

European Culture Capitals and Local Development Strategies: Comparing the Genoa 2004 and Lille 2004 Cases

Pier Luigi Sacco

Full Professor of Cultural Economics and Director DADI - Department Art and Industrial Design, IUAV University

Giorgio Tavano Blessi

PhD Candidate SSAV - School of Study Advanced in Venice
Junior Researcher TSM - Trento School of Management

Pier Luigi Sacco; PhD in Economics, European University Institute. Professor of Cultural Economics, IUAV University, Venice. Deputy Rector and Head of the Department of Arts and Design at the same university. Area coordinator, Master in Arts and Culture Management, TSM - Trento School of Management – Trento. Research topics: Cultural Economics, Evolutionary Game Theory, Economics of Pro-Social Behavior. E-mail: sacco@iuav.it

Giorgio Tavano Blessi; M.A. in Humanities at Ca' Foscari University in Venice, Phd candidate in the programme of Analysis and Governance of Sustainable Development, School for Advanced Studies in Venice Foundation (SSAV), Venice; Junior Researcher at TSM – Trento School of Management, Trento. Research topics: Cultural Economics, Culture and Sustainable Development. E-mail: g.tavano@unive.it

Abstract

European capitals of culture have become a case study of primary interest for those interested in assessing the long-run impact of systematic cultural policies. During the years, highly diverse cities have been chosen for this program, each one carrying its own socio-economic background, its endowment of cultural capital and so on. Consequently, different cities have chosen and implemented very different models of culture capitals. The two cities nominated for 2004, Genoa and Lille, provide the basis for an interesting comparative study in that they have opted for very different models. Genoa has focused upon an ambitious program of temporary, blockbuster exhibitions with relatively little impact on the city's long-term cultural endowment and on restoration and maintenance of the existing heritage. The emphasis is on the attraction of qualified tourists. Conversely, Lille has concentrated on the implementation of a complex radial structure of differential targeting for cultural policies that aims at creating a new model of a polycentric culture-based development process. The emphasis is on the creation of a dense local networking of cultural initiatives and on the involvement of area residents. The aim of this paper is to provide a comparative assessment of the two models as policy tools for the launch of culture-driven, self-sustaining local development models, with special emphasis on the role of city's management boards in the definition of strategies and in the governance of cultural policies of such complexity.

Keywords

Culture capitals, cultural policy management, urban planning, cultural clusters.

1. Introduction

In the current scenario of turbulent socio-economic change fuelled by globalization processes, virtually all of the countries that are characterized by advanced levels of industrial development are experiencing a massive re-shaping of their productive sectors. The logic of comparative advantage is driving such countries away from labour-intensive productions, and toward knowledge- and information-intensive ones.

In this context, culture and tourism are gaining momentum as fields providing increasingly large opportunities in a variety of respects. On the one hand, they are clear examples of industries characterized by high value added, high incidence of service and other intangible components, and by a relevant economic impact on the local economies. On the other hand, they play a key role in the restructuring of the existing stock of capital called for by the post-industrial transition, most notably urban and regional renewal processes.

These two factors have a different gradation of impact in terms of economic growth and social development, and represent also a base for the definition of renovation policies for cities and regions. Most of the European cities, for examples, base their renovation policies upon the relation between culture, cultural events, cultural heritage, and tourism. The definition of a development strategy focused on these factors is seen as a priority and as a fast way to increase the value of the urban and regional areas since those have impacts on all the social actors (Bianchini and Parkinson, 1993).

In particular, since the '70s European countries have started to promote new strategies of development focused on the exploitation of culture, tourism, creative industries and so on, in a prospective view where those elements are seen as new possibilities to generate economic, social, and urban value for cities (see e.g., DCMS 2004; Scottish Executive 2002).

At the economic level, for instance, culture has got a strategic role for the definition of a new competitive context for cities and countries in the post-industrial society. The assumption starts from the identification of the role of innovation and creativity which are seen as crucial for the possibility to give new sense and providing new ideas to the production and consumption of goods (Rullani, 2004), and also as the base for innovation processes in economically advanced countries (Porter, 2003). In this context, individual and collective motivation behind purchase and consumption of goods is no longer addressing basic needs, as it has been customary throughout the industrial era, but becomes part of a personal strategy for the creation and promotion of new identity models that are built through the symbolic and identity dimension of goods. Products tend therefore to become culture-laden, that is to say to acquire a dimension of expression that does not mirror the ex ante expectations of consumers but rather reshapes them according to a strategically planned logic of involvement and identification that is prompted by the same system of meaning from which the product is built (Sacco and Viviani, 2003).

At the social level, culture is seen as a tool that promotes cohesion through the creation of a common language, thus setting the stage for socially-driven development of human potential (Matarasso, 1997). Amassment of cultural capital has thus become an engine for further relevant goals such as the creation and/or regeneration of the social fabric, the generation of systematic opportunities for social networking, and more generally the optimal management of accumulation processes for other key intangible assets such as social capital (Bourdieu, 1983), with consequential benefits in terms of social order and cohesion (Everingham, 2003).

At the urban planning level, culture often plays a crucial role in the renovation of specific parts of the city. In such instances, culture is called for to prompt a multi-faceted regeneration process, focused on both physical renovation and re-qualification of buildings and on a deep rethinking of the social logic of space utilization (Stevenson, 1998). But culture has an important role to play also in the rehabilitation of landfill or brown-field areas located in urban centres. The creation of “cultural boxes” in areas with controversial land use destination is widely considered a smart move toward decreasing the (individually and) collectively perceived area risk. Such type of risk perception (technically called “stigma”) may represent a serious obstacle to the definition of a sensible development policy, especially when the actual area belongs to the historical core of the city or to some other kind of strategically crucial location. Most land use destinations, indeed, pose serious problems in terms of environmental and social sustainability, or of social inclusion vs. exclusion, or of social consensus. Culture is often seen as a sophisticated policy tool that, although not settling in itself any of the above issues (and often posing in addition issues of economic viability), may nonetheless provide a platform for collective awareness and debate that helps redefine them in more constructive ways once they have been rephrased within the “cultural box” frame. This kind of achievement is particularly interesting in European cases, where intelligent renovations of the existing city are often a better alternative to the planning of new suburban satellite settlements which hardly manage to acquire an identity of their own and to maintain a vital interaction with the core, with all the imaginable implications in terms of quality of life, exacerbation of social criticalities, social dilemmas, and so on (Bettini,).

It is not surprising, then, that cultural capital has attracted considerable attention both from theorists and policy makers (see Throsby 1999, 2001 for a path-breaking analysis). The main concern then becomes going beyond a “black box” characterization that tends to attribute to culture a sort of magical, unconditional capacity for social transformation and urban regeneration, for local economic development. There are indeed several cases studies that confirm that culture may be a good bet for city planners (see e.g. Greenhalgh, 1998; Landry 2003), but what is needed now is to get a more solid grasp of the critical conditions that make cultural policies fail or succeed. Because there is not a unique way to cultural planning, both at the urban and at the regional level. Cultural capital itself is a manifold notion, which aggregates quite different things, as it happens for other forms of both physical and intangible capital. And thus, furthermore, there is not a unique way of conceiving, implementing and managing a complex set of cultural events as the European culture capital one. For this reason, conducting comparative studies among cities that have faced this challenge may be very instructive, and conducive to a clearer understanding of the do and don'ts. Our choice has been picking the most recent cases of culture capitals, that of 2004, namely, Genoa and Lille, for a series of reasons: they happened in the same year, i.e. under the same global economic conditions; they represent two countries like Italy and France, that are characterized by close degrees of economic and social development; they have chosen very different approaches to the program, as a consequence of different planning philosophies. We therefore expect that this case study may be a useful point of departure toward a rigorous formulation of alternative cultural policy paradigms and to a critical appraisal of their accomplishments.

2. Background and Conceptual Framework

From the early stages of industrial revolution, and in particular from the middle of XIX century, the economic development process undertaken by the so called Western countries has been characterized by an increasing spatial concentration of physical and intangible forms of capital in urban areas. In a first phase, this process has been mostly unintentional and self-organized, a sort of externality of the virtuous circle based on the social division of labour that was

foreshadowed by Adam Smith. However, as the effects of the urban concentration process became apparent, with the resulting economies of agglomeration, scale, and scope, there has been an increasing tendency to let policy makers overtake the whole process to control it and to target its evolution to specific policy goals.

This is true not only for traditional economic processes leading to the emergence of large capitalist firms and of the industrial cities that have been hosting them, but also for alternative patterns of development focused on clusters of small- and medium-sized firms. Starting from the seminal albeit largely overlooked intuition of Marshall, scholars of the calibre of Giacomo Becattini (2000a,b) and Michael Porter (1989) have in recent years rejuvenated this tradition, as a response to the striking evidence provided by the economic success of clusterized firms in the open market scenarios put forward by the expanding globalization. They make a clear case for the impact of localization choices on the firms' competitive potential, and argue, on the basis of evidence from Italian and US case studies, that this may be a long-lasting feature of the late stages of capitalistic development. There are important differences between the viewpoints of the two authors, however. In Becattini's view, the crucial feature that makes clustering effective is the emergence of Marshall's "industrial atmosphere", a common cultural orientation that strengthens social bonds among the agents of the local economic system and causes a localized accumulation of intangible assets in both collective and decentralized forms (e.g. crucial competencies related to the micro-structure of the productive processes of the production chain to which the firms of the "industrial district" belong). In Porter's view, the cultural element is relatively underplayed, whereas the spatial concentration (i.e. the cluster) effect becomes the key.

These alternative visions emphasizing, in turn, the "district" dimension vs. the "cluster" one, find natural analogs when one turns to the analysis of local processes of cultural dynamics. We can therefore speak, in turn, of "cultural districts" vs. "cultural clusters", and it is far from being a matter of sheer terminology. In the cultural district model, Becattini's conception of the cultural district, one mainly focuses upon the activator effect of culture in creating a knowledge-friendly local "athmosphere", i.e. an economic and social environment in which easy and continued access to cultural opportunities fosters a widespread social orientation toward innovative thinking, far-reaching visions of human development and social cooperation, and so on. It is important to stress, however, that the passage from the industrial to the cultural district here implies a major substantial change: whereas the industrial district model is focused upon (decentralized) vertical integration (viz., on an increasing level of coordination of firms operating within a same value chain), the cultural district model is sustained by horizontal integration (viz., on increasing levels of coordination and complementarity among firms belonging to different value chains) that leads to culture-driven forms of local economic and social development. There are, indeed, lines of research that tends to conceive the cultural district as a direct extension of the industrial district model, i.e. in terms of vertical integration of the value chains of given local cultural and tourism industries (see e.g. Valentino, 2003), but there is reason to believe that a too mechanical extension of the original Marshallian idea to the cultural field runs the risk of missing the basic points and of foregoing the key opportunities (see Sacco & Pedrini, 2003 for a critical discussion).

The increasing interest for culture as the engine of local economic development finds its antecedents in certain experiments in urban and regional planning, such as the urban regeneration plans carried out by the Great London Council, based on a strategic vision focused upon building cultural infrastructure and activities (DCMS 1999). Santagata (2003) makes an attempt at abridging the district vs. cluster-based approaches by introducing a typology that encompasses the various possibilities, which is still, however, non exhausting. The variety of

observed cases of more or less successful culture-driven local development, indeed, still defies the existing analytical frameworks and calls for further theoretical and applied work.

In principle, there should be basically two alternative routes to culture-driven local development: a bottom-up one, based on the self-organization of the local system, and closer to the logic of the cultural cluster, and a top-down one, guided by a strategic vision and agency, closer to the logic of the cultural district. As a matter of fact, however, one has to rely upon a close interplay between the planned and the self-organized dimensions, so that the top-down vs. bottom-up contraposition is not really meaningful; it is only useful to discerning different aspects of the same process. Indeed, one can observe that, in some cases, the initial push comes from the bottom to be eventually taken over or supplemented by top-down initiative, whereas in other cases an initial planned intervention is complexified by the autonomous initiative of the actors involved. What is always true, however, is that planning a cultural district dynamics in a context where the basic conditions are missing is hopeless and counterproductive. A full critical discussion of such conditions is beyond the scope of the present paper; we address the interested reader to Sacco & Pedrini (2003). Here we simply observe that they call for an active role of a variety of different agents: the local government; the civil society (the so called third sector); the university and educational system; the corporate sector. Cultural producers, who are also a crucial agent of the process, partially overlap both with the civil society and with the corporate sector, but have a crucial, distinctive role.

The issue of the “progressive cultural district” (as we might call this synthesis of planned and self-organized components) has interesting connections to several lines of research in apparently diverse fields. In particular, we want to emphasize three of them, that could also be regarded as thematic characterizations of the three basic aspects of culture-driven development:

- the creativity-based attraction model of Richard Florida (2002), that emphasizes the role of quality of life and of technological infrastructure in the creation of a critical mass for the emergence of a knowledge-oriented economy;
- the competitiveness-based urban renovation model of Michael Porter (1989), that focuses upon the transition from an investment-based industrial orientation toward a self-sustaining innovation based economy;
- the capability-based model of Amartya Sen (1994, 2002), which underlines the central role of a general social involvement in capability building activities as a prerequisite for viable economic development.

In a way, the “progressive cultural district” model ideally encompasses all these aspects in a common theoretical perspective where the crucial integrating role is played by cultural innovation and production (in its interaction with technological innovation) and by its gradual transmission to different industries and fields of activity. The “progressive” aspect of the district organization lies in the fact that this diffusion dynamics is rationally anticipated by the actors of the local system and is therefore strategically pursued as a collective, cooperative endeavour of cross fertilization.

Starting from a meta-review of the existing literature, Sacco, Ferilli & Lavanga (forthcoming) identify ten strategic lines of action that together define the menu for an effective policy management of the progressive cultural district, whose relative priorities will of course change from case to case, as a response to both local conditions and policy objectives:

(Quality macro-dimension)

1. Quality of Cultural Supply (QCS)
2. Quality of Local Governance (QLG)
3. Quality of the Production of Knowledge (QPK)

(Development macro-dimension)

4. Development of Local Entrepreneurship (DLE)
5. Development of Local Talent (DLT)

(Attraction macro-dimension)

6. Attraction of External Firms (AEF)
7. Attraction of External Talent (AET)

(Sociality macro-dimension)

8. Management of Social Criticalities (MSC)
9. Capability Building and Education of the Local Community (CBE)
10. Local community involvement (LCI)

One can easily trace some of these strategic lines of action to the aforementioned approaches of Sen (CBE, LCI, DLT, QLG), Florida (QLG, AEF, AET, MSC) and Porter (QPK, QLG, DLE, AEF). The issue then become how they can be integrated in a wider, policy oriented approach for the elaboration and evaluation of strategic management policies aimed at fostering culture-driven local development. Whereas the general issue is well beyond the scope of the present paper, we consider the case of the comparative evaluation of the policies undertaken by the 2004 European Culture Capitals, namely, Genoa and Lille, as an interesting preliminary test for this methodology. In the remaining part of the paper we will therefore discuss the Genoa and Lille 2004 cases on the basis on the 10-policy lines scheme just introduced, in order to evaluate to what extent such policies may be conducive to an effective dynamics of emergence of a progressive cultural district bringing about a viable, long-lasting instance of a culture-driven economy.

3. The European Culture Capitals Program as an Engine for Culture-driven Local Development: Assessing Genoa 2004 vs. Lille 2004

As it has been anticipated in the previous section, we cannot really discuss here the variety of case studies and approaches that have emerged in the various contexts, in all its heterogeneity. We will focus on the European experience, which is the object of our comparative study, and in particular on the European Cultural Capitals program as a key opportunity toward a culture-driven local development dynamics.

The European Culture Capitals program was started in 1985 as an official program of the European Community aimed at promoting culture in all its forms and to make it increasingly accessible and knowledgeable to European citizens. In 2000, the European Parliament has redefined some aspects of the program, now being called European Cities of Culture, to adapt it to the pursuit of new goals. In the 2005 to 2019 time span, every nation receives a slot which is allocated through a competition rather than via direct nomination of the national government, as it happened so far. In this way, letting cities from a same country compete for the nomination, there is a natural incentive to enhance the strategic dimension of the bid and to pursue more and more systemic, far-reaching implications. As a consequence, also the cities that are not nominated benefit from their participation and may achieve ambitious goals. This is what

happened, for instance, for the 2008 UK slot, won by the Liverpool bid. Some of the other participants cities (such as Gateshead, for instance), developed and implemented ambitious plans that made substantial additions to the city's cultural infrastructure and re-oriented substantially the social orientation toward cultural activities and opportunities. Starting from 2007, moreover, the cities selected by the nominated EC countries will share their slot with cities belonging to the newly admitted EC countries or to future possible member states, so that there will be two capitals for each year, one from an established member state and one from an actual or prospective newcomer.

Genoa and Lille were designated as EEC for 2004 in 1998. Although Italy and France present several analogies in terms of public policy orientations, the philosophies of cultural planning that they have been defining through time are markedly different.

In the Italian experience, there is a traditional emphasis on the interplay between cultural activity and the tourism sector that leads to focusing on culture as a possible source of profit. The stock of cultural capital is therefore regarded as a key asset for city marketing, and should therefore be built accordingly, paying attention to the cultural activities that may have an appeal to specific segments of the tourism market (Ashworth & Voogd, 1995). This explains the Italian tendency of thinking of major activities in the cultural fields in terms of "events", that is to say, temporary, highly visible, and often expensive projects aimed at attracting a large number of highly focused visitors in a relatively short time span. This philosophy generates a restless search for opportunities for (cultural and/or sport) events, of which the Cultural Capitals program is but one among many others. Only listing the major ones, there have been the World Soccer Championship in 1990, the Colombiadi in 1992 (the celebration of 500 years since Columbus' arrival on the American continent in 1492), the Catholic Jubilee in 2000, together with Bologna as one of the eight European Culture Capitals in the same year, the Genoa G8 meeting in 2001, the Genoa European Culture Capital in 2004, and the Winter Olympic Games in Turin in 2006. Apparently, Genoa has played a major role, as it has been hosting as many as three of the major events. Many of these events have been opportunities for substantial infrastructural investment plans in many Italian cities, whose focus, however, has by necessity been twisted upon upgrading the city's endowment to the magnitude of the event rather than implementing a coherent, far reaching strategic vision. In fact, in the Italian context such major events are almost the only viable opportunities for effective city planning, and since several of them are typically carried out in emergency conditions (i.e. late action on tight deadlines), the focus on tourism has become the identifying character of large scale, ambitious urban public policies. A clear and extreme example is the Bologna 2000 ECC case, in which the headline was "one new event every day": in this case, the proliferation of events and, inevitably, their fragmentation which is a direct consequence of the "one every day" approach, caused the eventual disappearance of the cultural program into the normal activities of the city, with a negligible effect not only on the long-run orientation, but also during the supposedly peak period of the program.

The focus on tourism clearly downplays the role of innovative and creative cultural production at the expense of seeking events that capture the general consensus, i.e., blockbuster exhibitions and shows running on the beaten tracks. But this, in turn, has a negative effect on the cultural capital dynamics in that it does not add to the existing stock and selects against high-standard cultural production and research, which by necessity has to find its roots elsewhere. Moreover, it alienates the public opinion from a direct, lively experience of cultural innovation and therefore fosters conservative and even hostile attitudes toward thought-provoking cultural proposals. Furthermore, the emphasis on tourism naturally leads itself to the consolidation of a room-and-board-, souvenir-rent-based economy that essentially sells out the city's cultural clichés through

a progressive trivialization of its cultural and historical identity and sees residents as beneficiaries in economic rather than in cultural terms.

As already pointed out, there are examples of alternative approaches that give culture a major role both in re-defining urban identity and in addressing long-term economic and social issues through a substantial involvement of the local communities on an intrinsic, expressive basis rather than on an instrumentally economical one, without underplaying the tourism development issue but placing it in a proper context (Bianchini, 1993; Landry et al. 1996). A well-known, major case in point is Glasgow 1990 European Cultural Capital, which succeeded in creating a creative mix between big, highly visible cultural events and community-target activities based on a highly participatory approach, aiming successfully at a substantial reshaping of the city's cultural identity on a long-term, socially sustainable basis (Garcia, 2004). Interestingly, Glasgow was the first nominated city that did not already possess a strong identity as a cultural capital, a trait that was common to all of the previous nominees (Athens 1985, Florence 1986, Amsterdam 1987, Berlin 1988, Paris 1989). In fact, Glasgow was the first nominee to interpret this opportunity as a real platform for advanced strategic planning experimentation, rather than as a mere occasion for further visibility. This long-run-viability oriented approach has been taken up and further developed by other later nominees; of special interest is the already cited case of Liverpool 2008, which, once identified as the winning bidder, has launched a cycle of thematic cultural programming from 2003 to 2010, i.e. well before and way after the ECC year, in order to re-orientate the social, economic and urban regeneration of the city through a long-lasting action rather than through a one-shot peak of activity. Also, both in the Glasgow and in the Liverpool cases there is a clear perception that enhancements of the physical infrastructure of the city are only part of the picture, and that adding up to the intangible assets, e.g. the city's human and social capital, should be regarded as an equally important objective.

The French approach is much more aligned to the "structural" orientation than to the ephemeral one typical of the Italian approach, with a remarkably sharper orientation in terms of promotion of cultural innovation, support of local creative talents, and stimulation of the cultural demand of residents. In spite of this, the main strategic focus of Avignon ECC 2000, the only French nominee for the program after Paris and before Lille, was "to promote cultural tourism and reinforce the image of Avignon as an important cultural city" (Palmer and Rae Associates, 2004), although among the main stated aims stimulating local creativity was listed together with establishing Avignon as a cultural city internationally. Raising international profile was accordingly the top priority. The strategic planning in the French approach is in general highly formalized and carefully developed through a strictly hierarchical organization. This complex articulation may be difficult to manage, however. For instance, in the Avignon 2000 case its action was severely threatened by a substantial amount of internal conflict that resulted in the resignation of the Director of the project agency after one year of service and two years ahead of the beginning of the program. He was never replaced and a major internal reorganization was called for, with obvious costs in terms of continuity and coherence of the strategic action. As a consequence, the operation of the agency was criticized in terms of a weak representation of the cultural interests of the local community, of a lack in leadership and in a too vague allocation of responsibility, and of excessive thinness of the project team. The agency itself was basically closed after the completion of the program, with a negligible contribution to the development of the city's subsequent cultural policies, thus missing one of the basic objectives of the program. Neither Italy nor France were therefore starting their 2004 program building from an outstanding record of accomplishments at the national level.

3.1 Genoa

Genoa shares the same destiny of several former industrial cities, determined by the crisis of the local (large, state) industry and of the harbour, followed by an extensive process of productive re-conversion that is still under way. The traditional industrial backbone has thus gradually made room for service industries, and the former plants and warehouses have been calling for new destinations. Genoa is today steadily moving toward a post-industrial orientation, with its university and its research centres (it has been chosen to host the newly launched IIT, the Italian Institute of Technology) and its growing IT industry. In spite of this, its identity remained strongly linked to its industrial past and to its harbour, one of the largest in the Mediterranean Sea. Also its cultural identity was weak and relatively fuzzy, in spite of a major, recently renewed opera house and several prestigious theatres (featuring more than 650 shows for 470.000 people during the 2001 and 2002 seasons), an outstanding cultural heritage, and a tradition for giving birth to some of the outstanding Italian chansonniers, just to name a few primary assets. The ECC nomination has therefore been considered a vital opportunity to change radically the city's identification and to make it more coherent with its new profile of activities, and to promote further strategic complementarity between tourism and culture. The target of the EEC was that of bringing 2 million visitors to the city on a yearly basis, through the cultural and entertainment activities, the cruising industry and the business fairs. The very idea of culture has been interpreted on a relatively broad basis, to include science, technology, sport and, more generally, entertainment.

The focus of the strategy has been, then, renewing the city's image and raising its international profile, although the primary concern was improving image and identity at the national level, in order to make of Genoa one of the nationally recognized "cultural cities". But rather than looking at "mono-dimensional" national examples such as Florence or Venice, the idea was rather building the image of a multi-faceted city where the old but renewed industrial identity and the new cultural one coexist.

Cultural development has therefore been a clearly stated objective, to be pursued also through a substantial urban renewal and by the restoration of selected parts of the cultural heritage: the basis emphasis is thus on physical infrastructure. The program of activities has been, following the Italian tradition, essentially event-based, but the definition of the program has been carried out through a substantially participative approach, that has involved hundreds of local associations, which submitted more than one thousand proposals, part of which have been incorporated into the official program.

The strategic planning activity has been guided by a Committee that was chaired by the Mayor and included representatives of the Region and Province (the two other levels of local government), the University, the Chamber of Commerce and the port Authority. The actual management in all of its aspects has been deferred to a specific company, Genova 2004 Srl. The world-renowned art critic and curator Germano Celant, a Genoese, was appointed as the artistic supervisor of the whole program and personally curated one of the most outstanding projects, the exhibition on Arts and Architecture, the only major project with a distinctively contemporary focus.

The re-definition of the image of the city has been supported by a massive communication plan mainly targeted at the national level, and by a careful monitoring of the perceptions about the city both at the national and at the international level. The main channels have been printed media and street advertisement, whereas television was used as a channel for the production and diffusion of contents but no TV ads were produced. Local productive sectors have been

involved as sponsors and more sponsors have been found at the national level. There has also been substantial public economic support both at the national and at the local level.

The bulk of the resources has been directed toward a re-organization of the network of city museums and to heritage restoration, following a logic of improving the city's infrastructural endowment for cultural tourism, an activity that the city government feels as still strongly under-developed with respect to its real potential. The total budget for infrastructural investment has been around 200 million euro; in addition, the budget of Genova 2004 Srl has been an additional 33 million euro, 21 of which have covered the cost of the program of events and initiatives, 8 were absorbed by promotion activities and 4 by operating costs. Moreover, there has been a substantial amount of direct intervention by the local government and further activities covered by the fund raising of the promoters. Of the 33 million euro of the Genova 2004 Srl budget, 17 millions came from national public funding, 3 from local public funding and 13 from fund raising activities, of which 11 from private sponsors and 2 from direct revenues (ticketing, merchandising). The huge resources from infrastructural investment activity has been made available through EC funding (Genoa is the only Italian city participating in both Urban 1 and 2 Euro-programs), national public funding and again, to a relatively little extent, private sponsoring. On the basis of the stated objectives, results have been extremely satisfactory. The number of visitors has totalled some 2.8 millions (40% beyond the target), with an average daily attendance around 8.000 over 285 events and 154 conferences. Museum visitors have been around 380.000. Press coverage has been extensive (29 articles per day on average, plus a 29% increase in the number of web pages concerning the city). The project website had an average of 50.000 monthly accesses. The Genoa 2004 campaign won the Grand Prix Pubblicità Italia as the best public communication campaign for the year. Genoa 2004 also won the Globe Award for the Best New Tourism project Worldwide, yearly assigned by the British Guild of Travel Writers. Whereas the global tourism figures for Liguria and for Italy as a whole have been unsatisfactory in 2004, with uniformly negative growth rates for visitor presences, the growth rate for Genoa on a yearly basis is 7.97%, a massive success against a regional average of -3.97% (to which Genoa itself contributes) and a national average of -2.2%. A market research on the attendance of a selected sample of mostly major events reveals that 60% of the visitors were non-residents and that the overall judgement was very positive (CONSAV, 2005). An overall 19% came from Italian regions outside Liguria whereas foreign visitors made a 8% of the total. The total demand from locals (Genoa plus Liguria) then totalled 73% of the events reviewed. Foreign visitors were substantially more interested to exhibitions than to festivals.

In terms of perception, 42.8% of Italian public opinion in april 2004 realized that Genoa was hosting the ECC program, starting from an initial figure of 18% in September 2003. Visitors express the perception of a city that is "fuelling the engine of change" and 32% of them enjoyed the visit beyond their expectations. A substantial shift in the city image has therefore occurred, although much is still to be done (the majority of Italian still does not notice the change). Both Italians (72.3%) and Genoese (88.5%) residents largely feel that the ECC program had a positive impact on the city, and that it could have long-lasting consequences, but with little effect in terms of the quality of public services and of openness and friendliness of local residents toward visitors. The program also had a substantial impact on the residents' sense of belonging to the city. As to the economic impact, a cautious estimate ranges between 220.5 and 262.5 million euro, most of which generated by non-residents, whose both average duration of stay and average expenditure have increased with respect of the pre-2004 figures.

3.2 Lille

Lille is a city of 200.000 inhabitants located at border of France and strategically positioned in the earth of the commercial ways of north Europe. The city takes advantage of its convenient proximity to the Netherlands, Germany and England, that has made it one of the most important commercial centre since the XIV century. In the XIX century, the city has increased its importance becoming an important textile industrial area. As for Genoa, the city has witnessed in the past few decades a substantial change in its economic profile moving away from the from industrial to service sectors. As for Genoa, the city's cultural heritage is important, but, unlike the latter, Lille already enjoys some reputation in the national public opinion as a relevant cultural city, not only for its heritage but also for its cultural vivacity. The city hosts an Opera House, the Lille National Symphonic Orchestra, the second largest Fine Arts Museum of France and many others cultural infrastructures like the Lille Grand Palais, a congress hall, exhibitions centre and theatre, which in 2002 had more than 250 events, attracting about 1 million visitors. Furthermore, Lille has an outstanding reputation in the research and educational sectors, which are in many fields at the top of the national rankings.

The focus of the EEC program has been on long-run urban metamorphosis, namely, "bringing the colour back to the city" whose image, although well reputed, was not sufficiently appealing. Culture and creativity are seen as a key factor to achieve this result. Whereas the activities of Genoa were mainly concentrated in the historical city centre, Lille considered the whole metropolitan area, broadly meant, including its outskirts in the Belgian territory, for a total of 193 cities and towns, to establish a new leadership in the area based on cultural proposition, but also with major economic consequences: one of the stated objectives of this external projection of the program was creating a favourable mood to attracting the localization of corporate headquarters of national and foreign firms and corporate investment. Lille 2004 has therefore been, so far, certainly the most "European" of the ECC in terms of actual projectual networking. Creative involvement had, consequently, to stimulate this entire area, and was targeted in the first place toward promoting social cohesion and enhancing pride and self-confidence of the residents, who had to be involved directly in the cultural program through street festivals, meetings and workshops with the invited artists, and so on. Whereas in Genoa participation was mainly invoked in the creation of the program of events, in Lille it was meant as a key feature of the events themselves.

Concerning the programming, the emphasis has been not mainly on blockbusters exhibitions but rather on a large number of disseminated events targeted at particular audiences, whose objective was to involve as many cultural producers as possible. The total number has been around 17.500. An essential part of the strategy has been the opening and launching of 12 new poles for cultural activities, the Maisons Folie, 3 of which in the Belgian area, through suitable re-conversion of former industrial buildings, to create a web of creative-friendly environments for artists and residents, that included residential facilities and were aimed at the development of more intense social relationships and cultural cooperation. An essential part of the program was also the exploration of diverse cultural environments from throughout the world, not interpreting the ECC programming as a mere amplification of the local cultural identity but as an opportunity to create new connections and hybridizations among different cultures. One special events was also dedicated to Genoa, but no substantial coordination between the two programs was possible in that Genoa preferred to concentrate on its own program of activities.

Lille 2004 has been managed through the constitution of an association, Lille Horizon 2004, grouping several institutions at the state and at the local level, the metropolitan area and several cities and towns of the area. The board, chaired by the mayor of Lille, has 42 members

organized into three colleges: the institutional one, the economic one (including personalities from the corporate sector) and the cultural one (including personalities from the cultural sector). The total budget has been around 74 million euro, provided as follows: 10.7 million euro from the Région Nord-Pas de Calais; 6.7 million from the Département du Nord; 3.35 million from Département Pas de Calais; 13.7 million from Lille Metropole; 8 million from the city of Lille; 13.72 million from national and European public funding; 13 millions from corporate sponsoring from national and regional firms, thus covering more of 17% of the total budget; about 4.5 millions of extra financing from the European Community and the Communauté française de Belgique. Of this global budget, 24.4 million have been used to finance events at Lille and strictly surrounding areas, 75% of which came from the project partners other than the city of Lille. The total expenditure to finance the program has been 58.6 million. Promotion and marketing cost around 7.5 million, and an analogous figure went to operating costs. The restorations program, which had of course an autonomous budget, cost some 19 million euros, half of which covered by the city of Lille, two third of the remaining from the Ministry of Culture and the remaining sum from the Conseil Général du Nord. The total expense in capital infrastructure has been around 70 million euro, entailing a real urban metamorphosis for Lille, which totally restored the Opera House, built two brand new cultural facilities, and restored some of the most ancient churches and monuments.

As to the communication plan, along with the traditional promotional activities (including street signs placed in the main stations of London, Paris and Bruxelles), there has been one striking novelty: the Lille 2004 “ambassadors” program, an entirely volunteered initiative potentially addressing anyone to become a testimony of the spirit of the program and of its manifold activities and aims, as well as actively participating to the events. The number of enrolled volunteers was around 17.800, including expatriates all over the world; in particular, 70% come from the Nord-Pas de Calais region, 20% from other French regions and 10% from a number of other countries. Several hundreds gave their direct contribution to at least one event at least once a month, whereas about 200 have become full-time volunteers.

Coming to the program’s results, the total number of visitors have gone beyond 9 millions, of which 4.780 millions for the thematic feasts (the opening feast alone has attracted 730.000 people), 2.3 millions for visual arts, 0.824 for performing arts, 0.249 for the small thematic festivals “Mondes Paralleles”, 0.3 for the Maisons Folies events, for a total of 2.8 million tickets sold and more than 110.000 passes and accreditations. 39% of the events had free admission, thereby favouring wide participation, and special tariffs for residents and other classes of visitors have been conceived to favour the attendance to cycles of related events. More than 1200 schools have been involved in the program, and more than 900 special events have been targeted to very young audiences. The visitor presences had an increment of 39.7%, against a regional figure of 3.9% and a national figure of –0.5%.

The amount of corporate sponsoring raised (13 million euro) is an all-time record for the ECC program. Previous best performances, such as Luxembourg 1995 (6 million euro) or Brugge 2002 (6.4 million euro) did not reach the 50% of the amount raised by Lille. In addition, more than 350 small businesses adhering to the program actively cooperated hosting permanent info-points, special openings, thematic furnishings of shop-windows, and so on. As to the press coverage, the monthly amount of contacts on the official website was around 100.000; a special wap site for technologically sophisticated users totalled 245.000 different users. Audio-visual reportages from national and foreign televisions have been more than 2000. There were 5000 articles from the regional press and 1500 from the national one. Extensive coverage has been provided by the some of the main German, Dutch, Belgian, English, Italian, Spanish, American, Russian, Japanese, Chinese press organs among others, for a total of 1400 articles. The most

noticed aspects in the press coverage has been the innovativeness of the program, both in terms of artistic programming and of involvement of local communities and corporate partners. 140 official foreign delegations, of which 81 non-French, have visited Lille 2004, totalling 71 cities from 30 different countries. The number of visitors received by the Lille Office of tourism during 2004 was more than twice that of the previous year (from 308.000 to 822.942, more than 300.000 of whom were non-French), and the trend has continued after the end of the ECC program.

4. A Comparative Assessment

The above analysis tells us that, in absolute terms, both Genoa 2004 and Lille 2004 were huge successes with respect to the stated objectives, although the basic figures differ markedly. It can be useful, however, to make a comparative assessment in terms of how the two strategic approaches relate to the possibility of setting the ground for a culture-driven local development model.

Quality of Cultural Supply (QCS)

Genoa focused substantially on potential blockbuster exhibitions, with very little emphasis on cultural production and innovation. Lille paid special attention to fostering massive participation and contributions from cultural producers. Both exhibition programs were very successful, but Lille spread the cultural supply over an extremely wide area, whereas Genoa concentrated on the historical centre. Genoa insisted on the restoration of the existing architectural heritage, whereas Lille made a substantial effort toward the creation of a web of new cultural facilities throughout the region.

Quality of Local Governance (QLG)

Genoa did not take advantage of the ECC program to alter substantially its model of local governance. Lille made a massive effort in this respect, experimenting with an extremely ambitious model of coordination between different levels of local governance, even on a trans-national basis, with a focus on its Euro-region (Belgium, Southern England).

Quality of the Production of Knowledge (QPK)

Both Genoa and Lille carried out an extensive activity of scientific meetings and workshops. Genoa launched two new major research and archival institutions, one for ancient books (also featuring an advanced restoration lab), the other for music, both as a partnership with the local university. New university facilities were also created through restoration of old buildings in the city centre.

Development of Local Entrepreneurship (DLE)

Most of the focus of the Genoa program has been on the enhancement of the tourism-related sectors. Lille has been working toward somewhat more active forms of partnerships calling for direct partner involvement in the cultural activities, both for large and small businesses.

Development of Local Talent (DLT)

Attention paid to the local cultural scene in Genoa has been relatively peripheral and confined to relatively small events, whereas it has been one of the central concerns of the Lille program.

Attraction of External Firms (AEF)

Corporate involvement in Genoa has been almost exclusively targeted to local firms or to firms with strong local connections, whereas attraction of investments and localization decisions from external firms was one of the main concerns of Lille.

Attraction of External Talent (AET)

Involvement of non-local cultural producers has not been a priority for Genoa, if not in terms of ordinary professional involvement in big exhibition projects such as Arts and Architecture. Lille has on the contrary made an extraordinary effort to attract non-local cultural producers on an extremely proactive basis.

Management of Social Criticalities (MSC)

Genoa did not explicitly pay attention to this dimension, which was once again systematically tackled by Lille with targeted projects taking place in socially problematic areas, often on a permanent basis.

Capability Building and Education of the Local Community (CBE)

Both cities launched educational programs targeted at schooling ages, but Lille went further with a systematic calendar of events for residents, both under the form of classes and of workshop with local and international cultural producers.

Local community involvement (LCI)

Both cities actively engaged in this line of action, fostering the sense of pride and belonging of the residents. Actual citizen involvement was searched by Genoa especially in the programming phase, in order to give a fair representation to all interests and proposal. Lille emphasized the participation aspect during all the program, especially with the exceptionally innovative and successful "Ambassadors" project.

In a nutshell, then, it is apparent that the approach taken by Lille entails a much wider scope in terms of setting out the fundamentals of a culture-driven local development model, although the Genoa approach does pretty well on its own premises. Genoa is focusing its evaluation in terms of the economic impact of the program, the change of the city's perception in the local, national and international public opinion, and the city's positioning as a major tourism venue in the coming years. Lille's concern is with community involvement, the creation of a cooperative web of relations among institutions and local communities, attraction of foreign resources, emergence of new models of cooperation between culture and the corporate sectors. Genoa focuses upon physical infrastructure, Lille gives equal importance to the physical and the intangible one, especially in terms of social capital accumulation. In terms of horizontal integration among diverse value chains, Lille certainly faces the best prospects, although the extremely complex system of cooperative interactions that it has created requires a quite careful and intense maintenance that has to continue well beyond the end of the ECC program. To what extent Lille will be able to pursue this objective is an open question. On the other hand, we feel that it is necessary that, in order to develop a more solid cultural identity, Genoa should take advantage of the successful outcome of the ECC programs to widen its scope of action substantially, toward the pursuit of innovative, thought provoking cultural production, the proactive involvement of the local community, a much more substantial international networking, and a much more dense and effective interaction between the cultural and the knowledge-oriented sectors of its local economy. Increasing visitor demand is certainly an accomplishment and an objective to be pursued, but not at the expense of "freezing" the cultural dynamics of the city and its active involvement in the international exchange of ideas, people and projects. This will call for a more challenging interpretation of the managerial role of the public development agency and for a

stronger emphasis on the experimentation of innovative models to enhance further the quality of the local governance system, in order to adjust it to the increasing demands of the post-industrial transition process.

Aknowledgments

We wish to thank to Enrico da Molo and Davide Viziano, CEO and president of Genova 2004 Srl, respectively, and Donato Giuliani, Director of the Culture Department of the Region Nord-Pas de Calais, for their invaluable help.

References

- Ashworth, G. J. & Voogd, H. 1995, *Selling the City: Marketing Approaches in Public-Sector Urban Planning*, Wiley, London.
- Becattini, G. 2000a, *Il Distretto Industriale*, Rosenberg & Selleir, Torino.
- Becattini, G. 2000b, *Dal Distretto Industriale allo Sviluppo Locale. Svolgimento e Difesa di un'Iddea*, Bollati Boringhieri, Torino.
- Bianchini, F. & Parkinson, M. (eds) 1993, *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*, Manchester University Press, Manchester.
- Bordieu, P. 1983, *La Distinzione*, Il Mulino, Bologna.
- CONSAV, 2005, *Valutazione delle ricadute economiche per la città derivanti dall'insieme di eventi riconducibili a "Genova capitale europea della cultura 2004"*, Genoa.
- DMCS, 1999, *Creative Industries: The Regional Dimension*, London.
- DCMS, 2004, *Sustainable Development Strategy*, London.
- Everingham, C. 2003, *Social Justice and the Politics of Community*, Ashgate, London.
- Florida, R. 2002 *The Rise of the Creative Class*, Basic Books, New York.
- Garcia, B. 2004, "Urban Regeneration, Arts Programming and Major Events: Glasgow 1990, Sydney 2000 and Barcelona 2004", *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10, 103-118.
- Greenhalgh, L. 1998, "From Arts Policy to Creative Economy", *Media International Australia*, 87, 29-46.
- Landry, C. 2000, *The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators*, Earthscan, London.
- Landry, C. Greene, L. Matarasso, F. & Bianchini, F. 1996, *The Art of Urban Regeneration: Urban Renewal Through Cultural Activity*, Comedia, Stroud.
- Liverpool 2008: www.liverpool08.com
- Matarasso, F. 1997, *Use or Ornament: The Social Impact of Participation in the Arts*, Comedia, Stroud.
- Palmer and Rae Associates, 2004, *European Cities and Capitals of Culture*, Bruxelles.
- Porter, M. E. 1989, *The Competitive Advantage of Nations*, The Free Press, New York.
- Porter, M. E. 2003, "Building the Microeconomic Foundation of Prosperity: Findings from the Microeconomic Competitiveness Index", in the *Global Competitiveness Report 2002-2003*, World Economic Forum, Harvard University Press, Cambridge (Mass).
- Rullani, E. 2004, *Economia della Conoscenza. Creatività e Valore nel Capitalismo delle Reti*, Carocci Roma.
- Sacco, P.L., Ferilli, G., Lavanga, M. "Progressive cultural districts: a theoretical and policy design approach", mimeo, DADI, Università IUAV, forthcoming.
- Sacco, P.L., Pedrini, S. 2003, "Il Distretto Culturale: Mito o Opportunità?", *Il Risparmio*, 51, 101-155.
- Sacco, P.L., Viviani, M. 2003, "Scarsità, Benessere, Libertà nel Contesto dell'Economia dell'Identità", *Istituzioni e Sviluppo Economico*, 1, 2003, 5-41.
- Scottish Executive, 2002, *Draft Guidance for Scottish local authorities*. Available on line at www.scotland.gov.uk
- Sen, A. 1992, *Inequality Reexamined*, Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- Sen, A. 2002, *Globalizzazione e libertà*, Arnoldo Mondadori, Milano.
- Stevenson, D. 1998, *Agendas in Place: Cultural Planning for Cities and Region*, RESRC, Central Queensland University Press, Rockhampton.
- Throsby, D. 1999, "Cultural capital", *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 23, 3-12.
- Throsby, D. 2001, *Economics and culture*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- Valentino, P. 2003, *Le trame del territorio. Politiche di sviluppo dei sistemi territoriali e distretti culturali*, Sperlino & Kupfer, Milano.