

Creative Cities: What Are They For, How Do They Work, and How Do We Build Them?

Meric S. Gertler

Background Paper F|48
Family Network

August 2004

Canadian Policy Research Networks Inc. (CPRN)

600 – 250 Albert Street, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 6M1

Tel: (613) 567-7500 Fax: (613) 567-7640

Web Site: <http://www.cprn.org>

**Creative Cities:
What Are They For, How Do They Work,
and How Do We Build Them?**

By

Meric S. Gertler

Contents

| | | |
|------------|---|-----------|
| 1.0 | What Are Creative Cities For? | 1 |
| 2.0 | How Do Creative Cities Work? | 2 |
| 2.1 | “Buzz” and the Creative City | 2 |
| 2.2 | The Creative Urban Economy | 3 |
| 2.3 | Creative Activity and the Recycling of Urban Space | 5 |
| 2.4 | Arts, Culture and Urban Identity: Branding Cities and Nations | 6 |
| 3.0 | How Do We Build Creative Cities? | 7 |
| 3.1 | Federal Policy and the Creative City | 7 |
| 3.2 | Provincial Policy and the Creative City | 8 |
| 3.3 | Local Action and the Creative City | 9 |
| 4.0 | Conclusion: Creative, Competitive, and Cohesive Cities | 11 |
| | Endnotes | 13 |

Creative Cities: What Are They For, How Do They Work, and How Do We Build Them?

Meric S. Gertler¹
University of Toronto

1.0 What Are Creative Cities For?

With the flurry of recent attention and excitement around creativity and cities, it is worth reflecting on a simple question at the outset: what are creative cities for? In other words, why should we be interested in promoting the development of creative cities, and what societal benefits or objectives should we strive for when doing so?

First, we should support the development of creative cities because they play an ever more important role in enhancing the dynamism, resilience, and overall competitiveness of our national economy. They do this by enhancing the innovativeness of individual workers, firms, and other organizations that comprise our urban regions. With the widely acknowledged shift to a knowledge-based or learning economy, creative cities have become the key locus for the creation of economic value by supporting innovation, resilience and quality enhancement.²

Second, we should nurture the development of creative cities because they have the potential to enhance quality of life and opportunity for a broad cross-section of Canadians. A narrow reading of the recent arguments concerning creativity and its role in the economy implies that creative cities are merely the playground for a hip, young, well-educated, affluent, technologically savvy class of workers – a “plug-and-play-ground” for twenty- and thirty-something members of the creative class. While this kind of critique is entirely understandable, it reminds us of the importance of adapting the creative class thesis to the Canadian context in an active and critical (rather than passive) way, by making our aspirations very clear. The goal for public policy in Canada should be – and can be – to enhance the formation of *socially inclusive creative places*.

As the following discussion demonstrates, this goal is entirely realistic. The twin objectives of enhancing economic dynamism and improving quality of life for the many rather than the privileged few are strongly linked through the key concept of quality of place. Quality of place should be understood as both a means to an end (achieving economic dynamism) and – perhaps most importantly – an end in itself (attaining a better life for urban residents).³

2.0 How Do Creative Cities Work?

How do creative cities work to address simultaneously the twin goals of enhancing economic dynamism and improving quality of life? The answer to this question revolves around the fascinating interrelationships between three Cs: creativity, competitiveness and cohesion.

In a nutshell, the presence of creative activity drives competitiveness throughout the rest of the urban economy. However, the success with which an urban region can generate and retain creative activity depends to a large extent on its quality of place and community characteristics that promote strong social cohesion. Strong, vibrant neighbourhoods, relative freedom from social deprivation, and access to employment and social services such as shelter, education, nutrition and health care are fundamental components of quality of place. They are also strongly consistent with Canadian values in a way that distinguishes us from our American neighbours to the south.

2.1 “Buzz” and the Creative City

Recent research has illuminated a number of key ways that the presence of creative activity contributes to the competitiveness and dynamism of urban economies. The work of Florida and his colleagues is perhaps best known in this regard.⁴ He argues that highly educated labour (“talent”) – one of the most important inputs to the production of goods and services – is drawn to those places that already have a critical mass of creative people and activities. Talented people are themselves creative and, as we shall discuss below, their continued success relies increasingly on their own ability to assert their creativity in the workplace. Moreover, creative people are drawn to communities of other creative people – both those who are occupationally similar to them, as well as those with different occupational identities.

In the first instance, a critical mass of occupationally similar colleagues in a particular place signals some very important qualities and characteristics of the local economy: the presence of a well-developed labour market offering a rich portfolio of employment opportunities, now and in the future; and the opportunity to learn from one’s peers who are engaged in exciting work at the leading edge of one’s discipline (occupational or career “buzz”).⁵

In the second instance, the presence of “dissimilar creatives” signifies other, equally important local characteristics: the opportunity for cross-disciplinary learning through intended and accidental encounters with creative people in other fields; the presence of rich and stimulating opportunities for the consumption of cultural activities (music, visual and performance arts, theatre, dance, literary events, etc. – arts “buzz”); and a social environment characterized by tolerance of difference, the celebration of nonconformity and low “barriers to entry” – into both social networks and labour markets.

Florida also emphasizes how creative, talented people are attracted to cities with strong, vibrant neighbourhoods whose character and street life are often defined in culturally distinctive and novel ways. Equally important is an appealing built environment, defined in part by its cultural content: for example, its high-quality and compelling design, or its historical character.

It is for these reasons that astute analysts of urban economic change have discerned a subtle but important shift in the nature of workers' primary loyalties, from an older set of loyalties to a firm and an industry, towards a new set of loyalties: to an occupational group with which one feels an affinity, and to a place that offers career buzz as well as the kinds of desirable social and physical qualities described above.⁶

2.2 The Creative Urban Economy

Beyond these "Florida effects," there are a number of other important ways in which creative activity enhances the economic vitality of a city-region. As noted by Bradford,⁷ the work of Florida and others has helped raise consciousness more generally about the elevated importance of creativity as an input throughout the economy. The now-famous aphorism that "the MFA is the new MBA" captures this idea in a colourful way. Businesses of all types (so the argument goes) now value creative input as never before:

...businesses are realizing that the only way to differentiate their goods and services in today's overstocked, materially abundant marketplace is to make their offerings transcendent – physically beautiful and emotionally compelling.⁸

While such declarations strike us as intuitively plausible and appealing, hard evidence to support these claims has remained scarce until very recently. A handful of new studies begins to shed light on the shape of this phenomenon. Working under the auspices of the Design Industry Advisory Committee and Toronto's Design Exchange, researchers have succeeded in documenting the full extent of design activity within the Ontario economy and the contributions of design skills and creativity to a wide range of sectors.⁹ Among the study's more significant findings:

- The design workforce (defined occupationally to include graphic, industrial, interior, theatre, fashion and other designers, as well as architects and landscape architects) is growing at an average annual growth rate that is four to five times faster than the growth of the overall labour force (and this is true for both Canada and Ontario, between 1991 and 2001)
- Less than half of all designers actually work in specialized design firms. The rest are scattered across the many sectors of the Ontario economy, including manufacturing, professional and scientific services, retail, financial services, and so on.

Other recent research has identified how design has enabled firms in a diverse collection of industries – including construction, furniture, engines, toys and food products – to produce new, more environmentally sustainable products.¹⁰ Through detailed case studies, this work emphasizes how design has become an increasingly valuable input into the product innovation process.

And such contributions are not limited to designers *per se*. Markusen and King have recently documented the impact of artistic workers throughout the United States economy.¹¹ This landmark study defines “artists” to include painters, sculptors, photographers, writers, musicians, composers, dancers, choreographers, performance artists, actors and directors. Most noteworthy amongst their many striking conclusions, they find that artists raise overall productivity and earnings in the regional economy in at least five different ways:

- By “exporting” their work (i.e., by selling their products and services to markets outside of the regional economy, thereby drawing income into the region);
- By using their creativity to enhance the success of other products and services in many other sectors of the local economy;
- By purchasing specialized inputs and services from local suppliers, often inducing significant upstream innovation in the process;
- By helping employers across the regional economy to recruit talent when it is clear that the region offers an abundance of artistic and creative activity; and
- By enhancing the entrepreneurial culture of the region’s economy, since many artists are self-employed.

This last point deserves further elaboration. Successful artists are, by definition, risk takers. Indeed, given the often precarious financial existence that artists must confront, one would be hard pressed to think of another occupational group in our society that is more prone to risk taking. Markusen describes the stimulative effect this has on the regional economy, noting that artists typically “build remarkably entrepreneurial careers. Rather than living in poverty, working menial jobs or waiting for the next grant or role, they actively seek diverse markets and venues for their work.”¹²

Based on focus group analysis and extended interviews with 22 artists from the Minneapolis-St. Paul region, Markusen and King conclude that three local qualities are most important in attracting artists and retaining them in the community:

- The presence of vibrant artistic networks, nurtured by active occupationally-based member organizations, successful live/work facilities, and other institutions and events that produce and maintain strong “connective tissue” within the local arts community.
- A climate of strong support for the arts, evident through financial support (from public sector and philanthropic sources), a range and diversity of high-quality arts venues, as well as strong moral support (a climate of free expression and tolerance).
- A good and affordable quality of life.

There is one final aspect of the Markusen and King study that is worth noting, since it addresses the oft-heard objection to much of the recent creativity-based policy discourse: “this is good news for our biggest cities, but what about the rest of the country?” In tracking the evolving geographical distribution of artists within the United States, they note a discernible decentralizing trend that may be cause for optimism amongst a range of smaller urban regions:

Estimating the size of the artistic dividend by the share of artists in the regional workforce, we find the preeminence of New York and Los Angeles as artistic centres is waning. Artists are spreading out toward selective second-tier cities such as San Francisco, Seattle, Albuquerque and Minneapolis-St. Paul.¹³

If this trend is sustained, and if a similar trend is evident in Canada, this may bode well for mid-sized cities across the country, as well as smaller centres within easy reach (a 1-2 hour drive) of larger urban regions. Many such places pride themselves on their “good quality of life at affordable prices,” while also supporting a vibrant cultural scene. Such characteristics may provide a solid foundation on which to build and maintain successful urban economies, and recent analyses of the geography of economic activity and population growth between 1996 and 2001 provide evidence consistent with this.¹⁴

2.3 Creative Activity and the Recycling of Urban Space

Cities have often been likened to ecological systems, in which a diverse array of organisms in close quarters interact with one another in complex ways – sometimes competitively, sometimes cooperatively, but always with “spillover” consequences for one another. Within the rich ecology of urban life, artists have long played a key role as dynamic agents of positive transformation. Through a process that is well recognized by scholars and other urban analysts, artists play a vanguard role in colonizing underused, neglected, and devalorized urban neighbourhoods.¹⁵

The story is by now well known. A once thriving part of the city – typically home to industrial and warehousing activities – declines as such locations become physically and technologically obsolete, or uncompetitive in cost terms when compared with other locations in the region or farther afield. After a period of decline and inactivity, when these assets sit unused or underutilized, the buildings become inhabited by artists in search of urban space that is affordable, accommodates their functional requirements for space and light, permits (either tacitly or explicitly) the mixing of residential and working uses, and is favourably located with respect to other fixtures and features of the urban environment (accessible by foot, bike, or public transit to shopping, cafés, clubs, bookstores, art schools, and so on). And while artists play a leading role in this process, it is important to recognize that other creative activities may inhabit such spaces alongside them. For example, the emergence of new media and design industries in Montreal, Toronto, and Vancouver during the 1990s was strongly concentrated in older, previously industrial-warehouse, inner-city neighbourhoods.¹⁶

The next phase in this process has become all too predictable. Such neighbourhoods, once occupied by artists, soon attract others who are drawn by its vibrant cultural and street life and its “bohemian chic” appeal. Gallery owners are followed by ever more upmarket retailers, who are soon followed by property developers intent on cashing in on the local buzz. Land values and rents rise, reflecting the increased productivity and desirability of the neighbourhood. This process has been thoroughly documented in a recent, detailed quantitative study of Toronto and Vancouver neighbourhoods conducted by researchers at Ryerson University, working with cultural organizations in these two cities.¹⁷

The wider urban benefits of this process are clear and undeniable. Through their actions, artists are leading a process whereby “surplus” or redundant urban assets are recycled back into productive reuse, thereby breathing new life into once derelict precincts of the city. However, the contradictory nature of this change soon becomes apparent, as the very process of upgrading and renewal that was set in train by artistic regeneration ultimately leads to the geographical displacement of those same artists, who can no longer afford the rents. As we shall see below, this raises a crucial issue for creative public policy. Notwithstanding this contradictory outcome, the role that artists play in this process of recycling urban space is overwhelmingly positive.

2.4 Arts, Culture and Urban Identity: Branding Cities and Nations

Finally, it is important to recognize one of the more intangible but nevertheless significant impacts that creative activity can have on the urban (and national) economy. A fundamental paradox in the age of global culture is that, amidst strong pressures towards homogeneity and conformity, and notwithstanding the emergence of large and powerful global actors in the cultural industries to drive this process, there remains tremendous value in producing unique, distinctive and original cultural products.¹⁸ Such unique cultural products may ultimately provide the content and cultural capital that feeds the next wave of global cultural output. But they also create benefits both locally and nationally by shaping the identity of the creative places where such cultural products were originally produced. This is part and parcel of a global phenomenon in which the pantheon of stars has some notable new entrants: architects, musicians, artists, filmmakers, writers – even chefs.

Partly as a result of this, places have become ever more closely identified with (and by) their cultural stars and the distinct cultural movements and products they produce: their music, their architecture, their films, literature, art, fashion, and so on.¹⁹ This has obvious spillover benefits for both the city-region and the entire country, whose status and image abroad is strongly enhanced. As noted by Florida, as well as by Markusen and King, the wider recognition of a thriving arts and cultural scene producing original and distinctive work can act as a powerful stimulant to the attraction of investment and the talented workers on which firms depend.

3.0 How Do We Build Creative Cities?

What, then, are the key assets, infrastructure, and policy tools required to foster the development of creative, competitive and cohesive places? It is clear from the above discussion that much of the necessary infrastructure is indeed “soft,” as it serves to shape the social character as much as the physical environment of cities. The policy context shaping this is comprised of a complex mix of initiatives at the federal, provincial, and local levels, described below. Its multi-level nature suggests that future efforts to enhance the creative capacity of cities must rest on the effective coordination of policy initiatives between these three levels of government.

3.1 Federal Policy and the Creative City

In many ways, all of the measures taken by the federal government to enhance the health, prosperity and social stability of Canadians shape the context for the positive evolution of urban regions. For example, a taxation and expenditure system that directs resources such as income support and housing assistance to those most in need discourages the emergence of low-income ghettos and socially deprived, unsafe neighbourhoods. Strong public systems of health care, education, and innovation provide other vital forms of security and opportunity for advancement. Transfers and equalization payments enhance the fiscal capacity of provincial and municipal governments to invest in the physical and social infrastructure on which strong cities and vibrant neighbourhoods rely.

Nevertheless, it is possible to single out a number of specific federal responsibilities that have a direct (though often unintended) bearing on the creative capacity and character of Canada’s cities. Most obvious among these is federal cultural policy, in areas such as direct support for arts organizations, regulation of Canadian content on the airwaves, subsidies and tax incentives to firms and individuals engaged in the production of cultural products (including music, dance, visual arts, film, television, literature, magazines and book publishing), and protection of Canadian cultural industries from foreign domination. Closely related are the regulatory and legal frameworks ensuring freedom of expression and the protection of intellectual property that, together, help define a climate that supports and nurtures cultural creativity. It should also be noted that in other jurisdictions – notably Ireland – income taxation policy has been used explicitly as a device for encouraging artistic expression and retaining internationally successful artists at home.²⁰

This constellation of cultural policies has a very direct and obvious effect on the prosperity and vibrancy of the creative arts. But it has also – somewhat unwittingly – helped create the conditions that enabled the emergence of new, culturally-based economic activities such as new media that draw upon the content and capabilities of older, established cultural industries, as well as technological know-how, for their success.²¹

A second area of federal responsibility that is arguably crucial in ensuring the cultural vitality of cities is immigration and settlement policy. In an immigrant society such as ours, newcomers to Canada have had an immense impact on the cultural life of the country. Since they tend to settle disproportionately in a relatively small number of city-regions,²² their impact is, at least in the first instance, also overwhelmingly urban. It is expressed in our literature, cinema and other media; in our music, our fashion, our cuisine, and in the distinctive ethnic character of many of our neighbourhoods.

The settlement side of this policy realm is equally as critical as the immigration side. After all, it is through our settlement policies that we address the process of integration into social and economic networks, following entry into the country. Large cities have made no secret of their desire for further urgent financial support from the federal level to enable them to implement such programs more effectively where they are most needed. Amid growing evidence that our traditional systems for integrating newcomers into Canadian urban society have begun to break down, this need could hardly be more pressing.²³ And yet, such expenditures would represent money well spent, since they would directly enhance the creative character and innovative capacity of Canadian cities and society.

3.2 Provincial Policy and the Creative City

Many of the areas of federal responsibility outlined above are shared with the provinces. Health care and education policy are two prime examples. Social assistance and housing is also a shared area of federal-provincial responsibility. The provinces have also been key players in supporting the development of homegrown cultural industries such as film, television, publishing, and the arts. And some provinces – most notably Quebec – play a major role in shaping immigration policy.

Perhaps less obvious, but no less important, are the various ways that provincial governments shape land use planning systems and the physical shape and built form of the urban environment. Because our constitution has conferred the regulation of municipal matters to the provinces, making our cities their “creatures,” many of the most important aspects of this policy realm are controlled at the provincial level. Property taxation and land use planning frameworks are the two principal systems through which urban built form is shaped. Equally important are provincial decisions concerning major investments in hard infrastructure: public transit, highways, trunk sewer lines, and water supply networks. In a recent paper,²⁴ I have laid out some of the more important connections between the physical shape of the city-region, its ability to support creative and other knowledge-intensive forms of economic activity, and appropriate policy responses. I argue, *inter alia*, that city-regions (and the provinces that shape and constrain their planning processes) must ensure that:

- elements of the existing urban fabric that are qualitatively unique, distinctive and authentic are maintained and strengthened (examples here include: ethnic neighbourhoods with distinctive shopping streets, dining opportunities, streetscapes, etc.; historically significant buildings, streets and districts);
- natural environmental assets are protected and, where appropriate, enhanced to take advantage of their attractiveness;

- residential and employment densities are high enough, and land uses are mixed sufficiently to support a vibrant urban economy and cultural scene; and
- alternatives to automobile travel – public transit, walking, and cycling – are readily available; increasingly, the availability of high-quality, attractive alternatives to auto-based daily commuting represents a unique asset and feature of local and regional quality of place that ought to be encouraged and developed.

In addition to land use oriented initiatives, provincial policy has played a useful catalytic role in further developing the “connective tissue” and social networks that produce a sense of community amongst creative workers in the city. Ontario’s Ministry of Economic Development and Trade has played a key role in supporting the activities of Spadina Bus, an organization representing more than 2,000 creative workers in Toronto’s e-industries. In its first four years, Spadina Bus has organized and sponsored more than 70 events in which members of this diverse community can meet one another, exchange key information about prospective projects and partners, and develop their social networks. In a sector that is typically dominated by project-based and freelance work, such organizations play an essential role in facilitating the circulation of knowledge locally.²⁵

3.3 Local Action and the Creative City

Many of the observations concerning provincial jurisdiction apply at the local level as well, since policy areas such as land use planning are a joint provincial-local responsibility. Hence, within a provincially defined legislative framework, municipal governments still have the leeway to make important decisions concerning the physical and social character of neighbourhoods and the wider city.

Perhaps the best example of a positive local initiative whose adoption has fostered the emergence of new creative activity in the city is the City of Toronto’s landmark decision in 1996 to restructure its approach to the zoning of two older industrial precincts in the inner city known as “the Kings” (the King-Spadina and King-Parliament neighbourhoods).²⁶ These areas had undergone a steady, slow decline over the previous two decades, but their renewal was inhibited by overly prescriptive and restrictive zoning bylaws. The major institutional innovation that set in motion a new process of regeneration was the adoption of a new approach to zoning. Instead of regulating the *types* of uses permitted – the traditional approach – the city’s planners decided to regulate the character of built form through height, density, and setback characteristics. The theory, which was largely borne out in practice, was that this would free up these areas to enable them to accommodate a much wider range and richer mix of activities, including commercial, residential and light industrial uses. In the eight years since this regulatory change occurred, the Kings have experienced rapid redevelopment, with much of the new investment closely associated with the arts, entertainment, and other cultural activities.

As Bradford has noted,²⁷ the City of Toronto has recently produced a comprehensive culture plan, following the lead of other Canadian cities such as Montreal and Vancouver. Spearheaded by the city’s Culture Division, the plan enunciates a strategy that builds on Toronto’s current “cultural renaissance” – the construction of major new venues such as the Four Seasons Centre

(ballet and opera house) and the redesign of existing facilities such as the Royal Ontario Museum and the Art Gallery of Ontario.²⁸ However, it emphasizes the need not only to renew the fixed capital of the city's major cultural institutions, but also to redress the cumulative deficits in operating budgets that limit the activities and programming possibilities of many cultural organizations – large and small. The plan also explores new ways to highlight and strengthen the cultural activities of the city's amazingly diverse ethnocultural communities, recognizing these as lower profile but crucial elements of the city's distinctive cultural asset base. It should also be noted that Toronto's *Culture Plan* is but one part of a larger strategy articulated for the city, in which its cultural infrastructure, identity, industries and creative capabilities are regarded as key assets on which to build a stronger regional economy.²⁹

Beyond the sphere of government *per se*, other non-profit organizations such as Toronto's Artscape play a critical role in supporting creativity in the city by protecting and expanding the space available for artists to live and work. Given the property market dynamics outlined above, active intervention is required to offset the all-too-common tendency for artists to be displaced by the successful regeneration process they themselves set in motion. In addition to acting as developer and landlord for a number of live-work facilities for artists, Artscape has also sponsored the recent conference "Creative Places + Spaces," together with its counterpart organization in Minneapolis, Artspace. This highly acclaimed event convened a gathering of similar organizations from around the world, and began a process of collecting and disseminating "best practice" approaches to the thorny problem of creating and protecting space for artists in the city. The conference also served as an effective mechanism for showcasing the role of creative activity in driving the economic engine of the city-region.³⁰

In addition to carving out and protecting live-work spaces for artists, these local initiatives perform an additional function that was identified as crucial in the recent case-study literature reviewed above: strengthening the social space and "connective tissue" in which creative activities thrive. By enabling the development of multi-tenant facilities with a rich mix of occupants, these projects succeed in producing the optimal conditions for the elaboration and thickening of social networks and relationships. Another noteworthy example of this, with its origins in the private sector, is the highly successful redevelopment of a former factory building at 401 Richmond Street West in Toronto. It is now home to more than 130 cultural producers, and its success has encouraged the owners to replicate this model at a second site nearby.³¹

Finally, it is important to acknowledge local initiatives that address the challenge of integrating new Canadians into the labour market. As noted earlier, with recent data showing some disturbing trends of increasingly pervasive and chronic poverty within immigrant communities, this issue has taken on new urgency. In Toronto, the Toronto City Summit Alliance, a group of leaders from business, government, voluntary organizations and civil society, has spearheaded the development of the Toronto Region Immigrant Employment Council and new programs such as Career Bridge.³² The objective here is to enable recent, well-educated immigrants to acquire all-important Canadian experience in the form of internships with participating organizations, along with mentoring and career counselling. Having completed such programs, participants enjoy considerably greater success in finding regular, full-time employment in the labour market.

4.0 Conclusion: Creative, Competitive, and Cohesive Cities

There is a growing body of evidence that creative activity shapes the competitive character of a city by enhancing both its innovative capacity and the quality of place so crucial to attracting and retaining skilled workers. Public policy plays a critical role in nurturing a city's creative assets and infrastructure, and it is clear from the preceding discussion that this is currently achieved through the combination and interaction of diverse public sector initiatives at three different levels. Together, these interventions create the institutional and regulatory space for private sector and non-profit organizations to make their own unique contributions.

While local action, both public and private, is the primary force for creating creative cities, there can be no doubt that the policies and regulatory decisions made by senior levels of government are equally critical. Besides providing the core funding and regulatory support for cultural activities and organizations, they are especially important for shaping the broad background conditions and context that set us on a socially inclusive and cohesive path to the creative, competitive city. It is through the conscious use of these tools, together with creative local initiatives, that we can ensure that creativity and competitiveness are not achieved at the expense of social inclusion, as some have argued to be the case in certain American cities.³³

Although the primary responsibility for determining the physical character of the city rests with provincial and local governments, the federal government is a *de facto* player as well, by virtue of its status as a major owner of urban lands, buildings, and institutions. The recent attention to the "cities agenda" and the "new deal for cities" at the federal level suggests that the federal role may be expanded significantly.³⁴ The analysis offered in this paper implies that future federal initiatives – both urban and cultural – ought to be conceived and structured in ways that further enhance the creative character of cities.

Endnotes

- ¹ Prepared for the Policy Dialogue on Creative Cities, sponsored by Canadian Heritage and Industry Canada, in association with Canadian Policy Research Networks, Ottawa, June 14, 2004. My thanks to Tara Vinodrai for helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper. Thanks also to Anita Sands for providing background information on the tax treatment of artists in Ireland, and to Neil Bradford, Jane Jenson, Natalie Frank, and other participants in the Policy Dialogue for stimulating discussion and commentary.
- ² On the geographical consequences of the learning economy, including the consequences for city-regions, see: Gertler, M.S. 2001. "Urban Economy and Society in Canada: Flows of People, Capital and Ideas." *Isuma: The Canadian Journal of Policy Research* Vol. 2, No. 3: 119-130; D.A. Wolfe and M.S. Gertler. 2004. "Clusters from the Inside and Out: Insights from the Canadian Study of Cluster Development." *Urban Studies* Vol. 41, No. 5/6.
- ³ For an insightful and critical review of the emerging work on the creative class and the city, see Donald, B. and Morrow, D. 2003. *Competing for Talent: Implications for Social and Cultural Policy in Canadian City-Regions*. Report prepared for Strategic Research and Analysis, Canadian Heritage, Ottawa, May. Donald and Morrow argue strongly for a socially inclusive model of the creative city, in which quality of life and quality of place are equally important.
- ⁴ Florida, R. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books; Florida, R. 2002. "Bohemia and Economic Geography." *Journal of Economic Geography* Vol. 2, No. 1: 55-71; Gertler, M.S., Florida, R., Gates, G., and Vinodrai, T. 2002. *Competing on Creativity: Ontario Cities in North American Context*. A report to the Institute for Competitiveness and Prosperity, and Ontario Ministry of Enterprise, Opportunity and Innovation, Toronto, December.
- ⁵ For more on the urban economics of "buzz," see Storper, M. and Venables, A.J. 2003. "Buzz: Face-to-face Contact and the Urban Economy." Paper presented at the DRUID Summer Conference 2003 on "Creating, Sharing and Transferring Knowledge: The Role of Geography, Institutions and Organizations." Elsinore, Denmark. See www.druid.dk/conferences/summer2003/Papers/STORPER_VENABLES.pdf.
- ⁶ Markusen, A. 2004. "Targeting Occupations in Regional and Community Economic Development." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Available at: www.hhh.umn.edu/projects/prie/japa_ve1.pdf.
- ⁷ Bradford, N. 2004. "Creative Cities Structured Policy Dialogue Backgrounder." Ottawa: Canadian Policy Research Networks, Project F-115.
- ⁸ Pink, D.F. "The MFA is the New MBA." *Harvard Business Review* Vol. 82, No. 2: 21-22.
- ⁹ Gertler, M.S. and Vinodrai, T. 2004. *Designing the Economy: A Profile of Ontario's Design Workforce*. Toronto: A report to the Design Industry Advisory Committee. This project is part of Vinodrai's PhD dissertation research at the University of Toronto.
- ¹⁰ Gould, A. (ed.). 2003. *Design for Sustainability*. A special issue of *Exchange: Canadian Design Journal*, Design Exchange, Toronto.
- ¹¹ Markusen, A., and King, D. 2003. *The Artistic Dividend: The Arts' Hidden Contributions to Regional Development*. Minneapolis, MN: Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs, University of Minnesota, July [www.hhh.umn.edu/projects/prie/pub.htm]. See also Markusen, A. 2003. "Reaping the Great Payoff of the City's 'Artistic dividend.'" *Minneapolis-St. Paul Star Tribune*, Sunday, August 3rd, pp. AA1-AA2.
- ¹² Markusen, 2003, AA1.
- ¹³ Markusen, 2003, AA2.
- ¹⁴ Slack, E., Bourne, L.S., and Gertler, M.S. 2003. *Vibrant Cities and City-Regions: Responding to Emerging Challenges*. Report to the Panel on the Role of Government, Province of Ontario, August; Slack, E., Bourne, L.S., and Gertler, M.S. 2003. *Small, Rural and Remote Communities: The Anatomy of Risk*. Report to the Panel on the Role of Government, Province of Ontario, August. For a recent examination of visual artists living and working in small town settings in Southern Ontario, see Mitchell, C.A., Bunting, T.E., and

-
- Piccioni, M. 2004. "Visual Artists: Counter-urbanites in the Canadian countryside?" *Canadian Geographer* Vol. 48, No. 2: 152-167.
- ¹⁵ Jacobs, J. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage; Zukin, S. 1982. *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press; Ley, D. 1997. *The New Middle Class and the Remaking of the Central City*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- ¹⁶ Brail, S., and Gertler, M.S. 1999. "The Digital Regional Economy: Emergence and Evolution of Toronto's Multimedia Cluster." In H-J Braczyk, G. Fuchs, and H-G Wolf (eds.). *Multimedia and Regional Economic Restructuring*. London: Routledge, p. 97-130.
- ¹⁷ Jones, K., Lea, T., Jones, T., and Harvey, S. 2003. *Beyond Anecdotal Evidence: The Spillover Effects of Investments in Cultural Facilities*. Toronto: Centre for the Study of Commercial Activity, Ryerson University. See www.cscs.ryerson.ca/research/culture/ArtScapeShow.pdf.
- ¹⁸ For a penetrating analysis of the competitive environment and corporate strategies of these global players, as well as the possibilities for regulatory responses at the national and local level, see Grant, P., and Wood, C. 2004. *Blockbusters and Trade Wars: Popular Culture in a Globalized World*. Toronto: Douglas & McIntyre.
- ¹⁹ This phenomenon is well described by Scott, A.J. 1999. *The Cultural Economy of Cities*. London: Sage. Scott argues that, while the intimate connection between cities and the production of cultural activities is anything but new, the growing importance of culturally inflected production within national economies elevates the role of cities as cultural crucibles like never before.
- ²⁰ Section 195 of Ireland's *Taxes Consolidation Act, 1997* exempts from tax any "income earned by artists, writers, composers and sculptors from the sale of their work" so long as such work is deemed to be "original and creative works generally recognized as having cultural or artistic merit" and the claimant is resident in Ireland. See www.revenue.ie ("Artists Exemption") for further details on how this regulation is implemented in practice.
- ²¹ This argument is further developed in Brail and Gertler, 1999, who show how Toronto's new media industry draws upon older cultural activities such as publishing, film/TV, theatre, museums and advertising.
- ²² See Gertler, M.S. 2001. "Urban Economy and Society in Canada: Flows of People, Capital and Ideas." *Isuma: The Canadian Journal of Policy Research* Vol. 2, No. 3: 119-130, for a summary of recent evidence on the uneven geography of immigration.
- ²³ United Way of Greater Toronto, 2004. *Poverty by Postal Code*. Toronto: A report jointly prepared with the Canadian Council on Social Development.
- ²⁴ Gertler, M.S. 2003. *The Regional Knowledge Economy: Implications for a Smart Growth Strategy in Central Ontario*. Prepared for the Ontario Ministry of Municipal Affairs, Central Ontario Smart Growth Strategy Sub-Panel, on behalf of the Neptis Foundation, Toronto.
- ²⁵ For an analysis of such dynamics within a closely related creative sector, see Grabher, G. 2001. "Ecologies of Creativity: The Group, the Village and the Heterarchic Organisation of the British Advertising Industry." *Environment and Planning A* Vol. 33: 351-374; Grabher, G. 2002. "The Project Ecology of Advertising: Tasks, Talents and Teams." *Regional Studies* Vol. 36: 245-262.
- ²⁶ Bedford, P. 1997. "When They Were Kings: Planning for Reinvestment." *Plan Canada* Vol. 18, No. 4: 18-23.
- ²⁷ Bradford, 2004, pp. 8-9.
- ²⁸ City of Toronto. 2003. *Culture Plan for the Creative City*. Culture Division.
- ²⁹ See www.city.toronto.on.ca/business_publications/econdev_strategy.htm for further information concerning the important cultural dimensions within the City of Toronto's economic strategy. It is worth noting that, as this plan was produced in 2001, it was truly visionary in anticipating what has now become a widely accepted approach in economic development policy and practice.
- ³⁰ For further details, see: www.torontoartscape.on.ca

-
- ³¹ For a recent analysis of this fascinating model, see *New Workplace Commons*, a report commissioned by Canadian Heritage, the City of Toronto Culture Division, and the Ontario Ministry of Culture, prepared by the Graduate Programme in Culture and Communication, Ryerson University and York University, Toronto, September 2003. Report available at www.401richmond.net/401_Richmond.pdf.
- ³² See www.triec.ca and www.toronto.citysummit.ca.
- ³³ For a lively review of the recent “creative class debate” in the American context, see Gordon, A. 2004. “The Great Creative Class Debate.” *The Next American City* Vol. 5; and Florida, R. 2004. “Revenge of the Squelchers.” *The Next American City* Vol. 5. Both are available at www.americancity.org/archives/issue/5/florida.html.
- ³⁴ As further evidence of this trend, the federal cabinet announced by Prime Minister Paul Martin on 20 July 2004 includes a new Ministry of State for Infrastructure and Communities, headed by Toronto MP John Godfrey.



Canadian Policy Research Networks • Réseaux canadiens de recherche en politiques publiques
600-250 Albert Ottawa, Ontario K1P 6M1 • tel (613) 567-7500 fax/télé: (613) 567-7640 • www.cprn.org