

What Makes Cities' Marketing Policies Successful in Sustaining Contemporary Arts and Creating Social Value?

Michela Addis

Assistant Professor at Bocconi University and instructor
at SDA Bocconi Business School Marketing Department

Marta Fumagalli

ASK (Art, Science and Knowledge), Bocconi University

Michela Addis, PhD, is Assistant Professor, Marketing Department, L. Bocconi University, Milan, Italy. She is also an instructor at the Marketing Department, SDA Bocconi. Her field of research are cultural marketing, the experience of consumption, and customer loyalty and relationship management.

Marta Fumagalli, born in Lecco on December, 31st of 1980, is graduated in Economics for Art, Culture and Communication at Bocconi University, Milan, in 2004. She collaborates with ASK (Art, Science and Knowledge), research centre at Bocconi University, on different cultural projects. At the moment she is working in a renowned fashion and design factory.

Abstract

Through five international case studies, three Finnish and two Italian, some applications of territorial marketing adopted by the governments of Helsinki and Milan are identified and discussed. Support for the arts is generally cited as one of cities' investment priorities, one which requires careful planning if it is to fully develop benefits for residents and tourists. The cases studied concern contemporary art, and allow some of the causes of success and failure of implemented policies to be identified.

Keywords

Contemporary art, marketing, city.

Introduction

Arts and culture are generally considered important assets for any society. The educational and ethical value of art makes it interesting to the international community, and this recognition is translated into a country's mission to protect each and every expression of human creativity. The governments of continental Europe - with France and Italy in first place - have been active in the promotion of art since the medieval period (Frey & Pommerehne, 1989). They have invested heavily in order to leave the sector outside the typical commercial logic of the market. According to the Touring Club 2005 Report, however, public expenditure for arts and culture related tourism activities are very different across Europe: Italy spends €3,314 billion, equal to €57 per capita, Germany spends €8,193 billion which is equal to €99 per capita, up to France which spends €7,105 billion, which is €119 per capita (Touring Club, 2005 Report).

Whatever the amount of money invested, central governments and local administrative offices – especially with regard to Europe – have been involved in sustaining, maintaining and promoting cultural activities. Hence, the relevance of the geographical areas has put cities in charge of creating economic systems able to appeal to visitors as well as investors (Lever, 1993). This is particularly true with regard to people who traditionally use cities, i.e.

businessmen, residents, companies, and so on (Harvey, 1998). Those categories are considered to be the target of the new marketing policies of places (Van der Meer, 1990; Kotler, et al., 1999).

Since, in the postindustrial era, there is an increasing demand of places and contexts able to provide people with the power to oppose globalization (Petersen, 1999), culture has become more powerful in shaping the cities' development. Hence, the cultural-driven image of cities has become necessary for the development of geographical areas (Sacco, 2003) and human creativity has become the ultimate economic resource able to raise societies' living standards (Florida, 2002).

As a result, cities must address an important topic: How to sustain and maintain the cultural resources they have, and how to improve the role of culture as a connecting force for a society. In other words, what kind of cultural policies can be used to support the arts?

Cities' Marketing Policies

From an economic point of view, the urban system is a primary driver for the development of cities, which are now centres for new economic networks (Lever, 1993). Since cities are now evaluated on their ability to attract resources, the governmental and local policies become quite important. At the same time, the local policies of cities are also an interesting issue from a sociological perspective (Harvey, 1998): Cities must supply residents with a broad range of services, in order to become attractive to them too. Indeed, a lively city must attract new resources and leverage on the material and immaterial flows coming from tourists, businessmen, companies, travellers, immigrants, and so on.

A cultural-driven image of a city is a necessary component of future development of the economies. The marketing of spaces, with particular regard to building a strong and consistent image for a city, is a necessary tool in order to give rise to its future development (Kotler, et al., 1999).

From this perspective, applying marketing principles and practices to cities has raised interest since '80s, along with the competition to attract firms and companies for the new European market (Golfetto, 2000). However, those efforts can be employed by focusing on the resources which can enable a powerful productive aspect, and on the resources that are able to make the social and cultural aspects of cities grow.

Every activity of the marketing of places is a combination of (Valdani and Ancarani, 2000):

- 1) Promotion of places, of their features and distinctive resources , in order to attract more and more investments and visitors;
- 2) Satisfaction of present and potential economic operators' needs, thanks to the application of urban policies;
- 3) Re-engineering of administrative routines, in order to take care of the "customers" of the "urban system" product.

A broad range of urban marketing activities aims at creating the development of places, in order to achieve a strong productive basis. In doing so, cities become more powerful in attracting working people, visitors and tourists, and through them receive more new investments. However, since places are essentially made up of people and their lives, there is multiplicity of

perspectives and ideas, that have been developed over the years. It means that the potential level of conflict can be very high. Indeed, not only are there several market segments, but also the goals that cities want to reach can be different (Van Der Mer, 1990). Furthermore, cities should decide the destination of funds and the marketing policies able to reach those goals.

The relevance of this issue is even greater if it is related to contemporary art, which is by definition one of the most difficult artistic expressions. The literature on that topic is still scant, and finding cases of marketing policies able to have an impact on the cultural resources of a specific geographic area is very difficult.

In order to understand more deeply the marketing policies that the central and the local administrations of a territory can apply to put their missions in action, we have studied two different European cities: Helsinki and Milan. Indeed, both of them have invested many resources in developing arts and culture, but they have done that in different ways. The goal of our research is to better investigate the various kinds of geographical marketing policies and their effects on the cultural assets, with particular regard to their social value.

The paper presents the results of exploratory multiple case studies. The research study therefore made use of in-depth interviews conducted with the managers of several important institutions actively involved in contemporary art.

Helsinki Cases

Helsinki is a good example of pursuing policies which demonstrate the economic value and impact of culture and its role in developing the society, in other words enterprises, employment opportunities, tourism and international profile. In Helsinki there are some interesting institutions of contemporary art, that were able to elicit not only popular interest, but soon became important landmarks for the whole community. In particular, we have studied three cases: Kiasma Museum, Helsinki City Art Museum, and Cable Factory. Each of them addresses contemporary arts in different ways, and each of them is the result of several government policies. Through this study we are able to identify some of the marketing policies and their results on the performances of those artistic institutions.

The marketing policies of public administration can be traced back to the following initiatives:

The Constitution of the Frame Governing Body

One of the initiatives considered most far-sighted by the Finnish artistic institutions is the constitution of Frame, a body designed to bring supply and demand of the visual arts together in the smoothest and most efficient way.

Its mission is as follows:

“Frame Finish Fund for Art Exchange provides services and acts as an export body in international exchanges relating to the visual arts”.

Frame Finish Fund for Art Exchange was founded on 31st December 1992, under the Fine Arts Academy Foundation, founded in 1939 and nationalised in 1990 when the government adopted a national political system in support of Finnish art.

Since its foundation, therefore, Frame has been a governing body which only works thanks to the financing it receives annually from the Ministry of Culture, a department of the Ministry of Education: 100% of Frames financial backing (a value of over €200,000) comes from the state. The board consists of 12 people, 3 of whom come from the Ministry of Education, 1 from the City of Helsinki, 3 from the Fine Arts Association of Finland, 1 from the Artists' Association of Finland, 1 from the Association of Finnish Painters, 1 from the Association of Finnish Sculptors, 1 from the Association of Finnish Graphic Artists, and 1 from the Union of Finnish Art Associations.

Frame's first director was Markku Valkonen, the visual arts critic from the national daily Helsingin Sanomat, who was responsible for planning the organisation.

Frame was founded with a mission to support Finnish art on the international market. From the 1980's, the positioning of national art on the international market was largely managed by the State by means of agreements signed with other governments. But over time, the work was divided between a number entities. This allowed greater flexibility and independence to be achieved. At the same time this process created greater operational difficulties since the various entities needed to be sufficiently familiar with the international politics in force in the various countries. Frame was founded to address these issues, in agreement with the considerable effort which the Finnish government decided to bestow on cultural policies. It should be born in mind that 0.4% of the GNP is assigned to the development of creativity in Finland.

It is of fundamental importance for artists to appear with their works and installations in foreign exhibitions and Frame provides all kinds of support in this. It is committed to reducing the distance which has historically and geographically isolated Finland from the rest of the world. This distance is even riskier when innovation and experimentation are not easily reconcilable with large audiences, as in the case of contemporary art.

To help artists overcome these difficulties, Frame acts as a sort of information broker, or link between national artists and international art institutions.

More specifically, Frame:

- 1) Awards scholarships. Frame offers financial support to artists for the production, exhibition and presentation of their works abroad. Applications for scholarships are presented 3 times a year. In 2003 Frame evaluated 203 applications and awarded 108 scholarships.
- 2) Creates the basis for national and international projects for the production of contemporary visual arts, exhibitions or publications.
- 3) Acts as host to international visitors with the aim of broadening and reinforcing a network of relationships, and for exchanges and collaboration. Curators, critics art historians and scientists are invited to Finland to carry out research or projects. Other institutions may also participate in the visitors' programme.
- 4) Organises residential programmes, in association with HIAP– Helsinki International Artist Programme and with the Academy of Fine Arts in Helsinki. The programme is carried out through the *international artist-in-residence* and the *curator-in-residence*. The first is aimed at Finnish artists who are able to do work experience abroad, and are provided with accommodation and the opportunity to carry out research, produce and present their work. The second is aimed at international curators who wish to spend a period of time in Helsinki to do research and develop exhibitions and publications in the future.

- 5) Provides information about contemporary Finnish art. To do this, Frame uses two main communication channels: its website (<http://www.frame-fund.fi>) and its magazine called Framework. Framework represents the evolution of the old Frame news, a magazine published between 2000 and 2003. Today Framework aims to act as a forum, an additional way of promoting national art at an international level. The magazine contains information about artists and their news.

Frame thereby enters into collaboration agreements with foreign museums with the aim of promoting Finnish art. Table 1 summarises Frame's performance between 1999 and 2003.

Table 1: Frame's Performance, 1999-2003

Category	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Staff		2 (+1)	3	3	4
Scholarships (number and average value)	83	121	94	106	108
	1,996	1,550	2,132	1,971	2,052
Visitors' programmes	25	29	38	40	33

The Creation of Ad Hoc Museum Areas

Finnish public administration has paid considerable attention to creating museum areas devoted to housing contemporary art. There have been two particularly significant investments recently: the creation of an entirely new museum dedicated to contemporary art, the Kiasma, and the Cable Factory being used specifically for this purpose.

The Kiasma Museum

The Kiasma Museum of Contemporary Art was opened in 1990, when on the occasion of the renewal of the Ateneum museum, the Ministry of Education, responsible for the Government's education, science and culture policy, founded the Finnish National Gallery (FNG) which had two purposes:

- 1) Create a national identity for the Finnish people. The delay in the process of forming this identity, which goes back to the 19th century, can be attributed to the country's history;
- 2) Continuously increase the artistic heritage to nourish the identity of the society to whom it is aimed.

When it was founded, the Museum of Contemporary Art was responsible for filling the gaps in the initial collection. In particular, the collection lacked works of art produced in the 1970's and 1980's, especially in photography, conceptual art, video art and installations which had been neglected up till then by the buying policies adopted by the Museum of Finnish Art.

Since then the Museum of Contemporary Art has dealt with presenting the evolution of Finnish contemporary art to the public, mainly national works of art, giving international priority to those of the Nordic countries, the Baltic states and Russia, giving less priority to art from the rest of Europe and the United States. Works of art can only be bought from the latter countries if they represent current trends and processes of great artistic value.

The museum's collection seeks to:

- 1) Act as a meeting point for art and public, as well as a place for debate;
- 2) Help the public understand innovations in art, educating them towards contemporary art which is often wrongly considered to be difficult.

More specifically, Kiasma's mission is defined as follows:

"Kiasma, the Museum of Contemporary Art, is a totally new kind of centre for visual culture which functions as a living-room and meeting point for the general public. The aim is to bring contemporary art and artists into living contact with a wide audience. Kiasma is active, lively, pluralistic and open. Its activities follow the needs and requirements of today: the museum is open until ten in the evening and follows a customer-friendly 'one ticket' admission fee policy designed to attract as wide an audience as possible.

The Kiasma repertoire is not restricted to traditional collection and exhibition activities. Kiasma is a versatile, international stage for visual culture – performance, theatre, dance, multimedia and cinema – along with contemporary music, literature, seminars, lectures and a range of other events – and takes advantage of modern information technology in all its activities. Projects and new production forms in contemporary art form part of Kiasma's activities both inside and outside the museum.

Kiasma is not merely a physical space, but also a rich conceptual space which acts as a catalyst for various thoughts, ideas and discourses. Kiasma is an open forum for the exchange of opinions, the on-going process of redefining art and culture, and following the processes of art.

The museum provides its audience with the help and keys needed for encountering contemporary art, for example through museum education. Kiasma's work is research, the perception of interesting questions and points of view, and the motto: "Find out!"

The Government's interest in this museum later took the form of seeking a suitable space for displaying contemporary works of art. In 1992, the process of creating a new site for the Museum of Contemporary Art got underway, a place which was based on the museum's concept. This was seen as a versatile institution, a cultural centre dedicated to presenting interdisciplinary artistic programmes. The museum was seen as an open institution, which recognised and followed the principle that dealing in contemporary art means ignoring all disciplinary boundaries. For a museum such as this, the traditional distinction between work related to the collection and work related to temporary exhibitions becomes meaningless compared to organising seminars, lessons, debates and public events.

From the beginning, the Kiasma wanted to bring contemporary art to as many people as possible, teaching them to appreciate it in its many forms, expressions of a multitude of values. The museum's management wanted to do everything in its power to guarantee the public's physical and intellectual closeness to art. To this end, the new site represented a very important device.

The project for the new site began through an agreement made between the Government of the City of Helsinki, which agreed to give land to the City of Helsinki for building new houses, and the City of Helsinki which agreed to build a museum of contemporary art for this Government. The site chosen for the new museum was in a very central location, on a strip of land between Mannerheimintie, Helsinki's main thoroughfare named after its national hero, and the central post office (see Figure 1).

Figure 1: The Kiasma building



In the winter of 1992, the architecture bids for the construction of the museum were opened, and 516 projects were submitted. The tender, the biggest ever held in Finland, was open to architects in North European and Baltic countries, although architects from other nations were also invited to take part.

The tender took place in an atmosphere of perplexity and debate. Many people had doubts about the relevance of the project while others criticised the location because the new Museum would be too near the statue of the national hero, Marshal Mannerheim, on horseback.

Further doubts were added when, at the end of the tender, the winner Steven Holl, was announced. The uncertainty about the victory was not so much concerned with the project as with the nationality of the architect, who was neither Finnish nor Nordic. He won the tender for the Kiasma project, which in the words of the architect, was meant to represent: *“an interior mystery and the exterior horizon, which, like two hands clasping each other, form the architectonic equivalent of a public invitation”*.

The interior is structured on a ramp which accompanies the visitors on their journey towards contemporary art. The ramp also links the interior areas which are accessed through diagonal entrances. The interior is therefore formed like a “gallery of rooms”, void of an intermediate dimension but created to offset their considerable size against that of the works of art which they contain. All the rooms are of different sizes and are lit by natural light, though this varies due to the positions of the rooms. Asymmetry, dynamism, heterogeneity and silence are the project’s basic concepts.

The museum moved to the new site in 1998.

The Cable Factory

Helsinki’s Cable Factory cultural centre, the country’s largest centre, is located in a huge structure measuring 55,000m², consisting of one central and two side blocks. The building is a complex created at the beginning of the 1940’s to house the production of telephone and electronic cables by the Finnish Cable Factory Ltd, later acquired by Nokia Corporation. Nokia’s

new production line of the 1980's limited the manufacturing use of the space, leaving unused areas which were rented out, because of their special characteristics of spaciousness and light, mainly to artists. With time, these areas began to cause increasingly serious maintenance problems and Nokia decided to leave the whole building to the City in exchange for a new, smaller building, located nearby. The City of Helsinki's cultural development committee, led at the time by the famous director Jorn Donner, recommended a project in which the area should be devoted to artistic-cultural activities. Various proposals for the site were put forward but Finland's serious economic difficulties, caused by the soviet crisis, determined an agreement about using the building for a cultural centre, dedicated to art and culture. In this way, the renovation project would only cover essential maintenance of the whole complex, adapting it to its new cultural function:

"The conclusion of this process was that Cable Factory should be given to culture and arts, to artists and cultural organisations. I think that this decision was one of the most important decisions in the history of Helsinki in cultural field." (Antti Manninen, Managing Director)

Basically, the City of Helsinki wanted to give the Finnish people a cultural, artistic and multidisciplinary centre able to offer a series of cultural services impossible to find elsewhere. The ultimate aim was to enhance the image of Helsinki and the country in cultural and artistic circles, hopefully also creating positive effects for tourism in the city.

The area is currently owned by the City of Helsinki, but renting space to cultural and artistic individuals is handled by Real Estate Company Cable House, a private profit-making company founded in 1992 and wholly owned by the City of Helsinki, to renovate and manage the whole site. Even though it is owned by the city, the company receives no financing, either from the city itself or from the State, but remains completely independent economically. The Real Estate Company is directed by a board nominated by the city of Helsinki and made up of eight members including:

- The person who devised the idea, the film director Jorn Donner;
- A representative of the European Film Academy who acts as President;
- The administrative director of the City of Helsinki, an important figure for the legitimisation of the centre's activities at a public level;
- The City's Building Manager;
- An adviser to the Finnish Prime Minister;
- Three representatives elected by a group of artists and centre employees.

So far, the Real Estate Company has renovated the building with low budget creative solutions, keeping costs below 60 million francs, approximately €9.6m.

Cable Factory sets out to be a multidisciplinary cultural centre which focuses on offering areas devoted to artistic and cultural activities through a policy of highly attractive prices. A defined artistic proposal for the city, however, is not perceived as a natural consequence by the management.

Today the complex houses:

- Three museums: the Finnish Museum of Photography, the Theatre Museum and the Hotel and Restaurant Museum;
- The Centre Culturel Français;
- Six centres for dance and theatre;

- Five Art Schools
- Artistic workshops;
- Workshop areas;
- Five art galleries and three commercial galleries;
- Five main function centres which are rented for brief periods;
- A conference hall;
- Four gyms equipped for various types of sports;
- Three art shops;
- A bar;
- A restaurant.

More than 100 artists work in the laboratories and workshops, more than half of whom are Finnish, and they include musicians, actors, architects and dancers.

As well as this, the Cable Factory areas are home to numerous cultural, artistic, commercial and non-profit making organisations and companies. Approximately 60 music groups operate from the Cable Factory, as well as Helsinki International Artists-in-residence Program (HIAP), the offices of Trans Europe Halles, some film production companies, small production agencies, two radio stations, two small publishing houses and three small companies working in the new media sector.

Rental agreements for the space can be short (a few weeks) or long term. The Cable Factory does not screen the artistic-cultural groups who rent the space; a simple waiting list determines entry. If anything, screening is done by the City of Helsinki which makes a shortlist based on the need for financial support. It is the City Cultural Department which selects the groups who will receive economic support for the rent at the Cable Factory, support which amounts to approximately 1/3 of the total rent, and gives priority to those who demonstrate greater skill. Sometimes the State may become involved in this type of support for specific artistic activities or individual artists.

Cable Factory is visited by at least 250,000 people each year, even though this figure only includes paying visitors and does not take into account those who do not enter the sites which have an entry fee. No studies have been carried out on this topic and at present there is a great deal of confusion over which numbers Cable Factory refers to, the artists or the visitors.

As a consequence of the fact that building up the relationship between the public, local or otherwise, is the exclusive responsibility of the individual organisations and that the management of the Cable Factory does not invest in public events and services, the centre's image appears to be poorly defined and pays little attention to their needs.

According to the opinion of the Cable Factory management, having the chance to work in the cultural centre is a unique opportunity to improve one's image. It appears that the centre is gradually becoming more popular and well known, but only in terms of the cultural and artistic people who work there. A lack of organisation can be seen in terms of the general, non-specialised public as well as in terms of schools and universities, groups who should be more closely involved in the centre's activities.

Close Collaboration Between Institutions

Besides the creation of Kiasma and its site, the City of Helsinki has also tried to support contemporary arts by generating strong and long-lasting relationships.

The Helsinki City Art Museum is one of the most important Finnish museums, and it is dedicated to several artistic fields. It focuses mainly on the contemporary arts, both at the national and the international level.

Up to 1998, the Museum worked as an independent administrative office, but in 1998 it was taken over by the City of Helsinki Cultural Office.

The Art Museum is managed by a board, which is nominated through political procedures. Nine members of it are directly nominated by the City Council.

Officially, the mission of the Museum is to take care of the artistic policies and the collections of the City.

The Helsinki City Art Museum is made up of:

- Two museums: the Art Museum Tennis Palace and the Art Museum Meilahti, which do not have a permanent collection. They organize several big exhibitions per year, usually between 8 and 10. They also organize about fifteen small exhibitions, for which one room is usually enough;
- The Kluuvi Gallery, which organizes about fifteen exhibitions of various dimensions during the year;
- The Department of Preservation.

Each structure of the Art Museum is visited by between 100,000 and 200,000 people yearly.

The Museum is also in charge of the maintenance and improvement of collections and public sculptures that belong to the City of Helsinki. The Art Museum places most of its collections in public offices all around the city, with particular attention to the buildings which are new or recently restored. They want the general public to have the opportunity to look at works of art, and to live the experience of arts and culture. This policy is also able to improve the quality of the work-places.

In 2003, the Museum set aside €1 m to buy pieces of art. Furthermore, starting from 1991, the City of Helsinki has applied the “*Percent for Art Principle*”, which consists in the use of 1% of its budget to buy and to commission works of art. Around the city there are approximately 400 public pieces of art, included external sculptures, environmental works of art, and historical monuments. These pieces are located in hospitals, health centres, schools, centres for young people, and public offices.

While the pieces of art around the parks, streets and squares of the city belong to the collections of the Helsinki City Art Museum, in the museum building there are the pieces that belong to the State, to companies and to private owners. Nowadays, the collections of the City of Helsinki are made up of 9,000 pieces of arts. They are mainly Finnish, dating from several eras. The Museum is tries to organize at least one big exhibition based on the pieces that belong to the City of Helsinki.

In order to transform the utility of the collections into a public service, they are accessible to any researcher, and the Museum is in charge of their documentation, conservation, and research activities.

The Art Museum and the City of Helsinki have strong relationships based on collaboration and cooperation, the intensity of which has increased over the years. The Museum activities are considered to have contributed to the development of the City, mainly through the management of the public art and the active conservation of the pieces.

Milan Cases

The case study that we have conducted with regard to the City of Milan have produced results which give rise to concern. A very worrying framework emerges from it, and this is even more serious if we look at contemporary art.

Thanks to this study, we have identified the failure of the city in sustaining contemporary arts, and at the same time we are able to understand the reasons for this. Generally, it depends on the unwise choices of the local administration with regard to their marketing activities and their efforts in creating a successful image of the City. To better understand the reasons why, we report two emblematic cases that can be considered – unfortunately – typical of this situation.

The Museum of Contemporary Arts in Milan

In the world of Italian art, Milan is generally considered a very important centre for contemporary arts. Indeed, it is considered to be the Italian centre for fashion, design and, generally speaking, for any new trend related to what art and culture are nowadays. Hence, it is surprising to note that it is still waiting for a museum devoted to contemporary arts. As a consequence, one can point out that private individuals are the ones who mainly manage the activities for contemporary arts. Thanks to the initiatives and the works of these individuals, Milan remains an important centre for observing developments in the field of the social and the economic life of the country. However, it is also true that the local administration has recently presented interesting and important projects.

This is the case of the first project that we discuss here. It is called the Museum of the Present, and it is about the creation of a new museum, that should be devoted completely to contemporary arts.

The Museum project is part of a broader plan that aims at re-qualifying a neighbourhood in Milan, which is called Bovisa-Politenico. This area is quite peripheral, and it is located at the North-West of the city. The project has been presented at the Biennial Show in Venice, at the Italy stand. The competition for the new architectural plan was announced publicly in 1997, and it was won in 1998 by Ishimoto Architectural & Engineering Firm and by Serete group. The latter is in charge of the project of the Museum of the Present, which should be located in the former gasometers of AEM, Milan's energy company. However, work was stopped in 1998 because of some structural problems in this area of the City.

To go deeply into the case study, it is necessary to address the topic of the socio, political and cultural context in which this project was developed.

In Italy there are several museums dedicated to modern and contemporary arts, and among them, one of the most important is the Civic Museum of Contemporary Arts (CIMAC) in Milan. This institution is very interesting because it does not have a fixed site, but it uses only temporary places to carry out its activities. The places that have hosted the Museum have many problems from the points of view of services and structure. The Museum belongs to the City Council of Milan. Both from the administrative and the scientific perspectives, it is managed by the City Council Artistic Collections, which puts together all of the communal collections from ancient arts to contemporary arts.

Up to 2003, the CIMAC was hosted in a small space, located on the second floor of the Royal Palace. However, when the restoration works started at the Palace, the museum was closed, and only a small part of the collection remained accessible to the general public. It is hosted by the Museum of the Permanent.

The plans of the City Council call for two separate museums: The museum of the Twentieth-Century, that should be hosted inside the Royal Palace, and the Museum of the Present, that is going to be located inside the gasometers in the Bovisa area. The first Museum should collect works of art dating from the beginning of the XX century to the first years after World War I. The second Museum, on the other hand, is devoted to contemporary arts, and should find a perfect home in the gasometers. In fact, there is a huge space and it is also consistent with the needs for the display of contemporary arts. Finally, the collection is also going to be exhibited in some other places around the City, that need to be restored and converted.

The implementation of this project is completely under the control of the City Council but, up to now, it has done little, if anything.. This case is even more dramatic if we contextualise it in the City, which is extremely bad. Museums of modern and contemporary arts have to operate under very difficult conditions. It is easy for visitors to find some of them closed because of restoration works, and when they are open, their operation hours are usually reduced, due generally to the big issue of staff which is never enough to satisfy the visitors' needs and to find the point of equilibrium with the economic budget available to the institutions.

Again, private individuals are the main players here. One of the most important institutions that play a role in the Museum of the Present history is an Association called ACACIA, Friends of Italian Contemporary Arts, which has brought together private collectors since 2003. Even if ACACIA does not have exhibition places and does not have its own publications, its seminars, exhibitions, visits, and debates are quite important in the City. It also offers many services and discounts. The fee that people pay to become a member of the association is a sort of sinking money, and this feature highlights the interest of citizens of Milan towards the contemporary arts. The organisational structure of ACACIA is small, and it is managed by a small group of people. ACACIA has an agreement with the City Council that enables it to take part in the constituting process of the collection of the Museum of the Present. ACACIA donates one work of art each year up to the year 2007/2008. Thanks to the activity carried out by this institution, we can point out the relevance that contemporary arts play in Milan, especially for the general public, but, unfortunately, we cannot say the same with regard to the local administration. Indeed, the City Council does not seem to consider the needs of its customers at all.

The Cultural Centre for Young People

The ambitious project of the cultural centre "Factory of Steam" is the second interesting and important Italian case for which the discussion is worthwhile.

Towards the end of the 1980's, the City Council of Milan had to address many issues with regard to the future generations' interests and needs. Young people were demanding spaces and structures able to support their creativity and to raise their spirits. They also criticised the present situation for not offering them concrete opportunities to learn and to socialise, as well as to experiment. When the pressure coming from the young segments of the population started to become stronger and higher, and when the local administration could not avoid recognising that the biggest European cities were already working towards that goal, the City Council of Milan also started to think about it. Generally, the efforts of the big European cities were directed towards the support and development of culture and creativity of and for young people.

In 1988, the local administration created a project team at its core, which was in charge of studying and planning a project whose promising name was "The City of Young People". Even if we heard a lot about this project, no concrete action was taken, and it remained just a project, one of the many that have never been realised.

About ten years later, Mr. Albertini won the new local elections. He is still the Major of the City of Milan. The policies to give power and value to the young cultures were one of the main issues of his political plans. The way he proposed to address the topic was called "Factory of Steam". The Aldermanship of Sporting Activities and Young People asked for the support of several people among the most important authorities on art and culture in the City. In 1988 a former factory in which street-cars used to be produced was restored, and a multifunctional cultural centre took its place. The Factory of Steam was born. In order to correctly address the ambitious project, Mr. Scalpelli, who was the Councillor at that time, created a project team, which was in charge of the study of the technical features of the project. Several authorities of the Aldermanship were part of the team, as well as some experts that were called in from other fields.

The goal that the local administration was pursuing was to use the Factory of Steam as a real centre to produce culture involving young artists. The vision took the form of an open space an integral part of the City and its components. The space should have been available to any new proposal, should have hosted new cultural energies and trends, and should have been devoted to the support of the creation of new codes, languages, and creative activities that were related to the territory. It should certainly have been a big laboratory for new and young experiences and ideas.

Factory of Steam should have offered an experimental space to anyone who was particularly involved in dance, arts, culture, design, theatre, photography, communication and multimedia. The offer should have been made under strong and advantageous economic conditions. The space was dedicated to the experimental production of new artistic projects, that, in the second phase, should have been launched onto the market. At the same time, great visibility was expected for any cultural operator that was involved in the projects. They should have been part of a big network of relationships for exchange and interactions. Knowledge and experiences were expected as the results of this big investment.

Factory of Steam was proposed not only as a space for the production of arts, but also for its diffusion. Social events, shows and exhibitions were expected as one of the main components of the project. The event should have involved seminars, workshops, training sessions, exhibitions, shows, theatrical performances, movie shows, and so on. The project was also made up of a leisure component, such as typical restaurants and bars, which should have been devoted to originality and creativity. Indeed, those were the main drivers of the project, in its original version.

Young people were invited to experiment and try their ideas and their project under the supervision of experts of the cultural industry. The potential ideas should have been tested there, so that their success should have been addressed there. Hence, the young artist should have been in contact with many interesting realities and important authorities in the field, in order to take advantage of this promising opportunity.

The architectural project to restore the Factory of Steam aimed at maintaining the structures in a very conservative way. The industrial archaeology of the place was regarded as an important aspect of the structure. Hence none really wanted to re-build the structure through new and elaborate architectural plans (Figure 2).

Figure 2: The Factory of Steam



Factory of Steam occupies a huge area, which is overall of about 30,000 m². The buildings occupy a surface of 14,000m². The first half of the buildings is dedicated to cultural operators, which are selected through a specific process. The second half of them is devoted to activities, such as exhibitions, sports events, performances, restaurants and other services.

Even before the restoration works, the City Council decided to announce publicly a competition to select the first projects to be hosted in the Factory of Steam. Seventeen institutions won the competition, and they were from different fields of contemporary arts and culture.

The original plan defined a very short period of time to restore the buildings and occupy the area. Indeed, the process should have been over by the end of the year 2001, thanks to a temporal sequence made up of three steps. In February 2001 the Factory of Steam was inaugurated and the event was a great success, both for the politicians and the general public. One year later, none of the winning associations and institutions that were expected to occupy the new spaces by October 2001 had started to move in. In fact, since the work on the buildings was not complete, people were not allowed to move there. Some time after, Mr. Scalpelli, who was the person in charge of the project, was replaced and the new Councillor did not look at the Factory with the same enthusiasm. The last declarations of the City Council that were dated 2002 promised completion of the works by 2005; but two years later, in 2004, they were rescheduled to 2007.

Nowadays, the spaces that are completely restored are only a very small part of the whole buildings, and a few of the associations gained control of their spaces. Most of the Factory of Steam is still waiting for the restoration works to be completed.

Conclusions and Final Remarks

Both of the Italian cases which have been studied highlight some interesting weaknesses that refer to the local administrative office. The way in which it has addressed the main areas of the project is in some ways different from the one that has been applied by the Finnish Administration.

The main problem in their administration refers to the fact that a project manager has not been appointed. They have also not taken into account the possibility to create a project team. These deficiencies are quite important, since those roles are usually the ones in charge of the whole process of projecting and managing the first step of the lifecycle of the cultural institutions.

Because of the poor results achieved in the project management, they have also achieved bad results even in their search for funds and sponsorship. It seems that in those situations the reason why they did not get sponsorships does not refer to the lack of sponsors or money, but simply to the fact that no-one was in charge of this aspect of the managerial process. According to the results of our interviews with the managers of the cultural projects studied, the City Council of Milan did not even start to look for a main sponsor or for some money from the private sectors. This is particularly true with regard to the Factory of Steam case in which the City Council did not even list all the institutions and persons who could have been interested in taking part in the cultural project. Unfortunately, no-one working at the local administration has ever taken care of the project, or been in charge of its positive start up. This is interesting, since it is perfectly the opposite of what we know from project management in arts and cultural industries. It may depend on the lack of trust of any governmental institution in the cultural project, and in its possible conclusion: *"It is the last and new evidence that local Administration does not have any vision about the international inspiration of our city"* (Mr. Scalpelli, former Councillor).

Even if one considers the failure of the two Italian cases, Museum of the Present, and Factory of Steam as the results of a much more complex situation, one cannot deny that the main reason for that is rooted in the lack of a political will. And it does depend on the City Council.

Recently, the Italian cultural world has been shocked by some pessimistic and depressing news: public expenditure for arts and cultural projects has been decreased again. It becomes more and more difficult to sustain arts and their projects in a depressed economic situation. As a consequence, also for this year, Museum of the Present and the Factory of Steam are not considered in the list of cultural projects that the City Council of Milan will conclude.

As a conclusion, both of the cases are and remain very important projects for the city of Milan, since they relate to new subjects in the artistic local world, which is surprisingly poor for an important European city such as Milan. The possibility to bring them to life should be considered one of the most interesting projects for the future of Milan and its residents. Of course, it is an important investment from the administrative and political point of view. This is even more dramatic with regard to the historical development of the political project of Milan as a city: Italian arts and culture are neglected areas of investments by definition. Hence, it should

be possible to raise new political consensus from the investments in this area, also because it could represent a way to differentiate the local administration from other political groups.

The Finnish cases that have been analysed here are treated in a very different way. The Finnish local authorities have addressed the same issues in very different ways. The Finnish cases examined, in fact, illustrate the willingness of the political authorities to recognise the values related to some important cultural institutions, as being of a particular kind in the City capital. Duties, activities and responsibilities have been clarified from the beginning of the process, and they have been made concrete by a series of consistent initiatives and strong co-operative relationships. Those features are completely missing in the Italian cases.

Anyone who aims at managing a city and its residents should be aware of the relevance of arts and culture in the growing process of the city. Only through satisfaction of the residents' needs and by taking care of the next generations' interests is it possible to look further in the economic development of a complex reality such as a city. In Milan it has been a very long time since these legitimate expectations have been satisfied. Indeed, the local administration is convinced that in this city, since the available range of services and opportunities for citizens is broad, much broader than in other parts of the country, the needs of people are in some ways met, at the end of the day.

The premises and the goals of the two Italian projects together constitute one of best opportunities for the growth of the city, but, unfortunately, its local administration was not able to get them and exploit them. The reasons must be found in the lack of political vision, and a subsequent series of authorities which were not interested enough in the projects. Now, it is very important for Milan as a city that some authorities retrieve them, and give a new direction to the project by fixing the mistakes here identified.

Of course, building a new museum completely devoted to contemporary art such as the Museum of the Present, and a new multifunctional centre such as Factory of Steam could constitute a major development for the city. Indeed, the whole image of the Italian artistic system could take advantage of them, and the gap between the Italian contemporary artistic world and the ones that characterise other important European realities could be slightly reduced.

Thanks to these projects, Milan could once again find a discourse with its imaginary. Indeed, retrieving these institutions could be a first initiative to rethink the artistic system of the city. A list of the creative activities of the city could be made. Since many of the innovative cultural realities are small, a strong effort in supporting them could generate even higher benefits for the whole City. They could become a strategic resource for the city's policies to attract new segments of customers, visitors and residents. The economic and social benefits of that process, as well as the cultural ones, are easy to recognise.

References

- Florida R. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class. And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*. New York: Basic Books.
- Frey B.S., and W.W. Pommerehne. 1989. *Musei e Mercati. Indagine sull'economia dell'arte*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- Golfetto F. 2000 "Problemi aperti per il marketing delle città". In *Strategie di marketing del territorio*, E. Valdani, and F. Ancarani, eds., Milan: Egea, p. 113–128.
- Harvey D. 1989. *The Urban Experience*, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Kotler N., and P. Kotler. 1999. *Marketing dei musei. Obiettivi, traguardi, risorse*, Edizioni di Comunità, Turin.
- Kotler P., C. Asplund, I. Rein and D.H. Haider. 1999. *Marketing Places. Europe*. Financial Times Prentice Hall, Pearson Education Limited, London.
- Lever W.F. 1993. "Competition Within the European Urban System." *Urban Studies*, Vol. 30, p. 935–948.
- Petsimeris P. ed. 1991. *Le trasformazioni sociali dello spazio urbano. Verso una nuova geografia della città europea*. Bologna: Pàtron.
- Petsimeris P. ed. 1989. *Le reti urbane tra decentramento e centralità*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Sacco P.L., and S. Pedrini. 2003. *Il distretto culturale: mito o opportunità?* Università degli studi di Torino. EBLA. Working paper series.
- Valdani E., and F. Ancarani F. 2000. *Strategie di marketing del territorio*. Milan: Egea.
- Van der Meer J. 1990. "The Role of City Marketing in Urban Management." *Euricur Series*, n° 2.