Cultura21 eBooks Series on Culture and Sustainability
Cultura21 eBooks Reihe zur Kultur und Nachhaltigkeit
Vol. 3 / Band 3

Creative Cities and (Un)Sustainability – Cultural Perspectives

Julia Hahn

cultura21

Dieses Werk wurde als Magisterarbeit im Studiengebiet Kulturtheorie und interkulturelle Studien des Studiengangs angewandte Kulturwissenschaften an der Leuphana Universität Lüneburg, von Julia Hahn vorgelegt.

Gutachter:

Prof. Dr. Volker Kirchberg

Sacha Kagan

ISBN: 978-3-945253-04-5

Cultura21 eBooks Series on Culture and Sustainability
Sacha Kagan and Davide Brocchi, editors

Cultura21 eBooks Reihe zu Kultur und Nachhaltigkeit
Sacha Kagan und Davide Brocchi, Herausgeber

Vol. 3 / Band 3

The Cultura21 eBooks Series on Culture and Sustainability presents findings from inter- and trans-disciplinary perspectives in research and practice. The eBooks are published openly online by Cultura21 Institut e.V. in order to support broad dissemination and to stimulate further debates in civil society and further action-research in the field.

All volumes in the series are available freely at: http://magazin.cultura21.de/piazza/texte

Die Cultura21 eBooks Reihe zu Kultur und Nachhaltigkeit stellt Befunde aus inter- und transdisziplinären Perspektiven von Forschung und Praxis vor. Die eBooks werden durch Cultura21 Institut e.V. online veröffentlicht, um eine umfassende Verbreitung zu unterstützen und Debatten in der Zivilgesellschaft sowie weitere anwendungsbezogene Forschung in diesem Feld zu fördern.

Alle Ausgaben dieser Reihe sind frei verfügbar auf:

http://magazin.cultura21.de/piazza/texte

"A city isn’t just a place to live, to shop, to go out and have kids play. It’s a place that implicates how one derives one’s ethics, how one develops a sense of justice, how one learns to talk with and learn from people who are unlike oneself, which is how a human being becomes human." (Sennett 1989: 84)

“The city suggests a creative disorder, an instructive confusion, an interpolating space in which the imagination carries you in every direction, even towards the previously unthought.“

(Chambers 1993: 189)

Table of Contents

Introduction

The recent world exhibition Expo 2010 held in Shanghai, China under the motto *Better City, Better Life* circled around how urban environments of the future should look like, offering numerous architectural designs and presentations from all areas of the world. The mission statement tied sustainable development in the city to economic prosperity, divers cultures, innovations in science and technology, and interactions between rural and urban areas[i]. Yet the massive resettlements of residents in the course of the preparations of the Expo 2010 and the large economic need for migrant workers from all corners of the country for the prosperity of Shanghai and other Chinese cities begs the question of whether this world exhibition will bring some kind of sustained *better life* for people living in precarious situations (or even enable access to the exhibition itself), or if their problems will only increase[ii]. As this brief example shows, tensions can arise between ideals, utopian visions, how a city is conceptualized, the built characteristics this takes on, and the reality within the urban environment. A reflection of dominant understandings of cities at present, also regarding their implementation and effects on the human and non-human environment, seems crucial.

One of these prevailing notions of how the city is understood today is based on terms such as Creative City or Creative Class, which stress the importance of culture, art, and creatives in the [1]urban context. The Creative City approach, coined mainly by Richard Florida and Charles Landry, has witnessed worldwide attention, a kind of ‘Creative City fever’, especially in European and Northern American cities, such as Toronto, San Francisco, or Hamburg. This prevailing concept appears

as an ‘easy fix’, a ‘fit-all’ model for cities struggling with post-industrial changes in production and consumption and a global competition for ‘talent’. It has become a widely communicated message among policy makers, local governments, and academics. Correspondingly, a broad range of critique (both academic and community, grassroots) has formed around the implementation of Creative City strategies. It draws attention to negative effects regarding ‘place branding’, the positioning of cities in the global competition, gentrification processes, and growing inequalities, all encouraged by this new planning agenda. The social polarization of individuals as well as entire areas is a main concern of much of the critique. Due to the wide discourse on it, the Creative City concept appears as a significant field for examination and reflection, also regarding its critique. As a main point of interest here, it is looked at also from a sustainability point of view, enabling a critique of the urban concept regarding social justice, ecological issues, and its adaptability regarding current challenges and those of the future. Even if sustainability, or sustainable urban development is a wide area of examination, considerations regarding the potential of culture (or artists and creatives) within the city to enable processes towards sustainability are often missing. As Nadarajah and Yamamoto write: “[w]hile there are studies on culture in an urban context […] it is important to note […] that a serious, sustained consideration of culture in sustainability of cities is almost entirely absent” (Nadarajah/ Yamamoto 2007: 8). One example of a growing interest is the *Creating Cities: Culture, Space, and Sustainability Conference* held at the University of Munich in February 2010[iii]. In an attempt to discuss the interactions among culture, sustainability, creativity within the city, a main focus was on the dominant Creative City strategy. Largely criticized among the

participants and presenters regarding social inequality, exclusion of wide numbers of people, global competition among cities and regions, or neoliberal tendencies; the Creative City concept was reason for lively discussions. The numerous problematic effects addressed can all be regarded in terms of sustainability, or rather their unsustainable tendencies.

The connections between the areas of culture, arts, creativity, and sustainability offer a range of questions and examinations, which will partly be accounted for here. The importance and relevance of this is not only due to the wide application of the Creative City concept itself, making it a planning strategy, which affects many cities and their residents. The significance of bringing together these different aspects also stems from the fact that “the majority of the world’s population is now urban” (Boudreau/ Keil/ Young 2009: 17), making the city and its form a large influence for many people. Also areas surrounding cities are affected by the urban environment, often providing resources needed within the city. Of course, not all cities have been ‘rebuilt’ under Creative City strategy considerations, but as a dominant model, it shapes much of our understanding of cities today, the ways we live in them, feel within them, and think about them. This makes a critical assessment of the concept an important part of potentially rethinking and reconceptualizing cities in order to better include sustainability issues and their cultural dimensions.

The following thesis attempts to grasp the extensive range of writings on the urban context, past and present, with a main focus of the Creative City concept, also accounting for wider cultural and social developments. Generally, writings on the urban context come from many different disciplines, such as geography, sociology, urban

planning, political science, economy, or ecology. The cultural sciences approach used here aims at combining certain aspects of these different disciplines and integrating their findings to give more of a ‘meta-perspective’ of current developments in the urban context. Creative City strategies coming from a more economic (Florida) or urban planning (Landry) context are critically examined from what is termed the ‘wider field of sociology’, also including aspects coming from political frameworks. The aim is to address several current and widely discussed issues and concepts, while keeping an overarching, interconnected view of these. The first chapter attempts to describe main notions of the Creative City concept, assuming that this urban model is a dominant one today. Other previous urban sociology approaches are illustrated, offering a conceptual framework. The examination of the Creative City concept and its critique serves as a basis for understanding the problematic implications the model can have.

As the title *Creative Cities and (Un)Sustainability – Cultural Perspectives* suggests, the dominant urban planning concept is put into the context of (un)sustainability and its cultural implications to further understand the consequences this urban model can result in. The second chapter intends to address and combine the current and often described issues of Creative Cities and sustainability, both somewhat inflationary in their use. A hypothesis here is that this critique can be placed in the context of sustainability, enabling the identification of the assumed largely unsustainable tendencies within the Creative City model. Further, as the Creative City model is understood as a prevailing one, it reflects certain aspects of current developments. The characteristics of these developments can be regarded as largely

unsustainable tendencies, i.e. ones, which hinder the process towards sustainability. By recognizing unsustainable tendencies through the critique of the Creative City concept itself and by a critique of broader cultural, economic, and social developments it is possible to incorporate sustainability concerns beyond mainly ‘technological’ approaches to include cultural perspectives. Regarding this, it becomes clear that the process of sustainability requires a more holistic approach, including cultural aspects and the role they play for unsustainable or sustainable processes. Examining these cultural implications is a further main aim of the thesis. The underlying transformations in thinking and action needed for sustainability are essentially culture ones, such as changes in values, norms, etc. Only through this can the process of sustainability, which is an essentially open ended one, be realized. In order to better understand this, another goal is to offer key notions of cultures of sustainability and the transdisciplinary approach this implies. Key aspects of cultures of sustainability are described to show their importance for sustainability, but also to help point to unsustainable tendencies within the Creative City model, which tends to disregard many of these key notions. A combination of the broader characteristics of current cultural and social developments and their unsustainable tendencies with the cultures of sustainability connected to the Creative City concept enables a comprehensive examination of the prevalent urban model, which is considered a largely unsustainable one. This is done in anticipation of the attempt to modify certain key aspects of the Creative City concept.

A further aim of this thesis is a rethinking of the Creative City model by attempting to modify main notions of the urban concept. Creativity and the roles of artists and creatives are reexamined in order to offer a

starting point for a conceptual framework, which includes sustainability aspects and cultures of sustainability. Building on the unsustainable tendencies identified with the help of the critique, certain key aspects of the Creative City model can potentially be altered to better include sustainability considerations. Because it is identified as a mainly unsustainable model regarding its conceptual aspects as well as its implementations, the aim of rethinking it is crucial. Chapter three attempts to reexamine main aspects of the Creative City concept, the role of artists and the understanding of creativity, under sustainability considerations. The hypothesis here is that by rethinking these key notions the Creative City concept can be modified to enable a better inclusion of sustainability. Therefore, indicators of sustainability in the arts as well as aesthetics of sustainability are illustrated as basis for understanding the importance moving away from traditional notions (of aesthetics, artists, creativity) and the potential of artists functioning as agents of change for sustainability. Artists, creatives, and the concept of creativity play important roles within the Creative City concept, making it essential to rethink these when attempting to modify the Creative City concept. They offer a leverage-point for reconceptualizing the dominant urban model in terms of sustainability. Regarding this, the potential role of artists and creatives for the process of sustainability is examined, focusing on mainly sociological considerations. Also, a widening of the notion of creativity is attempted, one that will include, not only members of the Creative Class, but potentially everyone. This rethinking and modifying is seen as key also for a different kind of urban model, which is able to include sustainability concerns better. The term Sustainable Creative City is introduced, as a possible ‘new’ form of understanding the urban context. The potential policy shifts and different approaches a

Sustainable Creative City concept would imply are examined, with the aim of offering, not a fully thorough conceptual framework, but open, inclusive starting points for possible ways ‘beyond’ the Creative City paradigm.

1. The Current Understanding of the City and Critical Aspects

1.1 The Creative City Concept

The city is increasingly conceptualized using terms such as “Creative City” (Landry 2008) and “Creative Class” (Florida 2002), which stress the importance of culture and the arts in the urban context. Since the mid 1990s, first in the British and then in the American context, the Creative City concept has become a normative paradigm and a new model of orientation for urban planning and politics (Reckwitz 2009: 4). Urban theorist Landry and economist Florida have become the main representatives of what can be defined as the *Creative City concept*, which is prevalently applied by city officials, urban planners, businesses, and anyone interested in city development today with the goal of redefining the city as a ‘creative’ center. As Kirchberg notes: “it might be correct to regard the appearance of Richard Florida’s *Rise of the Creative Class* […] as a watershed event, if only because of the ripple effect his publication had on community leaders and urban planners” (italics by Kirchberg 2006: 199). The Creative City concept is often used as a form of strategic planning, Landry, for example, names techniques, stages, and preconditions for its implementation (Landry 2008: 164ff.). The overall triumph of the Creative City concept has to do with wider changes in economy and society, in which human creativity has become a key factor (Florida 2002: xiii). Within this transformation, changes in lifestyle and work show in the growing importance of experimental lifestyles and no-collar workplaces (ibid: 13), which have brought about a new class, including a new ethos or “fundamental spirit

or character of a culture" (ibid: 21) that focuses on new norms and values such as individuality, diversity, intrinsic forms of motivation, self-statement, and openness (ibid: 13)[iv].

1.1.1 Current Keywords and Underlying Concepts of the City

This shift towards a focus on creativity shows in the frequent use of the Creative City concept, for example by Florida and Landry. The term itself is examined and discussed in many disciplines, such as psychology, sociology, anthropology, and economy, making it a wide research field. Definitions of creativity depend on general characteristics of society and on the specific discipline it is examined by. Broadly, it can be defined as "the emergence of something novel and appropriate, from a person, a group, or a society" (Sawyer 2006: 33)[v].

For Florida, members of the Creative Class, as he terms it, use creativity to generate economic value, this being their basis, and can be divided into the "Super Creative Core"[vi] and "creative professionals"[vii] (Florida 2002: 69). Also there is a growing "Service Class", which is not included in the Creative Class, but is needed to meet its demands (Florida 2002: 68ff.). Contrary to Florida, Landry doesn't focus so much on the members of a new class, but more on the characteristics of creativity such as the ability to think flexibly and approach problems openly (Landry 2008: 14). For him creativity is shaped by ideas and thinking and "the importance of culture as a creative resource" (Landry 2008: 4). Although Florida generally assigns creative potential vaguely to every person (if their 'resources' are awakened) and sees a spreading of creativity (Florida 2002: 323), his precise division into groups of 'super' creative people and 'others'

reflects a classification of different fractions of society. As Kirchberg notes, Landry mainly regards creativity as a characteristic of the artist, whereas Florida widens the term greatly to include almost everyone working in postindustrial creation of value[viii] (Kirchberg 2010: 21f.). The term itself, what it 'really' means and how it can be scientifically explained, usually remains in a "Black Box" (ibid: 24)[ix]. Florida's and Landry's conceptions of creativity range from the "super-creative core" (Florida 2002: 68f.) to the "need to get beyond the idea that creativity is the exclusive domain of artists [because] there is social and political creativity and innovation too" (Landry 2008: xiiif.). Within this framework of an undefined and unclear creativity concept, the Creative City model focuses on the effects and consequences surrounding creativity and how ideal conditions can work towards the principle of creativity[x].

The Creative Class effects Space

Based on this, the concept of the creative class and of creativity as a "new currency that is more sophisticated and powerful than finance capital" (Landry 2008: xxv), effect urban space and have become its dominant paradigm. Both Florida and Landry draw the conclusion that creativity needs a certain framework to thrive and eventually bring economic well-being. Although, Landry, seeing creativity as a mainly individual characteristic, understands that it is only marginally affected by physical urban spaces, even though the environment can hinder it (Kirchberg 2010: 27f.). For Florida "place is the key economic and social organizing unit of our time" (Florida 2002: xix) making the quality of a place essential. Establishing a creative environment becomes key for the economic success of cities. Citizens make quality of life demands regarding their city, making culture, entertainment,

consumption, and urban amenities increasingly important for enhancing locations turning the city into an “entertainment machine” (Clark 2004). This shows a change in thinking about urban space and what drives development in a city. The city is no longer solely a ‘functional’ space with a separation between life and work and standardized forms of consumption and leisure, as in the functional city (Reckwitz 2009: 15). The ‘creative’ city sees itself (or is seen) as a cultural figure (one that carries specific symbols, signs, practices, in contrast to other cities), uses its local distinctiveness and develops it accordingly (ibid 2009: 7) in order to attract the creative class. As Landry notes “cities which are succeeding […] are also the most diverse, tolerant and bohemian places” (Landry 2008: xxxix).

Within the Creative City model the presence and concentration of artists, scientists, musicians, bohemians, and even gays is linked to the city’s economic development because these groups foster creativity and appeal to the new class. They also make up and form the creative climate of a city or an urban district. Florida develops different instruments for measuring this, such as a “creativity index” (Florida 2002: 235), “3 Ts” (ibid: 292) (technology, talent, tolerance), or the “gay index”[xi] (Florida 2002: 255), which help cities evaluate and plan accordingly. Landry also gives urban planning objectives (Landry 2008: 166ff.) and a “range of approaches and methods to ‘think creatively’, to ‘plan creatively’, and ‘act creatively’ (ibid 2004: xv). Further, he offers an “urban innovation matrix” for the self-assessment of a city (ibid 2004: 198ff.). Other planning tools for enabling a creative, open environment are a mixture of bottom-up and top-down methods, or removing obstacles of creativity such as bureaucracies (Landry/Bianchini 1995: 56)[xii]. The Creative City idea stresses the role of art and culture as

they contribute to the atmosphere of a city or district, its street life, diversity, and other aspects. This, all together, helps build what Florida refers to as “a world class people climate” (Florida 2002: 293), which then enables cities to label themselves as ‘truly’ creative. The importance of culture and how it is understood within the (creative) city is described further in part 1.2.

Growth and Competition

Other key words behind the Creative City concept, besides the mainly economic framework creativity and culture are seen in, is the promotion of growth - understood as growth of the Creative Class and with it, economic growth - and the competition among cities. Securing economic growth by implementing structures that attract the Creative Class is a main agenda of the concept. Growth in the Creative City concept is therefore put into an economic context; a context that sees the well-being of a city or society in solely economic terms. Also, Florida’s “creative capital theory”[xiii] explains the causality that “creative people power regional economic growth and these people prefer places that are innovative, diverse, and tolerant” (Florida 2005: 293). With this he explains that a certain type of human capital, the ‘creatives’, are important for economic growth. For him creativity or ideas are key economic goods and referring to the economist Romer, he terms this the “New Growth Theory” (Florida 2002: 36). Further, members of the Creative Class tend to cluster in creative communities and these then network among each other. This clustering force “of people and productivity, creative skills and talents” (Florida 2008: 61) has a large financial power, making ‘place’ a key element of the global economy. “The place we choose to live affects every aspect of our being” (ibid: 5) making where to live an essential life decision. Important

to note is that this is a choice, which isn't left up to everyone, as it is one, which depends on "the freedom and economic means to choose" (ibid: 7). This also reflects in what Florida calls "spiky world" and which shows in his division of generally four types of places (ibid: 31f.). For him, the top of this global hierarchy is made up of a small number of "superstar cities" (ibid: 127ff.), which have the power to attract creatives and produce innovation. The second group is characterized as places were goods and services are generated, mostly supporting the innovation hubs. With large population numbers and a general lack of connection to the world economy, mega-cities of the developing world are Florida's third group. Last are the large rural areas, which score low on economic activity, population, and association with the rest of the world (ibid: 31). Within this mapping of a spiky world (ibid: 17) "those trapped in the valleys are looking directly up at the peaks, the growing disparities in wealth, opportunity, and lifestyle staring them right in the face" (ibid: 38). Landry also notes changes in the global hierarchy of cities, in which some places rise and others fall (Landry 2008: xvii).

Within this spiky world not falling behind becomes more and more important for cities and those individuals who are lucky enough to have the ability to choose. As Zukin states: "city boosters increasingly compete for tourist dollars and financial investments by bolstering the city's image as a center of cultural innovation" (Zukin 2005: 282), which is a main strategy behind the Creative City idea. It relates economic growth and well-being of a city to its ability to attract high-value activities (such as cultural and artistic creativity) and exporting the low cost ones (Landry 2008: xviii). Both Florida and Landry stress the importance of cities "reassess[ing, JH] and rethink[ing, JH] their role and positioning – regionally, nationally and globally" (ibid: xvii). This

shows a certain imperative that has developed within the concept: a place needs to be creative in order to have advantages over others, through the economic growth this brings. Growth, or the attraction and enlargement of the Creative Class, becomes the key to survival. As Peck, quoting Dreher writes:

"'Be creative - or die' [is, JH] the new urban imperative: 'cities must attract the new "creative class" with hip neighborhoods, an arts scene and a gay-friendly atmosphere — or they'll go the way of Detroit'" (Peck 2005: 740)[xiv].

For Peck, behind creativity strategies there are "'neoliberal' development agendas, framed around interurban competition, gentrification, middle-class consumption and place-marketing" (ibid: 740f.). Shaw and Porter also examine urban regeneration policies and explain that many are based on the logic that the "lack of middle-class presence is a 'problem'" (italics by Porter/ Shaw 2009: 4). The Creative Class can be regarded as part of their identified middle-class. Within this logic the absense of a certain class leads to the urban decline of areas, which needs to be changed, regarding both the physical city and its image "especially if that city is positioning itself in the global marketplace of city competitiveness" (ibid). For Porter and Shaw, Peck, as well as for Reckwitz, the notion of the necessity of urban renewal through notions of the Creative City model are the results of underlying neoliberal principles (Reckwitz 2009: 2).

The broad and widely discussed development of neoliberalism has effects on large areas of society,[xv] as well as on the city. As Harvey defines it:

"[n]eoliberalism is in the first instance a theory of political economic practices that propose that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade." (Harvey 2005: 2)

Hackworth describes how neoliberalism has affected urban space, and even though he doesn't explicitly mention the Creative City concept, his findings can be related to it. In his book *The Neoliberal City* he attempts to use the space of the American inner city to understand how neoliberalism actually exists (Hackworth 2007: 13). Since the 1970s, the era of big government, Keynesian urban policy with public housing for example, has been replaced by growing independence of local authorities regarding their actions and responsibilities. In this setting, cities in the U.S. have become more and more entrepreneurial (for example, engaging in public-private partnerships) also in order to cover the fiscal deficits from this transition (ibid: 61). Cities become increasingly individually entrepreneurial (a characteristic of neoliberalism, as Harvey describes above) as they try to enhance their global standing and economic well-being. The Creative City paradigm offers a strategic planning framework, including aspects of the postindustrial economy (such as immaterial work), which fits well into the new neoliberal context. The Creative Class idea and its effects on they way a city should look, feel, and be built offers a normative concept that expands the underlying neoliberal development.

It should be noted that, fiscal liberalism, or neoliberalism is often accompanied by social conservatism (Harvey 2005: 81f.). This, of course, does not fit well into a Creative City concept that encourages social diversity by developing for example a "gay index". But, from a 'purely' economic standpoint, not regarding social and cultural aspects

and beliefs, within the Creative City model “neoliberal logic prevails: performance, marketization of public services, meritocracy, auditing, contracting out, and individualization” (Boudreau/ Keil/ Young 2009: 194).

Further, Peck argues:

> “Creative-city strategies are predicated on, and designed for, [a, JH] neoliberalized terrain. Repackaging urban cultural artifacts as competitive assets, they value them (literally) not for their own sake, but in terms of their (supposed) economic utility.“ (Peck 2005: 764)

Here Peck points to the connections between the planning concepts, which the Creative City model offers and the benefits this has regarding competitiveness within a neoliberal framework. The imperative of economic growth through creativity, the necessity of ‘staying ahead’ in a spiky world, and the idea that this will have a positive ‘trickle-down’ effect for all citizens of the city (Boudreau/ Keil/ Young 2009: 187) are all key aspects of understanding the Creative City concept as described here. The authors described here connect their ‘diagnosis’ of neoliberal aspects within the urban environment with a (usually) strong critique of these circumstances. The main objective here was to introduce several characteristics of neoliberlism and how they show in the Creative City concept. A more detailed description of a critique of neoliberal effects, also on the urban context is given in part 1.3.

Starting off, several key notions of the Creative City concept were explained in order to understand the context in which cities are viewed in today. Creativity and culture are put into a mainly economic context as they attract the desired Creative Class. Based on this, the growth ideology, the resulting competition among cities worldwide, and the underlying notion of neoliberalism were briefly described. Resulting

from this, it can be stated that at present the Creative City model is a dominant one and that it has changed the conceptualization of the city today. In order to see alterations in how the city is described and understood, a short overview of selected earlier texts mainly from urban sociology is presented in the following, as well as their characterization of the urban space. This does not claim to completely cover all aspects, but offers a starting point when thinking about ever changing notions of urban life.

1.1.2 Historical Overview

As described above, the Creative City model is a contemporary concept for describing the city and what its important aspects are. In this way, it can be seen as a diagnosis of current times, as a portrayal of certain societal and cultural aspects, which change over time. Therefore, a historical overview can be helpful in determining which aspects have changed, showing then, which characteristics of the current view of the city are new, or have been put into a new context (i.e. the economic context that creativity and culture are placed in). In the following, a short definition of the city is given, as well as a description of the changed social context in which cities are located. Fundamental shifts have occurred since the 1970s and the attempt here is to give a short overview without going into detail. In addition, key aspects of several seminal texts and the paradigmatic American urban sociology schools are presented, the “Chicago School”, the “Urban Political Economy School”, and the “Los Angels School”, in order to point out differences in the study of cities. (Further, in part 1.2 their focus on creativity and culture is examined). Of course, there are numerous important writings on the city, but for reasons of clarity and space, the main focus here is

on the mentioned American schools and several foregoing positions.

Many definitions of a city can be given, but an important aspect is that it is not so much something simply found ‘out there’, but rather is constituted partly through representation and discourse and as a space of intertwined and conflicting meanings of cultural, economic, and political relationships (Eade/ Mele 2002: 11). Wirth describes the city as “defined by a relatively large, dense, and permanent settlement of socially heterogeneous individuals” (Wirth 2005: 34). Further, Bianchini lists five dimensions that make up the city as a “complex and multi-faced entity” (Bianchini 1999: 34). Accordingly the city is:

- determined by geographical boundaries, and made up of specific natural aspects
- formed by human intervention, such as infrastructures, buildings, streets, public spaces
- a society, as it is a community of people, which have certain social networks and dynamics
- a system of economic activities and connections
- a society and an economy, which is governed by principles and regulations based on interactions between political actors (list based on ibid).

This shows the complexity of the urban space, the many facets it is made up of and also why so many different disciplines, ranging from geography, sociology, urban planning, political sciences, economy, and ecology regard the city as a research object. As the perspective here is determined by a cultural sciences approach, it is important to note that there has been a change regarding space within the discipline. Kirchberg points to the “spatial turn”[xvi] within cultural sciences, where space becomes an important cultural resource and thus culture is

analyzed spatially (Kirchberg 2010: 32). Further, it is important to refer to the "cultural turn"[xvii] within urban sociology. Until recently, "the study of culture and its importance to the urban form and change was relatively circumscribed" (Lin/ Mele 2005: 279) within urban sociological accounts (This will be examined further in part 1.2). The Creative City model brings the meaning of culture and creativity for a city into a new focus, as a new way to think about and 'solve' urban problems. Landry stresses the importance of the concept and sees it as a "call to action because the 21st century is the century of cities" (Landry 2008: xii). To understand why culture and creativity have moved into the spotlight in many accounts of urban development, it is important to describe aspects of wider societal transformations and how they reflect in the understanding of cities.

Social Context of Creative City Concept

The aim here is not to give a full description of the wide field of writings on societal and cultural changes[xviii] that have among other things, also affected the urban environment. As Porter and Shaw write "[t]here is a wealth of literature dealing with the global economic and social restructuring that precipitated the withdrawal of investment from cities in the twentieth century" (Porter/ Shaw 2009: 3)[xix] and only a few can be accounted for here. Rather, it is important to point to certain aspects of these changes that ultimately reflect in the contextualization of the Creative City model. As Lin and Mele describe:

> "with the precipitous decline in the manufacturing-based economies of cities that took place in the 1970s and 1980s. With the relentless pace of deindustrialization, older cities, both large and small, refashioned their economies from the production of things […] to the production of spectacles (events, leisure, and cultural activities)." (Lin/ Mele 2005: 279)

Here, Lin and Mele portray the circumstances under which the Creative City concept emerged. Landry refers to this as “fundamental changes occurring in the city at every level [because, JH] in their entirety they represent a paradigm shift from the typical city of 1970 to the city of today” (Landry 2008: xiii). Within this new context, new ways of thinking become necessary and the Creative City model attempts to offer these. This wider shift is mentioned in numerous literature regarding the changes within society and cities. Zukin describes that the vanishing of manufacturing industries has led to the emphasis on culture in cities: “[C]ulture is more and more the business of cities” (Zukin 2005: 282). Landry (as seen in the foregoing) and Florida, of course, both refer to the fundamental changes in everyday life (affecting work, leisure, and place) (Florida 2002: 165ff.), which are “based fundamentally on human intelligence, knowledge and creativity” (ibid: xiii). This transformation shows in the development of the Creative Class concept and, as described above, has implications for the city. This new understanding of the city also reflects in what Clark calls the “City as an Entertainment Machine” (Clark 2004), which can also be understood as a form of Creative City as it implies the emphasis on consumption, culture, and amenities as key aspects for urban economic well-being. The Entertainment Machine notion also stresses a major shift, recently in cities in Northern Europe and North America, to include not just production and growth, but also consumption and entertainment” (ibid: 8). As people make quality of life demands, aesthetic concerns become important for ‘entertainment’ cities. Lloyd also draws attention to the post-industrial developments in cities such as deindustrialization, globalization, and the increasing importance of immaterial labor. These are new patterns that characterize a city and its neighborhoods (Lloyd

2006: 13), which are accounted for in the Creative City concept. Peck, referring to Harvey, points to entrepreneurial urban strategies, which were a response to the “deindustrializing cities the 1980s” (Peck 2005: 761). This fits to the underlying neoliberal context of the Creative City model that is described above.

Castells also offers an account of the changes that among other things affect the city. He writes:

> “Networks, on the basis of new information technologies, provide the organizational basis for the transformation of socially and spatially based relationships of production onto flows of information and power that articulate the new flexible system of production and management.” (Castells 1989: 32)

This leads to a spatial dimension of the new technologies (and the wider transformations they include), where certain areas become economically irrelevant and others, where the “new professional-managerial class” (Castels 1989: 228) is located, stay central. This class is lives in “privileged neighborhoods of nodal urban areas” (ibid), which shows how it can be related to the Creative Class and their demands for ‘quality of place’. Castells gives a critique of this development and of what he calls the “dual city”, by which he “describes the increase in the polarization of rich and poor” (Susser 2002: 9). Important to note here are that the transformations Castells describes regarding information technologies and the restructuring of capitalism (ibid: 21ff.) can be related directly to the Creative City model. These changes make a new theory of what drives urban development necessary in order to explain, why cities based on producing goods are more and more in decline, whereas cities focused on services, ‘creativity’, culture, and consumption are regarded as ‘on the rise’. The

Creative City concept fills this gap, which developed through general changes, such as the shift from an industrial basis to a post-industrial one. This change, often seen as 'leveling out' the world and making place irrelevant, also socially,[xx] actually created a significance for work in the areas of service, science, and cultural symbolic production (Reckwitz 2009: 21). And as these work practices often rely on a face-to-face structure, clustering and the importance of 'quality of place' for creatives, there is actually a spatial concentration. This is theorized in the Creative City concept, which places its focus on planning and creating places that attract the new creative work force.

Historical Texts on the City

In the foregoing, the transformations that are the basis on which the Creative City concept has developed were described in short. The model is currently a dominant one because it includes key aspects of these changes in its conceptualization of the urban space. Changes in the 'function' of cities and how they are understood, occur according to the historical context. In order to see how the perception of cities has altered over time a step back can be helpful. In the following, various texts from urban sociology are shortly presented, as well as key ideas of the three American schools of thought. It should be noted that the general division into different 'schools' is a simplification of many theorists and research directions, yet this division is often made (Clark 2005; Kirchberg 2010)[xxi].

In the 19th century Tönnies examined the effects of urbanization and modernization on society and individuals. In his text *Community and Society* from 1887, he develops two ideal types of social formations, "Gemeinschaft" (community) and "Gesellschaft" (urban society), and as

“a town develops into the city […] these characteristics [of the family, village, town are, JH] almost entirely lost. Individuals or families are separate identities, and their common locale is only an accidental or deliberately chosen place in which to live” (Tönnies 2005: 19). For Tönnies these two ideal types offer the range of how a society changes from the family life in villages dealing with agricultural activities and arts and crafts that result from natural requirements and practices, to the city life where the center of “science and culture, which always go hand in hand with commerce and industry [is located]. Here the arts must make a living; they are exploited in a capitalistic way” (ibid: 20). Tönnies’s continuum from “Gemeinschaft” to “Gesellschaft” shows the development, or progress within society. In his text *The Metropolis and Mental Life* originally published in 1903, Simmel is concerned with the formation of the modern urban self, which is based on “the *intensification of nervous stimulation* that results from the swift and uninterrupted change of outer and inner stimuli” (italics by Simmel 2005: 25); circumstances which are created in the city. Within the metropolis the individual has a level of freedom and a mental distance towards others, unknown under other conditions, such as earlier forms of social formations (ibid: 28). Simmel also describes the need of the individual to express their own uniqueness in the city, in order to differentiate themselves from others. This “being different” (ibid: 30f.) attracts awareness from the otherwise autonomous individuals. For the city this means it “reveals itself as one of those great historical formations in which opposing streams that enclose life unfold, as well as join on another in equal rights” (ibid: 31). Wirth’s *Urbanism as a Way of Life* (originally published in 1930) is influenced by Tönnies and Simmel and can be regarded as one of the founding texts of the

Chicago School of urban sociology[xxii]. Wirth described a “state of *anomie*” (italics by Wirth 2005: 35) within the residents of the city, from which the individual acquires freedom regarding emotional controls of smaller groups (as Simmel also describes). But there is also a loss of morale “and the sense of participation that comes with living in an integrated society” (ibid).

For their research, the Chicago School used the city of Chicago itself as a paradigm for the modern city, in which the center was of great importance and, at the time, it was a trade and transportation hub. Within the Chicago School the socio-ecological balance of socio-spatial structures was examined (often with ethnographic tools). Physical structures such as land use, housing, transportation, etc. are not seen as isolated from the social structures of the city, but are results of them and influence them at the same time (Wirth 2005: 39). As Dear describes, Burgess, using a term from plant ecology, introduced the “zonal or concentric ring theory [as, JH] an account of the evolution of differentiated urban social areas” (Dear 2005:109). Both Park and Burgess developed the “human ecological research program”, which mapped the spatial distribution of social problems, especially in Chicago (Lin/ Mele 2005: 73). This was often criticized for “justifying the presence of urban social inequality through comparison with the “struggle for existence” in the evolutionary life of plant and animal communities” (ibid: 61). Clark refers to a “new Chicago School”, which stresses culture and politics more as drivers of urban development. Instead of focusing on income and economic factors as the New York school and L.A. school do. (Clark 2005).

In the 1970s and 1980s, resulting from a critique of the socio-ecological orientation of the Chicago School, the neo-Marxist New Urban

Sociology with its approach of the Urban Political Economy developed. This “New York School” (Clark 2005) sees urban development as a result of the political economy, the history of the object, the contradictions of social relationships and the role of the state as a stabilizer of capital relations (Kirchberg 2010: 33). The concept of *The City as a Growth Machine*, as described by Molotch, focuses on the power relations between the ‘growth coalition’ (made up of local business people, involved in property investing and real estate, local media, politicians, etc.), which is interested in the exchange-value of land, and residents, for whom the use-value is key (Molotch 1976). Within this context, the “growth coalition” tries to create ideal conditions for economic growth, but is also concerned with convincing residents of the advantages of growth for their well-being (Jonas/ Wilson 1999: 8). This shows the importance of the growth machine concept as it asks who rules, for what purpose and shows that there is no “value-free development” (Molotch 1976: 230). Yet, the approach of the Urban Political Economy does account for the possibility of social movements (interested in the use-value of urban land) to protest the growth coalition. “[I]nstances of use value revolt, primarily in the form of environment movements, are potential threats to rents and capital mobility” (Logan/ Molotch 1987: 14).

The so-called Los Angeles School,[xxiii] emerging during the 1980s, can be regarded as a postmodernist approach (in contrast to the modernist approach of the Chicago School), which looks at processes that are transforming cities, such as fragmentation, gated communities, the rise of minority populations, and suburbanization and sees the city of Los Angeles as a model for the 20th century (Dear 2005: 107ff.). The Los Angeles school proposes that the urban peripheries are now

structuring what remains of the city center, instead of a city organized around a central core (a change towards the Chicago School). Further, a “global, corporate-dominated connectivity is balancing, even offsetting, individual-centered agency in urban processes” (ibid: 113). Also, a linear development of urban space is replaced by a “nonlinear, chaotic process”, which reflects in a “non-contiguous collage of parcelized, consumption-oriented landscapes devoid of conventional centers yet wired into electronic propinquity and nominally by the mythologies of the (dis)information superhighway” (ibid: 113f.). This shows the way the Los Angeles School sees the necessity of a new paradigm of urban development within the new context of changed social and cultural circumstances. As Lin and Mele note,the city of Los Angeles is the “quintessential postmodern metropolis, a polycentric, polyglot, and polycultural pastiche” (Lin/Mele 2005: 106).

The overview of the different understandings of the city within urban sociology and the description of the various ‘schools’ shows how concepts of the urban space change over time and in different social contexts. The Creative City model emerged out of the need for a new conceptualization of the city due to wider transformations. Although not explicitly referred to as a ‘school’, the Creative City concept does show the current dominant model of what a city should look like; how is conceptualization should be. As the overview of the three schools shows, underlying transformations (from an agricultural to a industrial and to a postindustrial structure of society) affects urban development and its theorization. The current focus on culture and creativity then becomes a key aspect for the understanding of the city. Due to this a further, closer look at the changed meaning of culture and creativity for the urban context is helpful.

1.2 Culture (and Creativity) in the Urban Context

Establishing a working definition of culture is a first step in understanding its meaning for the urban context. As shortly referred to above, the changes in the economies of cities during the 1970s and 1980s led to a focus on the production and consumption of symbolic and cultural objects within cities. This development shows the increase of the use of culture (and creativity) for the standing of a city and its image, also regarding the attraction of the Creative Class. Florida's economically based urban development theory, with its focus on the importance of creativity and culture, means that cultural policy is more and more understood as economic policy. Culture and creativity become economically relevant resources for urban development within the Creative City concept. The definitions of creativity by Landry and Florida (and the discourse of the term in different disciplines), as mentioned above, mainly remain in a Black Box, a wishful result of "building the creative community" (Florida 2002: 283ff.). Within the Creative City model, 'creativity', the 'city' (or space), and 'culture' play important roles, which influence each other. Because (urban) culture is one of the main notions within the model, a closer look at it as a factor for urban planning and how it is regarded in urban sociological research is important.

In the following, a working definition of culture is presented and how culture is regarded in different approaches in urban sociology. In the Creative City model, culture is often put in the context of being economically 'useful' and enhancing the 'quality' of a city and its creativity. The three urban sociology schools are shortly reexamined according to their statements regarding urban culture. Based on this, the "Urban Culturalist Perspective" (Borer 2006) is described as it offers

a framework for investigating culturally meaningful places. This model offers a connection between ‘place’, the ‘cultural repertoires of people’, and how this affects the city (ibid). The question of how these foregoing assessments of urban culture differs from or resembles the Creative City concept can then be presented.

A Working Definition of Culture

As Borer states culture “is one of the most elusive words in the English language” (Borer 2006: 174), which sets the tone for the challenge of finding a definition for it. Similar to creativity, the term often remains imprecise and is therefore used in many different ways, which can also overlap or contradict each other. Often culture is contrasted with nature, as meaning civilization (opposing natural state of barbarism) or as describing human excellence. Also, especially for Marxist influenced sociology, culture is determined by economic structures to form the ideas, convictions, and practices of people. More common are definitions of culture ranging from ‘a way of life’ to the differences between ‘high’ culture and ‘popular’ culture[xxiv]. Aspects of all of these understandings can be found within the study of cities as the following shows.

Within urban sociology culture was often overlooked due to the focus on questions such as city politics, economic and social development, and segregation. Culture’s meaning regarding the form of the city and how it changes was often overlooked and as Borer observes: “[f]or all three schools of thought, culture is understood as a by-product of economic and politically interested decisions and actions” (Borer 2006: 176). Therefore, culture is seen here as something merely affected by other structures or developments. Borer differentiates between

‘urbanization’ (urban development) as the main concern of the three schools and ‘urbanism’ (urban culture), which is seen as merely dependant on the way a city is built (ibid). For the Chicago School, culture always remains a fixed entity spread among each isolated area of the city, which was affected by the city’s material structure (ibid: 177). In the ‘new’ Chicago School that Clark describes, culture is seen as a key driver of urban development, which shows that the focus has shifted towards regarding culture as an important amenity for cities (Clark 2004: 103ff).

The Urban Political Economy approach sees culture as an important strategy used by the “growth coalition” to upgrade and enhance the value of properties. Kirchberg argues that culture becomes a key economic basis within the urban ‘growth machine’ (Kirchberg 1998: 41). Therefore, interests in establishing a good business climate influence culture. The growth coalition mobilizes cultural actions, legitimizes them and forms them into practices that are consistent with their growth goals (Molotch 1976: 207). Kirchberg further refers to the potential of local social groups using culture to enforce their use-value interests (Kirchberg 2010: 34). Borer also notes that Sharon Zukin does study urban culture and the “symbolic economy” (Zukin 2005: 283), but remains within the realm of culture as a commercial good or lifestyle determined by financial aspects (Borer 2006: 178).

The Los Angeles School follows the Urban Political Economy in placing culture in an economic context, seeing it as a commodity or as consumable and therefore reading it as a “text”, “image”, or “story” (ibid). Borer’s sharp criticism of the Los Angeles School focuses on their postmodernist view of the city and its culture. For him, the use of metaphors that, in the tradition of postmodernism, don’t refer back to

anything,[xxv] creating an “ethnographic void” (Jackson quoted in Borer 2006: 179). Borer goes on to say that a

“full sociological account of cities would need to examine both the representations and symbols of the city and the conditions under which [they JH] emerge. [They are JH] embedded within a particular cultural context in which real people live, work, and practice the art of community and politics, together.” (Borer 2006: 179)

This overview of the understanding of culture within the different schools points to its often limited acknowledgement in the study of cities. But, Kirchberg also points to several overlapping details between the schools regarding culture and their view of it as an element for urban structure and development (Kirchberg 2010: 36). Contrary, Borer observes a general inadequate examination of culture (Borer 2006: 179).

The ‘fourth school’ of the ‘Urban Culturalist Perspective’, as described by Borer, claims to offer a fuller study of culture. An important aspect of this approach is that it uses both the anthropological definition of culture (‘way of life’) and the sociological understanding (referring to specific areas or to mass culture, popular culture, subculture, etc.). This way the perspective examines meanings in everyday practices as well as outcomes of institutionalized culture, with acknowledging both the “top-down” and “bottom-up” views of culture (ibid: 180f.). Six research areas make up the ‘Urban Culturalist Perspective’, these being: “images and representations of the city: […] urban community and civic culture; […] place-based myths, narratives, and collective memories; […] sentiment and meaning of and for places; […] urban identities and lifestyles; and […] interaction places and practices” (ibid: 181). This approach helps

account for the ways people make sense of place and how places can function as wider symbols for cities. For Borer ‘everyday’ places as well as cultural institutions offer a ‘sense of place’ to the people of a city, which makes them important research objects for urban sociology (ibid: 192). Culture is seen as individually and collectively formed and oriented towards values and norms, but also as urban culture in its institutionalized and consumable form.

For the inquiry of culture within the urban context it seems helpful, as Kirchberg notes, to connect the different schools with each other in an interdisciplinary way (Kirchberg 2010: 40). As for the proponents of the Creative City model, some aspects of their accounts on culture show correlations with those of the schools, even if Florida and Landry don’t explicitly mention this (ibid). The centrality of culture (and creativity) for urban planning in the Creative City concept puts these aspects in a new spotlight. Even though Landry and Florida’s writings cannot be precisely regarded as urban sociology, their ideas do affect the discipline. The Creative City model shapes cities in a physical and symbolic way, making the analysis of these effects an important research object for urban sociology. This can be seen in the recent and growing importance of the question of creativity within American urban sociology (ibid), which also shows the current dominance of the Creative City concept itself. Also, Reckwitz looks at the ‘self-culturalization’ of Creative Cities as their normative goal (Reckwitz 2009: 3). This affects the residents, political and economic institutions, and the media representation of the city, which understands itself more and more in terms of culture; as a cultural phenomenon. Beyond this symbolic character, the self-culturalization has a material one, which shows in the changes in residential and consumption areas or even

transportation (Reckwitz 2009: 3). Reckwitz goes on to define six characteristics of self-culturalized Creative Cities, these being: establishment of an art scene, creative industries, consumer culture, re-definition of 'high' culture, aestheticized districts, and often spectacular architecture (ibid: 22ff.). Culture (as meanings, signs, and symbols) within the context of these aspects helps the city establish itself as a specific, non-exchangeable entity (ibid: 30), which is the ultimate goal of the Creative City concept.

1.3 Sociological Critique of the Creative City Concept

As can be seen from the above, cities reflect social relations and wider societal developments in their conceptualization and physical structure. Therefore, problems and issues within cities can be looked at from a broad range. The focus here is on, what will be referred to as, the 'wider field of sociology' and what it offers regarding a critique of the dominant Creative City model. The goal here is to describe the key points of the different critiques, without claiming to make a complete account. There is a alrge amount of analysis that points to negative effects and the aim here is to illustrate a number of these. For reasons of clarity, certain main topics are given, which describe the main aspects of the critique. Of course, this division is not fixed and shouldn't be, as the described effects overlap and supplement each other. Also the order in which they are does not represent their significance. All critical effects are of great importance, especially regarding the people affected by them.

Critique of Gentrification

One of the main areas of critique of the Creative City model and a

growing field regarding urban questions is gentrification,[xxvi] also concerning the role of creatives and artists within the process. Andrej Holm describes the lack of a specific theory regarding the role of artists and culture for gentrification, even if they are acknowledged as actors within the process (Holm 2009: 65). Simply defined, gentrification is "the transformation of a working-class or vacant area of the central city into middle-class residential and/or commercial use" (Lee/ Slater/ Wyly 2008: xv)[xxvii]. This definition implies that not the usual changes among residents within the city are of concern, but the exchange of people of a 'lower' status with those of a 'higher' one. This does not only regard economic status but also the level of cultural and social capital (used in the classical sense, as based on Bourdieu 1982: 171ff.). An important part of the critique of gentrification within Creative Cities is that the concept involves the strategic promotion of districts as appealing to the Creative Class, such as a high number of artists, bohemians, or gays and being open and diverse (Florida 2002: xix). Florida himself does note the problematic situation and writes that

> "the current round of urban revitalization is giving rise to serious tensions between established neighborhood residents and newer, more affluent people moving in. In an increasing number of cities, the scales have tipped from revitalization to rampant gentrification and displacement." (ibid: 289)

But as Lees, Slater, and Wyly respond: "[t]hese are astonishing words from someone who has been on the promoting the attractions of gentrified/gentrifying neighborhoods […] for the best part of a decade" (Lees/ Slater/ Wyly 2008: 108). This shows that Florida doesn't account for the connection between the strategic measure of attracting artists or gays (which, according to Florida, proves tolerance within an area) as part of the Creative City concept and how they affect spatial context. It

also shows in the fact that gentrification, the process, which is encouraged by the Creative Class, actually endangers the diversity and openness Florida deems so crucial (ibid). One of Florida's self-acclaimed main influences Jacobs refers to this diversity and its self-destruction resulting from the growing popularity of the district and the sorting of the residents. As she observes: "[t]he winners of the competition for space will represent only a narrow segment of the many uses that together created success" (Jacobs 1992: 243). Yet, as Zukin describes, even though city planners regard the importance of Jacobs' preservation of the social life in cities, they don't ensure diverse population structures (Zukin 2010: 25). Zukin also criticizes Jacobs for failing to see that "she expresses a gentrifier's aesthetic appreciation of urban authenticity"[xxviii] (ibid: 18). This is further described by Zukin to be a instrument for power regarding the dominance of tastes of a certain group over tastes of another, especially when applied to urban space. The group with the 'authentic' feel of a street, or a district, then has the upper hand in the gentrification process, displacing other 'less authentic' tastes (ibid: 3f.).

Landry also mentions gentrification, starting with artists as 'regenerators' and continuing, if the area becomes 'safe enough', with the middle-class. According to him, it then becomes important "[f]rom a planning point of view [to] maintain low-value uses, that may have broader 'public good' benefits" (Landry 2008: 125). Remarkably the role of the artists or members of the creative class in boosting gentrification is largely left out of consideration in the planning tools and statements of Landry and Florida. Other authors stress the importance of creatives in the gentrification process, viewing them as 'pioneers' or initiators. Zukin explains that "real cultural capital", meaning spatially linked

cultural capital, becomes reason for real investments (Zukin 1990: 38). The artist, or creative, having a large amount of cultural capital, can transfer this on to the urban space. In Urban Political Economy words: artists help to increase the exchange value of land by way of their 'aura' and therefore enhance it. The development continues by "bringing new residents, their tastes, and their concerns into the city's mix; and creating not just an economic division but a cultural barrier between rich and poor, young and old" (Zukin 2010: 9). Holm describes that the incorporated cultural capital of artists (or creatives) becomes objectified and transferred on to certain places. This, in turn, makes access to it easier, as it can be consumed by anyone who enters this space. Holm also points to specific phases of gentrification in which different kinds of transformations of (cultural) capital within the upgrading of a district can be identified (Holm 2010: 69). In the first phase of the "fine art of gentrification" (Deutsche/ Ryan 1984), artistic activities pick up due to the concentration of people with high levels of incorporated cultural capital. Holm describes the second phase, which is the one the Creative City concept is mainly interested in (or wants to create). This stage is characterized by changes in the image turning the area into a 'hot spot' and changing, first the symbolic understanding and then the actual physical structure. In the following phase of the gentrification process, the value of land rises, which shows how individual cultural capital creates 'special places', which are then reason for higher rents (Holm 2010: 70f.). This is the transformation of cultural into economic capital, into "real cultural capital" (Zukin 1990).

The problem behind gentrification is that older residents of districts feel more and more socio-cultural alienation, eventually resulting in 'closed' neighborhoods and segregation. Artists, bohemians, creatives -

members of the Creative Class play an important role in this process. And as cities apply ‘urban renaissance’ or ‘urban regeneration’ strategies (reinvestment in a place after a period of disinvestment) this tendency increases. As Porter and Shaw state:

> “[e]gged on by celebrity academics such as Richard Florida […], governments and markets are implementing formulaic urban regeneration strategies as though they have universal application and no qualifying repercussions.” (Porter/ Shaw 2009: 1)

As described above, culture capital helps symbolically enhance a place encouraging gentrification. In this context Bourdieu describes the “club effect”[xxix] (Bourdieu 1999: 129), a process that excludes according to economic, cultural and social capital. Select spaces require social and symbolic capital based upon “people and things which are different from the vast majority and have in common […] the fact that they exclude everyone who does not present all the desired attributes” (Bourdieu 1999: 129). This shows that the consequences of segregation and symbolic violence can come from a policy that “favors the *construction of homogeneous groups on a spatial basis* (italics by ibid). Of course Florida stresses the importance of diversity and openness for Creative Cities, yet the effects described here point to the problems the implementation of the concept can have. When culture and creativity become the strategic focus in urban planning, their instrumentalization in turn can function as social and cultural exclusion within the gentrification process. In his text on the gradual redevelopment of the Lower East Side in New York, Mele identifies the importance of cultural appropriation in the process (Mele 2005: 313). Local cultural activities aren’t seen as ‘in the way’ of development anymore, but become the ground for it. As illustrated above, the specific

cultural capital is appropriated to form ‘hip’ or ‘gritty’ districts that can then be sold better. The local urban culture of a place becomes an image for it and is “appropriated for the global market-place of culture” (ibid: 309), in the end stripping it of any real representation of “its agents, the collective process of its inventions, or the environment from which it spawned” (ibid). The Creative City concept encourages this development by stressing the importance of becoming or staying ahead as a place for creativity. The superstar cities (Florida 2008: 135) rely on their images, which ideally go beyond the borders of the city, and therefore globally stand for their qualities in attracting the Creative class. This involves the marketing of districts and their “local distinctiveness” (Landry 2008: 11) even if these places have completely changed regarding their residents, activities, and land values due to gentrification.[xxx] Hackworth links gentrification and inner city redevelopment with the urban form of neoliberalism (Hackworth 2007: 95). Based on Harvey, he identifies a “neoliberal special fix” (ibid), which goes against the idea (of for example the Los Angeles School) of a chaotic and unsystematic urban development. Instead, Hackworth points to patterns that can be identified in the development of cities, such as gentrification. It is a reoccurring phenomenon, not contained to a specific neighborhood anymore and “a systemic part of neoliberal urbanization” (ibid: 100). If, as described above, neoliberal aspects are part of the Creative City concept, gentrification is among its characteristic developments. As Hackworth writes: “[t]he commercial core has become the billboard of neoliberal governance in American cities, mega-projects the featured product” (Hackworth 2007: 171) with the consequences of loss of public space and displacement of certain groups outside of the city.

Lehrer and Wieditz also discuss how massive reinvestments affect city centers in their examination of the “condofication” (Lehrer/ Wieditz 2009: 141) of Toronto. They too link gentrification to neoliberal policies and, as they argue, its blueprint has taken on a new form of “residential high-rise condominium developments in Toronto, and elsewhere” (ibid: 144). The authors further describe the specific political context in Toronto that eventually enabled an entrepreneurial approach and an enhancing of the private sector’s influence regarding building. They describe that the language of Toronto-resident Florida is introduced into planning strategies and that there is a demand for flexible and creative municipal planning, which can also be compared to Landry’s statements. Toronto fully embraced the Creative City concept (ibid: 150), which shows in the development of living areas for “condofiers” (which show similar characteristics as the Creative Class) (ibid: 152). A critical aspect of ‘condofication’ is, that it supports the division of city residents according to income and economic capital. High economic entry levels close off condos to large portions of people, resulting in a highly homogeneous composition of their inhabitants, ultimately affecting the socio-spatial structure of their inner-city environment. This segregated space within the condos is supplemented by the division of the city into three aspects, departing from the multicultural, diverse characteristics that are actually desired. Lehrer and Wieditz describe the emergence of three separate cities: “the constant city of the rich, the shrinking city of the middle-income households, and the growing city of concentrated poverty” (ibid: 141). Further, condos don’t encourage any interaction with their environment as they function as what can be described as a ‘vertical suburb’, which has all required amenities and residents within it. This account of the condo

development in Toronto is an interesting critique of the Creative City model as it shows how these policies and their consequences have become an integral part of the concept itself and the policies implied (ibid: 156).

The circumstances described above show how the urban Creative City landscape is exceedingly characterized by gentrification. This is also the reason why a large amount of the critique of the concept targets at gentrification and the negative effects it has on cities. As mentioned in the foregoing, the Creative City concept itself implies these developments as it promotes the importance of those that can be described as the ‘pioneers’ of gentrification. Both Landry and Florida’s rare consideration of the negative outcomes of the Creative City model points to a lack of awareness of these effects within the concept. The contradiction between the goal of attracting the creatives with diversity and openness and the common outcome of these creatives actually harming the socio-cultural mixture of districts seems to not truly be acknowledged by the proponents of the Creative City concept. What effects extreme gentrification developments can have is described and documented by Solnit and Schwartzenberg in their book on the influences the dot.com bubble and Silicon Valley had on San Francisco. This is an interesting account because it shows the critique of developments by residents of what Florida sees as one of the superstar cities. For them, San Francisco has been subject to massive gentrification, causing the loss of large amounts of the artistic community (Solnit/ Schwarzenberg 2000: 75ff.) resulting also in the city losing its ‘edginess’.

Critique of Growth Ideology and Competition

The critique around an economic growth ideology and global competition (i.e. for labor, location) is a wide field, which covers many different negative effects resulting from globalization, neoliberalization, or increasing differences between North and South. Much of the critique comes from areas regarding the ecological, social, cultural, economical consequences these developments have. In addition, the urban environment is affected, which shows for example in spatial segregation along ethnic lines, class, or economic status. The city offers a focused view on how these wide transformations have an effect on people and their environment. The focus here is on the growth narrative and the resulting competition as supported by the Creative City concept. As described above, growth and concurrently the competition among cities play a crucial role within the Creative City model. The (economic) well-being of a city is dependant on its ability to attract the Creative Class, which, in turn, secures economic growth. This relates to a global level in that there is a worldwide competition between cities in placing themselves at the forefront of being a 'truly' Creative City. These aspects, the growth-narrative and competition, are an inherent part of the concept. Of course other concepts, such as that of the "global city" (Sassen 2006: 85) also show the strategic advantage some cities have over others and the competition between them. Sassen's focus is on the global financial system and its fast-moving international investments, although certain global cities could be seen under the Creative Cities paradigm. The focus of the competition and growth idea within the Creative City concept is based on the strategic advantages a city has due to its quality of place and ability to attract and sustain creatives. Boudreau, Keil, and Young generalize the underlying principle behind this as follows:

“1) private accumulation creates incentives for innovation; 2) growth increases the quality of life, which then attracts more potential for prosperity; and 3) growth creates a sense of community, because prosperity will eventually trickle down. ” (Boudreau/ Keil/ Young 2009: 187)

Within the perceived necessity of competition and economic growth, place is regarded as essential and as Florida states: “[it] is the key economic and social organizing unit of our time” (Florida 2002: xix). And Landry continues in pointing to the struggle among cities for the ‘right’ kind of residents, “[t]he portability of skills and mobility of people forces cities to compete through the quality of their amenities, services, public realm and entertainment” (Landry 2008: 35). The competitiveness becomes a model of how to strategically place certain aspects, such as diversity or openness (even if they only exists symbolically), in order to gain a better position. This shows how the Creative City model works as a toolbox and paradigm for cities within a global struggle for the status as a creative hub. The city has to be shaped and built up in a way that corresponds with notions of the Creative Class and the increasing economic pressure to attract this group. In this logic, for example, urban renaissance policies (the redevelopment of a city’s core, which also implies gentrification) are responses to market forces, which are based on the neoliberal ideas of free market logic and their inescapability. These “market-obeying strategies” follow the “narratives of city competitiveness” and claim to “better position […] a city’s economy in the global race for wealth creation, [which] creates better societies” (Porter/ Shaw 2009: 250). The critical aspect of this is the question of who actually profits from this promotion of wealth and who loses from the labeling of certain urban places as “deprived” (ibid: 242) and therefore is in need of regeneration. Menzel notes that, solely

economic factors are used here as indicators for the well-being of a city or society, excluding others such as ecological and social aspects (Menzel 2004: 57). Not only can the general critique of neoliberalism, as stated for example by Harvey[xxxi], be applied here, but also a more specific critique of the consequences for the urban environment. If neoliberal, or strategies of the Creative City model are incorporated by city policies, their demands become part of the built environment. For example, public investments are likely to be reduced in areas that do not lead to a direct profit (Hackworth 2007: 78). This is part of the idea of the Creative City concept that a city has to actively incorporate strategies that encourage economic growth. In turn, cities that do not concur to this concept ultimately "have no-one to blame but themselves" and that the "creativity script works seamlessly with the new urban realpolitik, neoliberal-style" (Peck 2005: 765).

The critical analysis of how a city is shaped due to the growth machine (as stated in the Urban Political Economy approach) shows, that even though it claims to benefit all groups within the city through growth, development is actually the outcome of the dominance of one group over the other (Logan/ Molotch 1987: 230). This explains that the idea of a value-free development isn't accurate and that the use value of a high number of residents is given up for the exchange value of a few. Often the neighborhoods defined as 'in decline' and therefore in need of re-development, are made up of the most vulnerable population, which suffers under the measuring of success only in economic terms (Porter/ Shaw 2009: 4). Molotch further sees the naturalization of growth and correspondingly the global pressure of place competition as inevitable (Molotch 1999: 262). Not only does this affect social factors such as wages, which are cut do to competitors, it also leads to cultural or local

specifics of places becoming more and more similar, due to the need to appeal to the demands of the Creative Class.

In the Creative City concept, cities, as drivers of the national economy, and their urban quality of life become the key factors due to its potential to attract investments and a high-quality workforce. This development includes a process of neoliberalization, which, at least for Toronto, transformed the urban space “into a competitive city; the entrepreneurial city” (Boudreau/ Keil/ Young 2009: 20). This account of Toronto can also be translated to other cities undergoing Creative City changes. What is described here also points to the underlying (neoliberal) ‘do-it-yourself’ idea behind the Creative City concept and also to the idea of self-responsibility of cities for themselves especially in the face of the disappearance of ‘big government’. For example, during the 1970s in the U.S.A. this led to cities becoming more entrepreneurial responding to budget shortfalls due to changes in government structures (Hackworth 2007: 15ff.). The wide attention the concept has received since then shows how it fits into this development. Landry’s “toolkit” approach speaks to the idea that any city can implement creative strategies if a new thinking changes the mindset of urban governance and planning (Landry 2008: 45ff.). Also Florida’s “3 T’s” or his “people climate” (Florida 2002: 292f.), among others, aim at giving cities instruments to take matters into their own hands and develop themselves into creative hubs, even if not every city has the actual capacities to do so. Cities can assess themselves according to the indexes given in order to identify what needs to be adjusted. The underlying neoliberal logic is a main part of the Creative City concept, which corresponds with its emphasis on the need for economic growth brought about by becoming a ‘creative’ city and the

competitiveness that this results in. This shift towards increasing neoliberal policies shows in the physical structure of the urban space; how social relations are formed for example. This is a main aspect of the critique of the neoliberal growth ideology affecting cities. Florida's 'spiky world' also reflects the problems that are created due to the increased and intensified competition among (creative) cities - even if he himself doesn't see the controversial contributions his concept makes towards this uneven development. Other aspects such as more open systems of trade after the 1970s or growing globalization supported the competition among localities (Harvey 2005: 87). The correlation between the spatial location of an individual and their position in the social field (Bourdieu 1999) becomes a part of the Creative City concept and its creative competitiveness. The peaks, or superstar cities possess the capacity to remain at the top, whereas the valleys are left behind. For Florida, this being inevitable and Darwinian in fashion (Florida 2008: 132), the options and choices are left up to those that can make them, members of the Creative Class. A critique of this development, one that is supported and accelerated by the Creative City model, accounts for the social segregation and asymmetrical developments this fosters. As Harvey states:

> "one persistent fact within […] neoliberalization has been the universal tendency to increase social inequality and to expose the least fortunate elements in any society [such as] the dull fate of increasing marginalization." (Harvey 2005: 118)

These effects show within the city, as well as along its borders. Within the urban space "the young, cool, educated, high-value-added worker of the knowledge economy" (Boudreau/ Keil/ Young 2009: 183) is desired, pushing others out. Growth and competition only regard certain

areas, or people. Others are left “in-between” or stay completely rooted in their peripheral location.[xxxii] Regarding certain core or global cities and the periphery there is a heightened imbalance among them due to competition. Young and Keil, referring to Sieverts ‘Zwischenstadt’, give an interesting account of these so-called “in-between cities” and see them as a “new urban landscape which surrounds urban regions […] where a large part of metropolitan populations live, work and play” (Young/ Keil 2009: 89). These areas have largely been neglected as objects of research and also a critique of their lack of accessibility is missing. For example missing transportation connecting the “in-between cities” to other areas reflects these inequalities compared to (creative) city centers. Infrastructure is therefore a political issue for the authors as it disconnects the non-central spaces surrounding the booming city cores (ibid: 88).

A critique of the Creative City concept’s emphasis of economic growth and the resulting contest for being the most adequate place for creatives should not only include the results this has on the city centers themselves, as places of interest. It should also incorporate the asymmetrical developments this concept encourages around its borders, even if it is mainly focused on building a ‘creative’ core. Gentrification and extreme growth within the city and the regional decline of rural areas are effects that can be traced back to the Creative City concept’s normative claims of growth and creative competition - even if they are also linked to wider transformations as Smith points out (Smith 2008).

Critique of Instrumentalization of Culture and Artists

The need for growth and competitiveness within the Creative City

model corresponds with its emphasis on culture, artists, creatives, street-life, bohemians, etc. Culture or art, as defined above include a 'way of life' in the streets of a city, to 'high' museum culture and the popular culture of urban sub-groups. In the Creative City model all these aspects of culture are of interest for building a creative environment. It enhances growth and works as a positioning tool for setting a city apart from the rest: Creative Cities use culture to distinguish themselves internally (regarding different districts) and beyond their borders. The instrumentalization of culture is an overarching and reoccurring theme in the sociological critique, as for example and as mentioned above Adorno's Kulturindustrie. Also Bourdieu's account of market effects on culture in *Counterfire* (Bourdieu 2003) gives a very striking position of how culture and art are put into a precarious situation by economic forces, endangering their autonomous state. Bourdieu and Adorno's critique can be useful, even if both do not focus specifically on the urban context, which is why it is not considered in detail here. Of course, there are also several other critiques of market forces increasingly influencing culture or the arts, [xxxiii] but the focus here is on a mainly urban sociological approach.

As described above, culture is one of the main aspects of the Creative City planning model, setting it apart from the former accounts of culture within urban sociology. As for a critical reflection on the use of culture in the concept, some of the aspects mentioned by the different schools can be helpful to point to further negative effects of the concept. Zukin for example, states that culture has risen as a strategy as well as an overall theme of urban redevelopment, resulting in what she terms the "symbolic economy of art, finance, food, and fashion" (Zukin 2010: xiii). This "symbolic economy" consists of the production of space and

symbols; cultural and aesthetic ideals and meanings are included into the structure and feeling of buildings, streets, etc. Also cultural representations affect how certain spaces in the city are to be "consumed" and by whom (Zukin 2005: 281). In an Urban Political Economy sense, culture is used here to attract a certain type of resident or visitor, in that it symbolizes who "fits in" and who doesn't. Her links between this use of culture and the changes occurring in cities (i.e. shifts towards more entrepreneurial actions of cities and growth of finance, media, entertainment, cultural consumption) (Zukin 2005: 284) make her critique of the rise of the symbolic economy also one of the Creative City concept. For Zukin it is essential to understand how culture is used by cities as an economic base and how this in turn leads to displacement of people, for instance in increasingly commercialized public spaces. Elites with economic or political power have the best possibility to shape or control a city's public space or culture as it essential for proving the (economic) vitality of a city (ibid: 285). Her questions "Whose Culture? Whose City?" (ibid) show the close relationship between the function of culture in framing spaces, symbolically excluding, and building urban consumption spaces and how this reshapes cities according to the visions of a few. Public space (also including public institutions such as museums) is privatized to appear safer, making "culture a crucial weapon in reasserting order" (ibid: 289). This also shows how culture and consumption are closely linked to create cities of experiences, in which culture ultimately supports certain tastes and consumption patterns. In her recent book Zukin refers to this as "destination culture" (Zukin 2010: 31), in which cities (officials, private investors, etc.) invest, leading to physical and social transformations. All forms of "destination culture" are evaluated

according to their economic outcome and as a part of a Creative City strategy become means to enhance the quality of space in a city. This affects cities because it conveys the idea that with investments in culture "all cities can be winners" (ibid: 234). As Zukin strikingly writes:

> "As a result, public art installations, modern art museums, and festivals have become a pervasive part of cities' toolkit to encourage entrepreneurial innovation and creativity, cleanse public spaces of visible signs of moral decay, and compete with other capitals of the symbolic economy of finance, media, and tourism." (ibid)

This shows how culture is instrumentalized, which in turn leads to a prevention of encounters between heterogeneous groups of the population and inevitably to a 'closed city' (Lewitzky 2005: 51), also by supporting developments such as gentrification. Kirchberg also bases his findings on those of the Urban Political Economy and describes similar circumstances as Zukin. For him the role culture is to aestheticize urban spaces as a means for making them better consumable and sellable, which reduces the multi-dimensional city experience of communication among different groups within the city (Kirchberg 1998: 82f.). For Kirchberg a city's population is then differentiated according tastes (in the sense of Bourdieu's distinction, see Bourdieu 1982), which is a result of the privatized urban culture that is used to appeal to certain (consumer) groups (Kirchberg 1998: 94). Gottdiener uses the term "theming" in his description of the development consumption spaces by using certain symbols and themes, in which culture plays an important role (Gottdiener 2005: 303). Further, as Lehrer and Wieditz describe regarding developments in Toronto:

“culture, arts, heritage, as well as ethnic diversity are being absorbed and commodified under neoliberal conditions, into a marketing strategy that strives to demonstrate Toronto’s uniqueness to the world while, ironically, replicating and following the entrepreneurial strategies of other urban governments around the world.” (Lehrer/ Wieditz 2009: 148)

The authors reflect the critique of the strategic use of culture as a means of upgrading and enhancing districts or cities as this often has negative effects for the residents that aren’t acknowledged any kind of participation. As Peck notes, even social tolerance becomes a commodity and, along with arts and culture, do not actually help civilize “urban economic development” but function as the opposite, as “putative economic assets to evolving regimes of urban competition” (Peck: 2005: 763). This “capitalising on culture” and “culture-led regeneration” (Binns 2005) based mainly on economic returns can also be criticized because it legitimizes cultural policies and investments only if these fit into the economic rationale (ibid). If, contrary to the Creative City paradigm, culture or art doesn’t seem to attract the desired groups, then reasons for investments in the cultural sector are lost. This, in turn, can lead to the abandonment of cultural support because it lacks economic return value.

As seen above, artists and creatives play a role in gentrification processes. Even though many times this is not fully acknowledged on the artists’ side, they are participants in the creation and establishment of a ‘hip’ neighborhood. Still, this is also due to the use of these ‘creative’ individuals within the Creative City model as sources and enhancers of creativity hubs. Therefore, an important aspect of the critique of this use of culture and arts comes from the involved people themselves. They go against their instrumentalization within Creative

City strategies as examples from Toronto or Hamburg show[xxxiv]. Also, this critique is aimed at the classification of artists as part of the Creative Class. The problem behind Florida's division into different classes such as super-creative core and service class and who can be put into one or the other is discussed further below in this chapter regarding the concept of the Creative Class.

As seen in the forgoing, the Urban Political Economy approach offers a clear analysis of the instrumental use of culture for mainly economic reasons. The Chicago School, also the 'newer' one, does account for culture, yet it isn't regarded in such solely economic terms - even if Clark sees culture as a part of the city's entertainment machine, and therefore key economic driver (Clark 2004). For the Los Angeles School, with its fragmented view of the city, in which the center is now organized by the urban peripheries, space is understood as a text, which represents certain meanings. These show in specific semantics with signs and symbols. As Kirchberg notes social power structures enforced by these semantic structures can be examined by looking at symbols such as architecture (Kirchberg 2010: 35). Therefore, urban culture is not just a result of socio-economic conditions, but also of cultural systems and their reproduction. This focus on the meaning of symbols and images can eventually lead to a dissolving reality (ibid). Therefore it seems that the Los Angeles School doesn't regard the possibility of absolute instrumentalization of urban culture for planning or economic purposes. But culture or cultural signs are used to create differences within 'imagineering' (the cognitive assignment of simulated realities) (ibid: 35f.), which shows for example in the use of meaningful-sounding names for malls. This points to the instrumental use of culture that is acknowledged in the Los Angeles School.

Not accounted for in the US urban sociology schools, Florida and Landry's planning paradigms can be critically examined in terms of what Reckwitz refers to as "culturally-oriented governmentality" (in the Foucauldian sense) in the city (Reckwitz 2009: 8). The economic context that culture and art are placed in within the Creative City concept, in order to further develop spatial advantages, points to top-down planning strategies. These become the general principle of action revealing governmentality patterns. Governmentality as used here, refers to the specific form of steering, the "structural entanglement of the government of a State and the techniques of self-government in Western societies" (Lorey 2006), a kind of self-guidance or self-regulation of the individual. Instead of the former view of the city as an empty slate which has to be planned from scratch (i.e. Le Corbusier's ideas) Creative City strategies according to Reckwitz deal with already existing structures (Reckwitz 2009: 8f.). These given structures are then subject to governmental control and planning. Characteristic for the governmentality-forms of the Creative City model is the 'given' culture (in the sense that the city is already 'cultural' and therefore develops itself dynamically). This shows in Florida's clustering of subjective, creative talent and urban tolerance and Landry's view of the city as a place of cultural heritage and resources (Landry 2008: 6f.). The goal of this culturally oriented governmentality is the conscious shaping or increasing of already given cultural processes (Reckwitz 2009: 9). For Reckwitz this cultural governmentality shows in the normative framework of the Creative City concept to become (or stay) a 'creative' city. The imperative behind this governmentality also shows in the global division of regions or cities as either 'creative' or 'left behind' (defined as the one that haven't been subject to a successful culturally-

oriented governmentality). And as Reckwitz concludes, the culturally-oriented 'creative' city claims to be universal in its implementation, every city has the potential to become one (as Florida and Landry propose in their concepts), which it at the same time has to in order to compete. Yet this can hardly be redeemed for every region of the world, especially the 'valleys' Florida refers to (Florida 2008: 38). This critique of the governmentality structures imposed by the Creative City concept shows an important aspect of the underlying principles and helps account for the reasons cities and their planning authorities increasingly use culture to position themselves.

Critique of the Concept of the Creative Class

A critique of the Creative City model also requires a closer look at the term Creative Class as coined by Florida. Its wide influence as a determining principle of the Creative City concept makes an examination and critique of the ideas behind the Creative Class concept crucial. Landry briefly refers to the concept, but doesn't describe it in detail (Landry 2008: xxixf.), which makes Florida's conzeptualization of the term the main focus here.

As described above, Florida gives a relatively clear division of members of this new emerging class and 'others', but at the same time he accounts for even the possibility of "[f]actory workers, given the chance" (Florida 2002: 37) can be creative. But it is the 'super-creative core' that produces the truly creative forms, which due to their "economic function makes them the natural – indeed the only possible – leaders of twenty-first century society" (ibid: 315). This is also why he defines these individuals as a 'class' and urges them to take on their responsibilities as a "norm-setting class" (ibid: 317) towards building social cohesion

within society[xxxv]. Not only is this, in a way a reinforcement of class in a Marxian sense[xxxvi] - the labeling of their dominant position as something inevitable functions as a means of exclusion. Florida seems to remain attached to dominant notions of race and class (Wilson/ Keil 2008: 846). The importance of the Creative Class also translates to the urban context and reflects in the Creative City imperative to find these individuals and attract them or 'go under'. Opposing Florida, Wilson and Keil state that the "real creative class in these cities is the poor [due] to their immense contribution to the contemporary urban economy" (ibid: 841). This 'poor creative class' includes homeless, unemployed or underemployed people in socially neglected neighborhoods, who prove to be very resourceful and creative regarding spending or other logistics (ibid: 842). Further, the authors strongly criticize Florida's disregard of these people in his concept, which in reality are an essential part of the city's economy. Florida claims the need for his Creative Class for the development of cities, which "flagrantly configures an elitist theme for change that feudal lords and bourgeois captains of industry in the past would have hesitated to do" (Wilson/ Keil 2008: 844). This also fits to the underlying neoliberal principles of the Creative City model, which among other factors denies many merits of a welfare state and accordingly requires a more flexible, creative approach. The 'real' Creative Class needs to actively and flexibly act in daily situations in order to profit from decreasing welfare benefits.

Florida's concept, even though he acknowledges creativity in everyone, does appear highly class bias and denies any other form of creativity outside of an economic function. Outside of this purpose, creativity isn't acknowledged and therefore it is not important for the urban context. For attracting his Creative Class Florida stresses the importance of

tolerance for the quality of a city, but “[o]n the issue of poverty, class division, and structural inequalities, this notion […] is irrelevant” (ibid: 845). As a resident of Toronto states regarding Florida’s presence in the city:

"Richard Florida's exotic city, his creative city, depends on ghost people, working behind the scenes. Immigrants, people of colour. You want to know what his version of creative is? He's the relocation agent for the global bourgeoisie. And the rest of us don't matter." (resident quoted in Whyte 2009)

This report of an affected individual shows that the Creative Class model fails to capture the realities within the city. Correspondingly, the Creative City model relies on the blurring of actual circumstances and on the belief the Creative Class is the source of “civility, tradition, and good culture” (Wilson/ Keil 2008: 846). Peck also refers to criticism of Florida’s concept due to “its relative neglect of issues of intraurban inequality and working poverty” (Peck: 2005: 756)[xxxvii]. The potential relationship between the Creative Class (and policies following their needs and wishes, i.e. Creative City concept) and inequalities is not accounted for by Florida. Instead he only stresses the need for social cohesion (mainly for economic stability) and the responsibilities of a grown up Creative Class to assure this. The fact that Florida attempts to ‘solve’ social disruption (which according to him occurs often in times of economic changes) by morally addressing the members of the Creative Class to become a “more responsible group” (Florida 2002: 316) seems somewhat surprising. Peck also writes that due to Florida’s acknowledgement of everyone’s potential to be creative, but at the same time only assigning the membership of the creative core to a few, the solution seems to lie in self-responsibility. Every individual “need[s] to find a way to pull themselves up by their creative bootstraps” (ibid:

757). This refers to a ‘do-it yourself ethos’, which for Lloyd is part of the ‘neo-bohemia’ (which can also be somewhat related to the Creative Class notion) and corresponds with the entrepreneurial imperatives of neoliberal capitalism (Lloyd 2006: 242). Peck adds: “Creative-city strategies are predicated on, and designed for, this neoliberalized terrain” (Peck 2005: 764). Notions of the Creative Class extend to the urban environment and the ideals of flexible, intrinsically motivated, creative workers push out any negative conditions (or people not profiting from urban creativity strategies). They are not included in the Creative City concept and in turn, have less spatial and symbolic representation (seen in gentrification processes or public space conditions, as described above). The Creative Class concept is, as noted above, an elitist one, which excludes a wide urban population (and also those outside of the city in the ‘valleys’) and in the urban context it shows in top-down governance, even if it emphatically stresses the importance of grassroots developments, subcultures, and street-life.

Another critique of the Creative Class concept can be deduced from governmentality structures as an underlying part of the concept. It therefore deals with the consequences for members of the class themselves. As Lorey states, people working in the cultural sector have been moved into the center of society, functioning as hegemonic role models (Lorey 2006). This relates to Florida’s understanding of the Creative Class as an influential group increasingly determining how the economy is shaped, the city is built, or generally how society’s norms are shaped. The governmentality structures within the group of cultural workers reflect in the precarious working conditions, which, as Lorey explains, are actually ‘self-precarious’ (ibid). This self-precarization of

creatives results from their belief of fulfilling their most intrinsic wishes by carrying out their work. They therefore become easily exploitable since they are willing to put up with increasingly difficult working situations (such as temporary project-based jobs, or the inseparability of work and leisure time). Because there is a difference between these individuals and those in 'unintentionally' precarious situations ('left behind' socially), the self-determined creatives still regard themselves as non-conformist and maverick parts of society. Their self-chosen precarious situation reflects freedom and autonomy maintaining their understanding of themselves as not part of the societal center. Florida actually commends this freedom from rigid structures as a new found ability to pay more attention to others aspects of life, such as family (Florida 2002: 109). This can also be related to Florida's descriptions of the Creative Class and the (economic) shift towards the creativity imperative. For him the Creative Class is the new dominant and key driver of society and economy and his desire for more responsible, grown up creatives reflects their role-model function within the center of society. Also, the failing recognition of this new role by the creatives themselves, stems from their belief of not actually being an influential part of society.

The downward-spiral-effects these new principles of flexibility, constant self-improvement, innovation, and self-responsibility have are not accounted for by Florida. The constant insecurity of employment, the necessity of constantly having to (re-)produce one's self, the imposition of all responsibility on the individual are all negative results of the imperative of the 'entrepreneurial self' (Bröckling 2007). Also, because Florida's Creative Class has become a role-model for the ideal resident of a city, it ultimately affects the conceptualization of work or lifestyle in

general. This is another indication of the relocation of creatives into the hegemonic center of society and in turn, the effects their (life, work) situation has on other the groups. Their understanding determines that of others within the 'creative' economy or society[xxxviii]. This shows why a reflection of their conceptualization and the repercussions is an important part of a critique of the Creative Class and its urban implementation according to the Creative City concept.

Another consequence of the Creative Class notion can be found in the growing disparity between what Florida himself describes as the "mobile and the rooted" (Florida 2008: 79ff.) stressing the importance of location within the spiky world. He writes:

> "[t]he mobile posses the means, resources, and inclination to seek out and move to locations where they can leverage their talents. They are not necessarily born mobile, nor are they inevitably rich. What the mobile understand is that the pursuit of economic opportunity often requires them to move." (Florida 2008: 79)

Contrarily, the 'rooted' are made up of people 'stuck' in their location or those who have the means but choose not to leave. For Florida the Creative Class is made up of those who are highly mobile, which shows also in the circumstance that socioeconomic mobility is interdependent with geographic mobility (ibid: 81). Just as Florida hardly accounts for any negative effects his concepts might have, his book *Who's Your City* (2008) doesn't address the problematic of a spiky world. Rather, it emphasizes the importance of making the right decision of where to live. According to notions like 'happiness' or what life stage the individual is currently in, Florida offers us different locations to choose from. He also offers questions in order to "place yourself" (Florida 2008: 291). The fact that only a few, mainly members of the Creative Class

have the capacities to make this decision is recognized by Florida (ibid: 81), but his approach is to offer steps for lifestyle choices. So even though Florida sees location as a “divisive line that separates the have from the have-nots, alongside race, education, occupation, and income” (Florida 2008: 81) he fails to recognize how his concept of the Creative Class actually enforces these exclusion trends.

In their comprehensive book *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (2007) Boltanski and Chiapello examine, among other aspects, exploitation within an increasingly network-based form of organization within capitalism. They locate a new ‘cité’[xxxix] (in English: “city”), a normative reference system for capitalism to legitimize itself, within contemporary capitalism, which is based on the networking and mediating activity of agents (Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: 107)[xl]. The significance of a person within the ‘cité’ is rated according to their activity to constantly coin new projects, which in turn depends on relentless networking (ibid: 110)[xli]. Life becomes a sequence of projects, in which the individual is forced to be flexible, active, unattached and always open for socializing (ibid: 122). These characteristics can be linked to Florida’s Creative Class and the network-, project-based world can be seen as corresponding to the Creative Class concept.

Also Florida’s division of ‘mobile and rooted’ people can be related to what Boltanski and Chiapello describe. They see immobility is a new form of exploitation within the projective city and the “connexionist world” (ibid: 363). And as they add immobility is not only regarded in terms of geography, but also the inability to adjust to different people and their thoughts, so a kind of immovability. In a ‘cité’ based on networks and projects, the inability to function within these becomes a

reason for social exclusion. Even though Florida remains focused on geographical location, his account for the effect of education, race, etc. for the division among people (Florida 2008: 81) also points to the importance of the capacities and skills to function within networked relationships. For example, only the 'right' education can offer the abilities required to establish useful networks. The exclusion along the network lines functions according to mobility and immobility. This can then be regarded as exploitation (the insufficient compensation of work) because the immobility of some is the precondition for the mobility of others (Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: 364). The consistent presence of the "stand-in" individuals (ibid: 363), who stay in one location in order to cultivate contacts made by the highly mobile, are also dependent on these contacts. As soon as these are lost, or the project changes, the stand-in individual is in danger of being excluded and pushed to the edge of the network. Also, as the authors note, there is a necessity of to not become too attached (be it to a place, a house, or children), which ultimately leads to an even higher level of insecurity (Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: 364). These, 'lighter' forms of exploitation are complemented by more powerful forms, which affect human dignity (defined as the impossibility of subsuming a person according to only one quality) (ibid: 365). In a network world this extreme exploitation refers to the drastic loss of contacts and to a growing inability to sustain relationships[xlii].

Another reason for tension is the flexibility-norm of the projective city on the one hand and the need to be a specific and enduring individual on the other. In the network, adaptability becomes a key feature, the capability to adjust to specific situations without the pretense of perpetuity, although always appearing as a in some way 'special'

personality (ibid: 461). Consequently, members of the network have to possess specific competences but without remaining stuck within these. The authors see the tension between a stable, lasting individual, which is constantly in danger of getting suck in this state and the continuous need for adaptability, which can lead to the annulment of the individual in network relationships (ibid: 462)[xliii]. Also the clear division between business relationships (market related) and friendships (understood as authentic, non-selfish) is blurred, and concurrently the boarder of what is a commodity and what is not. The tension arising from this is made more endurable by mechanisms within the projective city, which shifts the borders of commodities and therefore legitimizes a changed division line (ibid: 464f.). New business structures identified in the projective city break with the former clear distinction between work and life, as for example in traditional Taylorism. In this past form of capitalism people were seen purely as machines (ibid: 466). The new forms of project-based business structures have, in a way, become more humane and accordingly, in contrast to previous forms, have incorporated the specific characteristics of people, their feeling, their pride, and their sense of morals. Due to their demand for broad commitment (such as constant networking, project recruitment, abolishment of life/work separation) the network structure of capitalism offers the legitimation of an increasing economization of people (ibid). Within this, capitalism has accumulated and economized areas to a higher degree than ever before, resulting in a need for the critical reflection of how far ‘freedoms’ that have developed with the network world should actually go (Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: 466).

Boltanski and Chiapello’s critique, based on very detailed descriptions, offers a very specific examination of the transformations within

capitalism's "Geist". Their identification of the exploitation pattern within a network-based, globalized, 'spiky world' offers a useful critique of Florida's concept. And even though Florida does account for factors such as "happiness" (Florida 2008: 148) (which isn't solely based on income) in his suggested reasons for deciding where to live, this is reserved only for those (networkers) who have the abilities to profit from the project-based organizational form.

Concluding Remarks

In the foregoing the key ideas behind the Creative City concept were described, its context, and underlying paradigms were examined in order to offer a closer look at the dominant understanding of the city today. Also previous conceptualizations of the city such as the three American urban sociology schools were illustrated, along with their acknowledgment of culture within the urban context. This pointed to differences between the Creative City model as a planning toolkit and how culture is regarded in urban sociology. What was referred to as the wider field of sociology, offered several points of a critique of the prevailing Creative City paradigm as well as its corresponding Creative Class concept. Without the objective of completely covering this extensive area, a number of general overarching themes were identified and described. This offers a basis for placing the critique of the dominant urban model into a further context. Even though the sociological critique described above doesn't specifically refer to aspects of sustainability, it can be regarded within this normative model, as the following will attempt.

2. Creative Cities in the Context of (Un)Sustainability

In order to examine the dominant urban model of Creative Cities according to aspects of sustainability in the following, an attempt is made to derive a working definition of sustainability. Also a brief historical overview is given to understand the context of the development of the terms sustainability and sustainable development. Based on a widened conceptualization of sustainability, not just including ecological aspects, but also social and cultural ones a working definition is given. This includes a brief look at cultures of sustainability and key ideas behind them in order to better include cultural perspectives. Building on this understanding of sustainability, unsustainability as a characteristic of the current social and cultural situation is examined. For this certain (sociological) accounts are described and examined according to characteristics that point to unsustainable tendencies. These findings illustrate wider developments within Western society and culture, which can then be put into an unsustainability context. Without ultimately defining unsustainability (or sustainability) this enables the identification of characteristics of unsustainability, which hinder the search process for sustainability. From this broader conceptualization of unsustainable tendencies, the Creative City model is examined. As the concept is a main understanding of the city today it can therefore also be regarded as a part of the dominant Western culture. Consequently, it can be seen as a contemporary model, including various unsustainable aspects, which can be identified by reexamining the sociological critique of the Creative City model of part 1.3 and including the characteristics of

unsustainability. The cultures of sustainability identified in part 2.1.2 can also be brought in relation to the dominant urban model, in order to further recognize its unsustainable tendencies. This shows that the cultural perspectives on sustainability are important as they point to unsustainable aspects of the current developments within Western society and more specifically in the urban context.

The main hypothesis here is that the Creative City model is largely unsustainable, a proposition that is supported by the findings of the sociological critique described part 1.3 and the characteristics of unsustainability. The goal here is not to offer concrete urban planning solutions or criteria of what makes a city sustainable. Rather, the identification of the unsustainable effects of the Creative City model can help point to possible ways to attempt to modify the concept to include sustainability aspects (also regarding culture and creativity approaches).

2.1 Concept of Sustainability

2.1.1 The Concept of Sustainability

The terms sustainability as well as sustainable development are extensively used, often interchangeably. This will be differentiated below, resulting in the working definition of the term sustainability. The wide discourses on these two concepts, which are often specific to different countries or disciplines, cannot fully be accounted for here[xliv]. Instead, some of the main writings and ideas regarding both concepts are briefly described in order to understand starting points and developments of the terms. Following this, a working definition is

given, which will serve as a point of reference for the attempted critique of the Creative City concept according to sustainability aspects. Also the importance of cultural perspectives within the search for sustainability is illustrated regarding the cultures of sustainability.

The current use of the term sustainability, but also of sustainable development comes from a mainly political origin regarding mainly environmental concerns, yet also including aspects such as social injustices. This already points to the often imprecise definition or use of the term, similar to culture or creativity. But, this should not necessarily lead to the rejection of the concept of sustainability as Davies and Brown state:

> "[r]ather we should seek the *contexts in which sustainability is applied*, suggesting that progress and understanding can only be achieved if appropriate frameworks are developed to enable investigators to identify and define the problems." (italics by Davies/ Brown 2006: 24)

Overall changes in technology, the demands for more resources, the growth mentality of a capitalist system for the provision of goods, growth of the world's population are all reasons for the emerging considerations within the concepts of sustainability or sustainable development. Historically, the concept of development, which should be able to sustain resources for future generations appears in the influential book *Limits of Growth* from 1972 in which Meadows et al. use models to investigate major developments of global concern, such as industrialization, population growth, use of non-renewable resources, environmental problems (Meadows et al. 2004: 51). The report concludes that the infinite growth based on finite resources isn't possible and therefore "a condition of ecological and economic stability that is sustainable far into the future" (ibid: 52) must be established.

This report reflects the idea that technology or scientific approaches can help identify, predict, and eventually solve problems surrounding sustainability issues. In 1987 the World Commission on Environment and Development, also know as the *Brundtland Commission* published the report *Our Common Future* and in it used the term “sustainable development” to refer to development that can meet the needs of the current population, but also those of future generations (Brundtland Commission 2004: 62). The report states that technological development, institutional changes, efficient use of resources are all part of the change process of sustainable development to enhance the current and future potential of humans (ibid: 63). This shows the global agenda pretense of the report and its idea of the possibility of further development as a solution for global problems. Under-development is regarded as a threat to the environment, which calls for a new form of development in a sustainable way. Robinson critically notes the human-centered character of the report, its promotion of more development (instead of less) and its absence of individual responsibility, relying on collective institutional approaches (Robinson: 2004: 373). This also illustrates how the report acknowledges conventional notions of on-going economic growth in order to improve human well-being, which is the entity under which all other is considered. Also, the *Agenda 21 Rio Declaration* of 1992 gave a direction for sustainable development, among other aspects regarding the urban context, initiating for example community-planning programs with a “human settlement objective” (United Nations 2004: 76). It can be regarded as the most influential report on sustainability issues as it led to the international spread of the term. The *Agenda 21 for Culture*, (approved in 2004 by the *Universal Forum of Cultures*) adds cultural guidelines for sustainable

development in cities and local governments (Agenda 21 for Culture 2004) and will be examined closer in part 3.2.

This brief overview of influential examples of the emergence of the term sustainable development in international discussions shows its origins in a mainly political context. Robinson further specifies the division between sustainable development, a concept used largely by governments and private sector organizations, and sustainability used more in the academic field and by NGOs (Robinson 2004: 370). He criticizes the term sustainable development for its underlying ideas, i.e. the possibility of a technological, rational fix to the problem. Coming from a mainly governmental and political background,

> "the rhetoric of sustainable development is about achieving sustainability for human purposes and ultimately conveys faith in the ability of humans to solve environmental and social problems through the application of reason." (Robinson 2004: 376)

This is one difficulty of the term, according to Robinson it fails to point to the actual underlying problems. For him new ethics, values, and a different way of encountering the natural world are needed, aspects that are not truly accounted for in a sustainable development concept (ibid). For the artist David Haley the term is also highly problematic because it "starts with the assumption that 'everything is going to be alright'. All we need to do is identify the problems and with the right science and right technology we will 'fix it'" (Haley 2008: 203). Several aspects of the critique of sustainable development, such as its vagueness, its tendency to foster delusions, or attract hypocrites are further described by Robinson (Robinson 2004: 373ff.), which eventually leads him to prefer the term sustainability as this includes both a technological approach and wider value changes (ibid: 378).

Only with this term the more fundamental changes are conceptualized, moving away from a purely rational approach and including cultural perspectives. In part 2.1.2 the general cultural deficit of the sustainable development or sustainability approach is examined, resulting in the recognition of the need for cultures of sustainability.

Another relevant aspect regarding the discourse on sustainability or sustainable development is described by Renn et al. and concerns the different pillar models. They focus mainly on the German context but give a useful overview. The many concepts that circle around sustainability or sustainable development in past and present often refer to areas of the human life-world and how they relate to sustainability. Predominantly, these have been the natural environment, the economy, or society. Starting with the strong consideration of environmental aspects, perspectives included more and more areas appearing to be relevant. Renn et al. illustrate this development by identifying three general kinds of concepts, which include a one-pillar model (main focus on ecological aspects), a three-pillar model (with equal consideration of ecological, economic, social aspects), and a four or more pillar model (which include aspects from the foregoing adding cultural and institutional dimensions) (Renn et al. 2007: 27). As the authors criticize, the constant addition of areas of the human life-worlds inevitably leads to a dilution of the concept of sustainability. Also the problem of the goal of sustainability may fall behind the individual aspects within the pillar model as often a normative reference is missing. But as they add, there have been attempts to include normative aspects, such as equity, as underlying norms, which can then be related to different areas such as economy or ecology (ibid: 28). This then offers ‘guidelines’ along which question of what defines a

‘good’ life, for example, can be asked.

Resulting from the insights above, that sustainability is a highly abstract and diffuse concept it is useful, also in the context of this thesis, to focus on sustainability understood as a search process, which includes the many aspects and levels needed in finding affective and enduring structures. Sustainability can therefore be understood, not as offering direct, concrete solutions, but more as guidelines or frameworks for the search process of sustainability, which can only be within a holistic approach.

The critique of the concept of sustainable development points to the lack of cultural aspects or inclusion of the non-human environment in considerations of the present or future. Also, questions of goals, or processes and their legitimation are ultimately cultural ones (underlying values and moral understandings) and often the pillar models not fully account for this. Taking this and Robinson’s account into consideration a working definition of sustainability, which will also be its basic understanding in the following, could be the one given by Moore:

> “Sustainability is a concept, a goal, and a strategy. The concept speaks to the reconciliation of social justice, ecological integrity, and the well-being of all living systems on the planet. The goal is to create an ecologically and socially just world within the means of nature without compromising future generations. Sustainability also refers to the process or strategy of moving toward a sustainable future.” (Moore 2005: 78)

This definition accounts for the normative character of sustainability, which includes many resolutions, compromises, and a re-thinking of very different (even paradoxical) aspects, as Kagan notes (Kagan 2008: 15). This can be combined with Robinson’s definition of sustainability as an integrative concept, which goes across fields,

sectors and scales (Robinson 2004: 378). This integration refers to the combinations of social aspects with biological ones, government interests with those of the research community, or the level of analysis with that of action, to name a few (Robinson 2004: 378). Yet, a main focus here, also in anticipation of the examination of the Creative City concept under sustainability aspects, is on the cultural perspectives on sustainability. If culture or society is affected by for example economic aspects (i.e. neoliberal tendencies), this has consequences for the urban context, as described above. This points to the importance of examining the cultural perspectives on sustainability in order to critically look at the Creative City model as an unsustainable part of our dominant culture.

2.1.2 Cultures of Sustainability

Cultural Deficit

Before looking at the significance of the cultural perspectives on sustainability, or the cultures of sustainability, it is important to understand the 'neglect' of these aspects within much of the discourse on sustainability (or sustainable development). Because the process of sustainability requires "nothing short of a fundamental change in our ways of working and consuming" (Bachmann 2008: 8) it demands, among changes in economic structures, etc., changes in values and norms, i.e. cultural changes.

Again, the definition of culture here is difficult. If culture is referred to in the sustainability debate, its use is often diffuse or different depending on the author or context. As noted above, the term already bears many definitions ranging from the narrower one of arts and humanities to a broader understanding of 'ways of life', i.e. symbolic practices, values,

and norms. Some authors point to the key role of artists or creative within the search process of sustainability (such as Dielemann, Kagan described in part 3.1.2) others refer more to the broader understanding of culture such as Brocchi or also Kagan, described below in this chapter. All understandings can be seen as a key part of sustainability, which doesn't make the conceptualization of cultures of sustainability a clear or easy task, but it is an important part of the holistic approach of the search process. Therefore, a clear ultimate definition of culture is not necessarily useful, but instead would result in a static conceptualization. All levels need to be included within the wider working definition of sustainability, as outlined above. Yet, differentiations of the definitions described by authors can still be helpful to point to difficulties in the achievement of sustainability, such as the understanding of culture as an opposition to nature. This difference to nature is one reason why there is a general lack of cultural considerations within sustainability (Kurt/ Wehrspaun 2001: 18). They further note that this definition of culture, that it begins where nature ends, is based on a very subject-centered worldview of enlightened modernity, which constitutes this polar opposition between nature and culture (ibid: 18).

This points to what can be termed as a cultural deficit. As Kurt writes:

"Anyone trying to find out why sustainability is not attractive as the task of the century will come across the 'cultural deficit' inherent in the conception of the model. In fact you will largely look in vain for artists as protagonists of the sustainable future development in the Rio declaration and Agenda 21. And culture as an element in society, going beyond the arts and humanist education to include symbolic and aesthetic creative practice by individuals and societies is scarcely mentioned either." (Kurt 2004: 238)

In this description Kurt stresses the importance of including all aspects of culture as a way of overcoming the missing perspectives in the sustainability concept. Also sustainability is often not integrated into cultural politics or the art world in general, due to the fact that it is often seen as an solely 'environmental subject' and not as a truly cultural issue (ibid: 239). The deficit of cultural aspects (both 'high' art and the 'way of life') also shows the predominant kind of thinking within the sustainability debate, which can only address (and solve) issues of sustainability to a certain end. The opposition of nature and culture described above, essentially results in the focus on mainly technological and scientific solutions, which in turn is based on

f"disjunctive thinking, simplification by reductionism and atomization of knowledge and experience, [which, JH] has allowed the economic and technological developments of the past century, but it has also engendered the global crisis of unsustainability and fails to address its level of complexity." (Kagan 2009)

What Robinson criticizes within the concept of sustainable development, its focus on the human ability to solve environmental or social problems, or the missing cultural connectedness to the life-world of people within the sustainability discourse (Kurt/ Wagner 2002: 16) can be traced back to the underlying notions Kagan illustrates. Without going into detail and historically reconstructing the emergence of this disciplinary, 'rational' thinking tradition[xlv], which would surely go beyond the realm here, it is still important to note that this thinking is not sufficient. The challenge of building a sustainable future cannot be met with the same thinking, which created ecological or social problems in the first place. A problem, as Bohm writes, "is insoluble as long as you keep producing it all the time by your thought" (Bohm 1996: 24). Notions of growth, economic and technological development seen as

bringing the needed solutions (as stated in the several of the sustainable development reports described above) cannot accomplish a “global mindset change” (Kagan 2010: 1) which includes fundamental paradigmatic shift in world views and ways of life (ibid). The problem of the disjointed knowledge for the context of sustainability is that the necessary holistic view, the possibility of the concept leading to fundamental and complete changes, is hindered. Further, connections between the highly complex problems of unsustainable developments are not seen at all, or only insufficiently due to the separation between disciplines.

Based on this critical look at the understandings behind the dominant approach to problems regarding sustainability, which follow the underlying notion that technological, scientific solution with eliminate crises, it becomes clear that a new framework is needed. The challenge of sustainability requires an inclusion of cultural perspectives in order to better account for the whole range of problems and issues, which are of urgency.

Arising from the identification of a cultural deficit and the mainly technological and scientific solutions applied, the task is to identify the cultural challenge at hand and to formulate cultures of sustainability. As Kagan describes: “the search process for sustainability is first and foremost, to be understood as a search for ‘cultures of sustainability’” (Kagan 2010: 2)[xlvi]. In the following, certain keywords for these ‘cultures’ as well as important underlying theoretical concepts are described in order to better understand them. Yet, a fixed concept of them would stand against some of their basic ideas (such as openness), as Kagan notes, which is why a rigid, clear-cut definition cannot be the goal here (ibid).

Theoretical Background

As the findings above show, the current (Western) thinking, mainly rational, linear, and disjunctive doesn't meet the complex challenge of sustainability. Instead, it seems a change in thinking is required for a complex reality (ibid: 1). This has several theoretical implications, which will be briefly addressed here. It helps better grasp the cultures of sustainability even without a clear definition. Although the theoretical background is considerably extensive, a few main points will be described here, focusing on their main implications for cultures of sustainability.

As already emphasized the search process of sustainability is complex, which is also why the current main concepts of sustainability often don't meet the challenge. As Kagan writes:

> "[s]ustainability is a young concept for an age of hypercomplexity, where challenges of increasingly globalizing economic exchanges as well as cultural exchanges are combining with the challenge of interconnected global and local ecological and social crises." (Kagan 2010:1)

This shows the forms of knowledge or conceptualizations needed for approaching sustainability. Cultures of sustainability can come to terms with this complexity. Since the current way of thinking reduces and separates it lacks the ability to make the connections needed. Morin illustrates this complexity as numerous amounts of interactions between a large quantity of units, resulting in uncertainty. Yet, as he explains "it is uncertainty at the heart of richly organized systems" (Morin 2008: 20). The current way of approaching this is therefore not sufficient, instead an approach which serves this complexity would allow for a thinking that wouldn't deface realities and try to reduce them,

but would see them as opportunities. As Montuori writes: “Morin recognizes the […] creative dimensions of diversity, and therefore urges us to approach this diversity in ways that celebrate polyphone and engage fully the richness of our world” (Montuori 1999: x)[xlvii]. This goes against a thinking-system that tries to encounter complexity by constantly reducing it. Also “commonly agreed-on notions of progress” (ibid) are not valid anymore, further developments are also uncertain. This shows why a different kind of thinking is needed, one that “relinks [and, JH] respects diversity as it recognizes unity, and that tries to discern interdependencies” (Morin/ Kern 1999: 130). What Morin points to here is also the need for unity, corresponding with the recognition of complex structures. This holistic understanding does not necessarily mean that it simplifies and again reduces, it merely accounts for the wider connections. The new thinking needs to incorporate both highly complex structures as well as account for the ‘bigger picture’, not remaining within strict disciplinary lines. This is needed for search process of sustainability.

This also accounts for a different disciplinary thinking. As Ramadier states: “[c]omplexity can be approached only through transdisciplinarity” (Ramadier 2004: 423) because it offers a framework that is based on the idea that disciplinary practices have to evolve to meet the complexity of the pressing issues of sustainability[xlviii]. It challenges the linear thinking tradition within the sciences, which as noted above, only offer limited solution proposals, by functioning across disciplinary borders. The prefix ‘trans-’ is based on the assumption that this kind of disciplinarity is not about reaching a consensus, but rather finds coherence within paradoxes, without simplifying them. It combines other theoretical frameworks such as multidisciplinarity (which shows

the juxtaposition between models belonging to specific disciplines) and interdisciplinarity (a process of dialogue between disciplines and transferring models from one to the other) (Ramadier 2004: 433). These overall connections that can be made through a transdisciplinary framework are helpful for the search for sustainability because they create new concepts, methods, and tools that are integrative, instead of purely disciplinary and analytic (Robinson 2004: 378). This encourages broader (working) relationships between research, action, and the everyday life-world of people. Nicolescu views transdisciplinarity as a new type of “in vivo” knowledge, which links the outside world of the object with the internal one of the subject, in contrast to the “in vitro” knowledge, which concerns only one level of reality (Nicolescu 2008: 3) [xlix]. Kagan, referring to Nicolescu, adds that action-research is an important aspect of transdisciplinarity (Kagan 2009).

Overall, this brief introduction to the main principles behind a transdisciplinary approach shows its importance for sustainability in general and specifically for cultures of sustainability. This is because it is theoretically open to different levels of reality, including contradictions and conflicts, thus remaining diverse. An understanding of sustainability based on the working definition given above, acknowledges the importance of this open character. The previous thought-tradition reduces the entirety of the world into parts, leaving a gap between theory and reality. Instead a transdisciplinarity approach will enable the understanding of “the notions of the whole and part, unity and diversity, together, both as complementary and antagonistic” (Morin quoted in Kagan 2010: 8).

A further theoretical aspect in this context, is that of systems thinking. The wide field of application of systems thinking (ranging from

management, manufacturing to environmental issues) and its theoretical background can, for reasons of space, not be described here in detail[l]. Therefore the goal is not to give a detailed overview, but to focus on key notions and their importance for cultures of sustainability. Regarding this, systems thinking offers “a qualitative leap from the ‘inter-…’ to the ‘trans-…’ […] and a way to gain an overview of complex systems, focusing on the relationships rather than on the details” (Kagan 2010: 4). This shows how systems thinking can encourage a connectedness instead of the division into disciplines[li]. This doesn’t erase findings from the disciplines, but adds a holistic view; it highlights the connections, as does transdisciplinarity. Dieleman refers to this kind of thinking as viewing society as an intricate system, made up of countless interacting elements that constitute the system as a whole (Dielemann 2008: 113f.). These elements build the system, yet are also limited by it, they constantly create the systems through effects and feedback loops, in which effects from the past influence the same event in the future. A chain of cause and effect forms the event in the present or future. This approach is useful for cultures of sustainability as it is holistic, not fragmented, allowing a ‘bird’s view’ and at the same time a micro-examination of systems and their elements, without loosing the perspective for either. Further, Capra aims to develop a unified and systemic approach for understanding both biological and social aspects, overcoming the division between the two (Capra 2002: 70). This makes his approach especially interesting for sustainability because it offers an inclusive theoretical approach. With this Capra also aims to go beyond the divisions between, for example mind and matter, within dominant Western thought. For this he extends the systemic understanding of (biological) life to the social domain, applying findings

of living systems to social contexts, which would connect the two based on the idea that “there is a fundamental unity to life” (ibid: 81). This approach already points to an important part of the cultures of sustainability. The focus on the interconnectedness of all living systems is an essential part of an understanding of sustainability that moves away from a fragmented, disciplinary view of singular systems. Culture becomes important here because, as Capra understands it in its anthropological sense (values, beliefs, rules) (ibid: 86f.), it offers changes towards the process of sustainability. Culture, in this sense, is the integrated system of how values and social behaviors are formulated. If the systemic approach allows connections between living systems and social, or cultural contexts then they influence each other and considerations of the ‘natural world’ become integrated into the values and norms of the social. In this way, culture or values can be changed to include sustainability aspects. Cultures of sustainability would help guide the way towards this goal.

This lies down the theoretical ground for cultures of sustainability, which will be illustrated in the following. As mentioned above, a distinctive definition cannot be the goal here, instead, key notions are described to give a conceptual framework. These key words also offer the possibility to better define unsustainable aspects of dominant cultural or social models.

Key Words of Cultures of Sustainability

Key notions of cultures of sustainability revolve around the idea that their framework is essentially “inter-…” (Kagan 2010: 3). This speaks to the importance of contact and communication among different elements of the system or between systems in general. But, as Kagan also notes,

this does not imply that differences are integrated and therefore made irrelevant (as a purely disciplinary approach would entail). Instead, based on the transdisciplinarity framework described above, 'inter-…' refers, for example to interculturality, which encourages dialogue while sustaining cultural diversity (ibid: 3f.). Also, inter-conventional relations work towards cultures of sustainability because they offer possibilities for "entrepreneurship in conventions" (Kagan 2008b: 147ff.) as a role for artists working as change agents towards sustainability, for example, which will be described further in part 3.1.2. Other aspects of the 'inter-…' are mentioned by Kagan, including the importance to view it not just as a logical practice but also including a "sensibility to the pattern that connects" (Kagan 2010: 7ff.), which will also be illustrated in part 3.1.1.

By looking at differences between sustainable and unsustainable societies, Brocchi identifies the problematic of cultural systems that do not work towards the process of sustainability. This also points to the difficulties of using the same thinking to solve problems, which have developed due to the same kind of thinking. For this he contrasts mainly closed systems of (Western) culture (which will be examined closer in part 2.2) with open systems of "*cultures* of Sustainability" (italics by Brocchi 2008: 35). In this context, he understands culture in the wider sense, as codes, values, and morals that are used to understand complex realities. In this way culture creates boundaries, it includes or excludes from the surrounding environment (ibid: 26). This systemic understanding of culture reflects how different cultures relate to their surroundings resulting in either the "non-evolutionary development" (aimed at retaining mainly inflexible boundaries) and being highly self-referential or in an "evolutionary development" model,

which requires and sustains flexible boundaries to encourage diversity (ibid: 47). This refers to what Kagan terms resilience and which is among the key words for cultures of sustainability (Kagan 2010: 2). Within the evolutionary development model, this plays a crucial role because it increases the ability to adapt to change coming from the outside. Referring to Haley, Kagan stresses the importance of resilience within the cultures of sustainability because this enables them to evolve and remain strong and sustained (Kagan 2010: 2f.). Within the more resilient cultures of sustainability diversity plays an essential role, as this helps them to adapt better. Just as the non-evolutionary models of development are reasonably closed, the 'evolutionary' ones rely on flexible boundaries, thus encouraging diversity as offering alternatives and responses that better suit possible "exogenous shocks" (ibid: 3). And as Brocchi describes, evolutionary development models tend to demand their environment to adapt to their social system, whereas the open evolutionary models adapt their system to the surrounding environment (Brocchi 2008: 47). This further can be related to the autoecopoiesis (Kagan 2010: 5) potential of a system, which can be assigned to the more open "evolutionary development" model. On the contrary, the "autopoietic system [of the 'non-evolutionary development'] is able to select which irritations it will notice and ignore the other ones" (ibid). Based on Luhmann's characterization of autopioetic systems (Luhmann 2005: 22ff.), Kagan explains that these systems will actually translate the irritations occurring at their borders according to their inner understanding, which can eventually lead to the self-destruction of the system (Kagan 2010: 6). This also explains why Luhmann's predictions of societies overcoming environmental challenges are rather bleak, as he only accounts for autopioetic

systems (ibid).

This points to the importance of cultures of sustainability for working towards the process of sustainability. Only evolutionary open systems allow a balanced, sustainable relationship with their environment, which at the least is also this way out of self-interest (in order to keep the system 'alive'). Morin refers to "auto-eco-organizing systems [which are, JH] autonomous/dependent with regard to their eco-systems" (Morin/ Kern 1999: 47f.). Kagan terms this autoecopoiesis, which goes beyond the strict (unsustainable) structure of merely autopoietic systems to include "ecopoietic tendencies, i.e. tendencies of psychic systems and social systems to construct themselves in open communications with their environments" (Kagan 2010: 6). Of course, the system needs some level of 'auto-' in order to sustain and reconstruct itself (ibid)[lii].

An additional key notion within the cultures of sustainability is that of "open ethics" (Kagan 2010: 7), which addresses the important aspect of the normative quality of sustainability. This again is based on the open framework required for sustainability, which cannot be singularly founded on "directly universal ethics" (ibid). These ethics involve diversity, reflexivity, or "plural rationalities" that don't work towards reaching a "common reason through communication" but rather remain open and appreciative of difference (ibid)[liii]. Kagan further notes that connected to these ethics are aesthetics, specifically that of the "patterns that connects" (ibid). This concept, which is based on Bateson, is especially important to enable an inclusive and interconnected view regarding sustainability. What the "aesthetics of the patterns that connect" means specifically for art dealing with sustainability issues is examined in part 3.1.1, also expanding it to

include topics, processes, and values that connect. Important here, for describing key aspects of the cultures of sustainability, is that “open ethics” are an important base for guiding the search process of sustainability.

Because cultures of sustainability move away from the dominant reductionist culture towards a multiple, complex understanding of reality, Kagan describes the fundamental shift and what new understanding it involves. For this, a new ecological literacy, which understands the “link between resilience and diversity”, the “dynamic balance […] in nature and society”, and “the creativity and open interdependence of webs of life” (Kagan 2009) is key[liv]. Capra’s notion, of being “ecologically literate” (Capra 2002: 230), which he relates to building sustainable communities, means “to understand the principles of organization, common to all living systems, that ecosystems have evolved to sustain the web of life” (ibid). Also, based on Morin, Kagan describes a literacy of complexity (Kagan 2009), which adds to the already stated importance of theoretically coming to terms with the complexity of reality. In the foregoing, the difficulties that arise from traditional or current ways of thinking were illustrated, pointing to the new way of conceptualizing required for sustainability. This extends ‘ecological literacy’ to include the new way of thinking, which means “our logic has to develop itself, and go beyond itself in the direction of complexity” (Morin 2008: 21). Kagan further offers notions that are important within this literacy such as a “complex dia-logical thinking” (as opposed to a solely linear logic), “the principle of eco-auto-organization”, which “explores the complex organizational relationships between individual life forms and the ecosystems in which they ***co-evolve*** and ***eco-evolve***” (italics by Kagan 2009). Also autoecopoiesis

as described above is part of this ‘literacy of complexity’. Further, the cultures of sustainability, besides value and norm aspects, also include the narrower sense of artists working on sustainability issues and accordingly the need for cultural changes (values, habits, norms) required. The specific potential of aesthetics of sustainability (Kurt 2004: 238) is described in part 3.1.1.

The cultural deficit identified above is problematic because due to it important aspects that could work towards sustainability are excluded. Arising from this, Kurt and Wagner stress the importance of integrating art and culture (‘high’ art and culture in its anthropological sense as a ‘way of life’) in order to base the debate of sustainability on a wider discourse (Kurt/ Wagner 2002: 248). The ethical questions this brings up (such as what is a ‘good life’, what aspects does this include) are an essential part of the search for sustainability. Also cultures of sustainability give notions that enable the identification of what tends to work more towards sustainability and what doesn’t. This process has to remain an open one, not dominated by a single fixed understanding of culture, sustainability, or the ‘right’ way of proceeding. Robinson stresses the importance of perceiving sustainability not as a “single concept” (Robinson 2004: 381), but rather as an “approach or process of community-based thinking” that integrates social, environmental, economic aspects, while “remaining open to fundamental differences about the way that this is to be accomplished” (ibid). For this, a general framework of cultures of sustainability including key notions described above can help guide a “conversation about what kind of world we collectively want to live in now and in the future” (ibid: 382).

2.2 Unsustainability as a Characteristic of Current Times

The notions described in the foregoing, also enable an identification of unsustainable trends or developments (also of the Creative City concept), which will be illustrated in the following, as opposed to cultures of sustainability. Just as an ultimate and definite meaning of cultures of sustainability goes against its inner notion, a definitive classification of a 'culture of unsustainability' cannot be given. Essentially, only tendencies that point to unsustainable effects can be identified. Brocchi illustrates "non-evolutionary development" models (Brocchi 2008: 47) and lists unsustainable aspects of the current dominant culture (ibid: 39), which show some of these tendencies. Yet no culture is fully unsustainable (or sustainable) as it is more about a process than an end-state. Of course, goals, norms, and values need to be discussed, but, as described above, the process needs to remain open. Still, in the following unsustainability will be identified as a main tendency or characteristic of the current (Western) culture. Certain aspects that can be assigned to unsustainable effects or consequences can be related to the current cultural model and described. This will enable a critical analysis of the Creative City model, as part of the dominant culture, regarding its (mainly) unsustainable aspects.

In the following the attempt is made to illustrate unsustainable aspects or tendencies of the current culture or society, mainly focusing on Brocchi and Kirchberg's findings. Adding to this, critiques of present developments within culture or society, such as Sennett, Bauman, Ritzer, and Boltanski and Chiapello, help identify further unsustainable tendencies. For this, certain aspects of a critique of current developments are briefly introduced, which focus on the dominant

Western culture[lv]. This also enables a better critical look at some main underlying paradigms that shape the Creative City model and its unsustainable effects, which can be tied to current developments. The key notions briefly presented above can help work towards sustainability and correspondingly also help to identify unsustainable tendencies. As identified in the foregoing, cultural perspectives play an essential role in this, also as a way to initiate a "global mindset change" (Kagan 2010: 1). On the theoretical level, the importance of systems thinking or transdisciplinarity approaches becomes clear, due to their ability to deal with complex realities and complex challenges. In contrast, the linear, fragmented way of approaching the issues of sustainability isn't capable of actually grasping all the relevant aspects. This problem shows in the current Western cultural model and its insufficient ability to confront the challenges of sustainability. It could be argued that the current methods of approaching sustainability reflect the deep situated difficulties the current 'non-evolutionary' culture has when dealing with the sustainability issues. As described above, a 'non-evolutionary' model, or a culture based on mainly autopoiesis and inflexible boundaries (Brocchi 2008: 47) is not as capable of reacting to 'irritations' from the outside, i.e. sustainability challenges. Also other key notions such as 'resilience' or 'open ethics' don't seem to correlate well will cultures or societies that tend to be 'non-evolutionary' and don't adapt to their surrounding environment.

Brocchi identifies the present dominant culture, its values and norms (based on its theoretical history of separation between subject and object, self-referential tendencies, and belief in progress and technologies) as mainly characterized by unsustainable aspects (ibid: 39). He sees difficulties behind certain 'myths' or dominant ideas that

have to be encountered by the cultures of sustainability to eventually bring about a “paradigmatic change” (Brocchi 2008: 37). Myths such as “the free economic market [or, JH] economic growth” (ibid) are basic understandings within the dominant culture and can be regarded as mainly unsustainable tendencies, because they are based on a “monodimensional and economic centred worldview” or a “globalized monoculture” (ibid: 39). The dominant culture (singular form) is based on aspects that can be put into the context of unsustainability and therefore be contrasted with cultures of sustainability (plural), which are multidimensional and more sustainable in their development. A culture (or society) focused largely on globalization and economization (such as the current one) has standardization effects and leads to the “decrease of cultural diversity [and, JH] a decrease of the evolutionary ability of the social system” (ibid: 40). This shows that there is a correlation between how a culture (or society) approaches its environment, its inner characteristics and its potential to be more sustainable.

In order to not only contrast the two development models of Brocchi, which help recognize (un)sustainable tendencies, but also further identify specific unsustainable characteristics within the current culture, Kirchberg offers a useful method. His connection between characteristics of the dominant (modern) culture[lvi] and the discourse of sustainability enables a wider inclusion of cultural perspectives. It also helps relate the characteristics of Western society or its culture (i.e. the predominant values and norms) to the identified dominant conceptualization of the Creative City. Unsustainable tendencies within the dominant culture are also part of the Creative City model, which is based on current understandings of society. For Kirchberg,

unsustainability is a characteristic of modernity (Kirchberg 2008: 93), which allows main aspects identified by critical accounts of current development to be put into the context of sustainability. By looking at Bauman and Sennett, Kirchberg identifies certain aspects that are important for the context of sustainability. If, as noted above, the cultural deficit is an aspect 'standing in the way' of sustainable structures, then this approach can help include the so important cultural view. It can help identify largely unsustainable tendencies within culture or society and therefore point to aspects that should be changed or modifies. Also, because Kirchberg uses sociological inquiries for recognizing unsustainable tendencies, and therefore connecting these findings to wider fields dealing with sustainability issues (such as ecology, socio-political approaches), his approach goes beyond disciplines, working towards a more transdisciplinarity approach.

In the following, several main critical perspectives of the current cultural model (or society) will be introduced, as a way to identify unsustainable developments and as a first step to formulating a critique of the Creative City model in a sustainability context. Bauman and Sennett, and their critical view of the current culture that Kirchberg describes will be widened to include several aspects of a critique of Ritzer and the already mentioned *New Spirit of Capitalism* of Boltanski and Chiapello. The authors, mainly applying a sociological approach, all offer aspects that can be useful here. Generally they all describe similar developments within current capitalism and society, but each offer different aspects, which will be mentioned here. Of course, many others could be named here, but as the aim is to show links between the critique of current developments and unsustainable tendencies, a few significant and widely discussed analyses are chosen. Without the

claim of completely covering all aspects of the critiques of current developments, main aspects are illustrated in order to see how these point to unsustainable tendencies or characteristics. This is also done in anticipation of the following critique of the Creative Cities model from a sustainability point of view. Certain aspects these critiques describe can also be related to the urban context. This goes further than the aspects of the sociological critique of described in part 1.3, which are mainly focused on direct urban consequences related to the Creative City concept. Tendencies, which Kirchberg identifies with the help of critique that indirectly points to unsustainability as a characteristic of current times, can also be found within the dominant urban model. In the following the certain aspects of the mentioned critiques are described, which will be reexamined in part 2.3 in order to formulate a sustainability critique of the Creative City model.

Kirchberg mainly focuses on Bauman and Sennett's critique to find aspects that are helpful for the discourse of sustainability (Kirchberg 2008: 93). Both identify critical aspects and offer ways to counter these developments, referring to "gamekeepers and gardeners" (Bauman) and "craftsmanship" (Sennett) (ibid: 94). Sennett's account of craftsmanship will be examined further in part 3.1.3. These 'solutions' are based on the identified negative effects or developments within the dominant culture. As Kirchberg states, both also see the critical developments resulting from the "wastefulness of the current use of human resources" (ibid). This exploitation of human resources results in feelings of fear and insecurity (ibid: 97ff.). A closer look at Sennett illustrates these developments.

Sennett describes the *Corrosion of Character* (1998) as a result of increased flexibility demands of current capitalism[lvii]. For him this

affects long term relationships, “corrodes trust, loyalty, and mutual commitment” (Sennett 1998: 24). By describing life situations of several individuals in detail, he contrasts the growth of character and community relationships with the increasing fragmentation and fluid identities within the new economy (Sennett 1998: 74). This results in a “lack of sustained human relations and durable purposes” (ibid: 98), making it more and more difficult to have a coherent life narrative. Taking risks are part of new market conditions within capitalism’s new form and are therefore increasingly demanded by large numbers of people, even if only a few truly benefit (ibid: 88). This is also examined in Sennett’s book *The New Culture of Capitalism* (2006), in which he further examines the effects the ‘new economy boom’ has on institutions and the increased social instability. For him the “fragmentation of big institutions has left many people’s lives in a fragmented state” (Sennett 2006: 2), which is part of a “new kind of economy” (ibid: 9). This shows how Sennett relates the life-circumstances of individuals to wider developments in society. Sennett further looks at changes in bureaucracy illustrating that the former ‘iron cage’ of bureaucracy (based on Weber) formed the structural lives of people and gave them “a sense of agency” (ibid: 36). Changes towards more flexibility in companies (ibid: 40f.) have affected these rigid bureaucratic structures, eventually resulting in specific deficits. According to Sennett these are “low institutional loyalty, diminishment of informal trust among workers, and weakening of institutional knowledge” (ibid: 63). The increasingly ‘corroded’ character of individuals is a consequence of these new structures. The claim that these new structures of capitalism would liberate people from the bureaucratic organization of, what Sennett calls “social capitalism” (ibid:

81), actually led to increased inequality and isolation (ibid: 82). The individuals are “on their own” (ibid: 61) resulting in a high need for self-management. Sennett’s account of the “specter of uselessness” (ibid: 84), which corresponded, especially in rising cities in the past, with growth (ibid: 85) also has a modern form in the new culture of the economy. The global labor market, the increase of automation (i.e. machines and computers creating economic values), and age as a criterion of exclusion are all parts of the threat of uselessness within the current economy (Sennett 2006: 86ff.), which leads to inequalities and ‘waste’ of human capabilities.

The effects these new economic structures have on wider social circumstances also show in Sennett’s description of the “citizen as a consumer of politics” (ibid: 133). This assimilation of the area of politics by the economy shows in the transfer of consumption patterns onto the political arena. The “consumer-spectator-citizen” (ibid: 161) is a consequence of the new form of capitalism, resulting in more passive relationship of individuals towards democracy. Marketing of politicians, impatience of people with existing structures, and the “user-friendly” (ibid: 171) version of politics are elements of the new ways of ‘consuming’ politics. For Sennett democracy needs involved, active citizens, i.e. “citizen-as-craftsmen” (ibid), which would help to form progressive politics due to their efforts and active approaches. Instead the culture of the new capitalistic structure stresses individuality, fragmentation, short-term thinking, and self-responsibility. And “[t]hese are cultural forms which celebrate personal change but not collective progress [whereas, JH] a polity needs to draw on sustained relationships and accumulate experience” (ibid: 177f.).

Although Sennett’s accounts tend to appear somewhat idealistic of past

work, community, or family situations (especially in *The Corrosion of Character*), his findings are still useful for pointing to unsustainable tendencies and their increase through new capitalistic structures. As Kirchberg illustrates, fear and lack of security are structurally built in parts of the new flexibility demands within the economy (Kirchberg 2008: 97). Sennett's descriptions of the new culture behind this economy shows how people, institution, or politics are affected by it, resulting in insecurity or apprehension. Fear thus becomes the main aspect shaping the actions of individuals. Regarding sustainability, fear becomes the reason to work towards sustainability and it is "not actively embraced as a moral objective" (ibid: 98), but only because a sense of fear of what the future might bring. This is problematic, because as noted above, a paradigmatic mindset change is necessary to effectively embrace the search process for sustainability. If fear is the main driving force behind sustainability measures, their implementation can only be insufficient. Also, it cannot be a goal behind the sustainability search process to use fear and insecurity as means to create and implement measures. As Kirchberg writes, this fear is due to Sennett's described fragmentation of institutions, which in turn leaves all consequences and responsibilities on the individual level. Sennett for example describes exclusion according to age, which shows how structural deficits of the new economy are ascribed to the individual, who "cannot relegate the responsibility to any other institutions but themselves" (ibid). This of course is also highly problematic in terms of sustainability, which again points to the usefulness of Sennett's accounts for indentifying unsustainable tendencies. This enforcement of self-responsibility hinders collective (political) actions and doesn't encourage thinking in terms of future generations.

Within the economic and social system “mass consumption and mass politics” (Kirchberg 2008: 96) have replaced qualitatively higher forms, as Sennett shows by describing the consumer-citizen’s approach to politics. This can be regarded as a characteristic of unsustainability as it encourages a passive approach to politics instead of “politics that support long-term oriented sustainability” (ibid). Again, Sennett’s critique of new capitalism’s socio-cultural effects on individual lives of people (i.e. the fragmentation of their lives, lack of sustained relationships, or characters) proves to be a helpful analysis for pointing to unsustainability tendencies hindering political actions. The consequences Sennett illustrates, the uselessness or waste of human talents or abilities, which are described above, are also an unsustainable tendency. As Kirchberg notes, “[t]he parallels between a wasteful and unsustainable lifestyle and the abuse and exploitation of many […] humans on a global scale are obvious” (ibid: 94). Not only on this global, macro level, but also on the most individual one, the unsustainable characteristics of current times can be identified with the help of Sennett. His description of character’s corrosion is also a tendency that can be understood as mainly unsustainable. “Character as such as sustainable trait, is now lost or […] corroded in an economy that is solely focused on (unsustainable) short-term yields and short-term satisfaction” (ibid: 95).

Kirchberg, as mentioned above, also looks at Bauman’s critique in this context, as it further helps make these links. As well as Sennett, Bauman critically looks at the wasteful use of human resources within the current economic structure, as a large majority of people are only partly included in labor processes (ibid: 94). This, similarly to Sennett, leads to uncertainty for individuals as well as society as a whole. What

Bauman terms “liquid modernity” (Bauman 2000) is characterized by vagueness and insecurity regarding jobs, relationships, status and a sense of worth. This leads to an “individualized, privatized version of modernity, with the burden of pattern-weaving and the responsibilities for failure falling primarily on the individual’s shoulders” (ibid: 7f.). Kirchberg acknowledges the connections Bauman makes between the individual (micro level) and wider social developments (macro level) when “describing the phenomenon of fear as an individual driving force but also as the socio-economic entity ‘capital of fear’ that is then changed by ‘dealers of fear’ into economic, social or political capital” (Kirchberg 2008: 98f.). Within this system, it is up to the individual to find answers to problems produced on the wider social level (ibid: 99). The unsustainable tendencies that can be identified by Bauman’s critical accounts can be found in the problems already mentioned above. The ‘liquidness’ of current times and the effects this has on security (or lack thereof) also represses long-term planning or thinking, instead leading to the domination of fear among wide areas of society. The constant worry or concern is in itself a highly unsustainable tendency, as it doesn’t allow for considerations regarding future generations and participatory inclusion of large numbers of people. Also the tendency to leave the solution of wider social problems up to individuals, who only have insufficient possibilities to deal with these, is unsustainable due to the inability to actually solve global problems (i.e. environmental problems or social inequality issues) (Kirchberg 2008: 99).

Ritzer’s term of McDonaldization[lviii] (Ritzer 2007: 11) offers a further account that can help point to unsustainable tendencies. With this term Ritzer describes the increased implementation of a set of certain

principles to ever more parts of the world (ibid). Not the homogenization tendencies of the world-wide spread of fast-food restaurants is of direct concern to Ritzer, but the rather underlying principles of the McDonald's franchise that "dominate more and more sectors of American society and an increasing number of other societies throughout the world" (ibid: 24). In the context of globalization, in the form of, as Ritzer writes, grobalization (ibid: 20) (meaning the forceful implementation of largely homogenic structures, resulting in the overpowering of local structures and limitation of abilities to react) McDonaldization is a core concept (ibid: 21). Ritzer bases this concept and its principles on Weber's description of the increasing movement towards "formally rational systems" (ibid: 24). The main principles behind the concept of McDonaldization are "efficiency, predictability, calculability, control, […] the substitution of nonhuman for human technology, as well as […] irrationalities of rationality" (ibid). Without explaining these 'ground rules' in detail, it is important to see that they have become "a wide-ranging and far-reaching process of global change" (ibid: 25). Further, McDonaldization effects and areas 'free' of these can also be looked at from a "something-nothing continuum" (ibid: 40). The continuum, although presented as consisting of two ends of a dichotomy, does not imply that 'nothing' or 'something' exists independently of one another (ibid). But conceptually, it is helpful for identifying developments towards either one of the ends. The McDonaldization developments described above can be placed at, or at least close to the 'nothing' end of the continuum. For Ritzer, 'nothing' is defined as "a social form that is generally centrally conceived, controlled, and comparatively devoid of distinctive substantive content" (Ritzer 2007: 36). In contrast at the other end of the continuum lies 'something' defined as "a social form

that is generally indigenously conceived, controlled, and comparatively rich in distinctive substantive content" (ibid: 38). The something-nothing continuum is helpful for identifying developments in different dimensions. According to Ritzer these are: "complexity" ('something' is regarded as unique, whereas 'nothing' is generic), "temporal" (specific to times, or non-specific, time-free), "human" (humanized or dehumanized), "magical" (enchanted or disenchanted), or "spatial" (local geographic ties or lack of these) (ibid: 42). Further, based on these dimensions, broad types of phenomena can be identified, which Ritzer terms "nullities [these being, JH] *non*places, *non*things, *non*people, and *non*services" (italics by ibid: 59). For example, *non*places lack distinctiveness and meaning, which makes individual and communal identity building difficult (ibid: 60f.). Ritzer applies the five dimensions described above to *non*places and by this identifying further their interchangeable aspects, the absence of local ties and time, their tendency to be dehumanized, and lack of enchantment (ibid: 65ff.). These ideas are based on Castells, who describes the shift from "spaces of places" to "spaces of flows" (Castells 1989: 348). Ritzer uses his distinction between "places" and *non*places to better understand what can be regarded as 'something' (or great good places) or as "nothing" (McDonaldized settings) (Ritzer 2007: 62).

Ritzer's accounts described here offer a further useful way of identifying unsustainable tendencies in current socio-cultural developments. He identifies major processes of grobalization, which include "capitalization, McDonaldization, and Americanization" (ibid: 20), also helping link the findings of Sennett and Baumann to his own. Therefore, Ritzer's accounts can also be regarded as a useful critique of current times and its unsustainable characteristics. Because McDonaldization

can be seen as a process of grobalization it forces its principles on places, institutions, or people. It impacts “many aspects of the social world (church, education, etc.)” (ibid: 26), overpowering local needs or actions and minimizing “differences within and between areas of the world” (ibid: 21). This of course does not support the search for sustainability, which, as mentioned above, needs to be open and participatory. If McDonaldization principles are applied in increasing numbers of areas, the results are growing similarities and simplifications. This limits the resilience abilities of a system, making its boundaries inflexible and closed off towards its environment. This, of course, is what Brocchi refers to as the self-referential non-evolutionary development model (Brocchi 2008: 47), which shows main characteristics of unsustainability. Therefore, Ritzer’s concept of McDonaldization helps point to unsustainable tendencies within current developments. Further, Ritzer’s something-nothing continuum, as well as the nullities are useful tools for identifying aspects that tend to be either sustainable (located at the ‘something’ end of the continuum, or defined as ‘places’, ‘things’, etc.) or unsustainable (at the ‘nothing’ end, or *non*places, *non*things). Further, unsustainable aspects of Ritzer’s findings can also be identified with help of Boltanski and Chiapello’s accounts.

As already mentioned in part 1.3, Boltanski and Chiapello’s book *The New Spirit of Capitalism* extensively examines the formation of the projective city, which for them is a reaction to the artistic critique of the 1960s, which demanded more authenticity, creativity and freedom within work processes[lix]. These demands were met, somewhat, by capitalism’s ability to absorb the critique to a certain degree if it fits to the internal logic of accumulation of capital, changing capitalism’s spirit

(Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: 27ff.). On the other hand, the social critique's charges of poverty and inequalities were not absorbed by capitalism (ibid: 36ff.), in turn the social critique was weakened due to the changes in capitalism's structure[lx]. But, as Boltanski and Chiapello find, there is still a need for critique of capitalism, due to still existent inequalities. Within the network world these forms of exploitation have changed, as described, mobility is a new form of exclusion. As the authors write:

> "the specific contribution of little people to enrichment in a connexionist world, and the source of their exploitation by great men, consists precisely in that which constitutes their weakness in this framework – that is to say, their immobility." (ibid: 361)

This can be related to what Sennett and Bauman describe regarding flexibility demands and the resulting fear and insecurity. The increasing necessity of being flexible within the current form of capitalism also requires constant mobility and as Boltanski and Chiapello describe "integrating oneself into *networks*" (italics by ibid: 110). But as the authors also note, "it must be understood that *some people's immobility is necessary for other people's mobility*" (italics by ibid: 362). This of course points to unsustainable characteristics within the projective city. The exclusion of large numbers of people within the network-based world (and beyond) is highly problematic within the context of sustainability and, because the projective city also increasingly affects other areas its (unsustainable) characteristics influence wider aspects of society. Boltanski and Chiapello regard the concept of the projective city as a "new general representation of the economic world" (Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: 103): a "new spirit of capitalism" (ibid: 151). The wider effects this has are described by the authors: "[c]hanges in the spirit of

capitalism thus proceed in tandem with profound alterations in the living and working conditions, and the expectations […] of workers" (ibid: 18). Related to what Sennett and Bauman describe this results in precarious circumstances in which "the security supplied by academic qualifications has diminished, retirement pensions are under threat, and careers are no longer guaranteed" (ibid: 18). Sennett's corrosion of character or Bauman's liquid modern time corresponds with this account. Therefore, Boltanski and Chiapello also offer a useful analysis of current forms of exploitation and the fragmentation and insecurity of modern times, all of which can be regarded as unsustainable characteristics.

Further, the projective city itself, its inner justification mechanisms, can be seen as mainly unsustainable. Although the network structure is not in itself an unsustainable characteristic (it can actually be helpful for enabling action or participation[lxi]), its form in the project cité is[lxii]. Within the projective city the network is constrained, as networking is only 'useful' if it help the specific project (ibid: 107). As mentioned, within this 'useful' networking, mobility or the ability to network is a form of exploitation, as the activity of constantly connecting with people and finding new projects gives status to people (ibid: 109). It becomes a necessity to remain mobile (be it geographically or mentally, moving between people or ideas) meaning that the value of the rooted "little people" (ibid: 361) is dependant on the links they have to the mobile actors. An "absence of links, [an, JH] inability to create them, [a, JH] complete jettisoning […] constitute[s] the condition of the 'excluded'" (ibid: 365). This demonstrates how the network structure, when it becomes a fundamental demand within the projective city, functions as a mechanism of exploitation creating inequalities. This is not compatible

with the concept of sustainability. The underlying principles of the projective city can be regarded as highly problematic and as an unsustainable characteristic of current developments. If, as Boltanski and Chiapello state, the projective city is forming into the current new spirit of capitalism, legitimating it, then the findings described here regarding exploitation and inequalities are important in order to point to unsustainable tendencies.

The exploitation through mobility of the project cité also points to the problematic of mainly thinking in terms of projects. As Sennett describes, long-term biographies tend to disappear within capitalism's new culture, which is also supported by Boltanski and Chiapello's analysis of the projective city. This shows how thinking in terms of projects hinders the development of sustainable, long-living aspects. Also the concept of sustainability itself requires long-term thinking and solving problems over many generations. If sustainability is looked at in the projective city it turns into merely a project, a short-term 'problem', which has to be solved. Participatory, inclusive structures that are of importance for the search process of sustainability cannot develop in a justification system that exploits people according to their mobility or immobility. The demand for ever mobile individuals also constraints developments towards local community or family ties. As Boltanski and Chiapello write: "today local roots, loyalty and stability paradoxically constitute factors of *job insecurity*" (italics by Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: 364), which hinders settling down, getting married, having children, etc. (ibid). The underlying structure of the project itself is that it has a beginning and an end, one follows after the other, and new groups of people are reconstructed according to the specific needs of each project (ibid: 105). As mentioned above, this goes against the very

understanding of sustainability as a long-term oriented process without an end. Sustainability does not have an ‘end state’, its principles must remain open and have the possibility to adapt to changing circumstance, i.e. as an evolutionary development model or a system of autoecopoiesis. Because there is no ultimate form of sustainability (or unsustainability), it cannot be regarded as a project that can be finalized and concluded. The important notions for cultures of sustainability of thinking systemically, holistic (without reductionism of course), and finding connections between different elements (the ‘inter-’) are all aspects, which cannot be fulfilled within projective thinking and approaches. Therefore, the very concept of the project does not correspond with the idea of sustainability (or cultures of sustainability).

Generally, all illustrated sociological accounts describe social and cultural effects of new structures of capitalism. Either in more essayistic form (*The Corrosion of Character*), or as broad empirical studies (*The New Spirit of Capitalism*), all are useful accounts for the context of sustainability. Their findings help identify unsustainable tendencies within the current culture of capitalism or the form of society. As described in the foregoing, unsustainability can be regarded as a characteristic part of current developments, especially brought about by new structures within capitalism. These new structures function as underlying forces that among other things also shape the conceptualization of the city. Therefore, these sociological accounts help to widen the already illustrated critique of the Creative City concept by pointing to unsustainable tendencies, which can also be found in the urban model. In the following the critique is re-examined in relation to the Creative City concept, in order to identify its unsustainable

characteristics.

2.3 The Critique of the Creative Cities Concept from a Sustainability Perspective

The sociological critique of the Creative City concept described in part 1.3 can, as well as the critiques described above, be put into the context of sustainability. Similarly to Kirchberg, the aim here is to understand the arguments put forth by the sociological critique within a sustainability context and therefore see the correlation between the two. Further, the critical findings regarding the current dominant culture described above can be related to the Creative City model. This then enables a critique of the prevailing Creative City paradigm from a sustainability context. The aim of this is to show that the Creative City model consists of many unsustainable tendencies, making it an insufficient model for meeting the challenges of sustainability, at least in its current form. Just as Kirchberg regards “unsustainability as another characteristic of modernity” (Kirchberg 2008: 93), unsustainability can also be regarded as a characteristic of the Creative City concept. As described in part 1.1, this dominant urban planning model is based on underlying understandings within society, which also enable its implementation. If these aspects are part of a culture mainly characterized by unsustainability, then the Creative City concept is ‘doomed’ to incorporate these. The effects described by the (sociological) critique of the Creative City model and that of the characteristics of current socio-cultural developments, points to unsustainability tendencies on urban and social levels. As Fainstein and Campbell write:

“[e]nvironmental pollution, traffic congestion, racial and ethnic discrimination, and financial crises afflict many urban cores. At the same time, gentrified neighborhoods adjacent to low-income areas display the emblems of affluence, and suburban enclaves of privilege, increasingly set off by walls and gates, sharpen the distinction between the haves and the have-nots.” (Fainstein/ Campbell 2002: 1)

This quote shows specific problems affecting the city, which can all be related to the context of sustainability. Gentrification and social exclusion (within a spiky world) as consequences described by the sociological critique are also illustrated by Fainstein and Campbell, which points to the spatial dimensions of the characteristics of unsustainability. In order to better see the relationship between the urban context (i.e. Creative City model) and unsustainability as a main characteristic of the dominant cultural or economic structure, the themes of the critique described in part 1.3 are reexamined under sustainability considerations. Also, the accounts of part 2.2, including the already described way they point to unsustainable characteristics, are related to the Creative City model. The combination of the sociological critique of part 1.3 with sustainability aspects and the connection of critique of current developments of part 2.2 with the Creative City concept will allow for a comprehensive approach to identifying the unsustainable aspects of the dominant urban model.

Sociological Critique Reexamined by Sustainability

As described above, in the following the aim is to incorporate the sociological critique illustrated in part 1.3 in the sustainability context, in order to identify the mainly unsustainable characteristics of the Creative City concept. A new perspective is given here, as the cultures of sustainability function as key notions to reexamine the critique and therefore regard sustainability aspects. Also the unsustainable

characteristics identified in part 2.2 are regarded as an underlying part of the Creative City model. This helps widen the field of urban sustainability issues from mainly 'technological' approaches of what can be termed sustainable urban development to wider approaches and considerations, including cultural perspectives.

This appears important as many models or analysis of the current urban context tend to either lack sustainability considerations or its cultural aspects. The problematic regarding the cultural deficit within sustainable development concepts described above can be related to 'sustainable urban development' because this approach also is mainly focused on finding tools, planning solutions, or efficiency gains to fight urban sustainability issues[lxiii]. It can be examined, that regarding main concepts, such as Creative Cities or sustainable urban development approaches seem to lack specific considerations that would be important to open the debate on sustainability issues (to include cultural perspectives) in the urban context. For example, in readers such as *The Global Cities Reader* (Brenner/ Keil 2006) or *The Urban Sociology Reader* (Lin/ Mele 2005), which give general overviews of main debates on the city, sustainability issues tend to be absent. Further, in books examining sustainability in the urban context (i.e. *The Sustainable Urban Development Reader* Wheeler/ Beatley 2004) cultural perspectives on sustainability are often missing. Even if some issues, such as urban exclusion and social resistance (Lin/ Mele 2005: 317ff.), can be incorporated into sustainability considerations under the working definition given above, the explicit examination of these in a sustainability context remains missing.

As described above, culture is a main topic in the urban context, especially regarding urban (economic) development, which also shows

in the dominance of the Creative City model. Cities and sustainability are mainly brought together on the level of design and technologies to create more sustainable cities, regarding issues such as transport, infrastructure, waste, etc. The use of the term sustainable urban development also points to the problems of the use of the term sustainable development also mentioned above. From this it becomes clear that culture, cities, and sustainability are rarely brought together in one Agenda (Choe 2007:133). And as Duxbury and Gillette examine, there has only recently been a 'local turn' regarding the application of sustainability issues on the city and community level and a growing consideration of "culture as a significant component of sustainability" (Duxbury/ Gillette 2007: 2). Considering the problems that arise from the cultural deficit and the focus of 'sustainable urban development' on technological solutions, it seems essential to include cultural aspects of sustainability into the context of the city. Again, the main aim here is not to list what makes a city sustainable or not (as a sustainable urban development approach would perhaps do). The goal here is to use the critical aspects of the Creative City concept as discussed in part 1.3 as a way to point to unsustainable, problematic tendencies of the dominant concept, also by including the findings of unsustainable characteristics within current developments. Because sustainable development is criticized in the foregoing due to its main focus on merely planning and technological solutions, without considering a wide shift in values, norms, and the 'global mindset', the goal here is show the importance of moving away from this notion to a more inclusive, open debate. As illustrated above and described by Robinson: "sustainable development is at best self-contradictory, and at worst a false veneer […] on a deeply unsustainable path" (Robinson 2004: 382). Sustainable urban

development solutions can be regarded as part of this path and therefore often fail to recognize the need for underlying fundamental cultural changes in values and norms within the urban context.

The following reexamination of the sociological critique of Creative Cities attempts to open the cultural perspectives on sustainability to the understanding of a dominant urban concept. For this, the findings and accounts of the selected critiques of current times presented in part 2.2 are related to the Creative City model. Of course there are many overlapping issues and consequences, and the goal is not to merely list them. Instead it is important to regard their interconnectedness and that they influence each other. As already be seen in part 1.3, the instrumentalization of culture for economic reasons for example affects gentrification processes, which in turn is part of the aim to attract the Creative Class.

2.3.1 The Critique of Current Times and the Creative City Concept

As the accounts of Sennett, Bauman, Ritzer, and Boltanski and Chiapello show many of the current dominant developments show characteristics of unsustainability. In order to link the findings of unsustainable tendencies within wider social or cultural developments to the smaller scale of (creative) cities it is helpful to look at how the current developments show within the Creative City concept. Therefore, the aim here is to point to aspects of the critiques described above that can also be found within the Creative City model, either in its theoretical framework or its implementation. This then helps identify unsustainable tendencies within the urban planning model.

As, for example, Sennett describes even though long-term relationships

or sustainable traits are becoming less and less important, place does still have significance (Sennett 1998: 137). Within the new economy, flexibility demands affect individuals regarding their location and the clustering force of talent lifts some places to “superstar cities” as described by Florida (Florida 2008: 127). Therefore, place matters according to its position within the global competition. Constant moving results in communities, which aren’t empty of social interactions, but in which “no one in them becomes a long-term witness to another person’s life” (Sennett 1998: 21). A ‘rootedness’ within a certain neighborhood or community is missing in lives of individuals whose character is increasingly ‘corroded’ due to market demands. Kirchberg also refers to Sennett and states that: “urban neighborhoods are fewer places of identity-building or identity-maintaining (sustainable) communities” (Kirchberg 2008: 95). The wider effects and results Sennett describes (such as flexibility demands, fragmentation of lives and institutions, feelings of uselessness) have a spatial dimension here. If people constantly are uprooted, if large institutions are fragmented, this reflects in the structure or form of local communities. As Sennett describes: “[m]igration is the icon of the global age, moving on rather than settling in [, this, JH] has not produced more community” (Sennett 2006: 2). What Sennett describes here can be related to the concept of Creative Cities as a main demand of this model is to attract the globally operating Creative Class. The economic importance of attracting and maintaining this group is a central concern of the concept and Florida’s finding of the “geographic sorting of people by economic potential” (Florida 2008: 93) stresses the need for the ‘right’ kind of residents in cities. Further, Florida argues that the clustering force of talent demands for “the most talented and ambitious people […] to live in the

means metros in order to realize their full economic potential" (Florida 2008: 96). These demands for cities to plan according to a certain 'creative' class and for their right to be in these urban areas corresponds with the flexibility demands of capitalism's new culture described by Sennett. This shows that the Creative City model is a result of the new developments Sennett so critically illustrates[lxiv]. The fragmentation of institutions and people's lives also relates to the Creative City model. Cities need to position themselves within the global competition for talent and accordingly shape themselves to attract creatives. If long-term relationships as well as biographies are increasingly destructed by flexibility, people's connectedness to places and local communities diminishes. If a city's institutions are too bureaucratic and inflexible regarding their responses to 'create' urban planning initiatives, this functions as a barrier in the way of building a creative environment (Landry 2008: 41). For example the "Creative City strategy-making process" (ibid: 168) is presented as tool for among other things assessing potential but also (bureaucratic) obstacles in the way of 'creative planning'. Further, the mobile Creative Class is constantly going from place to place, where their life-style demands are met increasing their ability to compete within the flexible economy. Instead the 'rooted' are excluded from these changes. If a city's urban planning concept is mainly formed around the flexible, fragmented, mobile economic structure it tends to incorporate the unsustainable characteristics of this new capitalism. As illustrated above, the unsustainable tendencies of the new economy can be identified within Sennett's accounts, they can also be found within the Creative City model, shaping its planning concept. Therefore, a connection between the unsustainable aspects of Sennett's descriptions and

unsustainability and, further, of this with the Creative City concept proves helpful.

Bauman's findings can also be related to the dominant urban planning model, in similar ways as Sennett's critique can. The insecurity and fragmentation described by the two resulting in fear and wasteful use of human resources also shows within the Creative City model. In his description of the spiky world in which cities compete among each other, Florida also mentions the "huge valleys" (Florida 2008: 32), which are mainly 'left behind' regarding economic activity and contact to the global economy. In the small number of places with the ability to generate innovations there is a high level of connectedness among the people, but also globally with other superstar cities. As Florida writes, the "peak-to-peak connectivity is accelerated by the highly mobile creative class" (Florida 2008: 32). Therefore, in places without this connectivity, residents tend to be unable to participate in the global economy. This means, the special local of these individuals is likely to determine the wasteful use of their resources. Bauman criticizes this as it results in a missing sense of self-worth. Also fear and uncertainty dominate within this situation. The constant need for members of the Creative Class to remain mobile and flexible can also generate fear. Deciding to not continue on the path of constant mobility bears the possibility of loosing the connectivity and thus fear becomes an individual driving force also for creatives. In an economy that increasingly demands this mobility, including 'staying connected', individuals have to find solutions to these circumstances for themselves. Even though these developments can be regarded as wider changes, dealing with them is left up to the individual. As Florida's ideas show, the decision of where to live (and how to fully benefit from

the new global economic demands) is up to each individual. The ideas of self-responsibility and self-accountability are part of the reason why Florida stresses the importance to “place yourself” (ibid: 287). This can be connected to Bauman’s critique and what is described above. The competition of talent, the demands for flexibility result in a constant state of insecurity among individuals, which in turn can be seen as a wider social problem as it affects increasing numbers of people. But, in Florida’s concept only individuals themselves can approach these problems, for example by choosing the ‘right’ place to live. Also the Creative City concept itself functions as a toolkit for cities to plan individually. It is left up to each individual city to find solutions (i.e. Creative City planning strategies) for the wider socio-cultural developments, by securing their economic well-being through attracting the Creative Class. The unsustainable tendencies that Bauman’s account help identify can be related to the Creative City concept in this way.

Further, according to Bauman, fear, as described above, is converted into economic or political capital. This wide social effect also shows within the smaller scale of the Creative City model. Fear is the driver behind a certain kind of safety, which shows for example in safe investments in the economy or on the political level as the “war on terrorism” (Kirchberg 2008: 99)[lxv]. It can also be identified within the urban context as for example in ‘gated communities’, which appear to keep out threats by building closed off neighborhoods. In the Creative City concept, planning strategies often result in gentrification processes, which potentially make a neighborhood safer. In ‘fully’ gentrified areas, preferred residents’ possible fears of aspects such as higher crimes rates, or ‘gritty’, ‘rough’ neighborhoods disappear through

the exchange of residents. Of course, often in areas that are only starting to experience gentrification processes, the ‘dangers’ of these neighborhoods are often reasons for a certain ‘feel’ of the area or for lower rents, in turn attracting ‘initiators‘ of the process (i.e. artists). But, in its further developed state, gentrification is a process that ‘gets rid’ of the dangers and in turn the fears of incoming residents, which otherwise would stay out. For investors or city planners that use Creative City strategies, this is a way to deal with safer environments, in which the perceived threats of the former structure of the neighborhoods have been pushed out by gentrification. As described above, the constant state of fear, resulting from instable lives, jobs, or prospects leads to a general state of strain and uncertainty, which is an unsustainable tendency within current developments. Fear cannot be a useful ground for working towards the process of sustainability. This is also reflected in the Creative City concept as it can be seen as a response to dealing with these new economic circumstances. If the economy demands flexibility and mobility, then cities have to adapt. Therefore, the urban planning concept benefits from, or is grounded on the developments Bauman and Sennett criticize. The unsustainable characteristics identified in Bauman’s account also show within the Creative City concept.

Ritzer’s findings and their identification of unsustainable tendencies also offer a useful account for pointing to unsustainable characteristics within the Creative City model. His concept of McDonaldization can also be applied to the urban context[lxvi]. For Ritzer “McDonaldized settings” (Ritzer 2007: 62) tend to be *non*places, characterized by a “placelessness” (ibid: 61). In these the elements of McDonaldization are strong, and as described above, resulting in generic interchangeable

settings (ibid: 65). The implementation of these principles and the increasing spread of these kinds of *non*places are indicators that point to unsustainable tendencies. Instead more (sustainable) distinctive 'places' "retain local creativity, spatial and temporal elements of the local, characteristics of the people who live in that locale, and magical elements linked to the local (Ritzer 2007: 58). Within the Creative City concept certain aspects of McDonaldization elements defined by Ritzer can be found. Efficiency, predictability, calculability, and control are all aspects that can be related to the urban planning concept. Even if the Creative City concept stresses the importance of diverse and open communities (Florida 2002: 283) and of encouraging street life or a vibrant music scene, in its implementation it follows certain principles. As Landry states, urban assets and resources are "countable, quantifiable and calculable" (Landry 2008: xxxiii). More than Florida, Landry's methods and tools seem to reflect aspects of McDonaldization. His "Creative City Strategy Method" (ibid: 166) or his "Creative Tools and Techniques" (Landry 2008: 176) are all concepts that have certain underlying elements of McDonaldization. The idea that assessing and applying a "conceptual toolkit" (ibid: 163) to build more creative cities and neighborhoods shows characteristics of McDonaldized approaches, which focus on efficiently assessing and planning towards a certain goal. Therefore, the unsustainable aspects of McDonaldization and its spatial effect of decreasing geographical ties through creating generic *non*places can also be related to the Creative City concept. If, the toolkit methods of building creative urban areas are applied the result can often be a "McDonaldized setting" (Ritzer 2007: 62). Also, gentrification, as it is often brought into direct relation to Creative City strategies, functions as a homogenizing force. By pushing

out certain residents, it results in neighborhoods with less meaning or identity-building abilities, i.e. *non*places. Former residents often perceive what appears to be an open, divers, friendly neighborhood, as actually lacking meaning or distinctiveness[lxvii]. This lack of local ties is an aspect Ritzer locates at the end of the spatial dimension of the "something-nothing continuum" (ibid: 42). This points to the unsustainable aspects that can be identified by help of Ritzer's analysis and then related to the Creative City concept. The gentrified areas within the Creative City have the tendency to become increasingly interchangeable, not only on the city level, but also regarding the global level (i.e. these neighborhoods have characteristics that can be found in more and more urban areas of the world). The danger of anonymous *non*places increasingly dominating the urban environment through the implication of Creative City strategies and its effects, such as gentrification, can be regarded as an unsustainable tendency. It hinders community building, inclusive, participatory settings[lxviii], that encourage exchanges between all residents of a neighborhood or city, which can be regarded as important for the process of sustainability.

To Ritzer's account of McDonaldization, its elements that show in the planning approaches of the Creative City concept, and the common results of *non*places, Boltanski and Chiapello's findings can be added. The formation of the projective city including its forms of exploitation through mobility (or lack thereof) can be related to unsustainable tendencies, as described above. Regarding the urban context, the view of urban circumstance and settings in terms of 'projects' corresponds with the Creative City approach. Overall, the network structure Boltanski and Chiapello describe can be related to the Creative City model and accordingly to the Creative Class concept. For Florida, the

Creative Class operates on a global scale and relies on “weak ties” (Florida 2008: 121), a term he uses from Granovetter for networking. The Creative Class, as described in part 1.3, is highly mobile, even if certain (creative) locations prevail, resulting in the competition of cities and the implementation of Creative City strategies. Networking, as mentioned above, is not in itself an unsustainable characteristic. But, its increased result of the clustering of talent and a spiky world can be regarded as problematic. As Boltanski and Chiapello extensively examine, within the projective city, mobility or the ability to network becomes a reason for exploitation, i.e. unsustainable tendency. The characteristics of the ‘creative’ workplace can be related to the projective city as it “integrates elements of the flexible, open, interactive” (Florida 2002: 117) tying it more to an “artist’s studio” (ibid) than to a more traditional form of an office or a factory. This of course relates to what Boltanski and Chiapello refer to when describing the development of the projective city. The artistic critique, with its demands for authenticity and autonomy, has been integrated into capitalism’s form of justification, as described above. Therefore Florida’s illustration of the ‘ideal’, “no-collar workplace” (ibid: 116) reflects what Boltanski and Chiapello describe. The creative ethos is made up of both lifestyle and work ethics and according to Florida incorporating “bohemian ethic” and the “Protestant work ethic” (Florida 2002: 192)[lxix]. What Boltanski and Chiapello see as the projective city, as a new form of justification within capitalism, is for Florida a “big morph” (ibid: 190), a combination of the different ethics (ibid: 211). Of course, Florida’s account isn’t capable of offering such a detailed analysis as Boltanski and Chiapello, but he does mention similar developments as they do; ones towards flexibility, project-oriented work. Boltanski and Chiapello focus much

more on the negative (unsustainable) effects this has than Florida, as for him it is not problematic that projects have become the dominant form of work and “[f]lexible schedules are heavily concentrated in Creative Class occupations” (ibid: 121). Florida doesn’t regard the increasing project work as raising issues of inequality, exclusion, or unsustainability, rather, following his conclusion of a big morph he states the “power of place” (ibid: 215), putting these new working conditions into a spatial context. The demands of the artistic critique, absorbed in capitalism’s justification structure, result in urban ideal forms of living and working, for example in what Zukin terms “loft living” (Zukin 1989). It can be stated that Florida’s descriptions can be seen as similar to the management literature of the 1990s Boltanski and Chiapello examine and in which they find emphasis on networked corporations, reduction of hierarchies, flexibility, innovation, and the ability to work in projects or teams (Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: 70ff.). This in turn reflects in the urban context. The Creative Ethos of a new class is shaping the “norms and pace for much of society” (Florida 2002: 211), including the city, and the development of it according to the Creative City concept. The emphasis on attracting the Creative Class within the concept also results in approaching this challenge with similar means. Thinking in terms of projects does not only show in the work or lifestyle elements of the Creative Class, it also reflects in the planning initiatives for cities. The Creative City concept tends to see the city (or the creation of its atmosphere) as a project, which has to be fulfilled in order to compete with others. Applying certain tools or concepts will result in accomplishing the ‘project: Creative City’. As stated above, thinking in terms of projects can be regarded as mainly unsustainable. Landry does stress the importance of cities addressing

sustainability in order to remain “stable and competitive” (Landry 2008: xix), but it proves difficult to find general long-term orientation within the Creative City concept. Within Florida’s spiky world cities have to be as mobile and flexible in their concepts as the people they are trying to attract. This approach, regarding the development of street life, “high quality amenities and experiences” (Florida 2002: 218) regards these aspects as projects, which have to be developed. Through assessment and tools these challenges are approached with the goal of meeting demands of certain residents and forming a Creative City. As illustrated above, Boltanski and Chiapello’s projective city shows unsustainable characteristics, which can also be helpful for pointing to unsustainability within the Creative City model. In this urban concept, certain aspects of the projective city shape the way the city is conceptualized and approached; as a project, or as an accumulation of numerous projects. Simply put, the project begins with a city, which isn’t capable of attracting the ‘right’ kind of residents (or wants to keep these) and ends with the state of a highly creative “superstar city”. This tends to hinder decisions oriented towards long-term (sustainable) solutions, which would benefit larger numbers of a city’s population.

The reexamination of the aspects identified by Sennett, Bauman, Ritzer, Boltanski and Chiapello and how they point to unsustainable characteristics proves to be useful to better understand how the Creative City concept shows tendencies that hinder sustainability. The notions of flexibility, a new form of capitalism, insecurity, and exclusion are all criticized by the sociological analysis of the authors above. These aspects, as described here, can also be found within the Creative City model, which in turn point to unsustainable tendencies within this urban concept. This link made between the characteristics of

unsustainability described in part 2.2 and the Creative City concept will be extended by the sociological critique of the Creative City model described in part 1.3 and how it relates to sustainability.

2.3.2 The Sociological Critique in the Context of Sustainability

In the following a brief reconsideration of the sociological critique's findings, presented in part 1.3, regarding sustainability issues is attempted. For this each of the general themes of the critique is looked at regarding unsustainable tendencies and adding the cultures of sustainability aspects described above. The more abstract, theoretical level of cultures of sustainability can be applied to a more specific, spatial dimension regarding the effects of the Creative City concept. As the critique already focuses on problems regarding the urban context and Creative City strategies, the aim here is to connect these with aspects regarding unsustainability. This enables the identified issues to be seen under wider aspects, which connects them among each other under the broader concept of sustainability.

Gentrification

As described in part 1.3, gentrification proves to be a main critique of the Creative City model. Coming from several contexts the critique of gentrification is often brought into direct connection with Creative City strategies, even if this link is not truly acknowledged by the main proponents of the dominant urban model. In its results, gentrification tends to lead to a more and more homogeneous environment. Neighborhoods that have experienced gentrification processes or are undergoing them presently, often have lost, or lose members of their communities due to higher rents, etc. Exclusion and displacement of people lead to 'closed' neighborhoods, which experience a loss in

social diversity, due to the increase of only one ‘type’ of resident. Eventually also artists and creatives, who can be regarded as pioneers of the gentrification processes are pushed out. In forms such as “condofication” (for example in Toronto) or massive city-wide gentrification (such as in San Francisco) the process can be regarded as largely unsustainable. Certain elements of the cultures of sustainability seem to lack in gentrified areas. The neighborhoods affected lose residents and therefore potentially a certain level of cultural or social diversity. On a more abstract level, these areas tend to become more autopoietic and self-referential, less able to react to challenges in an appropriate and resourceful way. This reflects, on a spatial level, the increasing lack of cultures of sustainability elements within more and more homogenous gentrified areas and ultimately in the Creative City model, as its strategies tend to encourage gentrification processes.

In neighborhoods with increasingly homogenous populations the possibility of inter-cultural communication is also gradually lost, simply because there are only certain people to communicate with. This can also be seen as a tendency that hinders these more and more ‘closed’ neighborhoods or communities in engaging in open and participatory processes towards sustainability. Normative aspects regarding sustainability such as open ethics based on diversity and reflexivity are more difficult in gentrified areas populated only by certain residents. If the population of an area is increasingly homogenous, it becomes more difficult for different people to feel connected to one another, to feel an ethical (or moral) responsibility for the problems of other. Simply put, if problems such as poverty are ‘pushed out’ and are no longer visible to people, their reflection of (and maybe actions towards preventing) these

circumstances will tend to decrease. This is unsustainable and doesn't support open ethics, which give a certain normative framework based on diversity.

Of course, this is not to say that 'pre-gentrified' neighborhoods have ideal conditions for their residents or are able to work better towards sustainability. Many problems, such as poverty or also environmental pollution, can prevail here, which is why it is important to improve these areas. But, gentrification processes often initiated or supported by Creative City strategies have the tendency to 'push out' these issues to other areas instead of finding adequate and sustainable solutions. Therefore, with help of several key words of cultures of sustainability it becomes clear that gentrification processes are a mainly unsustainable tendency often found within Creative City strategies.

Growth Ideology

The growth ideology and with it the global competition among cities, which is an inherent part of the Creative City concept, is widely criticized and can be seen as a mainly unsustainable tendency. The growth narrative, as described by the different accounts of the sociological critique, is based on neoliberal ideas, which are implemented in order to secure the economic well-being of cities and eventually its residents. Florida and Landry's concepts are based on the understanding of place as a key economic aspect. Therefore, cities have to create a quality of place, in order to attract certain residents, who in turn secure economic growth. This logic is based on the idea, that responses to global market forces (which are based on neoliberalism and free market ideas) are necessary in order to secure a position within the global economy, generate wealth, and ultimately,

ensure better societies. Capra also comments on the believed “trickle down” effect of “global economic expansion”, yet for him, the “striving for continuing, undifferentiated economic growth […] is clearly unsustainable” (Capra 2002: 146) due to the limited resources available. This approach of growth and its believed benefits for all is highly problematic as the sociological critique described in part 1.3 already shows. The growth ideology reflects in the spatial dimension as cities use strategies that attempt to encourage economic growth. Therefore, as mentioned, for example, only economically ‘useful’ initiatives are supported and areas ‘in decline’ are regarded as economically problematic and in need of improvement or not seen as important for the city. As described above, some areas do have problems regarding their economic development or social issues, but to approach these problems solely considering economic aspects doesn’t fully account for them. Not only economic factors are essential for the well-being of a city and its residents, but also social and cultural aspects.

The importance of economic growth and the competition of cities, which plays a crucial role in the Creative City concept, is a highly unsustainable tendency. It leads to a spiky world, which bears many inequalities among regions and people[lxx]. As Boudreau, Keil, and Young state: “we see the collusion of economic growth through neoliberalizing processes of capital accumulation with violations to human security and sustainability, especially in urban communities” (Boudreau/ Keil/ Young 2009: 31). With this focus on one (economic) logic, the Creative City strategies are not able to consider aspects of the cultures of sustainability. Diversity and reflexivity regarding alternative ways of creating well-being for cities and citizens is not

incorporated into this autopoietic system, which then tends to be “non-evolutionary” and simplifying according to only economic aspects. Resilience as the ability to adapt, or the flexible boundaries of an evolutionary development model are difficult to account for in an approach dominated by mainly a singular economic logic. Brocchi also refers to the problems of today’s dominant culture and lists, among others, growth and competition (Brocchi 2008: 93).

This also shows in the underlying understanding of growth as a ‘natural’ force or outcome within a city, which accounts for growth understood as value-free. Instead, the sociological critique, such as that of Molotch, focuses on the growth machine and the influence of a dominant group on the development of a city. Under these circumstances it seems difficult for the narrow economic understanding of growth and well-being in a city to incorporate open ethics, which rely on divers and reflexive approaches. Therefore, the abstract level of the normative quality of these open ethics cannot be reflected in a more concrete spatial level. This illustrates how the solely economic approach of the Creative City concept to city development and well-being is highly problematic and unsustainable. The self-responsibility, which is placed on cities (or individuals) regarding their future development and possibilities, becomes a reason for their implementation of Creative City strategies and for ‘taking matters into their own hands’. This can also be criticized as unsustainable, as it results in a competition, which is mainly focused on each city benefiting, with disregard for other cities (or residents seen as economically marginal). This also reflects what Bauman addresses as the problem of individuals (or here cities) solving socially created problems, who lack the appropriate tools for this. Also, it shows aspects of the projective city described by Boltanski and

Chiapello. As described above, the Creative City approach can be seen to view urban planning challenges in terms of projects, which have to be ‘solved’ according to economic growth and competition circumstances. This, of course, limits the understanding of these issues and the approaches to them. They remain insufficient and unsustainable, as they lack the ability to grasp wider challenges (beyond economic ones), which in turn makes them a characteristic of unsustainability.

Instrumentalization of culture

The sociological critique of the use of culture (or artists) within the Creative City model also points to the problem of an approach made up of a singular economic logic. As this shows, the need for growth corresponds with the emphasis that is placed on enhancing culture (be it ‘high’ or popular), attracting creatives and artists, or encouraging lively street-life. The ‘cultivation’ of these cultural amenities is an essential part of the Creative City concept. The critique of urban sociology, such as Zukin’s term of destination culture (culture evaluated according to economic outcome), the accounts of the Urban Political Economy, or Reckwitz’ description of culturally-oriented governmentality are all helpful to find aspects that tend to led to ‘closed’ cities, in which communication among heterogeneous groups is hindered. Culture’s (or artists’) role of enhancing or aestheticizing urban spaces, which is a key part of the planning concept behind the Creative City model is mainly regarded in terms of economic gain and understood as a tool for cities to distinguish themselves within the global competition between them. The imperative of becoming or remaining a ‘creative’ city results in division on spatial level (exclusion or displacement) and a spiky world. These are of course all aspects that the sociological critique helps

identify and that can be regarded as mainly unsustainable.

The ‘closed’ city of culturally aestheticized areas is one that tends to hinder intercultural encounters, and therefore can be seen within a mainly non-evolutionary model of development. Resiliance lacks within this largely autopoietic system of the city, due to its main guidelines along the economically efficient use of culture. It therefore also lacks the ability to incorporate other forms of cultures (or creativity) and with it abilities to adapt or find different approaches to challenges. Characteristics of the cultures of sustainability are not reflected in the city, which based cultural considerations on economic gains. Yet, culture as described above proves to be an essential part of the process of sustainability. The cultural deficit identified within much of the sustainable development approaches shows the importance of including cultural perspectives within the search for sustainability. This implies an understanding of culture, which isn’t dominated by a singular definition or regarded only in a specific way, i.e. economic view of culture. Therefore, it could be stated that, if, as in the Creative City concept, culture is placed within a mainly economic logic, then this approach also exhibits a kind of cultural deficit. Cultural considerations only in terms of economic gains are insufficient for the cultural perspectives needed for sustainability. This would tend to hinder the possibilities of culture (also in the urban context) of becoming a fully incorporated part of the process of sustainability and helping find approaches that go beyond the rational, disciplinary “literacy of Modernity” (Kagan 2009, see footnote 45).

Concept of the Creative Class

The Creative Class concept as a determining principle of the Creative

City model is also insufficient for the process of sustainability. As the sociological critique shows, it excludes and increases inequalities both within and outside of the city. In Florida's concept only a certain number of people, those of the super-creative core produce truly creative forms and innovations. Consequently, this leaves out large numbers of the population, not only economically, but also socially. Florida's demand for the Creative Class to take on their responsibilities and become the leaders of society also disregards the abilities and possibilities of 'ordinary', 'non-creative' people to take action towards challenges, also regarding sustainability. As described above Wilson and Keil, for example, criticize the class bias behind Florida's conceptualization. It doesn't account for poverty or inequalities, which leads Wilson and Keil to stress the importance of the 'real creative class', made up of the urban poor and deprived, their contribution to the economy and abilities to be creative. Florida's Creative Class is therefore only mildly able to foster intercultural communication, due to its disregard of certain groups. It can therefore also be situated more in a non-evolutionary development model. Resilience abilities cannot emerge if only one group or class is seen as the 'natural' leader of society, as these tend to be self-referential. Even though Florida stresses the importance of "social cohesion" (Florida 2002: 323) he remains cryptic in his description of how to accomplish this. The limited view of the importance of one class doesn't support diversity or reflexivity, which can be seen as important for forming cultures of sustainability.

Internally, the Creative Class concept incorporates governmentality structures and supports self-precarization tendencies among its members. As the sociological critique shows, the Creative Class model therefore becomes situated in the hegemonic, value or principle-

building center of society. Regarding this, Lorey explains that creatives increasingly function as role models. Also their willingness to put up with precarious working or life situations makes them easily exploitable (Lorey 2006). The mainly project-based working conditions support this. These circumstances can of course be related to the accounts of Sennett (regarding flexibility) and also Boltanski and Chiapello (regarding the projective city), which also points to unsustainable tendencies within the conceptualization of the Creative Class. This further corresponds with the 'do-it-yourself' tone of the Creative Class model, which pushes all responsibilities onto the individual (also comparable to the self-responsibility of each city for becoming a creative one). This tends to support individual attempts to solve problems and meet challenges, which doesn't necessarily support long-term, holistic approaches important for sustainability.

Concluding Remarks

The goal here was to open the debate on sustainability to include cultural considerations, moving away from a cultural deficit and applying this to the urban context. The hypothesis formulated above, stating that the Creative City model can be characterized as largely unsustainable is supported by the findings described above. The urban concept, as a characteristic within Western cultural developments can be related to the unsustainable tendencies the dominant characteristics illustrated in the foregoing. The cultures of sustainability further help point to critical aspects of the Creative City concept. Placing the sociological critique of the Creative City model in a sustainability context and through this identifying the urban concept's unsustainable characteristics is a first step in attempting to modify the concept. Also the critique of the unsustainability of current developments in Western

societies helps to point to underlying problems behind the Creative City concept. Both approaches of the critiques are important to understand basic developments that, among other aspects, affect the Creative City concept and to understand more precisely the effects this urban concept has on the city itself. Together, these approaches can enable a more comprehensive recognition of unsustainable tendencies in the Creative City strategies and their effects. This can then allow for an urban model, which is also based on aspects such as creativity and culture (like the Creative City concept), but is more open to sustainability issues. A rethinking of the Creative City model according to sustainability 'guide lines' (i.e. cultures of sustainability) offers the possibility of using an already dominant (and popular) concept, but with incorporated cultural considerations regarding sustainability. As Capra writes:

> "[a] sustainable human community interacts with other living systems – human and nonhuman – in ways that enable those systems to live and develop according to their nature." (Capra 2002: 215)

This shows that a change of certain main aspects of the Creative City model can be attempted in order to incorporate the "entire web of relationships" (ibid) into an urban concept, which can meet the challenges of sustainability. As a first step towards this, in the following certain aspects of the Creative City concept are looked at again. Based on the critique described above, the attempt is made to modify these in order to better work towards the process of sustainability. New roles for artists or creatives are elucidated, as well as different ways of understanding creativity, which will better support processes of sustainability. The aim of this is not to provide rigid guidelines or a set 'toolkit' for 'creative' cities to become more sustainable. In order to work

towards a search process for sustainability this needs to remain an open and inclusive practice. Therefore, the following aspects should function as ideas, or impulses, pointing to potential ways in which the Creative City model can be modified.

3. Art, Culture, and Sustainable Creative Cities

As the critique of the Creative City concept and that of the wider social and cultural development shows, several unsustainable tendencies can be found in the dominant urban model. Identifying these characteristics is enabled by understanding the aspects of the critique in the context of sustainability or unsustainability. Based on this, the aim here is to rethink certain aspects of this dominant concept and potentially modify them, attempting to introduce aspects of Sustainable Creative Cities. Because Creative City strategies are so prevalently used and discussed among planners, city officials, urban theorists, making it a dominant conceptualization of the city today, it is worth attempting to rethink and reconceptualize this concept. This would potentially offer a way in which cultural considerations of sustainability can ‘enter’ the urban context, going beyond solely technological approaches (such as, public transport or infrastructure). The cultural deficit identified in part 2.1.1 often reflecting in sustainable urban development approaches should be broadened or complemented by reconceptualizing a model, which is mainly based on cultural or creativity considerations. The Creative City strategies are of course highly problematic, as the critique shows, yet they do help draw attention to the importance of arts, culture, creativity for urban policy. And even if the Creative City model places these aspects in a mainly economic context, it does help raise attention for them. Whether the economic emphasis the Creative City concept places on cultural aspects can potentially (if altered) support cultural considerations for sustainability or if it only hinders alternative approaches to culture leaves much room for discussion. Still, the aim

here would be to change the solely economic approach and modify the Creative City model by using its most important aspects (art/artists, creatives, cultural considerations). If main aspects of the model, such as creativity or the role of artists in the urban context are reexamined, going beyond their understanding in an economic context, the Creative City model can potentially be modified to better include sustainability considerations and their cultural perspectives. The foregoing description of the critique and its relation to unsustainable tendencies helps point to aspects that should be reevaluated.

The goal here is not to approach this by listing different strict toolkits or a strategy method, as for instance Landry does for “Getting Creativity Planning Started” (Landry 2008: 163). Open and inclusive approaches are important for the search process of sustainability, also within the rethinking of the Creative City concept. Still, certain concepts or ideas regarding the reexamination of key aspects of the dominant urban model are given here, attempting to point to ways in which the model can be modified to include sustainability aspects. A rethinking of the role of the artist (or creatives), of creativity (beyond its individualistic understanding in the Creative City concept), possible policy changes and what underlying characteristics cities regarding sustainability issues should have, are all ways to attempt theoretical changes of the dominant urban model. These changes challenge main Creative City strategies and are an effort to work towards conceptualizing key aspects of what will be termed Sustainable Creative Cities. With the critique and the unsustainable tendencies in mind, a first step would be to look at the relationship of sustainability and the arts and role of the artists (or more generally creatives) and their potential role as “key change agents in sustainability” (Dieleman 2008: 108). Based on this, a

different understanding of creativity as offered by illustrating important aspects of it. This offers a framework for describing Sustainable Creative Cities and the shifts in policies and guidelines they might imply.

3.1 The Role of Artists and Creatives

3.1.1 Sustainability as a New Frontier for Arts (and Cultures)

Resulting from the accounts given in part 2.1, it becomes clear that sustainability requires fundamental changes in ways of thinking, acting, and regarding values and norms. As Bachmann states, the key to enabling an emotional understanding of the challenges of sustainability, adding an important dimension to technological solutions, is an art-approach (Bachmann 2008: 8)[lxxi]. He also notes that the “importance of arts for a more sustainable thinking” (ibid.) is often not understood well by artists themselves. The potential of the arts for sustainability is not highly accounted for inside and outside of the art field, due also to missing frameworks for building connections between art (or culture) and sustainability (Kurt/ Wagner 2002: 247). Therefore, it is important to point to the potential, which lies in the approach of sustainability from an artistic side and what artists can bring to the search process of sustainability. The cultural perspectives on sustainability not only help to identify unsustainable tendencies within dominant cultural models, but also point to the potential of the arts for the holistic search for sustainability. Artists or also creatives can address issues differently and find new approaches. Kagan states “Sustainability as a New Frontier for the Arts and Cultures” (Kagan 2008a: 14), which implies both the cultural perspectives important for sustainability and also the

potential of the arts to help work towards the search process of sustainability[lxxii].

Many definitions of ‘the arts’ or ‘art’ can be given, which also depends on the specific discipline it is examined by. As noted in part 1.2, both are usually considered as part of ‘high’ culture or refer to the field or world of art, including the actors, who are active in it. Generally, art can be seen as a universal feature of human societies, or as a rare feature, limited to Western culture (Turner 1996). The definition preferred here understands art “as a social product through different venues of production, distribution and consumption” (Kirchberg 2008: 101). This definition appears useful for the context here, because, as Kirchberg notes, it stresses the relationships between cultural and social contexts, and the arts[lxxiii]. Understanding art in this more sociological sense also can help not only regard it as something created in the sphere of ‘high’ culture, but also as something that possibly addresses people outside of this ‘limited’ space, as a social product. Therefore, this definition also appears more suited for inclusive and open processes required for sustainability. It can also help understand “the significance of unsustainability and sustainability for the arts” (ibid: 101). The social context in which art should be understood also shows that “artists can be product and source for social structures and processes [and therefore, JH] the arts and artists can be product and source for sustainable structures and processes” (ibid: 101f.). Art understood as a social product is influenced by and can influence tendencies in society and its cultural values. This of course goes against the understanding of an ‘arts for art’s sake’[lxxiv], the complete autonomy of art, which disregards any involvement or responsibility outside the art world. As Kagan notes, an entirely autonomous art world would result in

autopoiesis and lead to irresponsible, apolitical, even alienated artists with no connection to the 'outside world' (Kagan 2008b: 174). The understanding of the artists themselves within the autonomous art world is supported by the myth of "quintessential free agents […] rather than service, caring attitudes and participation" (Gablik 1991: 116), which in turn hinders their involvement in, for example, sustainability issues. Artist should though, as Kirchberg notes, still be able to act independently and in non-coherent ways, which would help keep approaches and search processes open ended (Kirchberg 2008: 102). Also, Bourdieu, for example passionately defends the art field against the (neoliberal) market logic, which according to him, is increasingly invading the art field and endangering its autonomy (Bourdieu 2003: 66ff.). This economization can be regarded as a tendency (even an unsustainable one), which can have negative effects the arts, such as the logic of profit applied to the specific logic of the art field[lxxv], which tends to disregard solely economic accounts[lxxvi]. But, the defense of art's autonomy against (neoliberal) market logic or increasing economization does not exclude its social context, even if Bourdieu defends the idea of an autonomous 'l'art pour l'art' world, which denies any economic involvement. Yet, an art attempting to question the dominance of profit and market forces and aware of its interconnectedness with other areas, would in fact work towards sustainability, as it would criticize the authority of a singular logic, which is a basis for highly unsustainable characteristics (as described in part 2.2).

In this context, Kagan names indicators for sustainability in the arts and competencies, which are useful for understanding arts' important role in the search process for sustainability (Kagan 2008a: 16ff.). Based on

Barth et al. he lists different competencies, such as foresighted thinking, interdisciplinary work, transcultural understanding, participatory skills, abilities in planning and implementation, and the capacity for empathy, compassion and solidarity, self-motivation, and reflection on models, be it on individual or cultural ones (ibid). Learning these competencies should support processes of sustainability, which, "necessitates societal modernization and may only be realised via the active participation of competent citizens; therefore the concept of *Gestaltungskompetenz* [requires these, JH] key competencies" (Barth et al. 2007: 418). This brief account of the very wide and multifaceted abilities and understandings that would support sustainability shows what aspects are important also regarding the possibilities of artists working towards sustainability. Artists (or creatives) could, not necessarily teach (in a top down way), but help develop or learn these competencies. Before this specific role of the artist is examined regarding its potential to work towards sustainability processes, it is helpful to name certain indicators of sustainability within art, as Kagan does, and to mention a specific understanding of aesthetics (of sustainability) that are relevant for this context.

Indicators pointing to sustainability within the arts concern the contents, processes, and values that artists address to or which are underlying understandings. Kagan notes that these indicators refer more to the qualitative level of the art works or interventions, rather than giving quantitative points of measurement to assess art by (Kagan 2008a: 17). This is an important aspect, as it doesn't imply a rigid framework for listing which art deals with sustainability or which doesn't. Also, as the working definition of sustainability given in part 2.1.1 goes beyond merely environmental considerations only regarding the human sphere

and implies cultural perspectives, a strict quantitative measurement of these indicators would not be sufficient. To these indicators Kagan adds what he terms the “aesthetics of the patterns that connect” (Kagan 2010: 7) based on Bateson, who sees aesthetics as the sensibility to “*the pattern which connects*” (italics by Bateson 2002: 8). This adds to the cultures of sustainability, supporting them, and to the open ethics described in part 2.1.2 as it widens aesthetics, which have been constrained within art history (Kagan 2010: 7).[lxxvii] This is what Margolin also refers to when stating that a different form of aesthetics is not about regarding art in terms of existing categories or frameworks, which would only apply a set of previous aesthetic conventions on them (Margolin 2005: 26). Miles further describes the problematic aspects behind using dominant understandings of aesthetics (as coined by Kant) for the context of sustainability. He illustrates that Kant’s

> “idea of disinterested judgments, in which beauty is independent of the circumstances of its making, leads to the white-cube spaces of modern art museums and the reductionist art history of Clement Greenberg (in which art states only what art alone can state – form). But an art which campaigns for […] sustainability, is as socially produced as the circumstances it refuses.” (Miles 2004: 202)

Miles points to the importance of defining art as a product of its social relations regarding the conventions (in Becker’s sense) that shape it, as a key part of understanding arts’ potential for sustainability. The issues that art addressing sustainability aspects points to or criticizes, also require a critical reflection of its own structures[lxxviii]. Kirchberg’s definition given above also implies the consideration of internal structures and social relations that art a part of the arts. Both Margolin and Miles point to the importance of a new kind of thinking (about art), also regarding aesthetics, which goes beyond dominant ones. For this,

describing certain aspects of what can shape or define aesthetics of sustainability (Kagan 2010: 8) is helpful, also complementing the indictors of sustainability in art, which will be attempted in the following. These are looked at from a very broad perspective, without going into detailed accounts, keeping the indicators open as ideas or impulses for regarding sustainability in the arts. Further, the focus here is not on examples of concrete art projects or initiatives, as there is most likely no ideal form "that would demonstrate all the quintessential elements of some 'ultimate' aesthetics of sustainability" (ibid: 10). Rather the conceptual, theoretical framework for rethinking key notions is of main concern.

Bateson's notion of "the sensibility to the pattern which connects" can be seen as a fundamental part of aesthetics of sustainability, to which Kagan adds topics, processes, and values that connect (Kagan 2010: 7ff.). For Bateson aesthetics is being responsive and understanding "[w]hat pattern connects the crab to the lobster and the orchid to the primrose and all the four of them to me" (Bateson 2002: 7)[lxxix]. This very concrete question Bateson asks helps understand his 'ecological' approach to questions of aesthetics, which automatically creates relations among all living things, in turn helping to define aesthetics in a more inclusive way, towards sustainability. As mentioned above by Miles, notions of aesthetics, which regard beauty as an independent category and can result in completely 'uninvolved' art (disregarding any connections to its environment), are not very useful understandings for art concerned with sustainability. Instead, Bateson shows that aesthetics can be defined by the connections or by recognizing patterns. He gives propositions that help see patterns, first-order connections (parts of any member of a species can be compared to

other part of the same individual), second-order ones (in which he compares the crab to the lobster and for example, humans with horses), and third-order connections (which compares the comparison between crabs and lobsters to that of humans and horses). These examples, admittedly appearing somewhat random, are a way for Bateson to derive an understanding that the "*pattern which connects is a metapattern*" (italics by Bateson 2002: 10) on which aesthetics of sustainability can be based. This offers a different understanding of aesthetics, one beyond Kant's notion, which is criticized by Miles and which is also questioned by Bateson's account. Recognizing a pattern connecting all living things with each other questions and counters a 'disinterested' aesthetic attitude, resulting in aesthetics that are by definition 'involved'. Bateson's approach of drawing attention to the "pattern which connects" and the need for a sensibility of this is an open and inclusive one. It offers the possibility to everyone asking the questions of 'what connects me to other creatures' to understand the overall patterns. Therefore, his derivation of the existence of a "pattern which connects" all living things by way of a metapattern is useful for aesthetics of sustainability, which should support a more inclusive, holistic, and collaborative form of aesthetics and artistic practice.

Further, the indicators of sustainability in the arts mentioned above (topics or contents, processes, values) can be linked to Bateson's "pattern which connects". The sensibility to the connected patterns that Bateson calls for is a "cornerstone of aesthetics of sustainability" (Kagan 2010: 8), which are an integral part of the more general cultures of sustainability and their key notions, described in part 2.1.2. Regarding this, Kagan refers to "three interconnected levels" (ibid) in which the arts can "express and foster such a sensibility" (ibid). These

three broad levels come from the described indicators. The “topics that connect” (ibid) ideally address “issues of social justice, cultural diversity and ecological issues” and explore “the inter-relatedness of cultural, social, economic, political and ecological processes” (ibid: 17). Further, links (between local and global, long- and short-term, intercultural) are an important aspect of the “topics that connect” (ibid: 8). On a theoretical level, transdisciplinarity is an important basis (ibid), which also corresponds with its role for the cultures of sustainability as described in part 2.1.2. As Kagan states: the “sensibility to the topics that connect expresses itself most fully in transdisciplinarity” (ibid). This supports the ability to link different aspects and issues with each other and wider developments, fully acknowledging the different levels and aspects of topics. Further, Johnston examines the arts and transdisciplinarity stating that:

> “the arts not only provide an exemplar of what transdisciplinarity actually is, but demonstrate the scope and potential of how transdisciplinarity thinking contributes to both knowledge production and current […] debates.” (Johnston 2008: 223)

For her, the arts are an arena, which go beyond their own discipline, dealing with wider concerns about “what it is to *be*” (italics by ibid: 231). This shows what possible abilities the arts have, such as creating links between different topics or concerns and offering new, experimental, and open ways in which these links can be understood.

Another important aspect of aesthetics of sustainability are the “processes that connect” (Kagan 2010: 9), which address ways in which artistic (and cultural) practices are conducted and achieved. This regards “search processes, research processes, learning processes, working processes” (ibid) that create different forms of involvement and

understanding. Kagan describes a number of these aspects, which will be schematically listed in the following. The processes that connect are particularly important for aesthetics of sustainability if they:

- involve all-out reflexivity[lxxx] regarding a wide range from individual routines to institutions and policies
- develop different kinds of reflexivity skills, beyond limited forms of (scientific) rationality and established rules and routines (criticized in part 2.1.2)
- understand and work with interrelations, having the ability to act in inter- and transdisciplinary teams and projects, for the arts this means a shift to a more collaborative and interactive work process, moving away from solely individualistic and autonomous forms
- are intercultural and interconventional (list based on ibid).

This also shows how these processes that connect go together with the cultures of sustainability and how they can help work towards a new way of thinking, necessary for the search process of sustainability. This again helps to see the potential of broader cultural perspectives or specifically artistic approaches and their importance for supporting a "*global mindset change*" (italics by ibid: 1).

The third level Kagan refers to is that of the "values that connect" (ibid: 9), which offer the normative considerations that are important in the context of sustainability. Open ethics within the cultures of sustainability reflect in these values, through which the aesthetics of sustainability can "inquire into the meanings and implications of justices, in a pluralistic way" (ibid). This also implies openness towards numerous

interpretations and understandings and “participatory polyarchic polities” (ibid), in which non-hierarchical working relationships allow for experimentation, as well as openness towards cultural diversity and adaption to the non-human environment (Kagan 2008a: 18f.). Kurt and Wagner also refer to the importance of the social dimension of aesthetics of sustainability including equity, community, and participation (Kurt/ Wagner 2002: 255). Further, critical accounts of the art world itself[lxxxi] and of dominant Western developments (such as growth, progress, the individual) are an essential part of the values that connect. This again coincides with the critical inquiry of dominant ways of thinking, which as described above, tend to have unsustainable characteristics. Adding to this Gablik argues for a “reenchantment of art”, or

> “healing [which, JH] requires bringing forth those capacities of understanding, trust, respect and help that have been suppressed – choosing to feel compassion instead of detachment.” (Gablik 1991: 178)

This coincides with the values that connect and works towards integrating the arts into their surroundings in a concerned and involved way.

Further reflecting on aesthetics of sustainability, it should be noted that the *Toblacher Thesen,* or *Tutzinger Manifest* resulting from the Conference *Ästhetik der Nachhaltigkeit* (Aesthetics of Sustainability) [lxxxii] stresses the category of beauty as a elementary basis for creating a sustainable future. Individuals who possess the capacity of turning ideas, visions, and experiences into symbols, rituals, and practices (i.e. artists), which can then be socially distributed are understood as key agents for the implementation of sustainability within

this manifesto. The *Tutzinger Manifest* offers a further category of the aesthetics of sustainability, that of 'beauty'. But, Kurt and Wagner see the diffuse understanding of aesthetics (often understood as merely 'beauty') as hindering the opening of sustainability towards aesthetic considerations or practices (Kurt/ Wagner 2002: 255). This is why the *Tutzinger Manifest* and its relative unclear use of aesthetics (i.e. beauty) should be expanded with the more detailed but still open "aesthetics of the patterns that connect" to go beyond its singular consideration of aesthetics. For Kurt, art is a "**form of knowledge**" (italics by Kurt 2004: 239f.), as it is involved in shaping values and is a medium for exploring possibilities regarding wide changes. For her this is where the full potential of art for the process of sustainability lies. As a form of knowledge it is able to create a cognitive understanding, yet one that goes beyond rationality, to include aesthetic competencies, which essentially makes it a different kind of knowledge that scientific or technological (but at the same time its equal). As Kagan and Sasaki describe:

> "'the artistic mode of knowing' develops intuitive processes of learning, exploring, being open to surprise, and being 'iterative,' i.e. not deciding/thinking and then implementing in a linear sequence, but learning-while doing and thinking-while doing in circular reflexive sequences and in parallel, overlapping, telescoping processes." (Kagan/ Sasaki 2010)

This of course, as described in the foregoing, is fundamental for overcoming the cultural deficit and fragmentation and separation of thought, which is a core aesthetic challenge (Kurt/ Wagner 2002: 253). If the aesthetics of sustainability show a new sensitivity regarding art's effective (creative) knowledge (more than scientific, technological) then its potential to offer alternate ways of thinking or action can be fully

accounted for (Kurt 2004: 239). For Kurt aesthetics of sustainability are characterized by expressive aspects, which include emotional considerations, but also go beyond these in their search for sustainable futures. She writes:

> "[a]n aesthetic of sustainability has to search for **forms of the less**, but also for **forms of nature-friendly opulence**. It has to create cultural diversity, permitting new abundance and sustained enjoyment. It has to sensitize people to a new time and culture and forms of spatial planning that are respectful of the environment. It should not restore the aesthetic concepts of earlier periods, nor should it fall back on merely emotional qualities: it has grant a constructive productive force to "sensual awareness" […] and aesthetic competence, and use this force for designing life-sustaining futures." (italics by ibid: 238)

Kurt's definition seems to include the topics and values that connect and also refers to the importance of 'sensual awareness' or 'sensibility to the pattern that connects'. It also stresses the importance of art as a medium of recognizing and exploring different approaches. This appears as an important aspect because the involvement of art (based on aesthetics of sustainability) as a conscious actor also can hinder the use of art as a form to 'sell' or simply 'aestheticize' (i.e. make things beautiful or appeasing) sustainability and its concerns. Kurt and Wagner note that this difficulty can occur, also due to the lack of experience (or the arts themselves or sustainability experts) with the role of arts for addressing sustainability issues (Kurt/ Wagner 2002: 257). Therefore, art understood as a form of knowledge with a specific aesthetic of sustainability is conceptually important in order to "embrace the […] categories of object, participation, and action without privileging the conventional formal characteristics of object" (Margolin 2005: 28). It also enables a more open view of art dealing with sustainability issues, going beyond only environmental subjects, to

include wide cultural perspectives regarding the search process of sustainability and connection to people's life-worlds. The foregoing accounts on the aesthetics of sustainability offer a basis for reflecting on arts potential role and what it can bring to processes towards sustainability. Aesthetics of sustainability break with foregoing notions of 'disinterested' aesthetics by their considerations of values, topics, and processes 'that connect', giving a normative context, which is especially important for sustainability. By this, it becomes possible to recognize problems with previous notions of aesthetics, which corresponds with the possibility to see difficulties resulting from the lack of cultural considerations and the dominance of disjunctive thinking, simplification, and reductionism by stressing the importance of cultures of sustainability. Therefore, aesthetics of sustainability are an integral part of the cultures of sustainability and help to extend the cultural perspectives to include the arts. In this context, it is also important to look at the role of the artist (or creative) as a potential change agent towards sustainability. This is also essential regarding the Creative City concept (and its stress on artists and creatives for the urban context), its critique and the possible ways in which it can be modified to form Sustainable Creative Cities.

3.1.2 Rethinking Artists' and Creatives Role

As the aesthetics of sustainability show, the notion of arts as a separate sphere, not really related to social issues, isn't a sufficient basis or framework for arts working in the context of sustainability. Certain limits to the autonomy of the arts, or artists are implied here, regarding for example values that connect, which stresses the importance of a normative approach. Artists (or also creatives) cannot be considered as

entirely irresponsible or autonomous actors, just as art has to be oriented towards "**aesthetics of participation**" (italics by Kurt 2004: 239) moving away from a closed off 'sanctuary'. This does not imply, as mentioned above, that art entirely loses its ability to independently approach issues and find new and different ways of dealing with them. As Kurt writes: "[a]rtists introduce their aesthetic design knowledge into **overall social transformation processes** in the form of art that was and remains independent" (italics by ibid). This points to the potential of artists (or creatives) in becoming key agents of change as well as the importance of these actors to remain somewhat autonomous, while taking aesthetics of sustainability into account. As mentioned above, reflexivity can be regarded as an important competence within the context of sustainability, which ca be fostered by aesthetics of sustainability. Artists, characterized as less autonomous or individualistic can function as agents who can bring about this reflexivity and through it wider changes. This shift away from the 'myth of the autonomous artist' enables a more inclusive and collective relationship between artists and 'regular' people within communities. As Gablik writes:

> "I believe that there is a new, evolving relationship between personal creativity and social responsibility, as old modernist patterns of alienation and confrontation give way to new ones of mutualism and the development of an active and practical dialogue with the environment." (Gablik 1991: 6)

For her, the emergence of socially interactive aspects for the arts helps reframe the art (or artists' roles) to include "new connective, participatory aesthetics" and move beyond the "modernist opposition between the aesthetic and the social" (ibid: 9). This of course is a main aspect of aesthetics of sustainability and helpful for arts and

sustainability. In the following a brief examination of ways in which artists can function as agents of change is attempted, not focusing of examples, but on the types of reflexivity that are essential and the potential of artists to support these.

Taking into account the different approaches through aesthetics of sustainability and the implied shift towards a different understanding of the 'involved' artist, it can be helpful to look closer at the potential of artists (or creatives) to become "key change agents in sustainability" (Dieleman 2008: 108). This, of course, should not imply that there is a completely new 'type' of artists or that this shift hasn't occurred yet. As previous art movements or artists show (such as the examples mentioned in footnote 71) social or ecological issues have been regarded in the art world[lxxxiii]. Yet, the still prevailing understanding of the artists as an autonomous 'genius' constantly drawing on his or her individual creativity[lxxxiv] is problematic within the context of sustainability, also noting that this definition of the artist (or creative) is also the predominant one in the Creative City and Creative Class concept. This, again, does not imply that art is instrumentalized in order to aestheticize sustainability processes. This 'use' of art (or culture) cannot be a goal, also because this is a problematic aspects of the Creative City strategies as the critique described in part 1.3 and 2.3 shows. Yet, a 'new' understanding of the role of the artist and their potential to work towards change in the sense of sustainability is key. Arts concerned with sustainability approaches such as "action-research" (Kagan 2009) can enable "multi-leveled reflexivity" (ibid), bringing together arts and sciences. The "building of a broader reflexivity and rationality" (ibid) points to possible ways of engagement of artists, creatives with other social actors to potentially change ways

of thinking and acting. Networks between artists, creatives and 'other' people are essential, supported by reflexivity and rationality, which goes beyond the dominant (scientific) understandings.

Dieleman describes this new reflexivity as a key notion in his examination of "more-than-rational" (Dieleman 2008: 117) reflexive capital. He regards sustainability as "structuration" (ibid: 108), which, based on Giddens, implies that it is "the result of many actions and practices of many actors, as structuration is the outcome of praxis over time and space" (ibid). This view regards the constant changing of society resulting from "actions, effects of the actions, feedback loops and reflection on the effects and the feedback loops" (Dieleman 2008: 108). Dieleman's account not only appears generally helpful for sustainability processes and cultures of sustainability as it includes numerous actors from all different areas of society and their potential to change structures and ultimately values, behaviors. It also places emphasis on reflexivity and regards it as an "important mechanism that can lead towards change [because, JH] we do not simply reproduce the social frames but be interpret them and while we interpret them and reflect on them we change them, often little by little" (ibid: 113). This shows why the concept of structuration is an especially useful one for sustainability and the key role reflexivity play in this process, as it examines both wider developments and individual, micro levels. Dieleman also notes, based on Lash and Urry, that due to the ever-growing importance of information and communication in contemporary life, access to these means is essential. Yet this access is limited, in turn limiting the ability of groups to participate in society (ibid: 116). Urry and Lash describe that within these social structures, autonomous, free, and reflexive individuals are 'produced', who are able to form their

lives and characters (ibid). This of course corresponds with the characteristics of the Creative Class described by Florida, which are highly problematic as the critique of parts 1.3 and 2.3 shows. These “reflexivity winners” (ibid) have large advantages over the “reflexive losers” (ibid), those who are ‘cut off’ from communication channels and are therefore incapable of shaping their own lives. This, of course, corresponds with what for example Sennett or Boltanski and Chiapello describe (illustrated in parts 1.3 and 2.3), but focuses on the importance of reflexivity in the lives of people.

Dieleman connects these findings with the conclusion that reflexive abilities or “capital” (in Bourdieu’s sense) of people and societies need to be improved in order to “facilitate a change process towards sustainability” (ibid: 117), not directly solving all problems, but at least making contributions. For this Dieleman sees artists or designers as essential as they offer different kinds of approaches, ones that go beyond the disciplinary, analytical, rational considerations of science and politics, to include more-than-rational knowledge, competencies, and abilities (ibid). The question of what kind of knowledge or reflexivity is needed for the process of sustainability results in the notion that challenging current notions, thinking ‘outside the box’, and going beyond boundaries (ibid) is essential. This corresponds with the already mentioned notions of cultures of sustainability (described in part 2.1.2), which offer key ideas on fundamentally different approaches and knowledge forms (i.e. transdisciplinarity, literacy of complexity, open ethics). Adding to this Dieleman examines the possible roles of artists (and designers) in acting as change agents and triggering new reflexivity. For this he names four different forms of reflexivity, its reflexive capital, and the roles of artists as change agents (Dieleman

2008: 119). Without giving a detailed description of these types and the examples Dieleman presents, these forms are briefly examined due to their importance for pointing to artists as key change agents.

Based again on Lash, Dieleman describes “aesthetic reflexivity” (ibid: 120) (based on the use of symbols, signs, etc. and the ability to reflect and express through identity, symbolic meanings, etc.) and “hermeneutic reflexivity” (ibid: 127) (based on comparing one meaning or activity to other ones, reflecting on situations instead of merely acting). The reflexive capital of aesthetic reflexivity is the ability to create “symbolic meaning and [to add, JH] identity, design and looks to sustainability” (ibid: 126). This describes a key ability of artists, but one, of which the problematic of sustainability becoming merely a lifestyle or fashion trend has to be considered. “Hermeneutic reflexivity” is important for sustainability as it enables people to reflect on everyday routines and conventions, with the help of tools and motivation, which artists can provide by “asking questions, creating experiments, […] creating space for associations, empowerment” (ibid: 131). Further, Dieleman names three ways in which “hermeneutic reflexivity” can be encouraged, these being “detachment, empowerment and enchantment” (ibid: 127f.). To these types of reflexivity Dieleman adds “ontological reflexivity” (ibid: 131) and “professional reflexivity” (ibid: 136). “Ontological reflexivity” transcends boundaries and goes beyond limits of scientific and technological approaches, combining different ways of observing, perceiving, thinking (ibid: 132). For this form of reflexivity artists appear as the appropriate change agents “par excellence” (ibid: 136). The “artful doing” (ibid: 137), based on Schön, of professionals regarding their approaches to their work is an essential part of professional reflexivity. This is relevant for sustainability because

through it people “arrive at contextual knowledge and at culturally specific products and technologies” linking emotional experiences with more abstract ones (ibid: 138).

All these briefly illustrated forms of reflexivity can serve as indicators for pointing to the importance and relevance of artists as change agents working towards sustainability. They also further help recognize how essential a more-than-rational knowledge or reflexivity is for sustainability and what artists can do to encourage it. This is therefore a useful addition to the aesthetics of sustainability and more generally shows the importance of cultural or artistic perspectives for sustainability. Only through more-than-rational thinking and acting can the complexity and wide spread changes of sustainability processes be recognized and approached.

The accounts of Dieleman, which are helpful in legitimating artists as possible change agents for sustainability and defining their contributions through the more-than-rational approaches they can offer, can be complemented with Kagan’s concept of “double entrepreneurship in conventions” (Kagan 2008b: 147). This notion pays attention to the “points of interactions between artists and the rest of society and to the boarder zones where art worlds meet outside worlds” (ibid: 148), which makes it especially useful for the context of sustainability. Kagan looks for the potential of artists to function as entrepreneurs and taking on the role of “*double entrepreneurship*” (italics by ibid: 148). This is a useful account as it can anticipate the way in which artists can work towards becoming entrepreneurs, changing set conventions, and essentially working towards sustainability. This account of the role of artists is also an effective as it adds a more sociological approach to the aesthetics of sustainability,

which defines more clearly the potential role artists can take on and how this functions. In his book *Art Worlds*, Becker examines the activities and the production networks necessary for art works to be created. Not a single artist is responsible for the creation of art, but a whole set of "people whose activities are necessary to the production of the characteristic works [defined, JH] as art" (Becker 2008: 34). In order to understand how these art worlds organize themselves, Becker introduces the notion of "conventions [which, JH] cover all decisions that must be made with respect to the works produced" (ibid: 29). These conventions affect artists, the audience, and all members working within the art worlds (such as publishers)[lxxxv]. They are not set, they can change over time, following new ideas or techniques of artists or art groups, who "usually develop their own innovative materials over a period of time, creating a body of convention peculiar to their own work" (ibid: 64). This potential to change conventions is also examined by Kagan who states that the "evolution of conventions depends on the intentional strategies of those individuals who decide to play *on* the rules rather then in the rules" (italics by Kagan 2008b: 154). This is also reflects in Gidden's concept of structuration described by Dieleman, in which individuals don't simply reproduce the social frames, or conventions, but interpret them, changing them little by little. This shows the dynamic behind conventions, which have to appear coherent in order for individuals to convict to it, making it strong (ibid: 158). Regarding this, Kagan looks closer at how conventions 'convince' people, finding that "[e]ntrepreneurship in conventions is the successful construction of a common purposeful convention" (Kagan 2008b: 160), using the information system of conventions (its discourse, conversation, and material characteristics) (ibid: 153). Artists can

function as “entrepreneurs in conventions” (ibid: 162), bringing conviction to new conventions and questioning existing ones, which in turn makes them potential agents of change (also towards sustainability). Kagan gives a thorough account on what steps artists should take and what qualities they should possess (such as rhetoric abilities for attracting attention, providing new angles, or using his or her social role as a “creator” and legitimizing actions) (ibid: 164f.). Within these different roles or abilities the artist is able to go “beyond rationality” (ibid: 166) or use his or her more-than-rational reflexivity to unconventionally and open-mindedly approach a problem, which is, as the foregoing accounts have shown essential for the process of sustainability. This potential role of artists can be hindered by a number of difficulties, such as the general ‘distance’ between artists and people outside of the art world, resulting from the need for a high level of cultural capital for understanding the complex conventions within the arts. Further, this can lead to the artists’ ‘entrapment’ within their own art world conventions or values (i.e. the Romanitc Order) (ibid: 171). These circumstances standing in the way of possible entrepreneurship in conventions shows the importance of artists functioning as double entrepreneurs, initiating change both within and outside of the arts. Artists have to establish themselves within the art world, legitimating their actions, and possess some effectiveness in the “outward-oriented entrepreneurship in conventions” (ibid: 175). This internal and external entrepreneurship further requires a high level of reflexivity of the artist, which can be related to the types of reflexivity Dieleman describes. Therefore is proves a useful addition to the accounts illustrated above regarding the potential role of artists as agents of change. Also Clark and Carreira da Silva’s accounts of the importance of arts participation

help argue for the importance of cultural participation as having a significant impact as a public good and raising political participation (Clark/ Carreira da Silva 2009: 263). Contrary to Putnam's description of a decline in membership in institutions and associations and the resulting loss of democratic virtues, they argue membership in cultural institutions is rising and correspondingly also the civic engagement and participation (ibid: 249ff.). For them class-oriented politics has shifted to more issue-based, individualistic "mode of citizenship" (ibid: 275). Their account helps to underline the importance of cultural (or artistic) participation or membership within cultural "scenes" (ibid). Yet, their stress on "individual fruition of amenities, mega-cultural events, etc. [as indicators of, JH] powerful and significant civic engagement" (ibid) would lean more towards the Creative City concept, not necessarily going beyond this concept.

With these conceptual approaches it becomes possible to better examine artists' activities, whether they can be helpful for the process of sustainability and what potential they actually have to bring ideas of alternative futures into people's focus. In this way, artists can further help to overcome divides between the autonomous understood art world and society (or environment) by changing conventions or adding reflexivity beyond rationality. Also they can possible point to the "mode of distanced, objective knowing, removed from moral and social responsibility, [which, JH] has been the animating motif of both science and art in the modern world" (Gablik 1991: 177f.). Artists can not only help overcome the cultural deficit and the missing values and morals within mainly technological or scientific considerations of sustainability or sustainable development (by orienting themselves according to aesthetics of sustainability). They can also change conventions or

understandings of autonomous art within their own world by acting as entrepreneurs guided also by aesthetics of sustainability. This does not assume that all autonomous art will ‘disappear’ or should, ‘aesthetic’, ‘individualistic’ art can exist alongside participatory art, ‘sensitive’ towards its surroundings (Gablik 1991: 181). Correspondingly, the rethinking of artists’ role for sustainability or in the urban context does not intend to ‘change’ all art. Yet the consideration and importance of artists working in the social context and understanding themselves as active members of society (politically, socially) should be regarded here. Not all artists should be turned into ‘involved’ critiques of current developments, fighting for a better world. But the legitimate and significant role participatory art can play for the process of sustainability should be accounted for. This would further allow artists to somewhat ‘free’ themselves from the role, which the Creative City concept accounts for them. Limited in their autonomy, artists (and creatives) can not be regarded as irresponsible individuals, whose cultural capital is a basis for gentrification (Kagan/ Hahn 2011). Removing the (engaged) artists from this context would be possible by rethinking their role also regarding sustainability.

The different accounts described here offer a conceptual framework for how artists can function as key change agents and in which ways their contributions are essential to the process of sustainability for example encouraging networks between creatives and ‘ordinary’ people. This adds to the cultures of sustainability, which help to move beyond the cultural deficit apparent in much of the considerations regarding sustainability (described in part 2.1.2). Artists can encourage more-than-rational reflexivity among divers members of society, empowering them and raising their awareness for sustainability issues. This also

reconciles the relationship between artists and ‘ordinary’ people, working towards more inclusive and open links, instead of a ‘closed off’ art world. Further, aesthetics of sustainability offer ‘guidelines’ or indicators pointing to a new relationship between art and sustainability and understanding of artistic practice. By examining the role of artist and the specific aesthetics within sustainability it is possible to rethink what aspects are important also regarding a modification of the Creative City model to include sustainability considerations, which is an aim here. This shows that the cultural perspectives on sustainability should include the roles of artists (or creatives) and the concept of aesthetics of sustainability. The rethinking of main aspects of the Creative City concept, i.e. artists’ and creatives’ roles, means that these are taken out of their mainly economical context and seen as change agents towards the process of sustainability, also in the urban context. In the concept of Sustainable Creative Cities, artists or creatives should not be instrumentalized, functioning as helpful actors for increasing the economic capacities of cities for positioning themselves in the global competition. Instead, their role is defined by inclusive practices and more responsibility, moving away from the individualistic and autonomous ‘genius’ artists (a basis for the Creative City concept). As the foregoing accounts have shown, the potential for artists to actively work towards supporting the sustainability process and therefore building sustainable communities is existent and essential. As Kelley states:

> “[a]rt invites us to explore the difference between intended and unintended contents of mind and culture, acknowledging the power of those unintended contents, and shaping space in which their mystery can play, sparkle and speak.” (Kelley 2008: 147)

Kelley's description again shows the more-than-rational ways in which art can support the process of sustainability. Artists in this understanding are not conceptualized as key actors of economic growth or as essential for the economic well-being of cities, which essentially is also based on the 'mystification' of the artist in the sense of the Romantic Order (described in footnote 84). Through the understanding of their roles and abilities as encouraging sustainability processes, the concept of the economic importance of them is somewhat modified, moving away from a singular definition or characterization. Although certain critical issues remain, such as artists' role in gentrification processes, if the understanding of artists and their roles is altered from a merely economic one, to include open, responsible, reflexivity-building potentials, they can become key agents within Sustainable Creative Cities. This presents a possible way in which the role of artists in the urban context (a main concern of the Creative City strategies) can be modified and therefore better incorporate sustainability issues. In the following another key aspect of the Creative City model is reexamined, that of creativity, attempting to also modify it, to better embrace sustainability considerations and to become more inclusive and open, moving away from a rigid form of creativity.

3.1.3 Rethinking Creativity

Another key aspect of the Creative City model is that of creativity. As mentioned in part 1.1.1, its definition is wide and ranges from context to context. The Creative City concept is not so focused on the psychological circumstance of 'how creativity comes about' or what the process of creativity looks like in detail, but rather on 'who is creative'

(assessed according to economic outcomes), i.e. the Creative Class. Therefore, the focus here is on the question of how creativity, or the Creative Class concept can be opened or overcome to include potentially all members of a society or city. In the Creative Class concept of Florida, which divides people into super-creative core and 'others', creativity essentially remains limited to certain groups, which is also reason for much of the critique of the concept (illustrated in parts 1.3 and 2.3). Even though Florida stresses the possibilities and importance of everyone being creative in order, "to build the broader creative society" (Florida 2002: xv), the actual (economically useful) creativity in the Creative Class concept is reserved for certain groups, those who bring about innovations. The problematic of this is described in parts 1.3 and 2.3 and results in mainly unsustainable tendencies as the concept excludes and fosters inequalities. Here a rethinking of creativity, or the Creative Class is useful in order to conceptually redefine, or least give certain key notions, of creativity in the context of sustainability and how this can work towards supporting Sustainable Creative Cities. For this certain aspects of how creativity can function and how artists and creatives can be seen as 'equal partners' within communities are described. The rethinking of creativity offers not a full, exact definition, but a new understanding of it as a more collaborative, connected creativity, in which all members of society (or in a city) can potentially come together on the same level. This is a main concern of Sustainable Creative Cities, which need to include local contexts and communities (human and other living creatures) as fully equal partners of creatives or artists. This is only possible by the incorporation of aesthetics of sustainability and a more responsible, not so individualistic understanding of the artist. This can be seen as a

modification of artists' and creatives' roles within the reconceptualization of Creative Cities to include cultural perspectives on sustainability.

The required equal partnership of artists, creatives, and 'ordinary' people can only be achieved through a different approach towards creativity, one that breaks with that of the Creative Class. The values of the Creative Class, which Florida defines as "individuality" (Florida 2002: 77), "meritocracy" (ibid: 78), and "diversity and openness" (ibid: 79), for example, don't correspond with aesthetics of sustainability or with sustainability. "Diversity and openness" does appear to be an important aspect of cultures of sustainability, but in the context of the Creative Class, as even Florida notes, it tends to be "a diversity of elites, limited to highly educated, creative people" (Florida 2002: 79). Processes of gentrification can further enhance this and as Florida describes, the "existence [of the Creative Class, JH] has certainly failed to put an end to long-standing divisions of race and gender" (ibid). This exemplifies the problem of the Creative Class concept, as it is conceptually unable to include all kinds of people (or creativity) into its definition. As noted above, open and inclusive encounters would be key and could be fostered by a wider understanding of creativity, eventually working to support contact and communication between individuals all alike in their importance for the community and for the process of sustainability. In this way, the rethinking of creativity offers an effective leverage-point to modify and reconceptualize Creative Cities within the context of sustainability (Kagan/ Hahn 2011). In the following a closer look a several notions that can function as impulses for creativity as an initiator of local encounters and communication between all equal members of communities are illustrated. The wide discussion of

creativity, also the critique of it mentioned in footnote 5, is not accounted for here. Instead, concepts that could enable and support developments towards a new understanding of creativity as a leverage-point for working towards Sustainable Creative Cities are introduced as possible starting points of this process.

In order to find ways to encourage equal partnerships between artists and 'ordinary' members of society and communities the divides that are fostered by the narrow understanding of the Creative Class have to be (conceptually) overcome. This includes a revision of creativity, or who is regarded as creative. Only considering the "highest order of creative work [which is, JH] producing new forms or designs that are readily transferable and widely useful" (Florida 2002: 69) is insufficient for finding new ways of communication. Additionally, it doesn't correspond with the aesthetics of sustainability, which stress the importance of values that connect, including participatory polities, diversity, and consideration of the non-human environment as part of its normative framework. The networks that should be encouraged in an informal and open way can bring about what Capra refers to as "emergence" (Capra 2002: 13). This ecological understanding of creativity as a "key property of all living systems" and the "spontaneous emergence of order at critical points of instability" is an essential part of the idea of open systems evolving and adapting to their surroundings (ibid: 14). This can be seen as a key point of the new understanding of creativity and its importance to remain open (essentially to all living things). As described in chapter 2.1.2, evolutionary open systems have more flexible boundaries and are more resilient through diversity. These systems remain open to "new ideas and new knowledge" (ibid: 123), which is enabled through the "emergence of novelty" (ibid: 122). Capra's mainly

ecological understanding of creativity can be helpful for the context of rethinking the creativity of the Creative Class as it offers a very basic and open approach to the term. Instead of the planning frameworks of the Creative City concept, which can be regarded as mainly top down, a creativity in Capra's sense would emerge out of divers and informal networks among equal partners. He writes: "[f]acilitating emergence includes creating that openness – a learning culture in which continual questioning is encouraged and innovation is rewarded" (ibid: 123). This of course has implications for the policies of a Sustainable Creative City, as these should be emergence friendly, remaining open and providing spaces of informal meeting possibilities, avoiding deterministic methods (Kagan/ Hahn 2011). It also enables creativity to be defined as something within all living systems, a biological phenomenon constantly emerging, offering a much broader inclusion than notions such as the super-creative core. Also, with this understanding of life (or creativity) as a "novel conception of the nature of mind and consciousness […] the Cartesian division between mind and nature" (Capra 2002: 33) is overcome. This of course speaks to the cultures of sustainability and shows the importance of defining creativity in a broad and open way.

A further important aspect is brought up by Kurt and Wagner who regard the creative individual as a role model for society within the ethical perspective of culturally based sustainability (Kurt/ Wagner 2002: 249). For them creativity is essential in the current structure of society (focused on 'faster', 'more', 'bigger', 'newer') in order to find individual and collective 'creative' solutions towards more sustainable life-styles (ibid). Acting in self-determined ways requires creativity, also for questioning the singular ratio of economic gains, which offers the

inclusion of emotional, intuitive meaningful aspects as parts of responsible actions (ibid). Referring to Böhme, they see the possibility of an emotional, intuitive and sovereign being, going beyond the autonomous, solely rational-driven individual and enabling a shift of the technological civilization towards a more humane culture (ibid). In their use of creativity, autonomy and self-fulfillment (at least to a certain degree) are not positioned against sustainability concerns, but used for them (ibid: 250). This account adds an important aspect to the rethinking of creativity, taking certain aspects of the creativity important for the Creative Class concept and its values, but examining them, when altered or 'redirected', as key towards working for sustainability. The responsible creative individual, Kurt and Wagner describe, can function as a change agent of social and cultural norms and values, if his or her freedom or autonomy, is seen, not as freedom of consumption or mobility, but as an ability to develop (ibid).

With this account the question arises in what way responsible, but still to some degree autonomous, creatives or artists can communicate with other 'ordinary' members of a community. For this, Bohm's concept of "dialogue", which he understands as "something creative" (Bohm 1996: 6) can be helpful. Since a certain degree of autonomy is necessary for artists working towards sustainability and the encouragement of creative local developments, it is important to offer equal 'playing grounds' for all members. The autonomy referred to here is one characterized by dialogical trans-local, interdisciplinary teams, working to self-manage local communities (Kagan/ Hahn 2011). In this context it becomes essential to conceptualize how these different actors or groups communicate with and encounter each other. Bohm understands this dialogue, different to discussion (in which the aim is to

win), as based on openness towards the other. This is the basis for the ability to "communicate freely in a creative movement in which no one permanently holds to or otherwise defends his [or her, JH] own ideas" (Bohm 1996: 4). His accounts offer the possibility to recognize aspects blocking communication and how these can be overcome through people who are able to "freely listen to each other, without prejudice, and without trying to influence each other" (ibid: 3). In this sense, it is important to open communication processes towards a dialogue approach, from which new understandings can creatively emerge, eventually leading to wider social changes. The wider potential of dialogue is acknowledged by Bohm by stating that there is

> "the possibility for a transformation of the nature of consciousness, both individually and collectively, and that whether this can be solved culturally and socially depends on dialogue." (Bohm 1996: 46)

The general openness of each individual encountering the other in dialogue comes from "*sharing a common content*" (italics by ibid: 26), even if they don't fully agree. In dialogue all these different assumptions, values, emotions, thoughts are considered, which enables the possibility that "if we can see them all, we may then move more creatively in a different direction" (ibid). Within dialogue there is no force to find an agreement or settle on disagreements, instead an "impersonal fellowship" (ibid: 32) can establish a certain bond or enable "collective participation" (ibid: 26) between participants, who don't necessarily have to know each other, but is based on a certain sensitivity to responses, perceptions, actions (ibid: 39). Bohm's concept of dialogue serves as a helpful addition to thinking about how creatives, artists, and 'regular' people can encounter each other, ideally in an inter-subjective space defined by shared experiences, in which

creativity can emerge (Kagan/ Hahn 2011). This enables a ‘thinking together’ between equal participants, which corresponds with the aesthetics of sustainability and their participatory approaches, adding the potential of all members of communities and societies to the search process of sustainability. The artist encountering ‘ordinary’ people in dialogue can ultimately function better as an initiator of new concepts or ideas and also being able to include the potential of ‘everyday’ people’s creativity. Their connectedness among each other also echoes in the aesthetics of sustainability and the patterns that connect.

From this context it becomes clear that creativity can be understood as emergent in Capra’s sense, coming from any member of a community and being initiated or supported through dialogue. Within this, it becomes important to regard that creativity can come from all individuals, not only those credited as members of the Creative Class and emerging from their talent, human or cultural capital (Kagan/ Hahn 2011). Artists or creatives as change agents are rather initiators or facilitators of creativity processes, instead of their ‘genius’ authors (ibid). For this broad understanding of creativity it is also important to define certain values or attitudes that can be important for supporting inclusive processes. Kirchberg refers to Sennett and his quest of finding values, which can secure “a stronger togetherness of people in view of collapsing institutions” (Kirchberg 2008: 100). This is not only important regarding the critique of unsustainable characteristics Kirchberg and Sennett offer (described in part 2.2), but also can be help for rethinking creativity. If all individuals should encounter each other equally, which would be ideally so in Sustainable Creative Cities, then certain values should be agreed upon, which would contribute to this. Sennett’s understanding of craftsmanship (Sennett 2008: 20ff.) and craftsmen’s

“desire to do good work” (ibid: 241), i.e. doing a job well for its own sake, is a helpful conceptual addition for enabling dialogue. Kirchberg presents craftsmanship as a potential ‘solution’ of unsustainability tendencies, as it regards the long-term aspects of things, helping to develop new abilities and overcoming the “corrosion of character” (Sennett) or feelings of fear and insecurity (Kirchberg 2008: 100). People or ‘craftsmen’ are “anchored in their tangible reality and they can take pride in their work” (Sennett 2008: 21), which helps build sustainability within an individual’s character, achieving a sense of self-worth and pride. Also, Sennett emphasizes the importance of asking ethical questions throughout the entire work process as a main characteristic of a craftsmen attitude. Due to this pragmatic understanding, stressing the link between means and ends, Sennett looks at the different “stages and sequences of the work process, [in order to indicate, JH] when the craftsman can pause in the work and reflect on what he or she is doing” (ibid: 296). This points to the potential of the craftsmen attitude of integrating sustainability considerations and normative aspects into work processes. This can also be expanded to include life-attitudes and values because for Sennett there is a connection between the material challenges the craftsman encounters and the skills required for human relationships (ibid: 289). This, of course, would also have to be expanded to include the non-human environment. It also shows how the notion of craftsmanship cannot only support sustainability but place creativity in a more ‘responsible’ context. Values are included in the craftsmanship attitude, which can further help to support participatory and inclusive processes. Sennett’s very detailed and historically deduced understanding of craftsmanship can be seen in contrast to the very

elitist definition of Florida's Creative Class (as the ones who bring innovation) as it is not based on talent, but on ability and motivation. Florida's concept doesn't seem to account for the importance of craftsmanship (also for the local economy), as it is not part of his creative core. This makes it possible for "nearly anyone [to, JH] become a good craftsmen" (Sennett 2008: 268), which enables an equal field of communication on which all characteristics of individuals are regarded as important and legitimate. The connection of individual creativity of potentially everyone (not just Creative Class members) with social responsibility, participatory approaches, and interconnectedness helps work towards a new understanding of creativity. As the critique of Florida's Creative Class concept shows, embracing all individuals and moving away from an elitist understanding of creativity must be a key part of sustainability considerations. Of course, as mentioned above, notions such as 'everyone is creative' often imply that creativity has become an imperative within the new economy, forcing individuals to constantly bring about 'creative' ideas or solutions. The notion of 'be creative' cannot be the aim of creativity reconsidered regarding sustainability, as it is, not a free and open call to include every individual's creativity for finding social and cultural solutions for sustainability issues, but an economic demand for anyone trying to compete in the new economic order. Only when taken out of this purely economic context can creativity and 'creative dialogue' among all individuals be helpful for the process of sustainability. Still, a rethinking and modification of the Creative Class concept is key in order to work towards the inclusion of all members of a community and stressing the abilities of potentially everyone to 'be creative' also regarding possible search processes for sustainability within the Sustainable Creative City.

3.2 Sustainable Creative Cities

As the accounts above show, a different understanding of creativity and the role of the artist is an important part of aesthetics of sustainability and a key aspect of modifying the Creative City concept to better include sustainability issues and their cultural aspects. Regarding the urban context, Duxbury and Gillette note that only recently has the global and national approach of sustainability been applied to cities and communities (Duxbury/ Gillette 2007: 2). This 'local turn' and the recognition of community sustainability correspond with the recognition of cultural perspectives as important aspects of sustainability (ibid). The notion of cultural sustainability (in communities) as the ability to preserve cultural identity, is an aspect of sustainable community development, understood as creating just and equitable communities by supporting cultural and social diversity (Duxbury/ Gillette: 4). These more 'ecological' communities incorporate to all members living in them, but also non-residents, and the non-human environment. Adding to factors, such as improving physical capital (maximizing the use of resources), increasing human capital (supporting areas like education, health, etc.), and multiplying social capital (participatory planning, collaborations), the enhancement of cultural capital (values, traditions, art, diversity, social history) is a main aspect of building sustainable communities (ibid: 7). As Hartmann describes, the causes surrounding "unsustainable practices" (Hartmann 1996: 108) center around:

> "a view that domination of people and nature are necessary and acceptable; acting as if human society is somehow separate from the biosphere; defining economic success based on ever-increasing production and consumption of good and services; and organizing the economy and the state to maximize the private accumulation of capital via market economy." (Hartmann 1996: 108)

The approaches Duxbury illustrates can be key to redefining communities, and peoples' roles in them, to encounter the causes Hartmann explains. Artistic interventions from artists working in "social contexts" (Bianchini 1999: 42) can help shift views and bridge gaps between, for example people and the environment, and go beyond singular logics of economic growth to include cultural perspectives on sustainability. This should also reflect in Sustainable Creative Cities, which should respect all cultural forms in their community, and as Duxbury and Gillette illustrate, focus on art-based solutions, encourage networks and public or shared spaces, support multiculturalism, enhance residents' abilities to communicate with each other, understand residents as experts of their community, empowering them and improve creativity skills and participation in the arts for developing community sustainability (Duxbury/ Gillette 2007: 8f.)[lxxxvi]. A certain 'meetingness' among residents of communities should be encouraged, rather than a 'missingness'. Bianchini also stresses "what urban planners and policy-makers also need today is the creativity of artists" (Bianchini 1999: 42)[lxxxvii]. Following Duxbury and Gillette, a community's capital, its natural, physical, economic, human, social, and cultural forms of capital is the foundation of sustainability within a community, therefore strengthening each would empower a community and work towards sustainability (Duxbury/ Gillette 2007: 6ff.). This would also counter developments that tend to fragment the local "urban social and political community" (Keil 1996: 37) through globalization processes. These interconnected processes of globalization and fragmentation have to be accounted for, as Keil states: "the regulation of these relationships through local politics […] is the only change to achieve a measure of sustainability […] in today's large cities" (ibid).

This points to the importance of policy changes within the local politics of cities or communities, supported by the cultural perspectives of artists and creatives and the rethinking of their roles. The possible policy shifts important for sustainability approaches within the city, should be based on these modified key aspects of the Creative City concept.

In this context, it is important to note that Landry does offer notions that 'go beyond' the Creative City model and regard sustainability concerns. For him sustainability has had implications in the urban context, resulting in "innovations, best practices and concepts, such as the ecological footprint idea" (Landry 2008: 258)[lxxxviii]. Yet, it could be argued that he remains within a sustainable urban development context, not actually including cultural perspectives or artists and creatives as key change agents. He doesn't redefine their roles within the urban model, only generally referring to creativity, leadership, and reflexivity, not describing from whom these should emerge. This in turn results in the underlying idea that simply adding sustainability concerns to the prevalent Creative City concept is sufficient. The question if it is conceptually helpful to hold on to the Creative Cities concept and add sustainability concerns is debatable. Without modifying the main aspects of the dominant urban model, it would prove difficult to transition from a mainly economic consideration of arts and culture to a true inclusion of them and their potential to encourage more-than-rational reflexivity or communicate issues of sustainability in dialogue.

Yet, Landry does describe areas of focus, which do correspond with certain aspects of the cultures of sustainability, such as inter-cultural projects or the notion of the "*Learning City*" (italics by Landry 2008: 259). This city is internally reflexive and able to continuously learn,

making it “key to sustainable creativity” (ibid). For Landry, the Learning City will eventually become the new predominant understanding of the city, yet based on innovations and creative approaches of the Creative City (ibid: 266). This makes the Learning City idea somewhat problematic, as it relies on concepts of the Creative City model, running the risk of not critically challenging these and therefore adopting them. As the critique of the Creative City concept shows, and as has been argued above, a rethinking and modification of key notions is important for opening these aspects towards the process of sustainability. Landry’s notion of the Learning City does offer some aspects, which can be of importance here. For him, a “key characteristic of the learning city is the ability to develop successfully in a rapidly changing socio-economic environment” (ibid: 267), which enables it to be “creative in its understanding of its own situation and wider relationships, developing new solutions to new problems” (ibid). Inherently democratic in its understanding, the idea of any city’s ability to constantly learn and adapt can be a useful approach for sustainability, as it reflects notions of the cultures of sustainability. Yet, the rethinking and modification of the role of artists and creatives and of creativity offered above remain important in order to actually ‘move beyond’ the understandings within the Creative City concept. Essentially, the ‘learning’ aspect of Landry’s new understanding of the city could be added to the Sustainable Creative City idea, to stress the importance of cities having the ability to continuously transform and adapt to new situations.

In the following, key aspects of Sustainable Creative Cities are illustrated, according to the accounts described above and based also on the critique of the Creative City concept, which should function as important notions, also for guiding potential policy shifts. These are

meant to function as initiators or ideas, sparking new approaches, which can be important, but essentially, similar to the cultures of sustainability and aesthetics of sustainability, remaining open-ended. Instead of proposing mainly top down planning tools, indicators of which city is ‘creative’ or not, or which ones can ‘keep up’ globally, the focus here is on a adaptive approach, which includes the importance of local actors and considerations in shaping a community or city. As mentioned, informal meeting places in which equal partners can meet an engage in dialogue would be a key aspect of Sustainable Creative Cities, as the descriptions above regarding artists’ role in shaping more-than-rational reflexivity, initiating change, and ‘leveling the playing ground’ for all people through rethinking creativity and craftsmanship approaches. These accounts or ideas can seem somewhat ideal or even utopian as they remain on a general theoretical level. But as argued by Castells, this can be important, also towards opening the approaches and concepts. He writes:

“sometimes, a utopian vision is needed to shake the institutions from shortsightedness and stasis and to enable people to think the unthinkable, thus enhancing their awareness and their control.” (Castells 1989: 353).

Just as artists or creatives functioning as change agents for sustainability can help raise awareness towards previously forgotten or not regarded aspects, these initiators or ideas can point towards new or different approaches, helping to include all individuals.

The prevailing definition of autonomous, ‘genius’ artists (also within the Creative City model) who are detached from any considerations outside of their art world is not sufficient for sustainability. Also the exclusive understanding of creativity in the dominant urban model is not sufficient

for participatory aesthetics of sustainability and communication or dialogue between all members of a community. As Collins writes:

> "[c]itizens must discover their roles as artists, with a creative responsibility in the restoration of their community, through something that could be described as social-ecological sculpture, or the healing of human and place-based relationships between nature and culture." (Collins 2004: 171)

The realization of creativity among all members of a city or neighborhood is an essential part of key notions of Sustainable Creative Cities, which should account for creativity coming from any area or group. This also helps include normative questions such as 'what is a good life', which needs to be answered by all members of a community, through their equal communication with each other. A sense of community well-being, a shared sense of purpose and values, which goes further than the quality of life demands or the "*people climate*" (italics by Florida 2002: 283) described in the Creative City concept. These demands tend to regard mainly the Creative Class and not all members of a community or city. Further, stressing the importance of the well-being of communities as a whole, including all members can also help to overcome or reverse (at least somewhat) the meaninglessness and powerlessness tendencies within certain places within the spiky world, by including the local identities and 'roots' of people and communities, regardless of their position within the global competition (Castells 1989: 350)[lxxxix]. Policies to encourage participation and a "collective strategy [or strategies, JH] toward the reconstruction of the meaning of the locality" (ibid: 352) are essential and can be better achieved through the modified understanding of the role of artists and creativity. Using the very ecological understanding of creativity by Capra and his inclusion of sustainability made up of an

“entire web of relationships”, such as ecosystems and human societies, it is possible to define a “sustainable human community” interacting with “other living systems – human and nonhuman – in ways that enable those systems to live and develop according to their nature (Capra 2002: 215). This concept of creativity, sustainable communities, and their relationships to their surroundings is a key notion of Sustainable Creative Cities. Sustainability is an aspect regarding how communities or cities should encounter or regard their environments, creativity addresses the need for these communities to adapt and change, in a “dynamic process of coevolution rather than a static state” (ibid: 230). Sustainable Creative Cities should incorporate the cultures of sustainability and shape themselves around these key notions, becoming “ecologically literate” (ibid) and using them as a general framework for building themselves according to sustainability concerns. For Capra this means using the basic principles of ecology (such as networks, cycles, partnership, diversity, or dynamic balance) and shaping sustainable communities around them, as they are directly related to the well-being of people (ibid: 230f.). Incorporating these principles and communicating them (also with help of the forms of reflexivity) can be a task for artists or creatives within Sustainable Creative Cities. This shows how modifying and redefining the understandings of these key actors, going beyond mainly economic concerns, helps recognize their potential for incorporating sustainability concerns in the urban context.

An aspect of Sustainable Creative Cities is that of proposed shifts in policies[xc]. This includes policies, which go beyond sustainable development considerations regarding urban issues (such as environmental management or sustainable urban development) to

include the cultural considerations and the potential of artists and creatives in the process of sustainability within the city. These potential policy shifts should not be clear cut, rigid ones, but specific to each locality, taking into account the particular, detailed situation in every community or city. The Creative City concept implies policies, which focus on using arts and culture (and other 'lifestyle' amenities) for positioning a city within the spiky world. The critique and corresponding rethinking of creativity, artists, and creatives can inform possible policy shifts, moving away from very top down approaches towards inclusive, participatory, open-ended ones. The Creative City concept's orientation along the globalized world economy and competition for talent should be altered, bettering including the local perspective and strengthening local communities. The rethinking of artists and creativity can help work towards this, increasing local communities' or cities' power to become a bit more independent from these global forces. Further, within Sustainable Creative Cities, there would have to be a shift away from the highly economical understanding of culture, art, and creativity as shaping a city's 'excellence', to an approach, which can better incorporate the potential of these aspects and "will open new ways of addressing critical issues" (Hawkes 2003: 38). The cultural perspective of sustainability and the implications this has for the roles of artists and creatives also means that policies have to incorporate and understand these roles, using "governance […] to work towards a healthy, safe, tolerant and creative society (rather than just a financially prosperous one)" (ibid: 37). This implies that instead of largely top down planning policies, new approaches should emerge out of and support the communication and dialogues of equal partnerships in informal meeting places. As Zukin states: "the struggle between the corporate city and

the urban village continues" (Zukin 2010: xi); policies within a Sustainable Creative City should encourage the latter. These should be oriented towards well-being, a "key concept used to describe the state of a community to which it is legitimate to aspire, […] to which public authorities should aim their interventions" (Hawkes 2003: 12). This normative aspect of the state of cities or communities can be addressed, among others, by artists or creatives, bringing different approaches to the policy framework of Sustainable Creative Cities. Within new policies regarding the well-being of a community, a reassessment of the growth imperative would be a further aspect for Sustainable Creative Cities. Sustainability concerns embrace all levels within a community or city in a holistic way, not only focusing on the economic concerns and on how to attract the Creative Class, but on the complex ecological, social, cultural, and spatial connections (Schubert/ Altrock 2004: 364) and the potential of artists and creatives to effectively address issues regarding them. The economic rationale for investing in culture or arts from a policy standpoint would have to change within Sustainable Creative Cities. Binns describes a "postindustrial city where a decommodified cultural policy reaches its full potential" (Binns 2005) through the constant participation of citizens. This cultural policy would be able to "reflect the will and ways of life of all citizens" (Binns 2005), as key aspect of Sustainable Creative Cities.

Combining the terms 'sustainable' and 'creative' in an urban concept, going beyond the mainly economic approach, or attempting to modify the Creative City model to better include sustainability concerns and their cultural dimension still leaves room for much more conceptual (and concrete) work. The wide use of the Creative City concept can be regarded as a reason for the attempt of rethinking some of its key

aspects, as done to some extent here. Only several important aspects of what was termed Sustainable Creative City were described here as a starting point for further considerations. As Nadarajah states: a "coherent cultural theory of a sustainable city or of sustainable urbanization has yet to be articulated" (Nadarajah 2007: 226). The critique of Creative City strategies can serve here as a helpful starting point for rethinking and modifying certain aspects of the urban model to include cultural perspectives on sustainability. Of course, further notions, implementations, and understandings within the dominant urban model could be rethought and reconceptualized. Also, further policy shifts, or guidelines for these, are essential. For example, the *Agenda 21 for culture*[xci] of 2004, offers useful reference documents for cities and communities attempting to commit themselves to "human rights, cultural diversity, sustainability, participatory democracy and creating conditions for peace" (Agenda 21 for culture 2004). The *Agenda 21 for culture* understands culture as a basic part of the development of cities and divides its 67 articles into principles, undertakings, and recommendations, which serve as clear and direct guidelines for cities and communities on a local level, but also address state and national governments, as well as international organizations. It has become an essential document for cities, which regard culture as an important aspect of sustainability and is cited by majors, councilors, and social and cultural actors (Agenda 21 for culture 2009). Many aspects of the 67 articles are also important for the context of Sustainable Creative Cities, offering a point of reference and framework. Also several articles echo the aspects of cultures of sustainability, such as articles referring to cultural diversity (Agenda 21 for culture 2004: article 1), dialogue (ibid: article 21), or the

encouragement of creativity and sensitivity (ibid: article 38). The document further regards artists and creatives as important for identifying problems and initiating changes (i.e. Agenda 21 for culture 2004: article 35). It also sees the importance of “cultural impact assessment” (ibid: article 25) (as mentioned in footnote 90) and incorporating and legitimating creativity within “the so-called peripheries […] defending the principle of the right of all citizens to culture and knowledge without discrimination” (ibid: article 28). Important to note is that these articles remain open to local specifics and should be implemented according to the needs and wishes of local communities and cities, tying the global initiative of providing a general framework for cities around the world to local considerations, an essential part of Sustainable Creative Cities. As the critique of part 1.3, also in the context of sustainability (part 2.3) shows, main elements of the Creative City model are problematic and exhibit unsustainable tendencies. Identifying these aspects, such as gentrification, the imperative of growth, or the Creative Class concept enables a rethinking of aspects of the dominant urban model. The critique is consequently an essential part of finding different approaches to the conceptualization of the city in order to address problems, or even try to overcome them, at least to some degree. Therefore, the critique of the Creative City concept and the reexamination of certain key notions proves a helpful starting point, also regarding Sustainable Creative Cities.

Concluding Remarks

Considering the opening quotes of Sennett and Chambers, the city offers a place of open, interconnected encounters and therefore is a crucial place for addressing and approaching the main concerns of our time. As Sennett states, the city is a place where “one develops a sense of justice, how one learns to talk with and learn from people who are unlike oneself” (Sennett 1989: 84). If sustainability considerations and their cultural implications are incorporated into the urban context, Sennett’s statement can be widened to include the communication between humans and the non-human environment. The normative framework, which can develop and be supported within a city, where open communication takes place, is an essential part of sustainability and a “sensibility to the pattern which connects”. The “previously unthought” (Chambers 1993: 189), which can be explored within the urban environment has the potential to immensely support the process of sustainability as it offers possibilities that go beyond dominant understandings and include new, open, interconnected ways of rising to present and future challenges. This, ideally, is what a city should be shaped around if it fully includes sustainability considerations. These ‘preconditions’ are often in contrast to existing structures within cities, in which developments can hinder communication or diversity and thus the process of sustainability. Therefore, as Boudreau, Keil, and Young state:

> “we believe that the first step towards creating a socially and environmentally just urban world is to understand the urban world we currently live in.” (Boudreau/ Keil/ Young 2009: 10)

This shows the importance of recognizing (and potentially criticizing)

current developments within the conceptualization of cities in order to identify where problematic aspects lie. The concept of sustainability offers a normative framework by which this can be accomplished. Building on the critique of urban structures through the context of sustainability it becomes possible to find aspects, which should potentially be altered or rethought. The critique or the understanding of existing conditions offers a basis for rethinking or redefining main notions in the urban context. Then, cities, as places of “meetingness” among heterogenic groups of people can be potential sites of emerging forms or perspectives that can be oriented towards a process of sustainability. Within Sustainable Creative Cities, the value and significance of communities (human and non-human) is an integral aspect of the approach to sustainability, also acknowledging the importance of cultural rights as human rights (Agenda 21 for culture 2004: article 3). This offers frameworks, which consider quality of life demands and questions of ‘what is a good life’ that go beyond mere lifestyle concerns of the Creative Class. Further, this shows that the contextual situations of every city or community, or individual are important. Sustainable Creative Cities should remain open to specifics within each place, which essentially means it will be different in every city or community. Unlike the Creative City concept, its characteristics prevent it from being a ‘fit-all’ model, which can be applied anywhere using similar planning tools. Therefore, it is an important part of the Sustainable Creative City approach to remain open and somewhat diffuse, in order to be able to adapt. This stems from the cultures of sustainability, which shape the underlying notions of this different urban approach. The questions of how this concept can still serve as an orientation, for urban planners, policy makers, residents, academics,

etc. should remain subject to open and inclusive discussions. An important part of this is the rethinking of key notions of the Creative City model, moving away from an urban concept ‘reserved’ only for a specific group, towards one, which recognizes fully the potential of all within the community or city. Regarding these considerations, a reflection of the accounts giving in this thesis, if hypotheses were comprehensively addressed and aims were met will be briefly illustrated in the following.

The accounts of the foregoing thesis focus on several current and widely discussed issues, such as the prevailing Creative City model and the concept of sustainability, with the attempt to bring them together. As a starting point for this, it is important to understand the main notions behind the Creative City concept, which is considered a dominant and highly influential way of understanding cities today. Its wide application makes it important to understand the underlying notions, the context it arises in and how it differs from other concepts regarding the urban context. Therefore, main aspects of the Creative City model were described in chapter one, as well as a brief overview of other urban (sociology) concepts. Correspondingly to the popularity of the concept, the critique of the dominant urban model addresses many problematic aspects that can be tied to the implementation of the Creative City concept. Several main aspects of the critique, mainly coming from the wider field of sociology were examined and described with the intent to understand the consequences and underlying concepts of this urban model. The aim of grasping the wide discussions on cities in general (from an urban sociology perspective), describing main aspects of the Creative City model, as well as the critique of it, enabled a better understand its prevailing position within the

understanding of cities and its underlying characteristics. By illustrating the Creative City concept, regarding its key notions, as well as the critique of it, a first step was made towards bringing together this dominant urban model with sustainability considerations. Further, a working definition of sustainability was given, including its cultural implications. By giving a description of the cultural deficit in discussion regarding mainly sustainable development; sustainability can be understood as a process, not an end state, which essentially requires cultures of sustainability and different theoretical approaches, such as transdisciplinarity. Several key words of cultures of sustainability were introduced as a general framework for understanding how the process of sustainability can be encouraged and characterized. Next to the cultural deficit, which helps recognize why the process of sustainability is hindered, a further step of identifying unsustainable characteristics was attempted. By examining several accounts of current times and connecting these to the urban model, the hypothesis was supported, that the Creative City concept is largely unsustainable, as well as many underlying developments that shape it. These sociological accounts describe dominant cultural, social, and economic developments and, as a main assumption, can be related to the Creative City model. In order understand the unsustainable tendencies within the Creative City concept, the different critical accounts of current developments were related to the urban model, which corresponds with many of these. In a further step, the critique of the Creative City model itself was related to unsustainability, arguing that it shows consequences of the implementation of the urban concept, that are problematic from a sustainability point of view. This was done, not only to distinguish unsustainable aspects of the Creative City model, but also to offer a

better understanding of what notions of the urban concept could be modified in order to better incorporate sustainability considerations. Building on the hypothesis that the Creative City concept is largely unsustainable, identified by placing the critique of it in the context of unsustainability, an attempt was made to rethink the concept.

The description of the critique of the dominant urban model from a sustainability context, including cultural perspectives, such as cultures of sustainability, proved to be a helpful approach for starting to think of ways to better incorporate sustainability concerns. Key notions of the dominant urban model, such as creativity or the role of artists and creatives, served as a leverage-point for potentially modifying the Creative City concept. Understanding artists and creatives as key actors within the search process of sustainability includes a rethinking of notions of aesthetics as well as the individual, autonomous artist. By redefining their role, they can become agents of change and bring new approaches, reflexivity, discussions, which better fit to the challenges of sustainability. Another step was to rethink a key notion of the dominant urban model, that of creativity. This was done with the intent of understanding creativity as more inclusive and open-ended and to therefore enable encounters between artists, creatives, ‘ordinary’ people, and ultimately the non-human environment. Accounts were presented that offer notions, which enable open communication between all of these actors. This rethinking of key notions of the Creative City model presented a way of moving away from the narrow understandings of creativity or artists in the Creative City concept, which are also main aspects of the critique. On the basis of these modified aspects, the notion of Sustainable Creative Cities was presented, including how these different approaches to creativity and

the role of artists and creatives affect the urban context. A reflection of what these ‘more sustainable’ cities would conceptually look like, including potential policy shifts, was presented as way to begin understanding how Sustainable Creative Cities could be shaped.

As this thesis has shown, understanding the dominant conceptualizations of cities is an important part of finding areas of inquiry regarding sustainability concerns. The critique of the Creative City model in the context of sustainability and the notion of Sustainable Creative Cities enables a reflection, which can serve as an important part of incorporating sustainability concerns, including cultural perspectives within the urban context. Yet, as described in this thesis, it offers more of a starting point, a frame for further questions and future inquiry and research. These would, among other aspects, have to circle around whether the Creative City concept can be ‘overcome’ by rethinking and modifying its key notions, or if it should be entirely abandoned. Yet the question remains, if this is actually possible, especially regarding the concepts highly popular acceptance and implementation. It seems worth the effort to attempt to reconceptualize its key aspects, as the concept does draw attention to the importance of cultural considerations. As this thesis has shown, it is conceptually possible to place artists or creativity into a different context, opening their potential for sustainability in the urban context. Further inquiry also regarding ‘on the ground’ work, specifically in communities and cities, and possible intercultural, inclusive, open networks is important to better understand the how Sustainable Creative Cities could be shaped. The incorporation of sustainability concerns (including cultural implications) in the urban context presented here can only serve as an initial point of departure for further discussions, research, and

conceptualizations on how sustainability can be better accounted for in the urban context. The cultures of sustainability or aesthetics of sustainability function as ‘guidelines’, but still remain essentially open and locally specific, just as the concept of Sustainable Creative Cities should. This is important as it prevents the concept from becoming simply a ‘plug in’ model (like the Creative City model), whose planning toolkits are applied in any context. Nevertheless, an overall concept, which has certain normative notions, coming from a sustainability context, is important for incorporating the often very diverse aims and interests, without ‘solving’ these differences, but nonetheless offering a holistic framework. This can potentially help ‘guide’ policy makers, encourage networks, and enable inclusive, participatory structures and spaces; all essential to building Sustainable Creative Cities.

Literature

Books

Abercrombie, Nicholas/ Hill, Stephen/ Turner, Bryan S. (2000): The Penguin Dictionary of Sociology. Fourth Edition. London: Penguin

Bachmann-Medick, Doris (2006): Cultural Turns. Neuorientierungen in den Kulturwissenschaften. Rowohlt Taschenbuch: Reinbek.

Bateson, Gregory (2002): Mind and Nature. A necessary unity. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Baudrillard, Jean (1997): Simulacra and Simulation. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt (2000): Liquid Modernity. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Becker, Howard (2008): Art Worlds. 25th Anniversary Edition Updated and Expanded. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Becker, Frank/ Reinhardt-Becker, Elke (2001): Systemtheorie. Eine Einführung für die Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften. Frankfurt am Main: Campus.

Berndt, Christian/ Pütz, Robert (2007): Kulturelle Geographien. Bielefeld: transcript.

Bohm, David (1996): On Dialogue. Routledge: Oxon.

Boltanski, Luc/ Ève Chiapello (2007): The New Spirit of Capitalism. London: Verso.

Boudreau, Julie-Anna/ Keil, Roger/ Young, Douglas (2009): Changing Toronto. Governing urban neoliberalism. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1982): Die feinen Unterschiede. Kritik der gesellschaftlichen Urteilskraft. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Bourdieu, Pierre (2003): Counterfire: Against the Tyranny of the Market. London: Verso Books.

Brand, Peter/ Thomas, Michael J. (2005): Urban Environmentalism. Global Change and the Mediation of Local Conflict. Routledge: Oxon.

Brenner, Neil/ Keil, Roger (2006): The Global Cities Reader. Routledge: Oxon.

Breuste, Jürgen/ Feldmann, Hildegard/ Uhlmann, Ogarit (ed.) (1998): Urban Ecology. Heidelberg: Springer.

Bröckling, Ulrich (2007): Das unternehmerische Selbst. Soziologie einer Subjektivierungsform. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Butterwegge, Christoph/ Lösch, Bettina/ Ptak, Ralf (2007): Kritik des Neoliberalismus. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Capra, Fritjof (1996): The Web of Life: an new scientific understanding of living systems. New York: Anchor Books.

Capra, Fritjof (2002): The Hidden Connections. A Science for Sustainable Living. New York: Anchor Books.

Castells, Manuel (1989): The Informational City. Information Technology, Economic Restructuring, and the Urban-Regional Process. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Clark, Terry Nichols (2004): The City as an entertainment machine. Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Clarke, Michael (2003): The Concise Oxford Dictionary of Art Terms. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Döring, Jörg/ Thielmann, Tristan (2008): Spatial Turn. Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften. Bielefeld: transcript.

Dünne, Jörg/ Günzel, Stephan (2006): Raumtheorie: Grundlangentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Fainstein, Susan (1993): The City Builders. Oxford: Blackwell.

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

Florida, Richard (2008): Who's your city? How the Creative Economy is Making Where to Live the Most Important Decision of Your Life. New York, N.Y.: Basic Books.

Friedrichs, Jürgen/ Kecskes, Robert (ed.) (1996): Gentrification. Theorie und Forschungsergebnisse. Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Gablik, Suzi (1991): The Reenchantment of Art. New York, N.Y.: Thames and Hudson.

Guerrilla Girls (1998): The Guerrilla Girls' Bedside Companion to the history of Western Art. New York: Penguin Books.

Haarmann, Anke/ Lemke, Harald (ed.) (2009): Culture/ Nature. Art and Philosophy in the Context of Urban Development. Illustrated Volume and Text Volume. Berlin: jovis.

Hackworth, Jason (2007): The Neoliberal City. Goverance, Ideology, and Development in American Urbanism.Ithace, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Harvey, David (1985): The Urbanization of Capital: Studies in the History and Theory of Capitalist Urbanism. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Harvey, David (2005): A Brief History of Neoliberalism. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hawkes, Jon (2003): The fourth pillar of sustainability. Culture's essential role on public planning. Victoria: Cultural Development Network.

Hirsch Hadorn, Gertrude (2008): The Handbook of Transdisciplinarity Research. Berlin: Springer.

Horkheimer, Max/ Adorno, Theodor W. (1997): Dialektik der Aufklärung. Philosophische Fragmente. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer.

Jacobs, Jane (1992): The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York: Vintage Books.

Jonas, Andrew/ Wilson, David (ed.) (1999): The Urban Growth Machine. Critical perspectives two descades later.

Kelly, Michael (ed.) (1998): Encyclopedia of Aesthetics. New York, N.Y.: Oxford University Press.

Kelley, Caffyn (2008): Culturing sustainability. A cookbook for artists and educators. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from:

http://islandsinstitute.ning.com/forum/topics/1163070:Topic:16092?commentId=1163070%3AComment%3A16336.

Klein, Naomi (2008): The shock doctrine. The rise of disaster capitalism. Toronto: Knopf Canada.

Kurt, Hildegard/ Wagner, Bernd (ed.) (2002): Kultur – Kunst – Nachhaltigkeit. Die Bedeutung von Kultur für das Leitbild Nachhaltige Entwicklng. Essen: Klartext.

Landry, Charles (2008): The Creative City. A Toolkit for Urban Innovators. 2nd. Edition. Near Stroud: Comedia.

Landry, Charles/ Bianchini, Franco (1995): The Creative City. London: Demos.

Lee/ Slater/ Wyly (2008): Gentrification. Oxon: Routledge.

Lewitzky, Uwe (2005): Kunst für alle? Kunst im öffentlichen Raum zwischen Partizipation, Intervention und Neuer Urbanität. Bielefeld: transcript.

Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (2005): The Urban Sociology Reader. Oxon: Routledge.

Logan, John R./ Molotch, Harvey L. (1987): Urban Fortunes. The Political Economy of Place. Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Lloyd, Richard (2006): Neo-Bohemia. Art and Commerce in the Postindustrial City. Oxon: Routledge.

Luhmann, Niklas (2005): Social Systems. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Morin, Edgar/ Kern, Anne Brigitte (1999) Homeland Earth. A Manifesto for the New Millennium. Cresshill: Hampton Press.

Morin, Edgar (2008): On Complexity. Cresskill: Hampton Press.

Nicolescu, Basarab (ed.) (2008): Transdisciplinarity: Theory and Practice. Cresskill: Hampton Press, Inc.

Osten, Marion von (ed.) (2003): Norm der Abweichung. Zürich: Voldemeer.

Porter, Libby/ Shaw, Kate (ed.) (2009): Whose urban Renaissance? An international comparision of urban regeneration strategies. Oxon: Routledge.

Putnam, Robert D. (2000): Bowling Alone. The Collapse and Revival of American Community. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Raunig, Gerald/ Wuggenig, Ulf (2007): Kritik der Kreativität. Wien: Turia + Kant.

Rech, Hans Ulrich (2007): Index Kreativität. Köln: Walther König.

Renn, Ortwin/ Deuschle, Jürgen/ Jäger, Alexander/ Weimer-Jehle, Wolfgang (2007): Leitbild Nachhaltigkeit: Eine normative-funktionale Konzeption und ihre Umsetzung. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Ritzer, George (2007): The Globalization of Nothing 2. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

Roberts, Peter/ Ravetz, Joe/ George, Clive (2009): Environment and the City. Oxon: Routledge.

Sassen, Saskia (1994): Cities in a World Economy. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

Sawyer, R. Keith (2006): Explaining Creativity. The Science of Human Innovation. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Sennett, Richard (1998): The corrosion of character. The personal consequences of work in the new capitalism. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.

Sennett, Richard (2006): The Culture of the New Capitalism. New Haven, London: Yale University Press.

Sennett, Richard (2008): The Craftsmen. London: Penguin Books.

Sternberg, Robert J. (ed.) (1999): Handbook of Creativity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Neil (1996): The New Urban Frontier. Gentrification and the Revanchist City. London: Routledge.

Smith, Neil (2008): Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space. Athens, Ga: University of Georgia Press.

Solnit, Rebecca/ Schwatzenberg, Susan (2002): Hollow City. The siege of San Francisco and the crisis of American Urbanism. London: Verso.

Susser, Ida (ed.) (2002): The Castells Reader on Cities and Social Theory. Malden: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Turner, Jane (1996): The Dictionary of Art. New York: Grove.

Wheeler, Stephen M./ Beatley, Timothy (ed.) (2004): The Sustainable Urban Development Reader. Routledge: Oxon.

Zukin, Sharon (1989): Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change. 2nd ed. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.

Zukin, Sharon (2010): Naked City. The Death and Life of Authentic Urban Places. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Articles

Adomssent, Maik/ Godemann, Jasmin/ Michelson, Gerd (2007): Transferability of approaches to sustainable development at universities as a challenge. International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education 8, no. 4 (2007): 385-402.

Agenda 21 for culture (2004): Agenda 21 for culture. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://agenda21culture.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=212&Itemid=&lang=en.

Agenda 21 for culture (2009): Cities, cultures and developments. A report that marks the fifth anniversary of Agenda 21 for culture. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://agenda21culture.net/index.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_download&gid=254&Itemid=86&lang=en.

Bachmann, Günther (2008): Gatekeeper: a forward. In: Kirchberg, Volker/ Kagan, Sacha (ed.): Sustainability: a new frontier for the arts and cultures. Frankfurt am Main: VAS, 8-13.

Barth, Matthias/ Godemann, Jasmin/ Rieckmann, Marco/ Stoltenberg, Ute (2007): Developing key competencies for sustainable development in higher education. International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education 8, no. 4 (2007): 416-430.

Bianchini, Franco (1999): Cultural Planning for Urban Sustainability. In: Nyström, Louise (ed.): City and Culture. Cultural Processes and urban sustainability, 34-51.

Binns, Luke (2005): Capitalising on culture: an evaluation of culture-led urban regeneration policy. Articles. Paper 5. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://arrow.dit.ie/futuresacart/5.

Bourdieu, Pierre (1999): Site Effects. In: Bourdieu, Pierre et al.: The Weight of the World. Social Suffering in Contemporary Society. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 123-129.

Borer, Michael Ian (2006): The Location of Culture: The Urban Culturalist Perspective. City & Community, 5, 2, 173-197.

Brocchi, Davide (2008): The Cultural Dimension of Sustainability. In: Kirchberg, Volker/ Kagan, Sacha (ed.): Sustainability: a new frontier for the arts and cultures. Frankfurt am Main: VAS, 26-58.

Brundtland Commission (2004): World Commission on Environment and Development. In: Wheeler, Stephen/ Beatley, Timothy (ed.): The Sustainable Urban Development Reader. London: Routledge, 60-63.

Buchanan, James (1965): An Economic Theory of Clubs. In: Economica, 32, 1-14.

Burgess, Ernest W. (2005): The growth of the city: an introduction to a research project. In: Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (ed.): The urban sociology reader. Oxon: Routledge, 74-81.

Chambers, Ian (1993): Cities without maps. In: Bird, Jon/ Curtis, Barry/ Putnam, Tim/ Robertson, George/ Tickner, Lisa (ed.): Mapping the futures: local cultures, global change. London: Routledge, 188-199.

Chiapello, Eve (1998): Die Künstler und das Management. Passagen/Passages, 31, 4-8.

Choe, Sang-Chuel (2007): Creating cultural identity for sustainability: A case study of Cheongju, Korea. In: Nadarajah, Manickam/ Yamamoto, Ann Tomoko (ed.): Urban Crisis: Culture and the sustainability of cities. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 133-155.

Choe, Sang-Chuel/ Marcotullio, Peter J./ Piracha, Awais L. (2007): Approaches to cultural indicators. In: Nadarajah, Manickam/ Yamamoto, Ann Tomoko (ed.): Urban Crisis. Culture and the sustainability of cities. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 193-213.

Collins, Timothy (2004): Towards an aesthetic of diversity. In: Herman Prigann (ed.): Ecological Aesthetics. Art and Environmental Design. Theory and Practice. Basel: Birkhäuser Publishers for Architecture, 170-173.

Clark, Terry Nichols (2005): The New Chicago School – Not New York or LA, and Why It Matters for Urban Social Science. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://faui.uchicago.edu/archive.html.

Clark, Terry Nichols/ Carreira da Silva, Filipe (2009): Revisiting Tocqueville: citizenship norms, political repertoires, and cultural participation. In: Cherkaoui, Mohamed/ Hamilton, Peter (ed.): Raymond Boudon. A life in Sociology. Oxford: Bardwell Press, 247-278.

Dangschat, Jens S. (1988): Gentrification – Der Wandel innenstadtnaher Nachbarschaften. In: J. Friedrichs (ed.): Soziologische Stadtforschung. Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 29 (1988), 272-292.

Davies, Wayne K.D./ Brown, Denise, F. (2006): Culturing Sustainability: Towards Frameworks of Understanding. In: Lee, John Chi-Kin/ Williams, Michael (ed.): Environmental and Geographic Education. New York: Nove Science Publishers Inc., 22-38.

Dear, Michael (2005): Los Angeles and the Chicago School: Invitation to a Debate. In: Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (ed.): The urban sociology reader. Oxon: Routledge, 107-116.

Deutsche, Rosalyn/ Ryan, Cara Gendel (1984): The Fine Art of Gentrification. October, 31, 91-111.

Dieleman, Hans (2008): Sustainability, Art and Reflexivty: why artists and designers may become key change agents in sustainability. In: Kirchberg, Volker/ Kagan, Sacha (ed.): Sustainability: a new frontier for the arts and cultures. Frankfurt am Main: VAS, 108-146.

Dowling, Emma/ Nunes, Rodrigo/ Trott, Ben (2007): Immaterial and Affective Labour: Explored. In: Ephemera. Theory and Politics in Organization. 7 (1), 1-7.

Duxbury, Nancy/ Gillette, Eileen (2007): Culture as a Key Dimension of sustainability: Exploring concepts, themes, and models. Working Paper No.1 February 2007. Centre of Expertise on Culture and Communities - Creative City Network of Canada, 1-23.

Eade, John/ Mele, Christopher (2002): Introduction. Understanding the City: Contemporary and Future Perspectives. Oxford: Blackwell, 3-24.

Fainstein, Susan S./ Campbell, Scott (2002): Introduction: Theories of Urban Development and their Implications for Policy and Planning. In: Fainstein, Susan S./ Campbell, Scott (ed.): Readings in Urban Theory. 2nd Edition. Oxford: Blackwell, 1-15.

Fischer, Doris (2010): Städte für die Arbeiter. In: Zeit 2010, May 4. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://www.zeit.de/2010/32/China-Wirtschaft.

Florida, Richard (2005): Cities and the Creative Class. In: Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (ed.): The urban sociology reader. Oxon: Routledge, 290-301.

Fraser, Andrea (2005): From the critique of institutions to an institution of critique. Artforum, XLIV, no. 1, 278-283.

Galloway, Susan/ Dunlop, Stewart (2007): A Critique of the Definitions of the Cultural and Creative Industries on Public Policy. International Journal of Cultural Policy, 13, 1, 17-31.

Gieryn, Thomas (2000): A Space for Place in Sociology. Annual Review of Sociology 26, 463-496.

Glass, Ruth (1964): Introduction: Aspects of Change. In: Centre for Urban Studies. London: Mac Kibbon and Kee, xviii-xix.

Gottdiener, Mark (2005): Looking at Themed Environments. In: Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (ed.): The urban sociology reader. Oxon: Routledge, 303-307.

Granovetter, Mark (1973): The Strength of Weak Ties, American Journal of Sociology, 78, 1360-1380.

Haley, David (2008): The Limits of Sustainability: the Art of Ecology. In: Kirchberg, Volker/ Kagan, Sacha (ed.): Sustainability: A New Frontier for the Arts and Cultures. Frankfurt am Main: VAS, 194-208.

Hartmann, Franz (1996): An ecopolitics for urban sustainability. In: Keil, Roger/ Wekerle, Gerda/ Bell, David (ed.): Local places in the age of the global city. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 107-115.

Holm, Andrej (2010): Gentrifizierung und Kultur: Zur Logik kulturell vermittelter Aufwertungsprozesse. In: Hannemann, Christine/ Glasauer, Herbert/ Pohlan, Jörg/ Pott, Andreas/ Kirchberg, Volker (ed.): Jahrbuch StadtRegion 2009/10 Stadtkultur und Kreativität, 64-82.

Johnston, Rosemary Ross (2008): Transdisciplinarity and the Arts. In: Nicolescu, Basarab (ed.): Transdisciplinarity: Theory and Practice. Cresshill: Hampton Press, Inc., 223-236.

Kagan, Sacha (2008a): Sustainability as a New Frontier for the Arts and Cultures. In: Kirchberg, Volker/ Kagan, Sacha (ed.): Sustainability: a new frontier for the arts and cultures. Frankfurt am Main: VAS, 14-24.

Kagan, Sacha (2008b): Art Effectuating Social Change: double entrepreneurship in conventions. In: Kirchberg, Volker/ Kagan, Sacha (ed.): Sustainability: a new frontier for the arts and cultures. Frankfurt am Main: VAS, 147-193.

Kagan, Sacha (2009): Qué TAL? – Transdisciplinary Action-Research & Literacy. Paper presented at the 2009 Summit of the World Alliance for Arts Education. (available at: http://sachakagan.wordpress.com/writings/).

Kagan, Sacha (Dec. 2010): Cultures of sustainability and the aesthetics of the pattern that connects. Futures: The journal of policy, planning and futures studies. (Page numbers according to PDF: http://sachakagan.wordpress.com/writings/).

Kagan, Sacha & Sasaki, Masayuki (2010): Sustainable Creative Cities: The role of the arts in globalized urban context. Workshop concept paper for the “4th Connecting Civil Societies of Asia and Europe Conference: Changing Challenges, New Ideas. An official side event of the ASEM8 Summit”, Asia Europe Foundation, 2-3 Oct. 2010, Brussels. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from:

http://www.leuphana.de/institute/ikkk/aktuell/ansicht/datum/2010/10/02/the-ikkk-hosts-a-workshop-at-the-official-side-event-of-the-asem-8-summit.html

Kagan, Sacha/ Hahn, Julia (2011 forthcoming): Creative Cities and (Un)Sustainability: From Creative Class to Sustainable Creative Cities. In: Culture and Local Governance / Culture et gouvernance locale, vol. 3, no. 1-2.

Keil, Roger (1996): World City Formation, Local Politics, and Sustainability. In: Keil, Roger/ Wekerle, Gerda/ Bell, David (ed.): Local Places in the Age of the Global City. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 37-44.

Kirchberg, Volker (1998): Stadtkultur in der Urban Political Economy. In: Göschel, Albrecht/ Kirchberg, Volker (ed.): Kultur in der Stadt: stadtsoziologische Analysen. Opladen: Leske + Budrich, 41-54.

Kirchberg, Volker (2001): Die McDonaldisierung von Stadtwelten und Stadtimage. In: Die alte Stadt. Vierteljahreszeitschrift für Stadtgeschichte, Stadtsoziologie, Denkmalpflege und Stadtentwicklung, 28, 1, 59-72.

Kirchberg, Volker (2006): Book Reviews: The City as an Entertainment Machine, by Terry Nichols Clark (ed.) and Neo-Bohemia: Art and Commerce in the Postindistrial City, by Richard D. Lloyd. In: City & Community, 5, 2, 199-202.

Kirchberg, Volker (2008): Angst and Unsustainability in Postmodern Times. In: Kirchberg, Volker/ Kagan, Sacha (ed.): Sustainability: a new frontier for the arts and cultures. Frankfurt am Main: VAS, 93-105.

Kirchberg, Volker (2010): Kreativität und Stadtkultur: stadtsoziologische Deutungen. In: Hannemann, Christine/ Glasauer, Herbert/ Pohlan, Jörg/ Pott, Andreas/ Kirchberg, Volker (ed.): Jahrbuch StadtRegion 2009/10 Stadtkultur und Kreativität, 19-44.

Kurt, Hildegard/ Wehrspaun, Michael (2001): Kultur: Der verdrängte Schwerpunkt des Nachhaltigkeits-Leitbildes. In: Gaia 10, 1, 16-25.

Kurt, Hildegard (2004): Aesthetics of Sustainability. In: Herman Prigann (ed.): Ecological Aesthetics. Art and Environmental Design. Theory and Practice. Basel: Birkhäuser Publishers for Architecture, 238-241.

Lazzarato, Maurizio (2007): The Misfortunes of the “Artistic Critique” and of Cultural Employment. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/0207/lazzarato/en.

Lehrer, Ute/ Wieditz, Thorben (2009): Condominium Development and Gentrification: The Relatioship between Policies, Building Activities and Socio-Economic Development in Toronto. In: Canadian Journal of Urban Research, 18, 1, 140-161.

Lorey, Isabell (2006): Governmentality and Self-Precarization. On the normalization of cultural producers. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/1106/lorey/en#redir.

Margolin, Victor (2005): Reflections on Art and Sustainability. In: Smith, Stephanie (ed.): Beyond Green. Towards Sustainable Art. Chicago: Smart Museum of Art, 20-29.

McRobbie, Angela (2002): “Jeder ist kreativ” Künstler als Pioniere der New Economy? In: Huber, Jörg (ed.): Singularitäten – Allianzen. Institute für Theorie der Gestaltung und Kunst Zürich, 37-59.

Meadows, Donella/ Meadows, Denis/ Randers, Jörgen/ Behrens III, William (2004): Perspectives, Problems, and Models. In: Wheeler, Stephen/ Beatley, Timothy (ed.): The Sustainable Urban Development Reader. London: Routledge, 49-52.

Mele, Christopher (2005): Globalization, Culture and Neighborhood Change. In: In: Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (ed.): The urban sociology reader. Oxon: Routledge, 309-315.

Menzel, Hans-Joachim (2004): Wachsende Stadt – Nachhaltige Stadt. In: Altrock, Uwe/ Schubert, Dirk (ed.): Wachsende Stadt. Leitbild – Utopie – Vision? Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 57-66.

Miles, Malcom (2004): Aesthetics and engagement: interested interventions. In: Herman Prigann (ed.): Ecological Aesthetics. Art and Environmental Design. Theory and Practice. Basel: Birkhäuser Publishers for Architecture, 202-207.

Molotch, Harvey (1976): The City as a Growth Machine: Toward a Political Economy of Place. The American Journal of Sociology, 82, 2, 309-332.

Molotch, Harvey (1999): Growth Machine Links: Up, Down, and Across. In: Jonas, Andrew E. G./ Wilson, David: The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives. New York: State University of New York, 247-265.

Montuori, Alfonso (1999): Series Editor’s Foreword. In: Morin, Edgar/ Kern, Anne Brigitte (ed.): Homeland Earth. A Manifesto for the New Millenium. Cresskill: Hampton Press, ix-xi.

Moore, Janet (2005): Is Higher Education Ready for Transformative Learning? A Question Explored in the Study of Sustainability. In: Journal of Transformative Education 3, 1, 76-91.

Nadarajah, Manickam/ Yamamoto, Ann Tomoko (2007): Introduction. In: Nadarajah, Manickam/ Yamamoto, Ann Tomoko (ed.): Urban Crisis. Culture and the sustainability of cities. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 3-12.

Nadarajah, Manickam (2007): Conclusion. In: Nadarajah, Manickam/ Yamamoto, Ann Tomoko (ed.): Urban Crisis. Culture and the sustainability of cities. Tokyo: United Nations University Press, 223-229.

Oehmke, Philipp (2010): Stadt der Gespenster. In: Der Spiegel 2010, January.

Park, Robert Ezra (2005): Human Ecology. In: Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (ed.): The urban sociology reader. Oxon: Routledge, 66-72.

Peck, Jamie (2005): Struggling with the Creative Class. In: International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 29.4, 740-770.

Pine Forge Press (2008): Interview with George Ritzer. Clip #3 “Starbuckization of Society. Pine Forge Press Study Site. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://www.pineforge.com/mcdonaldizationstudy5/videos/clip3.htm

Pütz, Uwe (2010): Den Städten droht die Spaltung. In: mobil 2010, October.

Ramadier, Thierry (2004): Transdisciplinarity and Its Challenges: the Case of Urban Studies. In: Futures 36, 423-439.

Reckwitz, Andreas (2009): Die Selbstkultivierung der Stadt. Zur Transformation moderner Urbanität in der “creative city”. In: Mittelweg 36, 18, 2-34.

Robinson, John (2004): Squaring the Circle? Some thoughts on the idea of sustainable development. In: Ecological Economics, 48, 369-384.

Runco, Mark A. (2004): Creativity. In: Annual Review of Psychology, Vol. 55, 657-687.

Sassen, Saskia (2006): Cities and Communities in the Global Economy. In: Brenner, Neil/ Keil, Roger (ed.): The Global Cities Reader. Routledge: Oxon.

Schubert, Dirk/ Altrock, Uwe (2004): “Wachsende Städte” – Inseln der Glückseligkeit im Meer der Schrumpfung zwischen Globalisierung und Nachhaltigkeit? In: Altrock, Uwe/ Schubert, Dirk (ed.): Wachsende Stadt. Leitbild – Utopie – Vision? Wiesbaden: VAS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 351-372.

Sennett, Richard (1989): The Civitas of Seeing. In: Places, Vol. 5, Nr. 4, 82-84.

Sheikh, Simon (2006): Notes on institutional critique. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://transform.eipcp.net/transversal/0106/sheikh/en#redir.

Sieren, Frank (2010): Wohlstandsverlagerung. In: Zeit 2010, August 5. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://www.zeit.de/2010/32/China-Wirtschaft.

Simmel, Georg (2005): The Metropolis and Mental Life. In: Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (ed.): The urban sociology reader. Oxon: Routledge, 24-31.

Smith, Neil (1979): A back to the city movement by capital, not people. In: Journal of the American Planning Association, 45, 4, 538-548.

Sorko, Katrin (2008): Tegernseer Landstraße. In: Süddeutsche Zeitung 2008, April 4. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://www.sueddeutsche.de/geld/strassen-in-muenchen-tegernseer-landstrasse-1.547099

Tönnies, Ferdinand (2005): Community and Society. In: Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (ed.): The urban sociology reader. Oxon: Routledge, 16-22.

United Nations (2004): Agenda 21. In: Wheeler, Stephen/ Beatley, Timothy (ed.): The Sustainable Urban Development Reader. London: Routledge, 73-79.

Webber, Melvin M. (1968): The Post-City Age. In: Daedalus 97, 1091-1110.

Whyte, Murray (2009): Why Richard Florida's honeymoon is over. In: the star.com, Jun. 27 2009. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://www.thestar.com/article/656837

Wilson, David/ Keil, Roger (2008): The real creative class. In: Social & Cultural Geography, 9, 8, 841-847.

Wirth, Louis (2005): Urbanism as a Way of Life. In: Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (ed.): The urban sociology reader. Oxon: Routledge, 33-41.

Wuggenig, Ulf (2008): Paradoxical Critique. Retrieved September 16, 2010, from: http://eipcp.net/transversal/0808/wuggenig/en.

Young, Douglas/ Keil, Roger (2009): Reconnecting the Disconnected: The Politics of Infrastrucutre in the In-Between City. In: Cities, 27, 87-95.

Zukin, Sharon (1990): Socio-Spatial Prototypes of a New Organization of Consumption: The Role of Real Cultural Capital. In: Sociology, 24, 1, 37-56.

Zukin, Sharon (2005): Whose Culture? Whose City? In: Lin, Jan/ Mele, Christopher (ed.): The urban sociology reader. Oxon: Routledge, 282-289.

Internet Sites

Creative Class Struggle: Retrieved September 16, 2010, from:

http://creativeclassstruggle.wordpress.com/

Not in Our Name: Retrieved September 16, 2010, from:

http://www.signandsight.com/features/1961.html;

aspektereport: http://aspekte.zdf.de/ZDFde/inhalt/18/0,1872,7925554,00.html.

Tutzinger Manifest: Retrieved September 16, 2010, from:

http://www.kupoge.de/ifk/tutzinger-manifest/tuma_gb.html (English version).

Magazins

Dérive. Zeitschrift für Stadtforschung. Nr. 39, 2010.

[i] An English version of the document can be found here: http://en.expo2010.cn/a/20081119/000001.htm

[ii] For reports on the situation in China in the forefront of the Expo 2010 see for example: Sieren 2010 or Fischer 2010.

[iii] The conference was held by the Japan Center, the Institute for Cultural and Social Anthropology, the Institute for Ethnology, and the Seminar of Economic History of the Ludwig Maximilians University Munich and the Urban Research Plaza of Osaka City University. For the conference page see: http://www.japan.uni-muenchen.de/veranstaltungen/alte_va/cc_02_10/index.html (retrieved September 16, 2010).

[iv] For Florida this has to do with what he describes as a "big morph" which has produced a new mainstream in which the bohemian or the artist doesn't feel alienated anymore due to the "resolution of the centuries-old tension between two value systems: the Protestant work ethic and the bohemian ethic […], which essentially has formed the "creative ethos" (Florida 2002: 192). Lloyd examines the existence of "Neo-Bohemia" in his study on the Chicago district of Wicker Park in Chicago, in which he challenges Florida's claim. As Lloyd argues "neo-bohemeia" is not a historically new group or class, but is distinguished by different structural contexts such as globalization, neoliberalism, and postindustrial cities (Lloyd 2006: 239). For Lloyd there hasn't been a melting together of two systems, instead the bohemian ethic, not the Protestant one, has best adapted to new realities and now is stressed economically (ibid).

[v] For an overview of newer research on creativity see: Sawyer 2006; Sternberg 1999; Runco 2004; In German: Rech 2007; Kirchberg 2010. Furthermore, there are a number of texts referring to a 'critique of creativity' and the imperative character it has taken on within post-fordistic economic structures. Creativity as a normative model of how everyone should be coincides with the development of artists and creatives as new role models for more economic growth (McRobbie 2002: 43). This 'be creative' imperative has far reaching consequences which are described in detail in following texts: Raunig, Wuggenig 2007; Bröckling 2007; von Osten 2003; Lorey 2006; Chiapello 1998.

[vi] This core is made up of "scientists and engineers, university professors, poets and novelists, artists, entertainers, actors, designers and architects [everyone who] fully engage[s] in the creative process" (Florida 2002: 69).

[vii] This group is made up of people working in "knowledge-intensive industries such as high-tech sectors, financial services, the legal and health care professions, and business management" (ibid).

[viii] For an overview of the debate on immaterial labor (theorized mainly by Lazzarato, Michael Hardt, and Antonio Negri) see: Dowling/Nunes/Trott 2007.

[ix] Although Florida does describe a process of “preparation, incubation, illumination and verification or revision” as important for creativity (Florida 2002: 33)

[x] The Cultural Industries, later developed into the Creative Industries, are often mentioned as the main areas in which cultural and creative goods or services are produced. These industries are part of the Creative City model as they are made up of areas in which the Creative Class work such as media, advertising, software, design, but also the contemporary art market, literature, music, and museums.
Since the mid 1980s the ‘Cultural Industries’ term (not to be confused with Adorno and Horkheimer’s “Kulturindustrie”, which criticizes the economization of culture, see: Horkheimer/ Adorno 1997) first emerged in Great Britain and was then in 1997 termed Creative Industries by the Mapping Document of the Creative Industries Task Force to include a wider range of areas. For an overview and critique see: Galloway/Dunlop 2007.

[xi] This index measures the number of gay residents by determining which unmarried roommates are of the same sex (Florida 2002: 255). A high number of gays, according to Florida, serves as an indicator of an open and tolerant area (ibid: 258), fulfilling one of the 3T’s, tolerance. Clark analyzes this ‘gay factor’ and finds that “gay impacts are severely reduced and often insignificant” (Clark 2004: 229).

[xii] Kirchberg notes that the use of creativity and urban culture concepts is generally made up of conflicts. These center around chaos and planning as a precondition for planning and between strategy and serendipity as planning basis (Kirchberg 2010: 20).

[xiii] Florida develops his theory of ‘creative capital’ according to Putnam who argues that there has been a decline in social capital regarding civic and social life, which leads to disconnectedness of individuals and communities (Putnam 2000). But Florida doesn’t see this as a threat to prosperity, instead he argues: “older communities are being exchanged for more inclusive and socially diverse arrangements” (Florida 2005: 292), which appeal more to the Creative Class and therefore are drive economic development. A further critique of Putnam’s negative effects of *Bowling Alone* (2000) is presented by Clark and Carreira da Silva 2009.

[xiv] This is not only an imperative for cities, but also for individuals. It also reflects in the way Florida describes important characteristic of the Creative Class, which include: self-management, intrinsic forms of motivation, self-statement, individuality, etc. (Florida 2002: 13). Further, Florida’s advice to choose the ‘right’ city (Florida 2008) also fits into the concept of creatively designing one’s own life but also the self-accountability that comes with it. The current German critical discourse on the creativity imperative is mentioned above in footnote 5.

[xv] This can’t be described here in detail. For an overview and critique see:

Harvey 2005; Klein 2008; In German, also regarding the critique of the neoliberal project see: Butterwegge/ Lösch/ Ptak 2007.

[xvi] Kirchberg names following texts regarding the “spatial turn” within cultural sciences. In German: Döring/ Thielmann 2008; Dünne/ Günzel 2006. In English: Gieryn 2000.

[xvii] Kirchberg refers to writings on the “cultural turn” such as, in German: Bachmann-Medick 2006; Berndt/ Pütz 2007; see also: Eade/ Mele 2002. The “cultural turn” is also proposed by members of the L.A. School (Borer 2006: 178).

[xviii] Some of which include: Sennett 1998; 2006; 2008, Baumann 2000; Ritzer 2007, which will be further described in parts 2.2 and 2.3.1.

[xix] They name following examples: Harvey 1985; Fainstein 1993; Sassen 1994; Smith 1996. Also important is Jacobs’ book: *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1992), which is a critique of the renewal policies within cities during the 1950s that eventually lead to the destruction of community life. Although mainly an urban planning book, its popularity and critique make it an essential analysis of city development at the time. Florida also refers to Jacobs as influential for him several times (Florida 2002: 41; 250) and her account of the importance of diversity, creativity, and an active street life (Jacobs 1992: 143ff.). Florida’s acknowledgement of Jacobs seems somewhat problematic as she very passionately defended (academically and ‘on the ground’) community life against top down planning policies. Florida’s accounts can be regarded as imposing exactly these top down strategies onto communities and cities as much of the critique described in parts 1.3 and 2.3 shows.

[xx] Reckwitz refers to Webber 1968. Florida also notes that globalization implies that place doesn’t matter, as new technologies “would free us from geography, allowing us to move out of crowded cities and into lives of our own bucolic choosing” (Florida 2008: 9).

[xxi] Dear lists aspects of a ‘school’ to give a working definition (Dear 2005: 108).

[xxii] Besides others such as: Park 2005; Burgess 2005.

[xxiii] Dear lists a number of geographers and planners as part of the school, such as Davis, Scott, and Soja (Dear 2005: 109).

[xxiv] For a short overview of different meanings of culture see: Abercrombie / Hill/ Turner (2000: 83).

[xxv] This is what Baudrillard refers to as “simulacrum”, which is made up of references without any foregoing references, “models of a real without origin or reality: a hyperreal” (Baudrillard 1997: 1).

[xxvi] There is also a growing number of media attention regarding the development of gentrification. In German for example: Oehmke 2010; Sorko

2008; Pütz 2010.

[xxvii] Their book also gives a good overview of the history of the term, explanations and contemporary understandings. Also important for the development of the term as well as describing explanations: Glass 1964; Smith 1979; Zukin 1989. In German: Dangschat 1988; Friedrichs/ Kecskes 1996.

[xxviii] The term “authenticity” as used here by Zukin is based more upon something claiming to be an authentic experience, than actually based on authentic origins. Regarding the urban context, “a city is authentic if it can create the *experience* of origins” (italics by Zukin 2010: 3).

[xxix] The notion of club effect has a source within economics, where it is referred to as “club goods”, for example by Buchanan 1965.

[xxx] As for community resistance against gentrification or urban renewal, which is an important aspect, especially within many groups dealing with changed urban landscapes, it essentially has to find new ways of action within these changed circumstances. Traditional forms of community action tend to encourage the image of a counterculture neighborhood, which ends up actually increasing its appeal as a creative hub as the Creative City model understands it. This is a wide field for discussion, which, for lack of space, can’t be examined further here. As for groups distinctively going against the Creative City concept see for example: Toronto based initiative *Creative Class Struggle* or Hamburg’s *Not in Our Name*.

[xxxi] He writes for example: “It has been part of the genius of neoliberal theory to provide a benevolent mask of wonderful-sounding words like freedom, liberty, choice, and rights, to hide the grim realities of the restoration or reconstitution of naked class power, locally as well as transnationally, but most particularly in the main financial centres of global capitalism” (Harvey 2005: 119).

[xxxii] A further critique of what this means for individuals, members of the Creative Class or not, is given in the critique of the Creative Class concept of this chapter.

[xxxiii] For example the edition of dérive 2010 is dedicated to the relationship of art and urban development

[xxxiv] As mentioned above for example: *Creative Class Struggle* and *Not in Our Name* in footnote XXX.

[xxxv] Castells also refers to what he terms the “new professional-managerial class” (Castells 1989: 228), which also “fundamentally shapes […] society” (ibid). Further, Castells notes the spatial organization of this class and their “concentration in privileged neighborhoods of nodal urban areas” (ibid.). Castells’ new class shows similar characteristics as the Creative Class (such as members of the new economy, high cultural and educational level, high status, etc.) (ibid.). He criticizes the structure this as it

results in as a “dual city” (ibid.), in which “distinct new segments of labor are included in and excluded from the making of history” (ibid.).

[xxxvi] Florida refers to Marx’ definition of class, as based on those who own and control the means of production and the workers under their employment. Yet he stresses that most members of the Creative Class, instead of owning actual property, posses the intangible properties of their (creative) ideas, which then translate into economic terms (Florida 2002: 68).

[xxxvii] His text also offers a good overview of the different approaches (conservative or left-wing) and critics of Florida’s ideas and their affects on urban development.

[xxxviii] As mentioned above (footnote V) von Osten (2003) refers to the ‘creative imperative’ which shows how the character of the artist successfully combines endless creative ideas and self-marketing and has therefore become a role-model within deregulated, flexible neoliberal structures in today’s economy.

[xxxix] ‘Cité’ refers to the word used originally in the French version of the book.

[xl] They base the development of this new projective city on extensive examination of management literature from the 1960s and 1990s in which they find a discrepancy between the ‘re-strengthening of capitalism’ in the 1990s and the simultaneous worsening of people’s precarious situation (Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: xxxiiff.). They also examine a helplessness of the critique of capitalism, which they divide into the social and the artistic critique (ibid: 38). This is due to the formation of the network-based ‘cité’, which is a new form of the normative justification logic needed by capitalism to legitimize its constant accumulation of capital as something that is useful and the best possible structure within society (ibid: 10). Further accounts of Boltanski and Chapello regarding the context of sustainability are examined in part 2.2.

[xli] Granovetter (1973) for example examines the importance of ‘weak ties’ within networks for finding jobs or new projects.

[xlii] Boltanski and Chiapello further refer to wider exploitation on the level of countries, corporations, and financial markets (Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: 365ff.).

[xliii] For further examination Sennett’s accounts can be useful here. He also examines the loss of long-term relationships and work relations due to a more flexible capitalism and the effects this has on the character of individuals, their values or communities, see: Sennett 1999; 2006. This will be examined closer in part 2.2.

[xliv] For example Robinson (2004) gives a good overview of the development of the concepts.

[xlv] Kagan refers to this as the “literacy of Modernity” (Kagan 2009), based on Descartes and Bacon, and becoming influential in the 19th century development of scientific disciplines and the technological sciences of the 20th century. This specific thinking, or literacy, is based on separation and generalization. Also Bacon’s main account is that progress in science and technology is beneficial to society (Hirsch Hadorn 2008: 21). Further Morin writes: “[w]e can diagnose, in Western history, the domination of a paradigm that Descartes formulated. [He, JH] disjoined on the one side the domain of the subject […] and on the other side the domain of the object” (Morin 2008: 51). This led to the increased differentiation between different disciplines, ultimately dominating the current understanding and conceptualization of the world. Brocchi also lists paradigms Descartes influenced and that are unsustainable (Brocchi 2008: 37f).

[xlvi] The plural of cultur*es* of sustainability is important as it distinguishes itself from a “monoculture of Globalization into a diversity of cultures of Sustainability” (Brocchi 2008: 27), which only refers to dominant Western society (ibid: 35). An inclusive and open approach to the search for sustainability must therefore go beyond the singular notion of culture to support a wider definition of cultures and cultural diversity. The focus here is on Western cultural or social aspects (and on the Western approach of Creative Cities), which makes it important to consider the plural cultures of sustainability also regarding the problems within this dominant culture. Referring to this, he offers a table, which contrasts this two forms nicely (ibid: 39).

[xlvii] In the book *Homeland Earth* Morin also views the earth as complex biological, anthropological totality, yet not just made up of merely the sum of the physical, biosphere, and the human. This again shows why fractured and reduced thinking cannot fully incorporate the complexity of realities (Morin/ Kern 1999: 130). This is also a concept useful for the search process of sustainability as well as cultures of sustainability because it views the earth in a holistic, yet also detailed way.

[xlviii] For a good overview of the development of the concept of transdisciplinarity see Hirsch Hadorn 2008: 19ff.

[xlix] Further, Nicolescu’s “included Middle” views all levels of reality, which is described in more detail by Kagan 2010.

[l] Important proponents of this thinking are for example, the biologist von Bertalanffy, who can be regarded as the pioneer of systemic thinking. Regarding the social sciences, Parsons and Luhmann are important. Relevant theorists today in the German discourse are for example Dirk Baecker and Helmut Wilke. For an overview on systems thinking in German see: Becker/ Reinhardt-Becker 2001.

[li] Luhmann, as a main proponent of a systems approach, doesn’t regard connections between systems. For him society is made up of autonomous

sub-systems (such as law, economy, politics) that are ultimately closed or "self-referential" (Luhmann 2005: 13), as only their internal rules apply to their system, which doesn't allow for coordination between them. This understanding of systems leaves a relatively bleak outlook regarding the possibility of change of systems by communicating among each other. This, it could be argued, is necessary (at least to a certain extent) for the process of sustainability. Therefore, as Kagan notes, Luhmann offers a concept for the culture of unsustainability, dominant in modern societies (Kagan 2010: 5). The impossibility of communication or adapting among the different systems makes them 'autopoietic'. This term is examined closer in the key words on cultures of sustainability below. For an overview on Luhmann's theory see: Luhmann 2005.

[lii] Capra also uses autopoiesis to refer to "self-generating networks as a defining characteristic of life" (Capra 2002: 13). Although he doesn't add the 'eco-', he does for example describe the cell as an open system, which, when a point of instability occurs, may form new structures. He describes this "spontaneous emergence of order at critical points of instability" (ibid: 14) as a crucial understanding of life and stresses the importance of "creativity [as] a key property of all living systems" (ibid: 14). This can also be related to the social dimension, which is a part of Capra's conceptual framework that integrates all aspects (biological, social, cognitive) of life (ibid: xv).

[liii] Kagan contrasts the 'rationalities' with Habermas' notion of reaching consensus by communication, which due to the idea of gaining a common reason doesn't work towards sustainability (Kagan 2010: 7).

[liv] In his book *The Web of Life* (1996) Capra "presents a synthesis of contemporary nonlinear theories of living systems" (Capra 2002: xviii), which attempts to grasp complex systems and their interconnectedness (or web-structure).

[lv] The term Western culture is used here to describe characteristics mainly found in the cultural and societal settings of Western Europe or Northern America. Due to globalization several aspects can also be found across the globe, but due to lack of space the degree of this cannot be examined here. As all the critiques used in the following analyze developments in Western cultural models, the focus will remain on these. Of course, analysis to what extent unsustainable tendencies can be found in other 'non-Western' cultures would be of interest for further examinations.

[lvi] Kirchberg also uses the term "postmodern times" to characterize the current state in society and also describes a "critique of modernity" (Kirchberg 2008: 93) to refer to critical accounts that have analyzed key notions. The terms modernity and postmodernity are not described further here. Yet, there is debate of whether modernity has ended (described for example by Baudrillard) and has been followed by postmodernity, or if the term modernity is still sufficient to characterize the current state of society

(as argued for example by Habermas).

[lvii] Sennett uses the term new economy to describe the current form of capitalistic structure mainly focused on the U.S. but also on Western Europe. For him this new form is the area of “high technology, finance, human services sectors, supported by global investors, conducted in institutions that are more flexible, responsive, and focused on the short-term than in the rigid bureaucratic cages of the past” (Sennett 2008: 34). The new economy has effects on individuals working in it, which Sennett specifically looks at, but its form also has wider social and cultural results, these being for example, the increased loss of rewarding work, which for Sennett is craftsmanship (ibid: 35) or the loss of long-term biographies.

[lviii] Ritzer also uses the term Starbuckization to describe a further development of McDonaldization. He refers to the coffee-chain Starbucks, which is similar to McDonalds regarding its structures and principles, but presents itself as a ‘warmer’ and ‘fuzzier’ environment. It places emphasis on the care of customers and employees using this as a way to improve its image, opposed for example to the general image of McDonalds (Pine Forge Press 2008).

[lix] The critique of Boltanski and Chiapello should be seen in the context of a tension between critical sociology and sociology of critique (Wuggenig 2008). Wuggenig regards Boltanski as the inventor of the sociology of critique (next to others like Thévenot and Heinich), which is opposed to the Bourdieu oriented critical sociology (ibid). For Boltanski, critical sociology is descriptive and indifferent and therefore unable to account for critique formulated by ‘ordinary’ people. Instead his pragmatic sociology of critique approach refers to people as “actants” (ibid) (contrary to Bourdieu’s “agents”), whose critique has to be taken seriously. As Wuggenig further notes, these attacks on Bourdieu’s theory are mainly on the “important and discussable ones” as Boltanski describes them (ibid) (contrary to the “agit-prop” of the 1990s). For Wuggenig these attacks of Bourdieu’s former students can be easily understood in terms of Bourdieu’s field theory, as Bourdieu has a dominant position within the academic field.

[lx] On the other hand, Lazzarato argues against Boltanski and Chiapello’s division of capitalism’s critique into the artistic and social and the resulting “misfortunes of the artistic critque” (Lazzarato 2007). For him, the artistic critique isn’t ‘responsible’ for the emergence of a new ‘cité’. Instead, the artistic critique also demanded social rights, equality and tied this to other ‘artistic’ demands such as freedom, authenticity, and autonomy (ibid).

[lxi] Boltanski and Chiapello actually see the possibility of a “revival of critique” (Boltanski/ Chiapello 2007: 516) through use of a network structure. They give examples of movements in the 1980s and 1990s that broke with traditional, established forms of the workers’ movement and instead used network structures (ibid: 518).

[lxii] Capra also refers to the “new economy’s network structure” (Capra 2002: 144) and concludes that the “flows of capital and information interlink worldwide networks, [and therefore, JH] exclude from these networks” (ibid). The excluded are people and areas that are of no economic gain.

[lxiii] The mainly ‘technological’ approach of sustainable urban development is a very broad and important field, which cannot be described in detail here. This is due to its extensiveness, but also because it mainly deals with finding tools, frameworks, indicators, and applications for creating sustainable cities (often regarding environmental issues), which mostly do not include cultural perspectives or only briefly. If they do include culture, then as ‘cultural sustainability’ understood as protection of the cultural identity of people, their history and connectedness to a specific place (Duxbury/ Gillette 2007: 4f.). Further on sustainable urban development see: Breuste/ Feldmann/ Uhlmann 1998; Wheeler/ Beatley 2004; Brand/ Thomas 2005; Roberts/ Ravetz/ George 2009.

[lxiv] Florida comments on Sennett’s corrosion of character and the negative effects this has on society. But, for Florida Sennett’s connection between character-building and long-term employment in large companies or institutions isn’t sufficient for explaining how stability is formed. Quoting Ciulla (Florida 2002: 109) Florida finds that changing working conditions don’t harm people’s character. Instead, Florida argues that it is fortunate that today “people are no longer required to be loyal to large corporations. Now people are free to direct their loyalties to more meaningful aspects of life” (ibid). Florida’s account of the ability to now be ‘free’ to engage in family, friends, or community aspects tends to miss that the increasing demand to be flexible doesn’t necessarily allow for more free time.

[lxv] The “war on terrorism” also shows aspects of the network-oriented projective city Boltanski and Chiapello describe. Their account of a connexionist world also shows in much of the structures of terrorist networks, which the “war on terrorism” aims to fight and defeat. Unlike previous wars between countries, this type of battle is characterized by fighting not by ‘enemy states’, but world-wide flexible terrorist networks in numerous diffuse locations and with spatially scattered members. This further shows how the projective city and its network structure can be used to analyze wider social or political developments.

[lxvi] Kirchberg also refers to McDonaldized urban areas, in which the appearance of an ‘urban experience’ is created mainly in order to encourage consumption. He refers to these “Urban Entertainment Districts” as a spatial representation of McDonaldization. In these areas, power representations are still prevailing, despite the pretense of a democratization of urban environments (Kirchberg 2001).

[lxvii] This can also be related to Ritzer’s term of Starbucksization, in which a seemingly warm and open atmosphere is created, when actually McDonaldized elements prevail. Gentrified areas, often with cafes, bars, and

active street life seem to be open to everyone, when actually only certain residents (or creatives) are desired, similar to Starbucks itself.

[lxviii] Ritzer refers to Oldenburg's term of a "great good place" (Ritzer 2007: 63), which functions as a "third place" or an "informal gathering place" (ibid).

[lxix] For Florida, formulating an ethos helps to identify creatives as a class, which should work towards a growing responsibility among its members. An awareness of themselves as a class is essential also for their function as leaders of society (Florida 2002: 315). Florida wants them to 'grow up' and take their 'natural' position within society, moving away from "uninvolved and me-oriented" (ibid) individuals. Yet, as Peck stresses, traditional forms of political involvement, such as unions, are not needed anymore within a society led by the Creative Class (Peck 2005: 746). Instead Florida remains vague and refers to the Creative Class developing of new forms of civic involvement (Florida 2002: 316). Boltanski and Chiapello find that new forms of critique are needed, ones that can better react to the projective city and its forms of exploitation and exclusion. For the critique it has been difficult to address the new circumstances within the connexionist world, which calls for a "form of justice adapted to this new logic" (Boltanski and Chiapello 2007: 535). This call for a reformation of the critique is different to Florida's demand for a 'grown up' Creative Class because it doesn't limit the responsibility or ability of minimizing inequality or exploitation through effective critique within the connexionist world to one class or section of society. The artistic critique, and more so the social critique, are potentially open to all individuals, and don't limit the "uncreative population [to, JH] merely look on, and learn" (Peck 2005: 746) as the Creative Class leads the way.

[lxx] Castells also refers to this uneven development by describing that regions, which aren't useful or valuable for capitalism are overlooked by investments, wealth and tend to lack infrastructure. This gives the changes in "information technology […] very definite spatial dimensions, with far-reaching consequences for the future of cities and regions" (Castells 1989: 33). Capra, referring to Castells, stresses that "certain segments of society, areas of cities, regions, and even entire countries become economically irrelevant" (Capra 2002: 144f.). Both these accounts also identify unsustainable aspects of the growth narrative and resulting competition.

[lxxi] Within the context of art dealing with sustainability, Kurt and Wagner see the origins of art concerned with environmental concerns and a growing debate of a cultural approach to sustainability, based on developments in the art world in the late 1960s (Kurt/ Wagner 2002: 256). Margolin gives a short historical overview of art concerned with sustainability issues, placing these into categories such as art concerned with land (i.e. "environmental art", "land art", "eco-art"), art concerned with sustainable practices (such as recycling), art responding to social issues (Margolin 2005: 22ff.). Others could be named here, such as Beuys' *7000 Oaks* project at the documenta 7

in Kassel, 1982; the ecological and environmental artists Helen Mayer Harrison and Newton Harrison, the group WochenKlausur, or the artist Patricia Johanson.

[lxxii] Kagan notes that sustainability is also used by some cultural policy makers and administrators to refer to "long-term support systems to the arts and cultural industries" (Kagan 2008a: 15).

[lxxiii] Further, Becker (2008) gives a useful account here regarding conventions, collective activity and the understanding that art works are joint products, which are created not only by an individual artist, but by a number of people. The concept of conventions and the role of the artist as an entrepreneur of these are examined further in this chapter regarding the role of the artist.

[lxxiv] This concept originated in the early 19th century in France as "l'art pour l'art" (Clarke 2003: 15). This tendency to see art as essentially independent of the rest of life is also based on Kant's aesthetics (and 'disinterest' as a key part of the aesthetic attitude) and regards art as a separate distinctive sphere (Turner 1996: 173).

[lxxv] Bourdieu's detailed description of the art field cannot be fully accounted for here. Simply put, it is made up of specific rules and legitimations, where cultural capital plays an important role in the positioning of individuals within the field (Bourdieu 1982).

[lxxvi] Adorno and Horkheimer's accounts of the Kulturindustrie already mentioned in footnote X can also be applied here to identify economization tendencies in the cultural field.

[lxxvii] The topic of aesthetics and its different definitions is a wide field, in which definitions historically change. As stated in the *Encyclopedia of Aesthetics* it is a "branch of philosophy concerned with art" (Kelly 1998: ix) and is also examined in other disciplines, such as art history, literary history law, or sociology. Turner offers a general overview, the occurring themes and a history of the term (Turner 1996: 171-183). Kurt and Wagner also offer a review regarding the separation of nature and culture also based on a diffuse understanding of aesthetics (Kurt/ Wagner 2002: 252-255).

[lxxviii] Previous art movements have dealt with internal structures of the art world, which can also be related to the context of sustainability. Ranging from, for example, the Guerrilla Girls, a group of female artists dealing with power structures and the over-representation of male artists in museums, etc. (Guerrilla Girls 1998) to Institutional Critique movements to artists such as Hans Haake, who question the institutional structures of the art world's organizations (see for example: Fraser 2005 or Sheikh 2006). These examples show that art has undertaken numerous efforts (during the 20th century) to become critically aware of its inner structures. This, as Kurt states, means that art "can now be entirely constructive in the search for sustainable life-forms" (Kurt 2004: 239).

[lxxix] Bateson uses the approach of asking art students what arguments they would bring forth to explain that a cooked crab, which he presents to them, is still a living thing. Through this he arrives at the symmetrical structure of the crab and eventually at the recognition of a reoccurring pattern. For him sensibility to this pattern is essential and he criticizes the lack of this in (school) education, which leads to an inability to learn about the entirety of things (Bateson 2002: 6ff.).

[lxxx] A wider form of reflexivity based on “more-than-rational” (Dieleman 2008: 108) competencies or knowledge is further examined below in this chapter, especially regarding the potential of artists in shaping it.

[lxxxi] This would include an Institutional Critique as described in footnote LXXVIII.

[lxxxii] This conference was held in April of 2001 by the Evangelische Akademie Tuzing, the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Ästhetik e.V., and many others. Supporters were able to sign a declaration, which was a call for actors of sustainability and politics to consider the cultural-aesthetic dimension of sustainability as a strategy for its implementation at the *World Summit on Sustainable Development* in Johannesburg, 2002.

[lxxxiii] An example is the *Monogahela Conference* held in 2004 at the Carnegie Mellon University, which brought together artists and theorists concerned with ecological and social issues and what change art can initiate regarding for example urban planning. A comprehensive documentation of the conference can be found here: http://moncon.greenmuseum.org/

[lxxxiv] Kagan refers to the Romantic Order (Kagan 2008b: 172), which originating two centuries ago and is still a dominant belief. In it, the artist is seen as an individual, who is gifted, can “create works of exceptional beauty and depth which […] express profound human emotions and cultural values” (ibid.). Kagan also refers to the “Technological System” (ibid.), which the Romantic Order paradoxically supports. This technological understanding is mainly characterized by autonomy and fragmentation, which in turn supports the development of an autonomous field of art, including the notion of the gifted artists and the denial of economic functions have lead to a “self-alienation of the art worlds” (ibid: 173).

[lxxxv] As Gablik notes, the way most of the audience ‘sees’ art is determined by conventions coming from the “language and concepts of Cartesian aesthetics, a tradition in which individuals and individual art works are the basic elements” (Gablik 1991: 116). These can be regarded as also shaping most of the conventions Becker refers to, even if he does include the other actors involved for his sociological account. Yet their actions are still mostly based on the notions of a ‘genius’, ‘creative’ artist.

[lxxxvi] Arts education, which would bring more-than-rational understandings into general education, is another essential part of artists’ role for sustainability, also regarding the urban context. Within cities incorporating

sustainability concerns, artists and creatives could help build open, inclusive networks among all residents (and non-residents) and bring artistic approaches into education. The aspect of sustainability in (higher) education is for example examined by Moore 2005; Adomssent/ Godemann/ Michelson 2007; Barth et al. 2007.

[lxxxvii] An example for the involvement of artists in the urban conext is the project 2008 (16th of August until 14th of September) *Culture/Nature*, part of the *International Building Exposition in Hamburg* (IBA) and its exhibitions *Elbe Island Summers,* which served as a platform for artists and others to reflect on cultural and social concepts of nature and the city related to climate change challenges. Various art projects circled around the specific situation in Wilhelmsburg, Hamburg also dealing with questions of how art and culture are used (for instance by the IBA) to achieve city planning goals. Their approach made "no clear difference between art praxis and urban praxis – and so our platform made it a point to involve locally and internationally active groups and individuals as artistic performers" (Haarman/ Lemke 2009, illustrated version). This makes the project especially interesting regarding the rethinking of creativity and roles of artists and creatives within Sustainable Creative Cities, showing how (art) projects can work towards inclusive, participatory structures, building more-than-rational reflexivity, and opening urban debates, also regarding sustainability issues. For documentation of this project see: Haarmann/ Lemke 2009.

[lxxxviii] As for Florida, his accounts only include aspects of sustainability (mainly regarding environmental concerns), which correspond with lifestyle demands, such as offering bike paths for the preferred activity of many members of the Creative Class (Florida 2002: 173). This approach is not sufficient enough for the task of including sustainability aspects and their cultural implications within the urban context.

[lxxxix] Castells does describe the problem of local movements becoming closed off, contrasting themselves to globalization developments. These "grassroots mobilizations tend to be defensive, protective, territorially bounded, or […] culturally specific" (Castells 1989: 350). They become more tribal and likely draw to "fundamentalist affirmation of their identity" (ibid). Extremely self-centered communities or movements cannot be a goal within a process of sustainability or a part of Sustainable Creative Cities as they do not correspond with cultures of sustainability, becoming more and more autopoietic, losing resilience and diversity.

[xc] The new policies could be oriented according to cultural indicators that can quantitatively and qualitatively 'assess' culture's contribution in the sustainability of cities (Choe/ Marcotullio/ Piracha 2007: 193ff.).

[xci] The origins of the document can be traced back to a meeting in September of 2002 in Porto Alegre, where mayors, councilors and directors for cultural affairs attended. Based on this, different drafts of the document were discussed in various networks (Interlocal, Eurocities, les Rencontres,

Sigma). The final version was approved by the 4th Forum of Local Authorities for Social Inclusion of Porto Alegre in Barcelona in May of 2004 as part of the first Universal Forum of Cultures. For a detailed report on developments see: Agenda 21 for culture 2009.

Creative Cities and (Un)Sustainability – Cultural Perspectives

Julia Hahn

The city today is increasingly conceptualized using terms such as ‘creative cities’ or ‘creative class’, stressing the importance of culture. The effects this can have on cities and neighbourhoods has been criticised from the wider field of sociology. This critique can be examined and placed in the context of the analysis of a culture of unsustainability, in order to identify how the concept of creative cities may bring about unsustainable tendencies. Building on this, a re-conceptualization of creative cities, based on an understanding of the role of the artist in cultures of sustainability is possible. Rethinking terms such as creativity can help form possible frameworks, which support sustainable creative cities.

Julia Hahn (*1981) studied Applied Cultural Sciences (2003 – 2010) at the Leuphana University of Lüneburg/ **Julia Hahn** (*1981) hat Angewandte Kulturwissenschaften an der Leuphana Universität Lüneburg studiert.

Volume 3 in the Cultura21 eBooks Series on Culture and Sustainability / Dritter Band der Cultura21 eBooks Reihe zu Kultur und Nachhaltigkeit.

cultura21

ISBN 978-3-945253-04-5