE and P. LEE (2010) *Policies and Strategies for the Creative Knowledge Economy in Birmingham and the West Midlands Region. How to enhance the city's competitiveness.* ACRE report WP10.3. Amsterdam: AMIDSt.

CARLEY, M. (1991) Business in urban regeneration partnerships: A case study in Birmingham. *Local Economy*, 6(2), 100 — 115

CARS, G., HEALEY P., MADANIPOUR, A. and MAGALHAES, C. DE (Eds) (2002) *Urban Governance, Institutional Capacity and Social Milieux*. Aldershot: Ashgate

CHAPAIN, C.A., STACHOWIAK, K. and VAATTOVAARRA, M. 2010. Beyond cluster policy: Birmingham, Poznan and Helsinki. *In:* Sako Musterd and Alan Murie, eds. *Making Competitive Cities: Pathways, Actors and Policies*. Wyley and Son

CHERRY G. E. (1994) *Birmingham A Study in Geography, History and Planning*, Belhaven World Cities Series: Chichester, John Wiley & Sons.

COAFFEE, J. (2008) Sport, culture and the modern state: emerging themes in stimulating urban regeneration in the UK, *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(4), pp. 377-397

COUCH, C., FRASER, C. and PERCY, S. (2003) *Urban Regeneration in Europe*, Blackwell Publishing, Oxford.

CURRID E. (2010) Symposium Introduction--Art and Economic Development: New Directions for the Growth of Cities and Regions. *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 29(3), pp. 257-261

CURRID, E. (2007) *The Warhol economy: How fashion, art and music drive New York City*, Princeton University Press, Princeton.

DEPARTMENT FOR CULTURE MEDIA AND SPORT [DCMS] (2004) DCMS Evidence Toolkit - DET (formerly, The Regional Cultural Data Framework) Technical Report. Department for Culture, Media and Sport, London.

DCMS (2008) *Creative Britain. New Talents for the New Economy*, London.

DEPARTMENT FOR TRADE AND INDUSTRY [DTI] (2001) Business Clusters in the UK - A First Assessment, Department for Trade and Industry, London.

DEPS (2008), *Statistiques d'entreprises des industries culturelles*, Culture Chiffres, 2008-4. Ministère de la Culture. France.

DETIENNE, M. (2000), *Comparer l'incomparable*, Le Seuil, Lonrai.

DJIAN JM., (1996) *La politique culturelle*, Editions du Monde, Paris, 282p

DONZEL, A. (1990) Regeneration in Marseille : the search for political stability in D R. Judd M. Parkinson (eds) *Leadership and urban regeneration : cities in North America and Europe* Sage Publications, London

DONZEL, A. (1998*) Marseille : l'expérience de la cité*, Anthropos, Paris

ED VAIZEY (2010) *'The Creative Ecology'*, Ministerial Speech, Thursday 10 February 2011, State of the Arts conference, London, Available online at: http://www.culture.gov.uk/news/ministers_speeches/7834.aspx (Accessed April 5, 2011)

EISINGER, P. (2000) The Politics of Bread and Circuses: Building the City for the Visitor Class, *Urban Affairs Review*, 35(3), pp. 316-333

EUROMEDITERRANEE, 2005, *Le Pôle média Belle de Mai souffle sa première bougie*, EPAEM, Marseille

EUROPEAN COMMISSION [EC] (2010) *Green Paper: Unlocking the potential of cultural and creative industries.* Brussels. COM (183).

EVANS, G. (2001) *Cultural Planning: An Urban Renaissance?*, Routledge, London.

EVANS, G. (2009) Creative cities, ceative spaces and urban policy, *Urban Studies,* 46, pp 1003-1040

FLORIDA, R. (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life***,** Basic Books, New York.

GARNHAM N. (2005) From cultural to creative industries. In *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, pp. 15-29.

GRAWITZ, M. (2001*) Méthodes des sciences sociales*, Dalloz, Paris.

GRAY C. 2002 Local Government and the Arts. *Local Government Studies*, Vol. 28, No 1, Spring 2002, pp. 77-90

GRESILLON, B. (2009) Marseille-Provence 2013, capitale européenne de la culture : une chance pour la ville ; une chance pour le territoire ? , *Urbanisme*, 2/2009

GRIFFITHS, R. (1995) Cultural strategies and new modes of urban intervention, *Cities*, 12, pp.253-265

H&M GOVERNMENT (2009) *Partnership for growth. A national framework for regional and local economic development. Building Britain's future*. H&M Government, London.

HOUSE OF COMMONS (2010) Business, Innovation and Skills Select Committee, *The New Local Enterprise Partnerships: An Initial Assessment. Volume 1*. HC 434–I. The Stationery office, London.

HUBBARD P. (1995) Urban Design and Local Economic Development. A Case Study in Birmingham. *Cities*, 12(4), pp. 243-251

INSEE (2008) *Les fonctions culturelles : des dynamiques régionales différenciées qui accompagnent le boom de l'emploi*, INSEE Economie, 127

IVEY, W. J. (1999) Bridging the for-profit and not-for-profit arts, *Journal of Arts Management, Law & Society, 29*(2), pp. 97–100.

JONES, P. and WILKS-HEEG, P. (2004), Capitalising culture: Liverpool 2008, *Local Economy*, 19(4), 341–60.

KANTOR, P. and SAVITCH, H.V. (2005) 'Debates and Developments. How to Study Comparative urban Development Politics: a Research Note.', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29 (1), pp. 135-151

KADUSHIN, C. (1974) *The American intellectual elite*, Little, Brown, Boston.

KING S. (2004a) Making Mansions. In L. Kennedy (ed) *Remaking Birmingham. The Visual Culture of Urban Regeneration*. New York: Routledge.

KING, N (2004b) Using templates in the thematic analysis of text, in C.Cassell and G.Symon (Eds.) *Essential Guide to Qualitative Methods in Organizational Research*. London: Sage.

KONG L. (2000) "Culture, economy and policy: trends and developments", *Geoforum*, 31, 385-90

LATARJET, B. (2010) Marseille-Provence 2013 : genèse, objectifs et enjeux d'un projet culturel métropolitain,, *Méditerranée*, 114, pp. 27-30

LERICHE F. and S. DAVIET (2010) Cultural Economy: An opportunity to boost employment and regional development. *Regional Studies* 44(7), pp. 807-811

LERICHE F., DAVIET S., SIBERTIN-BLANC M., ZULIANI J.M., (Eds) (2008), *L'économie culturelle et ses territoires*, Toulouse, Presses Universitaires du Mirail.

LIEFOOGHE C. (2009), *La créativité : une ressource pour le développement économique d'une région de tradition industrielle ?*, Colloque de l'ASRDLF.

LISTER D. (1991) The Transformation of a City: Birmingham. In M. Fisher and U. Owen (eds) *Whose Cities?* London: Penguin Books.

LORD REDCLIFF MAUD (1976) *Support for the Arts in England and Wales.* Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, London.

LORENTE, J.P (2002) Urban cultural policy and urban regeneration. The special case of declining port cities : Liverpool, Marseilles, Bilbao, in CRANE, D., KAWASHIMA, N., KAWASAKI, L. (Eds), *Media, arts, policy and globalization*, Routledge, New York and London, pp 93-104.

LORENZEN, M., SCOTT, A.J. and VANG, J. 2008: Editorial: Geography and the cultural economy. *Journal of Economic Geography* 8, pp. 589-92.

LUTZ, J. (2006) Extending the cultural research infrastructure: The rise of the regional cultural consortiums in England. *Cultural Trends,* 15 (1), No. 57, 19-44

MARKUSEN A. (2010) Organisational Complexity in the Regional Cultural Economy. *Regional Studies*, Vol. 44, No. 7, pp. 813-828

MARKUSEN A. & JOHNSON A. (2006), *Artists'centres: evolution and impact on careers, neighborhoods and economies*, Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis

MARKUSEN A. (2006) "Urban Development and the Politics of a Creative Class: Evidence from the Study of Artists." 2006. *Environment and Planning A*, Vol. 38, No. 10, pp. 1921-1940.

MARKUSEN, A. and GADWA, A. (2009) *Arts and Culture in Urban/Regional Planning: A Review and Research Agenda*, Working Paper #271, Minneapolis, http://www.hhh.umn.edu/projects/prie/pdf/271CulturalPlanningResearch.pdf

MARKUSEN, A. and GADWA, A. (2010) Arts and Culture in Urban or Regional Planning: A Review and Research Agenda, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 29(3), pp. 379-391.

MARSEILLE PROVENCE 2013. (2008) *European Capital of Culture: Application form*, Marseille.

MAY, T. (1993) *Social research: issues, methods and process*, Open University Press, Buckingham.

MILES, S. and PADDISON, R., (2005) Introduction: The rise and rise of culture-led urban regeneration, *Urban Studies*, 42(5/6), pp. 833–839.

MOULINIER P., (2001), *Les politiques publiques de la culture en France*, PUF, Paris, 127

NEFF, G. (2005), The Changing Place of Cultural Production: The Location of Social Networks in a Digital Media Industry, *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, pp. 597-134

O'CONNOR J. (2008) *The cultural and creative industries: a review of the literature.* A report for Creative Partnerships. Arts Council of England.

PANKRATZ, D. (1999) The collaborating arts: Final report from the American Assembly meeting of 13 November 1998, *Journal of Arts Management, Law and Society,* 29(2), pp. 107-121.

PEACOCK, A. (2000) Public Financing of the Arts in England. *Fiscal Studies*, 20 (2), 171-205

PERALDI, M., and SAMSON, M. (2005). *Gouverner Marseille : enquête sur les mondes politiques marseillais*, La découverte, Paris.

PIGNOT L and SAEZ J.P. (Eds.) (2010), La ville créative : concept marketing ou utopie mobilisatrice ?, L'Observatoire, *la revue des politiques culturelles*, n°36.

PIORE, M. J., & SABEL. C. F. (1984) *The second industrial divide*, Basic Books, New York.

PORTER, L., BARBER, A. 2007. Planning the Cultural Quarter in Birmingham's Eastside. *European Planning Studies,* 15 (10), 1327-1348

RAGIN, C. (1989) *The comparative method. Moving beyond qualitative and quantitative strategies*, University of California Press, Berkeley.

SAEZ JP (Eds) (2008), *Culture et société, un lien à recomposer*, Editions de l'attribut. France.

SANMARCO, P. and MOREL, B. (1988) *Marseille : l'état du futur*, Edisud, Aix en Provence.

SAXENIAN, A.L. (1994) *Regional advantage: Culture and competition in Silicon Valley and Route 128*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge.

SCOTT, A. J. (2006), Creative Cities: Conceptual Issues and Policy Questions, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28(1), pp. 1-17.

SMITH, R. & WARFIELD, K. (2008) The creative city: A matter of values, in P. COOKE & L. LAZZERETTI (Eds), *Creative cities, cultural clusters and local economic development*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

SMYTH, H, (1994) *Marketing the City: The role of Flagships Development in Urban Regeneration*. London: E&F Spon.

SPENCER, K., A. Taylor, B. Smith, J. Mawson, N. Flynn, and R. Batley (1986) *Crisis in the industrial heartland: A study of the west midlands,* Oxford, Clarendon Press.

STIEGLER B. (2006), *Réenchanter le monde : La valeur esprit contre le populisme industriel*, Flammarion, France.

STORPER, M. (1997) *The regional world: Territorial development in a global economy*, Guilford, New York.

SUZANNE G. (2006), L'économie urbaine des mondes de la musique, Le district rap marseillais, *Annale de la recherche urbaine*, n°101, pp. 75-81

TALIANO DES GARIETS F. (2002) Les politiques culturelles des métropoles régionales françaises de 1945 à 1995, in J.C. Callede (Ed.), *Métamorphoses de la culture : pratiques et politiques en périphéries*, Maison des sciences de l'homme d'Aquitaine, Pessac.

TALLON, A. (2010) *Urban regeneration in the UK*, Routledge, London

UNDP/UNCTAD (2008) *Creative economy. Report 2008* (Geneva-New York: UNDP, UNCTAD).

URBAN COMMUNICATIONS (2004) *Creating the Profile for Birmingham's Creative and Cutlural Industries: Marketing Creative Birmingham.* Report to Creative Birmingham Partnerhsip Board.

UZZI, B. (1996) The sources and consequences of embeddedness for the economic performance of organizations: The network effect, *American Sociological Review,* 61, pp. 674-98.

VICKERY J. (2007) *The Emergence of Culture-led Regeneration: A Policy Concept and its Disctontent.* Research Papers No 9, Centre for Cultural Policy Studies, University of Warwick, UK.

VILLE DE MARSEILLE (2002) *Marseille 2002-2012 : la culture au cœur du débat. Schéma Directeur Culture*, Direction Générales des Affaires Culturelles, Marseille.

VILLE DE MARSEILLE, 2009, *Plan local d'urbanisme de la Ville de Marseille*, Marseille, France.

WARD, K. (2010) 'Towards a relational comparative approach to the study of cities.', *Progress in Human Geography*, 34(4), pp. 471-487

WELLMAN, B. (2001) Physical place and cyberplace: The rise of personalized networking, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research,* 25, pp.227-52.

ZAHIR M. (2010) *Birmingham City Council Creative Strategy*. Presentation at the ACRE Conference.

Barcelona, 27-29 May 2010