

Utopian Visions of Small City Transformation:

The challenge and potential of enacting small city cultural sustainability
agendas in an age of globalization, and against the backdrop of the creative
cities phenomenon

by

Sharon Karsten

M.F.A., University of Calgary, 2008

B.A. (Hons.), University of Waterloo, 2001

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in the

School of Communication

Faculty of Communication, Art and Technology

© Sharon Karsten 2018

SIMON FRASER UNIVERSITY

Fall 2018

Approval

Name: Sharon Karsten
Degree: Doctor of Philosophy
Title: **Utopian Visions of Small City Transformation:** The challenge and potential of enacting small city cultural sustainability agendas in an age of globalization, and against the backdrop of the creative cities phenomenon.

Examining Committee:

Chair: **Sarah Ganter**
Assistant Professor

Stuart Poyntz
Senior Supervisor
Associate Professor

Nicole Vaugeois
Supervisor
AVP Scholarship, Research and Creative Activity
Vancouver Island University

Alison Beale
Supervisor
Professor

Catherine Murray
Internal Examiner
Professor

Kathleen Scherf
External Examiner
Professor, Adventure, Culinary Arts and Tourism
Thompson Rivers University

Defense Date: 12 December 2018

Ethics Statement

The author, whose name appears on the title page of this work, has obtained, for the research described in this work, either:

- a. human research ethics approval from the Simon Fraser University Office of Research Ethics

or

- b. advance approval of the animal care protocol from the University Animal Care Committee of Simon Fraser University

or has conducted the research

- c. as a co-investigator, collaborator, or research assistant in a research project approved in advance.

A copy of the approval letter has been filed with the Theses Office of the University Library at the time of submission of this thesis or project.

The original application for approval and letter of approval are filed with the relevant offices. Inquiries may be directed to those authorities.

Simon Fraser University Library
Burnaby, British Columbia, Canada

Update Spring 2016

Abstract

Amidst a rising tide of awareness surrounding the unsustainable futures facing cities large and small, theorists and practitioners alike are turning to culture as a way to understand and foster new possibilities surrounding sustainable development. Small cities are seen by some to cultivate, by nature of their size and the kinds of connectivity they engender, unique understandings of the value of culture. While not all small cities offer progressive understandings of cultural sustainability, many are working with these concepts in progressive and innovative ways.

This dissertation seeks to unpack the phenomenon of cultural sustainability – examining its relationship with the creative cities phenomenon of the 1990's/2000's, and with the over-arching logics posed by the larger forces of neoliberal globalization. It looks at the ways in which cultural sustainability agendas are being implemented by governments within municipal small city contexts – the empirical portion of this study conducting case studies analysis, including documentary research, interviews and critical analysis, of the British Columbian (Canadian) small cities of Prince George, Kelowna and Kamloops.

Through this research I explore a potential paradigmatic shift – from Creative Cities to Sustainable Creative Cities. I probe at the differences between these two world-views, and ask how leaders intent on activating new holistic and future-conscious forms of development might conceptualize culture's sustainable development role. Within this journey, I recognize a unique potential within small cities, in particular, for the formation of new approaches to sustainable cultural development – acknowledging their place on the margins of dominant municipal leadership practice and their subsequent potential capacity for innovation and change. Here I uncover significant challenges, as well as 'glimmers of hope', as these cities struggle to actualize culture's sustainable development potential.

Keywords: small cities; culture; sustainable development; cultural sustainability;
creative cities

Dedication

I dedicate this piece to those who worked alongside me to make it happen. To my small kids, husband and mom who supported me through the process; to my community on Denman Island whose resilience, quirkiness and helpfulness amaze me; to my supervisor, Stuart Poyntz, whose lengthy mentorship spanning a decade fuelled an internal transformation; to Nicole Vaugeois, who believed in my radical ideas and helped make them happen; to the staff and Board of the Comox Valley Art Gallery for enabling me to walk in two worlds at once; and to all who participated in the research interviews with boldness and integrity - thank you.

Table of Contents

Approval.....	ii
Ethics Statement.....	iii
Abstract.....	iv
Dedication.....	vi
Table of Contents.....	vii
List of Acronyms.....	xi
Chapter 1. Introduction.....	1
Chapter 2. A New Kind of Government.....	4
2.1. Creative Cities Strategy in a Nutshell.....	4
2.2. The Creative Class.....	5
2.3. A Blurry Brand of Politics.....	10
2.4. Creative Cities & Polarization.....	12
2.5. (Un)sustainable.....	14
2.5.1. Sustainability and Planning.....	15
2.5.2. Social Sustainability / Cultural Sustainability.....	16
2.5.3. Creative Cities: Unsustainable.....	17
2.6. Proliferation of Creative Cities Strategy.....	18
Chapter 3. Historical Context.....	20
3.1. Culture and Democratic Freedom: WWII & Postwar Eras.....	20
3.2. Culture, Anthropological Expression & Cultural Democracy.....	23
3.3. Neoliberalism.....	27
3.4. Neoliberalism & Culture.....	31
3.5. Neoliberalism, culture & cities.....	33
3.6. Postmodern City-Building: Two Models.....	36
3.7. Different Models, Similar Logic.....	41
3.8. Postjustice Society.....	41
3.9. Critical Analysis of Culture in the Neoliberal Age.....	42
3.10. Creative Cities - The Logic of Late Capitalism.....	43
Chapter 4. Social Democratic Potentials.....	45
4.1. The Birmingham School & the Cultural Turn.....	45
4.2. Two Examples that Buck the Trend.....	48
4.2.1. UNESCO, European Commission & Council – Culture / Sustainability.....	49
4.2.2. Sustainable Creative Cities.....	51
4.2.3. Agenda 21 & Sustainable Community Planning.....	53
4.3. What types of culture should sustainable creative cities support?.....	57
4.3.1. Culture In, For, As Sustainable Development.....	61
4.3.2. Cultural Sustainability & the Birmingham School.....	62
4.4. Sustainable Creative Cities – Case Studies.....	63

4.5.	Small Cities a Site of Innovation	63
4.6.	Neoliberalism a porous concept?.....	68
Chapter 5. Methodology		71
5.1.	Why study small cities in Canada?	71
5.1.1.	Why British Columbia?	72
5.2.	What is a small city?	73
5.3.	What is Policy?	75
5.4.	Why examine Prince George, Kelowna and Kamloops?	78
5.5.	Timeframe	78
5.6.	Research Questions	78
	Interpretive / Critical Analysis.....	79
5.7.	79
5.8.	Qualitative Research Dilemmas.....	82
5.9.	Case Studies.....	85
5.10.	Research Tactics	87
5.10.1.	Documentary Research Analysis:	87
5.10.2.	Interviews	88
5.10.3.	Exclusions	90
5.11.	Researcher / Practitioner	91
5.12.	Conclusion:	93
Chapter 6. Findings: Prince George.....		95
6.1.	Municipal Context	95
6.2.	Economic/Tourism Approach to Culture	97
6.3.	Cultural Sector - Context.....	98
6.4.	Cultural Planning.....	98
6.4.1.	Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP).....	98
6.4.2.	Official Community Plan (OCP).....	99
6.5.	Municipality	100
6.5.1.	Cultural Strategic Plan (or absence thereof)	100
6.5.2.	Financial Context - Municipal	101
	Current social/cultural budget:.....	101
	Why Amalgamation?	101
	Other forms of Municipal Support.....	103
	Insights from Interviews.....	104
	1. City / Cultural Group relationships are key	104
	2. Rationale for Funding is Unclear	104
	3. Cultural and social agenda combination presents a key tension.....	106
	4. Relationship with Golden Raven is seen to require a strategic re-think	110
6.5.3.	Summary	110
6.6.	Regional District of Fraser Fort-George	111
6.6.1.	Financial Context.....	111
6.6.2.	Cultural Plan - Vision and Goals (Golden Raven)	112
6.6.3.	Definition of Culture	112

6.6.4.	Insights from Interviews.....	114
1.	Quality control is a challenge for the funder	115
2.	Should tourism persist as a key objective?	117
3.	Collaborative energies are stifled by cultural funding silos	120
6.6.5.	Summary	122
6.7.	Critical Evaluation of Prince George Cultural Ecology.....	122
6.8.	Conclusion	126
Chapter 7.	Findings: Kelowna, B.C.	127
7.1.	Context.....	127
7.2.	Economic/Tourism Approach to Culture	128
7.3.	Cultural Sector - Context.....	130
7.4.	Cultural Planning.....	132
7.4.1.	Official Community Plan	132
7.4.2.	Cultural Plan	137
	Vision and Goals	141
	Financial Context & Priorities	142
7.4.3.	Summary	144
7.5.	Insights from Interviews	145
7.5.1.	Critiques	146
1.	Cultural Scientism impacts on funder/organization_relationships	146
2.	Attendance measurement takes priority - minimizes risk-taking potential	148
3.	Confusion over the role of culture within a sustainability framework	149
	A change in course?	151
7.6.	Conclusion	152
Chapter 8.	Findings: Kamloops, B.C.	154
8.1.	Context.....	154
	Economic / Tourism Approach to Culture:	156
8.2.	156
8.3.	Cultural Sector - Context.....	158
8.4.	Cultural Planning.....	161
8.4.1.	Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP) and Official Community Plan (OCP) 161	
8.4.2.	Cultural Strategic Plan.....	162
	Cultural Strategic Plan - Vision and Goals	163
	Financial Context and Priorities	166
	Observations	167
	Where does the cultural strategic plan sit now (the failure of the Performing Arts Centre initiative)?.....	168
	Cultural Development within the City's Larger Development System	170
	Moving Forward - Strategic Plan and Vision	174
8.4.3.	Summary	176
8.5.	Insights from Interviews	177
8.5.1.	Critiques	177

1. Need to balance agendas related to attendance, programming and risk-taking	177
2. Allocation of funding – large vs. small, professional vs. ‘un’professional	179
3. Consideration of role of art within larger social fabric	180
8.6. Conclusion	183
Chapter 9. Reflection	185
9.1. Predominance of Neoliberal Governance Modalities	185
9.2. Predominance of Arnoldian/Professional Culture	185
9.3. Culture’s Marginalized Place within Municipal Power Structures	186
9.4. Non-Progressive Policy and Indicators Frameworks	187
9.5. Mismatched Rhetoric	187
9.6. Creative Cities / Resilient Cities	188
9.7. Glimmer of Hope	189
9.7.1. Prince George	189
9.7.2. Kelowna	190
9.7.3. Kamloops	192
9.8. Hidden Potentials	193
9.9. Applying the Birmingham School’s ‘Cultural Turn’	196
9.10. Response to Research Questions	197
9.11. Change Factors	202
9.11.1. Seeds of creative sustainable creative city building	202
9.11.2. Moving Forward	204
9.12. Conclusion	204
References	206
Appendix A. Interview Guide	233

List of Acronyms

ASEF/ASEM	Asia Europe Foundation
CURA	Community University Research Alliance
EU	European Union
ICSP	Integrated Community Sustainability Plan
LA21	Local Agenda 21
MSC	Most Significant Change Model
OCP	Official Community Plan
PG	Prince George
RDFFG	Regional District of Fraser-Fort George
UNBC	University of Northern British Columbia
UNESCO	UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization Prince George

Chapter 1. Introduction

In recent decades, creative city strategy has grown to be seen as an essential, and at times progressive instrument of municipal government within industrialized (and industrializing) nations (Throsby, 2010, p.7; Amin & Graham, 1997, p.415; Peck (2010), p.163). One of the primary rationales underlying the use of this strategy involves the re-positioning of municipal entities as ‘players’ in what is seen to be a new information (or knowledge) economy (John & Storr, 211, p. 411). Theorists such as Richard Florida and Charles Landry have helped to catalyze interest in creative cities strategy through publications that speak to the value of creative places in attracting talent (and thereby investment), drawing in tourism, increasing overall desirability of place and solving social issues. Works such as Florida’s *The Rise of the Creative Class* (2002) and Landry’s *The Art of City-Making* (2006) have gained a kind of canonization in the libraries of municipal decision-makers world-wide (Pratt, 2010, p.15), and have opened up new and expanded roles for arts and culture within the new world economy.

At the same time as this strategy was becoming popularized, however, a counter-movement developed that posited creative cities theory as stemming from a logic of economic essentialism brought about by neoliberal globalization (McGuigan, 2004, p.1). The ways in which culture has been conceived and utilized within this strategy are seen, through this line of critique, to undermine its emancipatory dimensions, and its possibilities as a catalyst for progressive and democratic change (Ponzini & Rossi, 2010, p.1054). Culture has become, in this view, a mechanism for the ‘government’ of populations – and a stimulant for economic gain... a resource that has become subject to the demands of the global marketplace, and implicated in the marketization of arenas formerly dedicated to democratic processes – such as the public square (McGuigan 2005; Miller and Yudice, 2002; Zelizer, 2011, p.249). Under these circumstances, many (including Richard Florida himself – see Florida, 2017) now consider culture as enacted through creative cities strategy as an ‘unviable’ mechanism for pioneering progressive, democratically-oriented change.

Situations do exist, however, in which culture is deployed by municipalities to open doors for the emergence of participatory and progressive democratic realities. Wyman (2004) views culture as having the potential to liberate the imagination – thereby enabling the

“achievement of all we hope for as a society” (p.2). Duxbury (2002) sees the cultural imagination as a catalyst for the development of meaningful democratic participation: “the more people are engaged in cultural activity at a practical level... the more likely they are to participate actively in the democratic process” (p.5). Furthermore, cultural development in Mitchell and Duxbury’s (2000) view provides a means by which to achieve social cohesion – counter-balancing dominant “postindustrialism, postmaterialism, and postmodernism” logics seen to have generated realities of fragmentation and isolation (p.82). McGuigan (2005) views culture, and the ‘cultural public sphere’ as a means by which to critically intervene in, and provide alternative outlets for, the expression of these global forces – enacting, for instance, semiological warfare in the pursuit of new democratic realities. Seen in this light, cultural development (if not the Creative Cities construct in particular) hold potential for the enactment of progressive, democratic change.

This counter-movement to the creative cities script is seen in some instances as being progressively enacted within small cities. While creative cities script was originally conceptualized and applied within the domain of urban (and often industrially-oriented) centres such as Copenhagen, Milwaukee, Austin, Seattle, Toronto, etc., it has, throughout the past decade and a half, been taken up also within small cities. Actualized within this context, in which the qualities of place, locality and community are, in theory at least, valued differently than in large urban centres, (Duxbury & Campbell, 2011, p.111; Luckman, Gibson & Lee, 2009; p.71; Herbert-Cheshire, 2000, p.208; Parkins & Reed, 2012, p.6), creative cities strategy has taken on new meanings. I probe this transformation - asking whether there is to be found, within these contexts and incarnations, the potential for sustainable and progressive change.

The first three chapters of this dissertation explore the creative cities construct – presenting a genealogy of the concept and its spread through professional planning networks. This includes an examination of the construct’s motivating philosophies, history and varying manifestations – as well as critical analysis. Through this journey, I look, in particular, towards the ‘cultural sustainability paradigm’ – a manifestation of this counter-movement that can be seen to harbour key differences from the standard creative cities script. Through this research, I position the cultural sustainability paradigm as a viable alternative to the creative cities script.

Chapter four explores ways in which cultural sustainability is operationalized within municipalities – leading to chapter five – a methodology for my fieldwork. Chapters six through eight present this work in the form of case studies documenting the cultural policy ecologies present in three small Canadian cities - Prince George, Kelowna and Kamloops (British Columbia). Here I look at the ways in which cultural sustainability is taken up by governments within these locales. Through this research I discover numerous challenges as leaders struggle to enact sustainable culture-led transformation. I also discover glimpses of possibility that, if recognized and expanded, could lead to radical, progressive and utopian evolutions of dominant municipal cultural governance paradigms.

In chapter nine I reflect on these findings – bringing into play a range of critical lenses to enable the emergence of different insights. Chapter ten, the conclusion, references back to the core research questions asked, and presents further broad reflection on the journey taken through this project at large.

This dissertation is written first and foremost for municipal leaders wanting to engage with cultural sustainability principles and agendas - also, for anyone interested in the potential of culture as a vehicle for municipal change. It asks, at its core, *what small city governance practices can tell us about the challenge of using cultural policy to develop a fuller and richer sustainable culture?* Through this journey I struggle to see a way through the dominant creative cities paradigm and into another more democratic, progressive and future-oriented one – possessive of a fundamentally distinct way of seeing and understanding culture’s role and potential within a global narrative characterized by market-based growth and socio-environmental decline.

Chapter 2. A New Kind of Government

2.1. Creative Cities Strategy in a Nutshell

Creative cities strategy – referred to in some quarters as a strategy (Ponzini & Rossi, 2010, p.1042) and in others as a movement, (Morrison, 2011, p.495) fad (Luciani, 2006) or cult (Chen, 2012) is a phenomenon that developed throughout the past 30 years – beginning in urban centres within the ‘Global North’ and sweeping outward – to countries throughout the globe; and inward – to be taken up also by non-urban, non-metropolitan centres. The strategy has its roots, on one hand, in 1940’s and 50’s wartime (and post-war) national identity and infrastructure re-construction efforts in which culture came to be seen as a force of political re-articulation – a mechanism by which to shape political identities on the national level, and to recognize, celebrate and exploit ‘difference’; and, on the other, in the ‘new world paradigm’ brought about by the fall of the Berlin Wall, the global spread of capitalism and the proliferation of new technology. Since the 1990’s, the strategy has gained ground as a municipal management technique – offering alternative sets of governance arsenal designed to meet new-world challenges.

The narrative commonly expressed surrounding the growth of creative cities agenda points, at the outset, to theorists and consultants Richard Florida and Charles Landry as key initiators of the movement, and to their publications as catalysts for its global proliferation (Peck, 2010, p.163; Vinodrai, 2011, p.189). Florida’s strategy, summarized by Christopher Dreher as “be creative or die” (p.163), urged cities to “attract the ‘new creative class’ with hip neighbourhoods, an arts scene and a gay-friendly atmosphere” (p.163). The idea, expressed in such works as *The Rise of the Creative Class*, and *The Art of City Making*, is that creativity spurs innovation, which in turn spurs economic progress and the ability to ‘compete’ in a global marketplace founded on knowledge and information. Creativity, according to Florida, has replaced raw materials, physical labour and flows of capital as the primary driver of urban economic success” (Throsby, 2010, p.136). Florida saw the emergence of a new creative class as an “innovative source of urban dynamism”... whose work uses creativity as an “engine of innovation and urban growth” (p.136). He called on municipalities to develop environments suitable for the creative class – ones that attract “high-technology, industry concentration, and talent” (p.61). So as to remain or become competitive in a changing information-based

landscape, cities must, according to this argument, engage in place-making projects designed to catalyze creative class clusters.

Florida was to change his tune significantly in his 2017 book *The New Urban Crisis*. Here, in response to mounting evidence, he acknowledges the negative impacts of creative class agglomeration – most notably as related to the polarization of wealth. Within creative city economies, he admits, the “advantaged knowledge workers, professionals, and media and cultural workers who made up the creative class were doing fine...[yet] blue collar and service workers... were “sinking further behind” (p.4). While Florida had foreshadowed these polarizing effects as early as 2003 (p.3), it wasn’t until the release of this 2017 book that he fully acknowledged their disastrous potentials. Such a reveal came after cities throughout the globe had, for more than two decades, been pursuing a creative class ideology for which he was, in significant measure, seen as a champion. Notwithstanding this reversal, the creative cities ideology, it seems, has taken on a life of its own – such that Florida’s backtracking arguably lacks the fortitude to affect a significant reversal of this agenda.

In what follows, then, I trace the evolution of the creative class script. Beginning with Florida and Landry, I show a connectedness between the creative cities theory as conceptualized by these theorists and a wider neoliberal agenda. I also uncover two of the key critiques mobilized in opposition to this movement – one that echoes Florida’s later concerns with the movement’s propensity to polarize communities along lines of income; the other of which points to the movement’s lack of commitment to principles of sustainability. I then show how the movement has, in spite of these critiques, progressed to become a dominant modality within municipal government frameworks globally.

2.2. The Creative Class

What is the creative class? Drawing on seminal theories by Karl Marx, Joseph Schumpeter, and more recently Peter Drucker, Daniel Bell and others (Florida, Mellander & Adler, p.54), Florida depicts the rise of “a new social class rooted in knowledge work or mental labour” (p.54). This class, comprised of workers spanning a wide range of industries including “science and technology, arts, culture and entertainment and the knowledge-based professions” (p.54), has grown, he claims, “from roughly 5 to 10 percent of the workforce at the turn of the twentieth century to

roughly a third or more of the workforce in the advanced economies by the early twenty-first century” (p.54). Florida characterizes the creative class as valuing tolerance and self-expression, individuality, meritocracy, openness and diversity. (Florida, 2002). Creatives seek “overall meaning and happiness in life” (Kiriakos, 2001, p.307) and therefore place a strong emphasis on location. In Florida’s view, creative professionals “do not merely move for jobs... but look for locations that allow them to be creative in the community ” (p.307). Creative Cities strategy, then, plays into this group’s migratory preferences. It builds on, and exploits these preferences – using them to further a new-world governance and market agenda.

To gain ground in attracting the creative class, cities were advised by Florida to embrace the ‘Three T’s’ of economic growth – technology, talent and tolerance (Throsby, 2010, p.136). Municipalities that value and actively foster these T’s are, he says “the kinds of places that, by allowing people to be themselves and to validate their distinct identities, mobilize and attract the creative energy that bubbles up naturally from all walks of life” (Florida, 1995, p7). In tangible terms, this strategy is played out in the buzzing, trendy neighbourhood characterized by plenty of ‘on-demand entertainment’ and a multitude of casual ‘third places’, like “coffee houses and bookstores where numerous informal social ties can be cultivated” (Zimmerman, 2008, p.232). Endemic to creative city neighbourhoods is, presumably, “an open and tolerant culture”, a large “concentration of bohemians and gays”, and a particularly urban recreational and nightlife ecology” (p.232). Cities considered meccas for the creative class are, in other words, those that have succeeded in “validating and satisfying [particular] lifestyle, recreation and cultural needs of the creative class” (p.232). By attracting creatives and concentrating creative energy and ideas, cities are enabled to compete within a networked and symbolic landscape endemic to the new-world order.

Landry, in similar style, touted the benefits to be found in ‘creativizing’ urban locales. Believing that “there is always more potential in any place than any of us would think at first sight” (Landry, 2011, p.517), he encourages municipalities to ‘rise to the challenge’ of tapping this potential by creating the conditions needed for people to “think, plan and act with imagination in harnessing opportunities or addressing seemingly intractable urban problems” (p.517). Like Florida, Landry views creativity as a way to create wealth, while at the same time enhancing the environment and addressing social problems. In Landry’s words: “By encouraging creativity and legitimizing the use of imagination within

the public, private and community spheres, the ideas bank of possibilities and potential solutions to any urban problem will be broadened” (p.518). While Florida addresses the issue of the creative city through the conduit of the ‘creative class’, for Landry the focus is on “bringing creativity into the practice and policies of urban regeneration” with an aim to “address the city’s economic and social problems” (Haddock paraphrasing Landry, 2010, p.28). Here, creativity is seen as a general, all-purpose opportunity-creating and problem-solving tool. It is a resource that enables cities to combat social ailments while at the same time creating ‘ladders of economic opportunity’.

Central to the creative cities agenda expressed by these theorists was a focus on creative infrastructure – including both ‘hard’ and ‘soft’ infrastructure - and ‘mental infrastructure’ – “the way a city approaches opportunities and problems; the environmental conditions it creates to generate an atmosphere; and the enabling devices it fosters that are generated through its incentives and regulatory structures” (p.28). Both theorists encouraged a radical shift away from an ‘old-world’ governance style – advocating for the cultivation of flexibility and risk-taking in the construction of new realities (Peck, 2010, p.166). Here, then, we see emerge a call for not only creative events and spaces, but also for creative government – ie: for a style of government that is flexible, responsive, innovative and entrepreneurial. This form of government is responsible for producing new realities and subjectivities endemic to, and compliant with, the new market paradigm.

Such a government was encouraged by both Florida and Landry to hone in on the downtown as the ‘stage’ or ‘container’ through which such realities and subjectivities are produced. “Think of a revitalized downtown as an idea generator” [says Florida], “and the urban subcentres as incubators”(Florida, 1995, p165). This urban core needs, according to Landry, “to provide the physical preconditions or platform upon which the activity base or atmosphere of a city can develop” (Landry, 2011, p.518). Downtowns must systemically encourage the ‘clustering’ of like-minded business interests – especially those involved in ‘creative industries’ - through which can be developed dynamic hubs that can participate in global networks of exchange (Florida, 1995, p.27). Through strategic agglomeration, cities and their downtowns become attractive centres for trade, investment and tourism, and link into the global marketplace.

The clustering mentality advocated by these theorists, it has been observed, stands in stark contrast to the “far flung fordist spatial division of labour” (Florida, Mellander &

Adler, 2011, p. 3) – in which large factories, rather than particular locations/ milieus and localized networks, served as human resource magnets, and in which “the consumption preferences of workers were not only subservient to the microeconomic demands of the firm, but the firm even controlled worker housing and consumption” (p.3). The urban crisis brought about by globalization and post-fordist labour processes saw the decline of numerous industrialized urban centres, and in particular, of the ‘inner city’ as a traditional base for large-scale manufacturing operations (p.3). Florida and Landry call upon cities to re-imagine their urban cores in such a way as to encourage clustering of knowledge-based enterprises and creative industries, thereby stemming the effects of deindustrialization and decline.

Throughout the 80’s and 90’s, then – in concert with the recommendations made by Florida and Landry – the creative industries became development agents for municipal governments globally. The term ‘creative industries’ is widely defined as industries that “have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent, and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (UK Department for Culture, Media and Sport, 1998). Mapped into this construct is a host of formerly distinct entities – “advertising, architecture, the arts and antique markets, crafts, design, designer fashion, film, interactive leisure software (ie: music, television and radio, performing arts, publishing and software)” (Milicevic, 2014, para.3). Numerous statistics from advanced industrialized countries show significant growth-potential in these industries - in the U.K. for instance the Creative Industries to the economy is “substantially greater than that of the construction industry and to exports twice that of pharmaceuticals”. These industries comprise the fastest-growing component of the U.K. economy, with “a real growth rate twice that of the economy as a whole” (Crossick, 2006, P2). The same growth-trend holds true in numerous industrialized countries. Askerud & Engelhardt (2007), looking at statistics procured through UNESCO, claim that the “cultural industries have become one of the fastest growing sectors in industrialized economies (p.3) – a trend, it claims, related to “profound transformations in economies and societies, and to a changed perception of culture and its role in these processes” (p.3). Within the paradigm shift brought about by globalization, then, creative industries have become valued as ‘fuel’ for the innovation agendas inherent to the new global marketplace. Florida and Landry advise municipalities to strategically cultivate such industries so as to ‘boost’ the desirability and marketability of their urban cores.

Cities investing in the creative class would see, according to Florida, economic growth through improved productivity (measured through economic output per capita):

Real economic growth comes not from population growth, but from improvements in productivity... we found no statistical association at all between population growth and economic growth, either for metros or states. This not only challenges the notion that population growth is a proxy for economic growth; it puts the lie to development strategies that encourage population growth as an end in itself (Florida, 2014, p.259)

Here, then, Florida advocates a kind of 'smart growth' – in which Cities are advised not to expand their population base per-se, but to grow their productivity through creative class investment.

The task of re-imagining the urban core, and of attracting creative industry was seen by both theorists to involve investments in symbolic capital – ie: in the ways in which a city's core communicates, through symbols, its values and assets. Here it is recognized that places are more than material constructions; they become part of a broader 'cultural imagination' and are constituted - and reconstituted – not only through economic forces, but, moreover, through activities of signification and representation... through “the elaboration of some kind of mental map of the world which can be invested with all manner of personal or collective hopes and fears” (Harvey as cited in Paulini, 1999, p.152). The importance ascribed to the symbolic can be seen to play into the concept of 'cognitive cultural capitalism' – described by Vinodrai as an emerging form of post-fordist capitalism in which “production increasingly relies on symbolic and aesthetic considerations” (Vinodrai, 2011, p.146). The idea here is that city scenes (ie: particular collections of amenities indicative of place) are embedded with “symbolic meanings” (Silver, Nichols Clark & Graziul, 2011, p.230). By strategically cultivating such scenes, a city establishes itself as “a dynamic place of business, tourism and multiculturalism” (Stevenson, 2003, p.141), and cultivates “competitive advantage over other cities through its ability to convert itself into a site of postmodern consumption and spectatorship for the middle and upper classes” (p.58). The use of culture as a vehicle for cultivating symbolically-charged realities highlights a level of performativity at play, and positions “culture as a resource... a principal component of ... [the] postmodern epitome (Yudice, 2011, p.29). In a move that Guy Debord might characterize as 'spectacular' (Debord, 1967), Florida and Landry advised local governments to carefully consider, and strategically cultivate, the symbolic elements of their city's scenes – particularly those within the downtown core. Here, we see the basis for the construction

of Flagship developments, one-off mega-projects (Pratt, 2010, p. 17), and the turn towards creative industries as symbolically-charged constructs. Through such investments, culture emerges as a conduit of postmodern logic, and as a resource endemic to the knowledge economy.

With the emergence of the creative cities concept, then, we see emerge a new style of governance designed to enable cities to engage symbolically and economically with world market forces, and through this engagement to attract and produce new municipal subjectivities. The replacement of industry jobs with creative sector jobs marks a large-scale social transformation through which social relations are radically altered. To compete in the emerging symbolically-charged knowledge economy, city leaders, administrators, bureaucrats, etc. are advised to cultivate the kind of city that is desirable to the creative class, and to creative industry in general – a task that involves placing focus on aspects of place, and in particular on the downtown/inner city as a core representation of place. By encouraging a creative re-development of key symbolic locales, cities can attract (and produce) ‘new economy’ workers, and strategically boost their marketability on the world stage.

2.3. A Blurry Brand of Politics

The concept of the creative city has garnered praise as well as criticism from both sides of the political spectrum. Florida calls himself a “political independent, fiscal conservative, social liberal, and believer in international competition and free trade” (Florida as cited in Peck, 2010, p. 163). He speaks of creative cities theory as ‘fitting’ into the political ideologies propagated by both left and right: “Today, I work closely with mayors, governors, business, political and civic leaders from both sides of the aisle on economic development issues, and a good deal of the time, I cannot even tell who is Republican and who is a Democrat”(p.185). Whether this kind of fence sitting is purposely ambiguous, or constitutes a genuine expression of his political non-commitment, is perhaps a moot point. What is important, it seems, is that the creative cities thesis as developed by Florida and Landry denied partisanship – positioning itself as an appropriate governance strategy for those on both sides of the political spectrum.

The ‘leftish’ qualities of this discourse present the creative city as a mechanism for a democratic re-imagining, and for the expression of plurality - with public space and

creative mindsets serving as key 'articulating' agents. Judd (1988) observes that "the enhancing of the creative and cultural economy of the cities has become one of the preferred ... ways to strengthen local communities' sense of spatial and group-based belonging; to develop the active involvement of citizens in public affairs; and to pursue these goals along with those of urban growth and larger economic development" (Judd, 1988). And Duxbury (2002), points to the ways in which urban discourses such as the creative cities script have brought into the spotlight community as the "cornerstone of identity in emerging concepts of governance"... meaning concepts like "community, identity, 'belonging', human and social capital, and civil society have now become 'mainstream' (p.6). Such concepts carry a distinct social democratic flair, in the sense that they make room, in theory at least, for the expression of plurality and difference within politics – and for various visions of social emancipation as related to the 'public good'. In a similar vein, Ponzini & Rossi (2010) observe the creative cities script, in rhetoric at least, as catalyzing "heterarchical, decentralized and dynamic processes in which local actors commit to constructing and portraying themselves as 'autonomous agents' within the public realm of the city" (p.1052). This decentralization and de-hierarchization makes allowance for a plurality of voices and agendas to come together in order to imagine, and to activate, new realities in terms of the 'public good'.

Lending weight to a discourse of plurality is the concept of creativity itself – an idea that in some of its connotations evokes notions of humanism, communitarian exchange and altruism. In Landry's (2006) words: "civic creativity is imaginative problem-solving applied to public good objectives. It involves the public sector being more entrepreneurial, though within the bounds of accountability, and the private sector being more aware of its responsibilities to the collective whole" (p.3). Creativity as described by Landry is able to push beyond a market paradigm; to 'bend the market logic to bigger goals' (p.339). In these terms, the concept emerges as one steeped in humanism, and concerned with societal betterment. "Creativity for the world or for your city [observes Landry] gives something back. It is a creativity that generates civic values and civility" (p.336)

From another perspective, however, the term 'creativity' can be seen to play into economic imperatives propagated by neoliberalism and right-minded politics, and to produce and reinforce, rather than 'bend' market logic. For Holcombe (2011), "cultivating creativity means cultivating entrepreneurship" (p.390). Such entrepreneurship fuels cities

as economic centres, enabling them to “work as markets, trading and production centres with their critical mass of entrepreneurs, artists, intellectuals, students, administrators and power brokers” (p.411). Here we see a kind of dialectical relationship between creativity and market growth. Creativity enables market exchange, which in turn enables creativity. Seen in this light, creativity serves as a determinant in “our ability to adapt to [and produce] new economic imperatives” (Craik, 2007 p.13). These dual and competing understandings of creativity highlight a tension at the heart of creative cities discourse. One of the dominant observations that has emerged with regards to this tension posits creative cities theory as a form of ‘compromised’ leftism... ie: as a phenomenon whose core commitment to economic imperatives is ‘softened’ and ‘made palatable’ through humanistic rhetoric characteristic of left-leaning discourse. Deborah Stevenson (2004), for instance, equates creative cities phenomena with ‘third way politics’ - a form of leftism that emerged globally in the 80’s and 90’s (propagated by Tony Blair’s New Labour party) in which significant concessions were made to accommodate market imperatives. Stevenson views this new left to have, in practice, relinquished the ideals of social democracy including its commitment to social emancipation and its focus on redistribution as a means for societal betterment... while at the same time retaining some of its rhetoric. She observes, for instance, a radical shift in the third way’s common replacement of the term ‘social justice’ with ‘social inclusion’ (p.125). The latter term speaks to a form of power that enforces order by systemically promoting conformity with the prevailing economic regime, rather than, as implied in the former term, allowing for radical difference and dissent. In Stevenson’s view then, the creative cities script, while seductive to left-leaning politicians and bureaucrats globally, undermines some of the most fundamental pillars of social-democratic thought - clothing what is essentially economically-driven policy promoting conformity with a neoliberal market regime in language that is humanistic and inclusive.

2.4. Creative Cities & Polarization

While creative cities theory is often presented as a progressive, new-world ‘salve’ to be applied as a means to enhance competitiveness and address a wide range of social issues, empirical research shows creative cities texts to have, in many cases, enacted profoundly negative impacts related to social and humanitarian agendas. Almost a decade prior to the release of *The New Urban Crisis* (Florida, 2017) theorists Mary Donegan and Nichola Lowe (2008), for instance, were conducting research on the

relationship between creative class and wage rates in American cities. These theorists concluded that “there is a significant relationship between the creative class and inequality in metropolitan areas” (p.47)...and that “the *level* of a region’s creative class is directly related to the region’s *level* of inequality”(p.52). These theorists furthermore shed light on the ‘tolerance index’ observed by Florida to be endemic to centres boasting high concentrations of creative class (Florida, 2012) - observing that while urban centres demonstrating high concentrations of creative class workers do, as Florida suggests, house high concentrations of immigrants, immigrants within these centres are statistically excluded from high-income jobs, and are taking up, rather, low-wage jobs that support the lifestyle amenities desired by the creative class (Donegan & Lowe, 2008, p.56).

This tendency of creative cities projects to polarize communities along the lines of income and race has furthermore been documented in numerous case studies within industrialized nations. Jeffrey Zimmerman, for instance, in his case study *From Brew Town to Cool Town* (2008) traces the efforts made by Milwaukee’s municipal government during the early 2000’s to pursue a creative cities model of downtown urban revitalization. Resulting from a ‘remodelling’ of the urban core, there occurred, he observes, a remarkable polarization within the city which “brought into even sharper relief what was already one of the most economically and racially polarized large cities in the United States” (p.230). With the downtown becoming increasingly gentrified through investments in an infrastructure of elite consumption, racial and income disparity became more pronounced – both within and outside of the urban core. Zimmerman observes, for instance, a growing jobless rate among African-American males, coupled with a purging of the African-American population from the downtown core through housing re-development strategies (p.241). He observes dire social consequences to have arisen from the City’s decision to re-direct funds normally earmarked for low-income populations towards infrastructure projects designed to attract, and pander to, the creative elite:

In 2006, to give just one representative example, the local parks district announced that 43 public swimming pools – 90% of the city total – would close due to budget shortfalls, thereby undermining the quality of life in many of the city’s poorest neighborhoods. The same agency was still robust enough however to earmark a generous \$200,000 for the installation of additional public art in the upscale corridors of the city’s

downtown area, an ostensibly more essential form of municipal action under the new Florida-inspired urban imperative (p.241)

The re-allocation of funds in this manner is seen by Zimmerman as a logical outcome of a theory that “conspicuously omits old-economy workers from the utopian contours of the emerging city, while simultaneously ignoring ‘obsolete’ forms of politics, like unions or class-based political parties, all of which are ‘breezily dismissed’” (p.240). The dismissal of such redistributive entities is furthermore accomplished, observes Haddock (2010), within a centralized governance structure controlled by elite groups of proponents:

The public-private partnerships responsible for... [creative cities flagship] projects rarely solicit/receive input from other local actors, apart from investors and the business community, and are often shielded from public scrutiny and political accountability. As a consequence, the culture embodied by these projects remains alien to large parts of the local community, deprived of voice and left with no tangible benefits, and the legitimacy and efficacy of the branding process is diminished” (p.18)

While inclusively/ tolerance is touted as a key agenda within Florida’s urban regeneration theory, then, this agenda is often, in practice, drowned out by the more pressing agenda to support the creative (often ‘white’) elite through the development of gentrified environments.

2.5. (Un)sustainable

Building on the polarization critique is one that takes issue with the creative city’s incomppliance with sustainability principles. Moore (2005) defines sustainability as:

a concept, a goal and a strategy... the concept speaks to the reconciliation of social justice, ecological integrity and the wellbeing of all living systems on the planet... the goal is to create an ecologically and socially just world within the means of nature without compromising future generations. Sustainability also refers to the process or strategy of moving towards a sustainable future (p.78)

This critique takes issue with the movement’s inaptitude to consider the long-term effects of its actions on the wellbeing of society, and upon the planetary ecosystem at large. To better-understand the movement’s incomppliance with a sustainable development mandate and discipline, I look first at some of the key concepts informing this discipline as related to planning and culture. I then return to the creative cities movement – making

comparisons between its key aims and objectives against those endorsed within a sustainable development paradigm.

2.5.1. Sustainability and Planning

Within planning and academic contexts, the sustainability discourse has been coupled with the term 'development' to create 'sustainable development' as a discipline, and a visionary development paradigm. Growing to prominence in the late 1980s (Drexhage & Murphy, 2010), sustainable development now exists as "a contested discursive field which allows for the articulation of political and economic differences... and introduces to environmental issues a concern for social justice and political participation" (Cuthill, 2010, p363). This discipline has grown rapidly within first-world municipal governance contexts, and is now considered a key facet of numerous planning regimes internationally. Through this discipline, the ideals of sustainability are applied within physical and social domains – notably, within our analysis of the creative cities discourse – to the city as a site of political articulation and struggle.

Key to the concept of sustainability, and sustainable development, are notions of diversity (Janssens et al., 2010), community cohesion (Brabazon, 2013, p.45) and resilience (van der Heijden, 2014, p.x). Diversity is seen as a hallmark of 'ecological' as well as 'sociological' health, and is positioned as an ideal to be cultivated through systems of governance premised upon inclusion (Miller & Katz, 2002) – through which a broad and multifarious range of largely endogenous interests are activated in the service of a given community's development.

Implicitly expressed through this focus on diversity is the value of a community's 'self-identity', and its 'social cohesion', to its long-term wellbeing. Such cohesion involves "building shared values and communities of interpretation, reducing disparities in wealth and income, and generally enabling people to have a sense that they are engaged in common enterprise, facing shared challenges and that they are members of the same communities." (p.18). By allowing a populace, including the full spectrum of its membership, to define for itself its values, purpose and goals (rather than having such pieces imposed 'from above', as has often been the case in traditional planning processes driven by outside 'experts'), communities are seen to cultivate collectively-owned belief systems upon which long-term health is built. Such health, frequently

referred to by sustainability proponents as 'resilience', is seen as a defining quality of sustainable communities – who, through active cultivation of a strong identity and mechanisms of collective participation, improve their chances of weathering an array of storms endemic to the information age.

This concept of 'social cohesion' brings to light the cultural aspects of sustainability – and the ways in which shared understandings surrounding a community's values and identity are *culturally* constructed. Social cohesion, observes Hawkes, "is utterly dependent upon the capacity of the individuals within a community to understand, respect and trust one another... qualities [that] are built through cultural interaction" (p.18). Here, culture is recognized and valued for its propensity to encompass and produce "values, motivations, aspirations, attitudes, and creativity – a world where hopes, dreams and plans engage the heart and soul, not just within the psyches of individuals but between them and among them – at the heart of communities themselves" (p.18). Duxbury, Gillette and Pepper (2007) point to culture's potential to "transform communities and individuals in positive and meaningful ways over the long term – advocating for the pursuit of sustainability's "ethical underpinnings" and for the propensity of culture to enact, within this context, forms of social cohesion rooted in "a holistic and creative process".

2.5.2. Social Sustainability / Cultural Sustainability

Until recently, the concept of culture has been widely conceptualized as a facet of 'social' (as opposed to ecological and/or economic) sustainability. Polèse and Stren (2000), define this concept, within an urban context, as follows:

Social sustainability for a city is defined as development that is compatible with the harmonious evolution of civil society, fostering an environment conducive to the compatible cohabitation of culturally and socially diverse groups while at the same time encouraging social integration, with improvements in the quality of life for all segments of the population (p.15-16)

Here, culture is positioned as a mechanism by which to build 'social capital' – that is, to produce "a myriad of everyday interactions between people" premised upon "valuing self and others; trust (interpersonal and generic); connection (participation and networks); [the value of] multiple relationships and [of] reciprocity in relationships" (Bullen & Onyx,

1998). Culture is, in other words, seen as a kind of 'glue' through which communities are 'bound together' in a shared and meaningful relationship.

Seen in this context, culture becomes valued for its propensity to 'bring into conversation' a multifarious collection of interests, to weave tapestries of meaning out of diverse and multifarious articulations and to enact forms of solidarity within social landscapes that are essentially pluralized.

In recent decades, however, calls have been made for culture to be 'ungrouped' from the concept of social sustainability and constituted as a 'fourth' pillar of the term – that is - a dimension of sustainability in its own right (see Duxbury, Gillette & Pepper, 2007 & Hawkes, 2001). This call follows a move by UNESCO to recognize the centrality of culture within development contexts internationally. In its 1996 report, *Our Creative Diversity* (1996), UNESCO authors call for new, more 'holistic' understandings to be cultivated surrounding sustainable development – ones that take into account not only the economic, environmental and social dimensions of this term, but also its cultural dimensions. The authors of this report posit a new development paradigm in which "what [has] been achieved for environment and development" (ie: the recognition of the centrality of environmental concerns to development agendas) is also accomplished for "culture and development" (p.8). The report therefore advocates a position for culture at the 'centre-stage' of development agendas internationally – referencing culture's role in shaping "all our thinking, imagining and behavior" (p.11). Here, culture is itself recognized as a source of "energy, inspiration and empowerment... knowledge and acknowledgment of diversity" (p.11). Furthermore, it is seen as a "dynamic source for change, creativity, freedom and the awakening of new opportunities" (p.11). Within this report is recognized a 'constitutive', rather than merely 'supportive' role for culture in enacting progressive forms of sustainable development.

2.5.3. Creative Cities: Unsustainable

At this point we return to the Creative Cities phenomenon, and to critiques of the phenomenon as 'unsustainable'. Given the rising emphasis placed upon culture as a constitutive agent in development agendas worldwide, and the fact that culture is featured prominently within the creative cities script's development agenda, this critique of the creative cities phenomenon as unsustainable is, perhaps, surprising. What

appears to be lacking in the creative cities proponents' usage of culture, however, is (according to many of its critics) a recognition (and exploitation) of culture's sustainability-producing potential.

The kinds of meaning constructed through the movement are often, according to critics such as Ratiu (2013) and Baycan (2011) seen as antithetical to the pursuit of long-term societal well-being – and to the holism and collectivism embedded in the concept of sustainability. In its propensity to polarize communities, creating gentrified environments characterized by mono-cultural precincts and marketized tourism constructs designed to attract wealthy consumers¹, and in its preferential treatment of one particular segment of the community (ie: the creative class) over others, the creative cities script is chided for its construction of an elitist society grounded in uniformity rather than diversity.

Furthermore, the creative cities script has been seen to produce, broadly, the “corrosion of neighbourhoods” (Kagan & Hahn, 2011, p.16) and the erosion of social cohesion - as evident in its gentrifying effects. Finally, the resilience of communities is seen to be compromised through creative cities applications - through, for instance, their development of jobs landscapes characterized by ‘shaky’ forms of labour. By pandering to the needs (or whims) of a highly mobile class of elite workers, then, creative cities projects are seen to undercut diversity as an element of social (as well as ecological and cultural) sustainability, and to erode the social cohesion within, and resilience of, communities.

2.6. Proliferation of Creative Cities Strategy

Notwithstanding these critiques, municipalities and governance entities globally began, throughout the past 20-30 years, enlisting cultural policy constructs as vehicles for creating the types of environments that attract entrepreneurs and innovators so as to increase liveability for, and productivity of, the creative class. Under this agenda, creative cities policy would be deployed in re-shaping town squares, re-vitalizing urban neighbourhoods, designing tourism constructs and driving urban planning processes (Ponzini & Rossi, 2010, p.1040). Additionally, a network of creative cities hubs

¹ Note that this literature review features and draws upon dominant critiques of the creative class construct and its use of large-scale cultural tourism agendas to fuel market growth. The review does not delve into literatures surrounding ‘creative tourism’ – an alternate form of tourism that often features small-scale, endogenously-produced tourism designed to contribute to sustainable development agendas.

transcendent of the municipality emerged during this time - fostering the international proliferation of the creative cities movement. The City of Leipzig (European Union, 2014), for instance, serves as a key partner in the European Creative Cities Network, which connects creative industry clusters within major Central European Cities, and provides opportunities for the “development and promotion of creative industries potentials” (para. 1). And nation-states including Britain (British Council, 2014), and Canada (Creative City Network of Canada, 2014) have launched creative city networks designed to link creative centres to one another within a globalized network of trade. These networks provide opportunities to tap into the “expertise of peer municipalities across the country” as well as globally.... and promote the economic, as well as socio-cultural benefits to be gained through creative cities development. As stated on the British Council’s website: “Creative Cities are successful cities. They succeed culturally, economically, socially and environmentally. They are good places to live: they attract talented people, who attract investment and create jobs. By finding innovative solutions to the problems such as crime, traffic congestion, they make life better for citizens” (British Council, 2014b). Such networks, then, position creative cities initiatives within the larger socio-economic context brought about by neoliberal globalization. In recognizing and connecting creative centres, they foster the growth of creative cities strategy globally.

The success of creative cities theory is evident, as well, in the recognition attributed throughout the last three decades to the movement’s key proponents - Florida and Landry. While battling a series of poignant critiques coming from both the left and right (Peck, 2010, p163-164) - including those mentioned earlier regarding the movement’s propensity to promote inequality and unsustainability; and while ultimately capitulating (at least Florida, in-part) to these, the theorists nonetheless have risen in status as consultant super-stars, and have become valued as public speakers internationally - their theories becoming seen as an “essential component in any respectable economic policy-maker’s development strategy (Throsby, 2010, p.7). In summary – fuelled by Florida and Landry’s creative city theory ideas, the notion that capitalism is entering a ‘new dawn’ characterized by creativity as a driving force has proven to be highly seductive force in the development of urban renewal agendas globally.

Chapter 3. Historical Context

In taking a birds-eye view of the dramatic rise of the creative cities concept, a number of questions arise. What factors have come together to produce the appetite for this theory amongst municipal planners and bureaucrats globally? Upon what traditions/histories and assumptions were creative cities ideas constructed, and how did these play into a changing global imagination surrounding urban growth and identity? To address these questions, I look briefly at the major social/political cultural and urban development shifts that occurred within industrialized nations post-WWII through to the current 'neoliberal' age; highlighting, in particular, the changing role that culture assumed in the construction of the city, and of civic identities.

3.1. Culture and Democratic Freedom: WWII & Postwar Eras

Throughout and following from WWII, amidst a global landscape shaken by the uncertainty, vulnerability and brutality of a war in which artistic expression was deployed in powerful new ways towards the shaping of public opinion (the war on propaganda being, perhaps, 'the war that Hitler won' (Herzstein, 1978)), culture came swiftly to the forefront of national and international policy agendas as an instrument of identity-construction and defense. Allied forces used culture in response to the propaganda issued by the Axis powers – deploying it as a vehicle by which to build imagination and solidarity surrounding democratic and enlightenment ideals. UNESCO, for instance, was initiated by Allied forces in 1945 to “promote collaboration among nations through education, science and culture” so as to “further universal respect for justice, for the rule of law and for the human rights and fundamental freedoms... affirmed for the peoples of the world... by the Charter of the United Nations” (UNESCO, 1978). In response to the threat of global totalitarianism, UNESCO was to propagate a “discourse of ‘cultural relations’” that was international in scope, and that combined “humanist progressivism with a notion of multiply reinforcing levels of international relations (Druick, 2006, para. 18). This discourse emphasized the necessary convergence of “education, culture, and commerce” (para.18) in the creation of an enlightened social paradigm: "Through UNESCO the governments of member states ...[gave] new emphasis to their belief that education is indispensable to a country's development; that it is vital for political

democracy, for raising living standards, for adequate understanding of the discoveries of modern science, and for cultural as well as for economic growth" (Laves & Thomson, 1957, p. 191).

Individual allied nation-states, in-line with this discourse, would deploy culture as a political tool to show solidarity with UNESCO's agenda, and commitment to enlightenment and democratic principles generally. Culture would also, following from wartime turmoil and destabilization, be deployed by nation-states as a means to 're-build' national pride and identity – and through such re-building to enact cultural systems of defense. The U.S. State Department in 1938, for instance, created the Division of Cultural Relations citing the following rationale:

When Hitler and Mussolini's exploitation of education as instruments of nationalist policy was at its height... our Government was determined to demonstrate to the world the basic difference between the methods of democracy and those of a 'Ministry of Enlightenment and Propaganda'. There was to be established in the Department of State an organization that would be a true representative of our American tradition of intellectual freedom and educational integrity (as cited in Miller and Yudice, 2002, p. 39).

Here, culture is articulated as a kind of 'antidote' to the propagandistic communications being enacted by the U.S.'s enemies, a catalyst for the development of democratic values and a mechanism by which to defend and protect the nation's identity.

Britain as well deployed culture during and following the war to resist totalitarian communications platforms, to reinforce its commitment to democratic freedoms and reconstruct national identity and pride. In 1934, the British Council was established – an entity whose work involved cultivating international relationships through arts, sport and education (Fisher, 2009, p.31). The function of culture as a relationship-building catalyst was used by the Council as a key point of differentiation – a way to mark its programs as superior to those enacted by the Germans (p.31). This attempt at differentiation was evident in the structural composition of the Council itself, which was developed as an arms-length entity... its detachment from government ensuring (in theory at least) a degree of freedom and preventing a government-articulated propagandistic agenda from controlling its mandate and purpose. This rejection of propaganda did not, however, translate into a de-politicization of culture. Through the Council, the British government presented a 'democratic alternative' to fascist cultural regimes, thereby showcasing its own political commitment to a free and independent society (p.31).

In Canada, culture was rhetorically deployed throughout and following the war as a kind of “beacon” of free society... and became a political tool by which to both defend and differentiate the nation from its ideologically compromised enemies and neighbours (ie: fascist regimes and American mass culture). The *Massey Commission Report* (1951), a seminal post-war document that has informed numerous cultural policies up to the present and laid the foundation for the formation of the Canada Council for the Arts, outlines a role for culture in creating a democratic society (Dowler, 1996, p338):

If we as a nation are concerned with the problem of defense, what, we may ask ourselves, are we defending? We are defending civilization, our share of it, our contributions to it. The things with which our inquiry deals are the elements which give civilization its character and meaning. It would be paradoxical to defend something which we are unwilling to strengthen and enrich, and which we even allow to decline. (Government of Canada, 1951, p. 274)

Here, culture is valued within a national context for its capacity to civilize the populace in such a way as to create shared ‘character’ and ‘meaning’. Such meaning is to be created, claims the report, through a strategic agglomeration of culture and democratic idealism. Through this connection, the *Massey Report* would advocate for greater investment in the arts and humanities as “the best means of developing Canadian citizens and building the Canadian nation” (Litt, 2005). Culture, then, is seen to provide a vehicle by which citizens are enabled to engage more fully and passionately in the creation of a ‘meaningful’ democratic society. It is also deployed to create citizen subjectivities whose identities and behaviour are compliant with the needs of the post-war capitalist nation-state.

Within Canada as well as within numerous other industrialized nations, democratic values were, throughout the war-time eras and into the 1950’s, linked with an Arnoldian understanding of culture as “high culture” – that is, as “the best that has been thought and said in the world” (Arnold as cited in Harrison, 2010, p. 100). Matthew Arnold’s theories on culture and society, which presented culture as a “remedy to anarchy”... and as “the best substitute for a religion that was no longer effective” (Bartie, 2013, p.9) - dominated the field of cultural policy during these eras, and provided an approach to culture that was to shape postwar policies in Europe and beyond (Belfiore & Bennett, 2010, p.27). These theories paved the way for the public service model (based in-part upon cultural protectionism) that took hold and was developed in the post-war eras in Britain and Canada... through which was painted a portrait of the state as society’s

'better self' (McGuigan, 2005, p.36). The state was seen as a key player, then, in the creation of an 'ethical' populace whose ideals were aligned with those of UNESCO and with common understandings of democracy. The *Massey Commission Report* as an expression of the Canadian state's ideological orientation, serves as a case in point. While a complex document that pairs the pursuit of 'high art' with anthropological approaches to cultural development -negotiating a shift between the two – (Druick, 2006, para. 9), the report has been seen, as well, to build upon a "colonial legacy of British paternalism" (Beale & Van den Bosch, 1998, p.7) and to exude a tone of 'liberal humanist nationalism' characteristic of an Arnoldian approach to culture and politics. The document has as a key goal the civilization of the Canadian populace through publicly funded education, broadcasting and the arts (p.7).

While the Arnoldian approach to cultural policy may appear, on first glance, to spring from a socialist frame of reference, it was, in fact, "accepted generally within advanced capitalism as a means of containing recurrent crises" (McGuigan, 2004, p.36). Similar to the way in which Keynesian economics was widely seen in the post-war eras to legitimize "state intervention in the multifarious workings of capitalist society" (p.36), the state's deployment of cultural policy, and investment in culture was legitimated as a means to 'assist' in the coherent running of the capitalist social order. That state intervention through an Arnoldian approach was seen, as well, to 'reengineer the soul' (p.36) was also considered appropriate, as such reengineering was premised (as discussed above) 'in opposition' to totalitarian regimes, and in pursuit of social-democratic values. Through Arnoldian culture as expressed through education and high art, citizen behavior was produced and directed in such a way, then, as to manifest the promise of democracy, the character and meaning of nationalism and the ideals of the international allied community as articulated by UNESCO. At the same time, it was used to secure the hegemonic dominance of the nation-state.

3.2. Culture, Anthropological Expression & Cultural Democracy

Moving into the 1960's and 70's - eras in which the polarities of WWII gave way to widespread social unrest, to widespread immigration (fuelled in many cases by the demand for labour in the growth economies of Europe, Canada and the U.S.) (Sunny Levin Institute, 2014) and to a problematization of identity and difference within politics

(Rectenwald, 2013)- the 'Arnoldian' civilizing cultural development agenda would be critiqued within industrialized governments as exclusionary and elitist, and would give way (though not entirely) to new 'anthropological' deployments of culture in governance strategies, and to a broadened definition of culture generally. Challenged during these eras was the "strong tendency of nations to construct themselves as homogenizing cultural formations governed by the logic of one people, one culture, one nation, one history" (Bennett, 2001, p.17). While in the Arnoldian paradigm nation states were widely implicated in initiatives to 'democratize culture' – assuming a "top-down approach that essentially privileges certain forms of cultural programming that are deemed to be a public good" (Peters & Pierre, 2006, p.269), this approach would give way, in 60's and 70's to a governance agenda characterized by 'cultural democracy' – that is, to an agenda premised upon culture as an entity owned by 'the people', and activated from below in the articulation and negotiation of difference (p.269). Government entities took on the task of enabling the expression of difference through culture – thereby facilitating processes of widespread 'public sphere' participation.

In Britain, the United States and Canada, for instance (as well as in numerous other industrialized nations), government cultural arms facilitated and funded the 'community arts movement', which problematized formerly-held definitions of 'high art' and attempted to place the means of cultural production into the hands of 'the people'. An exponent of British movement, Sue Braden (1978), speaks to the underlying socio-political shifts that led to this new role for, and conception of, culture:

There is a change of climate, a growing awareness that what is termed 'artistic expression' can no longer be withheld from those who wish to have some measure by which to view their lives and by which to expose that view to others. [...] A whole series of moves from artists, certain funding bodies and members of different communities over the past ten years have begun to put the arts on a path which will re-establish the importance of a vernacular vocabulary of artistic expression and perhaps ultimately expose the rigid formulas of many of the 'recognised' arts. For, almost as an aside, this movement threatens to disrupt the most deep-rooted notions about the nature of art itself (p.4).

This 'disruptive' approach to art is echoed in an array of art movements that popped up throughout the globe during the 60's 1970's such as the 'popular theatre' 'Theater for Development', 'people's theatre', and, more broadly, the 'community cultural development' movements (A dams & Goldbard, 2002, p.12). Here, artists and organizations "attempted to bridge the gap between artist and community by connecting

their work to social activism” (Goldbard, 2006, p.104). In Canada, the National Film Board’s controversial *Challenge for Change* initiative (a program initiated in 1967 and operated until 1980 - sending documentary filmmakers into an array of communities so as to enable groups to ‘tell their stories’ through participatory, social-change oriented media) was to spark international debate surrounding the role of culture in community development (Waugh, Winton & Baker, 2014). And the artist-run centre movement, a populist movement instigated in the late 60’s and provided funding through the Canada Council for the Arts – positioned the arts as an agent of community development and democratization, and as a vehicle for ‘activist politics’ (Robertson, 2006, p.1). Within the U.S. and Britain, employment programs instigated by CETA (the US Comprehensive Employment and Training Act) and by Britain’s Manpower Services Commission (Goldbard, n.d.) provided publically funded community-development jobs to artists – prompting what many saw as a “new and better day for art” (n.d.). Such programs were considered innovative at the time, and influential in adapting cultural forms to the “purposes of democratic cultural development” (Goldbard, 2006, p.105).

In funding a wide array of ‘vernacular’ approaches to culture, the Governments of numerous industrialized nations became implicated in challenging deep-rooted assumptions surrounding culture, and in stripping culture of its elitist overtones. Rather than constituting a vehicle for the hegemonic reinforcement of singular identities (ie: as was the case with ‘high art’ in its implicit referencing of fundamental democratic ‘truths’), culture was here framed in terms of its propensity to stimulate “community development, participation, the democratization of public space, and the revitalization of social life ...” (Vaz & Jacques, 2006, p.244). Such an approach made tangible some of the philosophical debates being played out in cultural studies – a discipline whose emergence in the 1970’s would problematize ‘elitist’ conceptualizations of culture, and draw attention to culture as articulated by ‘the people’. Funding related to this movement emphasized artists’ potential “impact on a community” and in particular their capacity to assist “those with whom they make contact to become more aware of their situation and of their own creative powers” (Bishop, 2012, p.178).

For a brief moment in time, then (ie: the late 1960’s and 70’s), what might be termed a ‘radical’ and ‘inclusive’ approach to culture was widely institutionalized within the cultural governance entities of industrialized nations. Here, culture became a tool for the enactment of the social democratic imagination – including the pursuit of social justice

and the recognition of systemic forms of inequality. Culture, in other words, was used to actualize an emancipatory and progressive democratic change agenda. Such an agenda was steeped in a dissenting cultural politics supportive of “the right to be different...[for] all those who, in one way or another, have been placed outside dominant social and cultural norms: disabled people, gays and lesbians, women, the poor, and the elderly as well as immigrant or indigenous groups” (Bennett, 2001, p.13). The importance placed on difference would, during these eras, re-position culture as an anthropological force, and as a ‘whole way of life’ (Williams, 1983, p.233). Culture was also to be conceived as a vehicle for political action – and was seen to respond to and represent a wide range of social movements and their respective interests. Through culture, governments were seen to critically examine the power relations underlying elite and ‘civilizing’ uses of culture – and to enable a diversity of identities to be played out in the public realm (p.244).

At the same time as this ‘new’ political understanding of culture was appearing on the international stage, however, the influence of Arnoldian forms of culture was still being felt - resulting in many advanced capitalist governments (and in the governance structures of trans-national entities like the E.U.) taking up a mix of liberal humanism/nationalism and anthropological approaches to cultural policy. In Canada, for instance, in spite of the period of the 1950s to 1970’s being characterized by “a growing ideology of cultural pluralism” (Bennett, 2001, p.38)– to which the federal government committed formally through the Canadian Charter of rights in 1960 (which barred discrimination on the basis of race, national origin, colour, religion or sex), and through the Multicultural Policy of 1971 (p.38), state-led cultural investment activity continued to show a preoccupation with ‘nationalism’ – demonstrated through unprecedented levels of investment in elite, national identity-building cultural entities such as the National Arts Centre (funded in 1966), Telefilm Canada and the CRTC (both funded in 1968). (Wyman, 2004, p.186).

This tension between anthropological and Arnoldian (or liberal-humanist) utilizations of culture would, moving into the 1980s and 90s and on a global scale, begin to be re-positioned within a prevailing logic brought about by neoliberalism and globalization. Here, the political expediency of culture – including both its ability to recognize and appreciate difference *and* its ability to unify entities through the creation of common systems of belief and identity, would be positioned within the larger context of economic

expediency. Culture would, in these eras become an important 'resource' to be cultivated within the global neoliberal regime.

3.3. Neoliberalism

Beginning in the late 80's, then, following from the dissolution of colonial regimes and the crumbling of Soviet barriers to the capitalist world market, there evolved what some call a new form of global sovereignty; a new global logic (Hardt & Negri, 2000, p.xi). This logic, widely referred to as neoliberalism, is characterized by an unleashing of the market as the primary global authority – an authority that makes even the nation-state subject to its rule.

Thorsen and Lie (2010) identify neoliberalism as a concept steeped in a wide array of often-conflicting traditions and definitions. This “loosely demarcated set of political beliefs” is hinged in their view upon “the conviction that the only legitimate purpose of the state is to safeguard individual, especially commercial, liberty, as well as strong private property rights (p.14). David Harvey (2007) presents a definition that affirms and extends this view:

Neoliberalism is a theory of political economic practices that proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade. The role of the state is to create and preserve an institutional framework appropriate to such practices. The state has to guarantee, for example, the quality and integrity of money. It must also set up those military, defense, police and legal structures and functions required to secure private property rights and to guarantee, by force if need be, the proper functioning of markets. Furthermore, if markets do not exist (in areas such as land, water, education, health care, social security, or environmental pollution) then they must be created, by state action if necessary. But beyond these tasks the state should not venture (p.2).

Harvey (1988) admits, however, that in spite of the neoliberalism's rhetorical attempts to limit the state's power, it in many cases, and ironically, implicates the state as a key actor in 'entrepreneurial' new socio-economic realities. In this act it distinguishes itself from, for instance, the 'anarcho-capitalism' brand of liberalism, which advocates that the state be abolished altogether to make room for individual freedom to flourish. Anarcho-capitalism marks an extreme version of what is often called classical liberalism – a stream that tends to favour *laissez-faire* economic policies and that espouses the belief

that the state should be minimal (Thorson & Lie, 2014, p.12). Modern liberalism (or neoliberalism), on the other hand, is characterized, in spite of its often-articulated rejection of state intervention, by a “greater willingness to let the state become an active participant in the economy” (p.5)... and to assume an entrepreneurial role in the formation of new socio-economic realities. This pursuit of state entrepreneurialism (as discussed in Chapter 2) marks a “profound shift away from the Keynesian welfare state whose interventions were premised upon the need to manage the market, and correct for ‘market failure’ (Harvey, 1989). The neoliberal state, rather, presents a “deliberate attempt at cultural restructuring and engineering based on the neo-liberal model of the entrepreneurial self” (Peters, 2001, p.58).

This entrepreneurial self is characterized, according to Gray (1995), by a “definite conception, distinctively modern in character, of man and society” (p.xii) in which the individual is seen to entrepreneur his or her fate. One of the key elements of this conception, he claims, is that it is *individualist* – that is – “it asserts the moral primacy of the person against the claims of any social collectivity” (p.xii). Within this orientation lies the concept of libertarianism which, as its name suggests, is typified by a “concern for liberty above everything else, especially economic or commercial liberty, coupled with a corresponding de-emphasis of other traditional purposes and values such as democracy and social justice” (Thorson & Lie, 2014, p.5).

In its focus on individual economic rights and freedoms, neoliberalism has been seen to downplay democratic commitments to the ‘public’ or ‘collective good’. The theory has, according to many, been responsible for increasing wealth polarization globally, and for “expanding and consolidating capitalism as a social order based on exploitation and oppression” (Radice, 2004, p.91). As a social order, it has been seen to concentrate power and wealth “in elite groups around the world, benefitting especially the financial interests within each country and US capital internationally”(p.91). By systemically enabling power concentration, neoliberalism is seen to enact a form of imperialism without empires; or, to create a new construct of empire founded upon capital accumulation.

The Neoliberal ‘turn’ is often attributed to a consensus that emerged between the Thatcher and Reagan governments within and following 1979/80 (Harvey, 2007, p. 1). Neoliberal ideology was in this year positioned by both governments as a solution and response to an emerging crisis of capital accumulation. As growth collapsed throughout

the industrialized world threatening an economic downturn similar in size to the Great Depression, the upper classes, according to Harvey, “felt threatened... [and] had to move decisively if they were going to protect themselves from political and economic annihilation” (p.15). Rather than turn to socialist solutions— a real possibility given the “conjoining of labour and urban social movements [that occurred in the 1970’s] through much of the advanced capitalist world” (p.15), the Thatcher and Reagan governments put forward a “programmatic attempt to advance the cause of individual freedoms” (p.40) - an initiative that effectively masked a project whose ultimate aim was the restoration of economic power to a small elite (p.15). Once instated in the governance apparatuses of these nations, neoliberalism proved to be a powerful force – its logic constituting a key driver of political rationalities and of ‘common sense’. Neoliberalism could then “use its powers of persuasion, co-optation, bribery, and threat to maintain the climate of consent necessary to perpetuate its power” (p.15).

The neoliberal eras were (and are) marked by a number of large-scale global transformations - the erosion of barriers to flows of labour and capital between countries (Sassen, 2013, p.3), the “dismantling of once-powerful industrial centers in the United States, United Kingdom, and more recently in Japan” (p.3) coupled with “accelerated industrialization of several third world countries”; and the “rapid internationalization of the financial industry into a worldwide network of transactions (p.3). These transformations were made possible through the growth of new technologies (p.19), which facilitated an exponentially growing connectedness within and between nations; and by political alliances (both implicit and explicit) through which consensus surrounding the free-market paradigm was created. With the rise of trans-national economic policies such as North American Free Trade Agreement and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and the development of trans-national trade entities such as the World Bank, WTO and the IMF, the concept of national sovereignty was altered so as to position nation-states as economic players within larger, and highly integrated, systems of exchange.

Neoliberal rationalities have been seen to target and erode the ideals underlying both ‘official’ and ‘from-below’ conceptualizations of democracy. Democracy becomes re-articulated in consumerist terms; citizens become consumers and the concept of *one person, one vote* is replaced with *one dollar, one vote* (p.171) Such a shift Munck (2004) sees as cutting at the heart of the ideal of ‘popular rule’ upon which democratic societies

were founded, and as having a profoundly negative impact upon these societies: “The way democracy itself has become devalued as a political currency is perhaps the most damaging effect of neoliberal hegemony over the past quarter of a century” (p.60). By re-positioning official democracy within a consumerist paradigm, neoliberalism is seen to constrain and reduce democracy’s legislative power.. Furthermore, the concept of citizenship is, within a neoliberal paradigm, increasingly equated with consumerism– ie: citizens exercise their rights, and express their agendas through consumer behaviour (Wheeler, 2012). Such re-positioning downplays the role of the citizen in constructing new socio-economic realities through collective acts of imagination and articulation (McGuigan, 2005). In equating citizenship with consumerism, then, and in systemically disabling citizen agency through the enactment of widespread polarization, the progressive possibilities for ‘popular governance’ housed within the ‘from-below’ conceptualization of democracy are diminished.

The erosion of democratic norms and values housed within both conceptions of democracy has been seen to coincide, it should be observed, with the rise of a new approach to governance called ‘biopower’ (Venn, 2009, p.208). Foucault introduced this concept to describe a new-world governance logic whose power “takes hold of human life” (Taylor paraphrasing Foucault, 2011, p.41), exercising domination over human wants, desires and corporeal identities. Foucault traces the shift from “classical judicial-legal or sovereign power” – a power exercised over death (p. 41) and premised upon the imposition of limitations (ie: deductively taking away services, wealth, etc.), to contemporary manifestations of power –biopower- in which power is ‘productively’ exercised over life. Expressed through government systems, biopower becomes biopolitics – “a series of regulatory controls exerted on the population and on individuals in order to harness and extract life forces” (Ong, 2006, p.13). Such a power “functions through norms”... is internalized by subjects rather than exercised from above through acts or threats of violence” and is “dispersed throughout society rather than located in a single individual or government body” (Taylor, 2011, p. 43). By constructing citizen subjectivities on a corporeal level, biopower constructs realities that are complicit with neoliberalism’s market agenda.

In enacting biopolitical governance regimes, contemporary capitalist governments have been seen to deploy both Arnoldian and anthropological approaches to population management. In Arnoldian fashion, governments can be seen to implicate themselves in

the business of identity-construction. These identities, it should be said, are (generally speaking) no longer fashioned around a project of national solidarity and defense, as was the case in the post-war Arnoldian governance agendas, but rather around a consumerist paradigm and the notion of the individual as an economic free-agent (McGuigan, 2004, p.98). Furthermore, the identities produced by contemporary governance strategies are, in effect, pluralized. While governments in post-war eras used high art as a governance mechanism to 'educate' the masses and bring them in-line with particular manifestations of democratic freedom and participation - new governance regimes under the influence of biopower can be seen to cultivate a range of identities through a broadened definition of culture that is, in effect, expressive of the plurality at play within the global marketplace (Nair, 2004, p.108). By taking up both Arnoldian and anthropological governance approaches within a biopolitical framework, governments are able to 'delve deeper' into the body – into the diversity of 'selves' that comprise a populace, and into the collective imagination harboured by these selves – thereby producing widespread alignment with the neoliberal paradigm (Raco, 2012, p.46).

Biopower as presented by Foucault, then, constitutes a key mode of government through which neoliberal logics operate. The term uncovers a dramatic shift in the nature of contemporary governance – in which governments have become increasingly involved, as entrepreneurial agents, in the production of identities and behaviours. When juxtaposed against the rapid erosion of long-held democratic norms and values, the rise of biopower as a dominant governance technique can be seen to indicate a sweeping and socially regressive societal change. Here, long-held understandings pertaining to the role of the individual and the collective imagination within democratic societies have been altered in such a way as to position these both as actors within a commodity paradigm.

3.4. Neoliberalism & Culture

The implications surrounding the rise of biopolitical power are, within the context of cultural governance agendas, significant. Cultural policy has, since the 1980's, become largely justified on grounds that are not specifically cultural: "enhanc[ing] education, salv[ing] racial strife, revers[ing] urban blight through cultural tourism, creat[ing] jobs, reduc[ing] crime" (Yudice, 2012, p.12), etc. Cultural entities have, in other words,

become increasingly imbricated in the social and economic engineering of people and locales... and must handle these agendas in such a way as to support the larger aims of a market economy.

Culture has also, in and of itself, become valued as a commodity – and in this capacity has been used to enact new forms of biopolitical hegemony. Governments began, during the 70's and 80's to invest in cultural industries – recognizing within them an opportunity to generate wealth through global economic connectivity... and to regenerate economies (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p.2). The example set for the international community in this regard was the U.S., whose status as a capitalist superpower enabled it throughout the eras of industrialization and beyond to dominate cultural technologies such as “film, Hollywood market, etc.” (p.74). – and to disseminate “Anglo-American rock music and pop music culture across much of the world” (p.74). Throughout the 1980s and 1990s, global cultural trade was intensified with the ramping up of “political and cultural contact across the globe” (p.74). The American government's investment in (and deregulation of) cultural industries during this time had the effect of dispersing American values internationally – resulting in the emergence of a new kind of cultural imperialism that served to bring nation-states throughout the world into compliance with American trade agendas (Howley, 2010, p.7). Throughout the 90's and continuing into the present, then, led by the U.S. as an exemplar of successful cultural industries production and by a belief in cultural industries as a phenomenon endemic to the ‘information age’, countries throughout the global north began to invest in culture, and in cultural industries, as a means to generate profit and participate in the growing global consensus as related to free-market capitalism. (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p.88).

Within this shift, culture, conceived of narrowly in terms of the arts and heritage and used as an instrument for national identity construction, was broadened to include the more global creative industries (Cunningham, 2002) – those that “are more open to trade and exchange, in contrast to protectionist and utilitarian national culture” (Evans, 2009, p.1009)... and that position the concept “at the crossroads between the arts, business and technology” (p.1009). Cultural industries, under this ‘anthropological’ definition, were seen as those industries that “have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have the potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (DCMS, 2001, p.5). This broadening is seen as part of a ‘turn’, in which the arts and culture generally became valued for their economic

development potentials - reversing a trend in which “the exchange value and economic impact of the arts [and of culture] had been both denied and resisted” (Evans, 2009, p1009). Cultural industries as a concept, then, came to be viewed by governments through the lens of economic growth, and valued for “employment and GDP contribution”(p. 1004). This new value was in many cases reinforced by empirical evidence that showed cultural industries as powerful economic stimulants (Hesmondhalgh, 2007, p.60).

While within this context culture was rhetorically associated with democratic freedoms, and coupled with enlightenment ideals such as knowledge-dissemination and the ‘cultivation of the self’, such freedoms were, in the end, brought into compliance with the ‘ruling’ regime – and the concept of democracy reinvented as an expression of this regime’s logic. This re-invention involved changes to both the fundamental principal of aggregative democracy – ie: converting the principle of *one person, one vote* into *one dollar, one vote*; and to cultural dimensions of democracy – transforming the concept from one premised upon the pursuit of the ‘collective good’, into one rooted in the concept of ‘market good’. Citizens within this new conception of democracy are re-positioned as ‘consumers’, their democratic participation characterized by their participation within a global system of trade.

3.5. Neoliberalism, culture & cities

Cities would, within this new paradigm, take on new roles as ‘hubs’ for international trade and investment, and as purveyors, producers and symbolic representations of market logic. In part, the city’s newfound role stems from a process of rapid urbanization that occurred during the latter half of the 20th centuries. 2007 is cited by the IMF as the ‘tipping-point’ in which the majority of the world’s population, for the first time in history, resided in cities or towns (IMF, 2007). The growth of the global urban population occurred at an astounding rate throughout the late 90’s and early 2000’s – rising from 13% in 1900 to 29% in 1950, to 49% in 2005 – a trend that is expected to continue over the next two decades with a projected 60% of the world’s population residing in urban settings by 2030 (UN World Urbanization Prospects, 2014). Given this trend, cities have risen in significance - becoming “highly concentrated command points in the organization of the world economy,... key locations for finance and for specialized service firms... [and] sites of production, including the production of innovations

(Sassen, 2001, p3). Cities have emerged, as well, as the 'main actors' in Creative Industries governance – dominating even national strategy and intervention in this area (Hartman as cited in Evans, 2006, p.1010). Given their central role within, and as instigators of, of this new paradigm, strategic development emphasis has been increasingly placed upon cities as agents of cultural industries growth. This growth is commonly measured, within the municipal setting as well as within the national, "in terms of job and wealth creation... in comparison with the economy as a whole and, importantly, relative to other industrial sectors" (p.1018).

On the urban planning front, this shift involved a move towards 'postmodernism' as a dominant aesthetic and organizational logic – building upon, and at the same time transforming, the previously pervasive modernist logic of the 40's, 50's and 60's. Terry Eagleton (1987) defines postmodernism as follows:

playful, self-ironizing and even schizoid... it reacts to the austere autonomy of high modernism by impudently embracing the language of commerce and the commodity. Its stance towards cultural tradition is one of irreverent pastiche, and its contrived depthlessness undermines all metaphysical solemnities, sometimes by a brutal aesthetics of squalor and shock.

This definition draws attention to the close relationship seen to exist between postmodernism and 'late' capitalism as a paradigmatic social order (Jameson, 1991). It furthermore brings to light the ways in which the postmodern is framed in opposition to modernism, and to "the belief in linear progress, absolute truths, the rational planning of ideal social orders, and the standardization of knowledge and production" (Harvey, 1990, p.9). Postmodernism is seen to privilege, rather, difference and heterogeneity as "liberative forces in the redefinition of cultural discourse" (p.9).

In architectural terms, postmodernism was seen to resist and pose alternative to the "utopian high-modernist building" whose "prophetic elitism and authoritarianism... remorselessly identified in the imperious gesture of the charismatic Master" (Jameson, 1991, para.3). Dominant city planning ideology had, during and immediately following WWII, been occupied (in Arnoldian fashion) with the agenda of developing collective municipal identities, and prefaced on a belief in the power of aesthetics to unify, bring order to and systemically 'civilize' populations. This view presented the city as a "machine-like unit where every part (zone) was expected to have a specific function – roads were for traffic not people, the suburbs were for people not industry" (Stevenson,

2003, p.81). Furthermore, it was believed that “the problems (disorder) of the city could be solved by imposing the technical solutions supplied by experts (p.81).

Moving into the 70's, 80's and 90's – spurred in part by critiques of modernist city planning levied by such theorists as Jane Jacobs whose widely-read book *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961) problematized the rigidity and ‘top-down’ governance logic within such planning processes and advocated instead for the inclusion of organicism and ‘bottom-up’ approaches to urban design (ie: for anthropological approaches to planning premised upon ‘difference’) - urban planning agendas began to take on, in rhetoric at least, diversification as a key outcome. Challenged in these eras were the “glass towers, concrete blocks, and steel slabs that seemed set fair to steamroller over every urban landscape from Paris to Tokyo and from Rio to Montreal” (Harvey, 1990, p.40). These forms gave way to “ornamented tower blocks, imitation medieval squares and fishing villages, custom-designed or vernacular housing, renovated factories and warehouses, and rehabilitated landscapes of all kinds” (p.40). City-builders during these eras advocated widely for “new shared spaces, new, improved public realms, new mixed-used urban landscapes, new intercultural interactions and an urban time-space fully animated and enlivened with a rich array of social and cultural activities” (Amin & Graham, 1997, p.416). Such structures and activities point to an urban planning and architecture approach rooted in ‘pluralistic’ and ‘organic’ strategies that conceive of urban development as a “‘collage’ of highly differentiated spaces and mixtures” (Harvey, 1990, p.40).

Culture was perceived as a key mode of differentiation within the post-modern, post-industrial cityscape, and was taken up as a meta-agenda through which other municipal plans were accomplished. In the field of urban planning, new terms emerged that conveyed this importance: “cultural territories’ and ‘places’, ‘cultural districts’ and ‘poles’, ‘cultural engineering’, ‘cultural planning’, ‘planificación cultural’, ‘cultural regeneration’, and ‘culturalisation of the city’” (Vaz & Jacques, 2006, p.242). This trend led some to announce the end of the ‘information economy’ and the beginning of the ‘cultural economy’ (p.242). Culture here becomes an instrument of economic development and is used as a strategy of intervention for urban revitalization.

Beginning in the 70's and increasing throughout the 80's and 90's cities increasingly began to compete with one another, through culture, to become optimally positioned within the new globalized economy (Evans, 2006, p.215). Central to this competitive

agenda was a focus on brand development: “The proliferation of images, events, festivals, architectural icons, ‘revitalized’ and redesigned public spaces, whose symbolic dimension is potentiated and ennobled by culture, becomes the raw material for urban marketing” (p.211). During these eras the hard branding of culture in relation to civic places would mimic, in its approach, “the power and practices of commercial branding and its packaged entertainment and emporiums” (p.211). It is here that we see emerge, for instance, the ‘theme park-city’ and the ‘disneylandisation’ of urban cores – representations of what Vaz & Jacques refer to (bringing into focus the ideas of Guy Debord (1967) as ‘the spectacle city’ (Vaz & Jacques, 2006, p.241). Cities came to be viewed (and marketed) as “playgrounds of the affluent classes (or those high in economic, cultural or symbolic capital)” (Stevenson, 2003, p.141) – and were fashioned in such a way as to attract tourists and knowledge-economy workers. This led to a widespread concern amongst city-builders throughout the globe with the aesthetic dimensions of urban cores, and with commercialized forms of spectacle (p.100).

3.6. Postmodern City-Building: Two Models

In what follows, I provide two models of city building through culture that would become widely replicated throughout the globe. These models, which vividly convey a ‘new-world’ conception of culture as an entrepreneurial resource, are presented as a ‘prelude’ to the creative cities movement. They show this movement as occurring not in isolation, but ‘on the back’ of a growing interest in and experimentation with culture as a regenerative tool in the construction and commodification of urban locales.

Within the U.S., a phenomenon called the ‘Festival marketplace development’ arose during the 1970’s and 80’s, and swept through urban planning circles - becoming a popular and widely replicated urban regeneration strategy globally (Stevenson, 2003). This development model – premised upon an urban regeneration project accomplished with the Boston waterfront in the early 1970’s by developer James Rouse, is defined by Stevenson as: “a formula for redeveloping derelict waterfront sites which pivots on consumption, entertainment and spectacle (p.141). The formula clusters, within a highly managed and aesthetically dynamic downtown environment, a particular consortium of cultural attractions – which in the case of Boston included an “Acquarium, Convention and Exhibition Centre, Maritime Museum, IMAX cinema (added later), [and] attractive public open space and festival marketplace” (Ward, 2006, p.279). These components

work together to create a milieu akin to a theme park – re-framing shopping and street life in such a way as to attract corporate and consumer dollars, and draw tourists (Stevenson, 2003, p.100). The overall impression created by this carefully manufactured aesthetically dense development is “a scene of happy animation where people might safely gather in large numbers a carefully managed enclave from which the many problems of urban decay, crime, [and] social and racial tension had been banished” (p.277).

The Festival Marketplace model was soon after taken up in Baltimore with its ‘Harbourplace’ development in the late 70’s. This ‘regeneration’ initiative was again pioneered by Rouse, and involved the clustering of tourist and marketplace amenities together in a disneylandesque environment (p.275) within the urban core. Given Baltimore’s former lack of ‘tourist appeal’, and the fact that “scarcely anyone had previously chosen to go there for any but the most utilitarian of reasons”(p.276), the rapid transformation of the city during the 1970’s into a perceived tourist hot-spot thrust it onto the world stage as a model of urban regeneration: “In 1983 alone, the city was visited by an estimated 4,000 representatives from 87 cities across the world, eager to learn how its apparent renaissance had occurred” (Ward, 2006, p.273). Ward documents the trajectory of this development – noting the popularity of the Baltimore model as having occurred based on savvy marketing and an uncritical acceptance of the value of the Marketplace Festival construct... as well as on the widespread belief in the tourism industry as a potential solution to the decline of industrialized urban cores. In spite of its ‘textbook’ appeal, however, the Baltimore festival marketplace model was seen as complicit in a trend of urban decline that occurred in Baltimore during the decades following its construction:

In 2004 Baltimore recorded, at 41.8 homicides per 100,000, the worst murder rate of any American city... moreover, this was merely the most shocking headline from the Maryland city’s unenviable portfolio of indicators of economic distress, social deprivation and community breakdown...between the census of 1950 and 2000 the city’s population fell from just under 950,000 to just over 650,000... In 1999, nearly a quarter of its population (22.9%) fell below the poverty line (p.271).

Ultimately, the model is exposed by Ward as a “dangerous illusion” (p.275) in that it created a profound interest in an urban regeneration strategy that was, in the end, ineffective at stemming out-migration, raising educational attainment levels, decreasing housing abandonment rates, reducing drug abuse, etc. (p.272).

The Festival Marketplace concept can be seen as a characteristic example of a post-modern city-development logic premised upon urban spectacle. Common to many of these iconic developments are exorbitant costs – with projects often turning out “to be overdue and over budget, some overrunning by over 100%” (p.205), and espousing development plans that are pushed forward on the basis of glossy sales pitches characterized by “a fantasy world of underestimated costs, overestimated revenues, overvalued local development effects, and underestimated environmental impacts” (p.205). Many such projects -which have been accomplished throughout American cities including Norfolk, Virginia; Flint, Michigan and Toledo, Ohio, and internationally in centres such as Sydney, Birmingham, Belfast, Barcelona, Osaka, Melbourne, Izmir, Cairo, Shanghai, Rotterdam, Rio de Janeiro, Warsaw, and Cancun (p.278-279) - have been seen to “rely more on blind faith, ‘pork barrel politics’ and constructed visions which appear not to look beyond the short-term physical impacts and landscapes they create” (p.205). Within the Festival Marketplace construct, then, we catch a glimpse of a kind of neoliberal governance logic that is not only focused on the creation of spectacular simulacra for a market economy, but that is itself spectacularized – premised upon a kind of schizophrenic (Jameson, 1991) detachment from reality, and removed from the real effects to be had by these projects both upon municipal budgets and the urban poor.

In comparison with the Festival Marketplace construct is another cultural development trend that arose called ‘Cultural Planning’; or ‘Europeanization’ – described by Sassatelli (2002) as “a societal transformation pointing to a reconfiguration of cultures, identities and forms of governance” (p.225). This model pivots on the “nurturing of local cultures and seeks to incorporate the expressive and broadly defined cultural activities into the reimagining process” (Stevenson, 2003, p.109). Through this reimagining, it attempts to coordinate urban and cultural policies and their implementation in such a way as to “address the challenges of urban decline” (p.109).

The model is seen to have emerged within Europe during the 90’s, and has since been replicated within cities throughout the globe (p.109). The iconic exemplar is Glasgow, which, in 1990 was awarded the European City of Culture (ECOC) title. While the title had previously been awarded to prestigious European cultural centres based on the status of their pre-existing arts amenities, the selection of Glasgow as one of Europe’s ‘least-healthy cities’ (p.343) - demonstrating a high unemployment rate, rapid out-migration and considered widely to be one of the more “extreme cases of an industrial

city in decline” (Paddison, 1993, p.342) - marked a shift in which the ECOC was to be increasingly seen as a “catalyst for urban regeneration” (Garcia, 2005, p.843).

Glasgow City Council capitalized on the 1990 ECOC award – developing a “strategic investment programme which would ensure the long-term future of the cultural sector and contribute greatly to economic and social regeneration” (1990, p.3). In-line with the ‘anthropological’ turn of the 70’s and 80’s, Glasgow’s municipal agents leading the 1990 reconstruction activities constructed the city’s cultural agenda for the award-year broadly, defining ‘culture’ as “everything that makes Glasgow what it is: history, design, engineering, education, architecture, shipbuilding, religion and sport, as much as music, dance, visual arts and theatre” (p.4). In spite of this rhetorical recognition of diversity, however, significant investment focus was placed on the high (Arnoldian) arts, which were seen as a key catalyst for urban transformation. In the award year, for instance:

40 major works were commissioned in performing and visual arts and 60 world premieres in theatre and dance took place. There were 3,979 performances and 656 theatrical productions, 1901 exhibitions and 157 sporting events. Glasgow Royal Concert Hall opened (costing E29.4 million) and the McLellan Galleries (costing E5.8 million) were renovated. Tramway was secured as a major visual and performing arts venue... [all of which translated into] a 40% increase in attendances... for theatres/halls/museums and galleries... [and] an 81% increase in tourist and 89% increase in day visits (p.4).

Such cultural investments were justified primarily in economic terms -largely through the argument that they would attract tourism.

Glasgow’s investment in culture during this time was combined with an aggressive marketing initiative designed to transform the city’s image, as well as the city itself, so as to make it appealing on the international stage. This process had in fact been started a decade earlier with the creation of a ‘Glasgow’s Miles Better’ image-building slogan and campaign (Stevenson, 2003, p.109). In 1991, however, as part of the ECOC award process, the city’s image-building initiatives were combined with cultural investments in such a way as to move deeper into terrain involving the municipality’s core identity. In contrast to the 1980’s marketing approach in which the goal was “to increase the external visibility of the city and, in a diffuse manner, to counter the stereotyping of it”, a more purposive campaign was built in 1990 which sought to “reconstruct the type of city which Glasgow represented” (Paddison, 1993, p.347). Such a reconstruction called for the reconfiguration of ‘cultures, identities and forms of governance’ – re-forming, in

essence, the roots of the urban experience. Arts and culture would play a role in re-configuring the city's identity from its roots upward (p.347) - changing the meanings and understandings associated with place. Ultimately, this transformation was accomplished with an aim to re-position the city as a player within the global market economy. Throughout Glasgow's 1991 transformation, then, cultural and marketing investments worked side-by-side to enact a radical re-structuring of both "the image and economic base of the city" (p.342).

Such an approach was widely perceived to have boosted the image and reputation of the city internationally (see Garcia's (2005) study examining international news articles referencing Glasgow within a positive vs. negative light between 1986 and 2003). However, the shift carried with it a host of problems, and sparked a range of controversies. Paddison (1993) shows that while the campaign was successful at increasing tourism, drawing approximately 600,000 visitors to the city for the EC City of Culture (p.348) spectacles, the economic gains made through tourist revenue were, in the long-term "reduced by the effects of external constraints, the recession, macro-economic policies and the decisions of externally-controlled firms" (p.348). Additionally, the re-invention of the city's core identity was to become a point of critique and protest among a number of leftist as well as workers groups who observed the 'new' identity to lack authenticity and to engender profound distributional imbalances (p.343).

These imbalances are unpacked by MacLeod (2002), who draws attention to a growing intolerance for the socially marginalized as having arisen during and following from the 1991 Glasgow transformation. Concurrent with the spectacular forms of development conducted in downtown Glasgow during 1991, for instance, was a move to 'remove' the homeless population from what were envisioned as 'pristine' public spaces. MacLeod draws attention to the transformation of Glasgow's downtown Buchanan street as part of the ECOC initiative – including the integration of performance spaces, galleries, penthouse lofts, luxurious bars and restaurants and a five-star hotel. These amenities, it was argued, would make the city centre "a better place for everyone [by helping to] develop and enhance [its] civic spaces" (p.612). MacLeod observes as concurrent with these developments, however, a rise in aggressive forms of policing, and the demise of the George Hotel – a building that had served as a cheap hostel for homeless people: "With the opening of the Galleries, the George Hotel and its clients presumably assumed a role as part of Buchanan Street's 'clutter' and were cleared from the civic gaze"

(p.612). This lack of concern for the welfare of the homeless population was reinforced by local media outlets whose approach to the issue of homelessness is characterized by MacLeod as 'vengeful'. News headlines such as "Beggars are Damaging City Centre" and "Beggars Scaring Away City Centre Shoppers" were common (p.612), he observes, and served to reinforce and widely legitimize an attitude of 'revanchism'. Such an attitude is seen by MacLeod as endemic to a wide range of new-economy urban revitalization projects. One of the outcomes of a 'spectacularized' fetishization of the urban core, then, is (in MacLeod's view) "a sadistic criminalization of urban poverty and war against welfare" (p.605). Glasgow's "brutalizing demarcation [within the 1991 transformation] of winners and losers"(p.605) – serves as a case-in-point.

3.7. Different Models, Similar Logic

As with the Festival Marketplace model, the Cultural Planning model, and the example of localized cultural regeneration set by Glasgow in relation to the 1991 ECOC award, has been studied by urban planners internationally - resulting in the replication of this approach through a wide range of contexts: "In the United Kingdom, Australia, the United States and Canada, in particular, city-based cultural planning has emerged to be the most significant local cultural policy innovation of recent years" (Stevenson, 2003, p.109). The Cultural Planning model (as is apparent in a brief comparison of the above-outlined case studies) can be distinguished from the Festival Marketplace model in its focus on endogenous forms of cultural development – ie: rather than 'importing' a particular set of cultural assets, the strategy focuses on growing and developing assets that are local. In many ways, this localism can be seen to implant within the strategy a humanist orientation (Garcia, 2005). Given, however, that this endogenous development has been positioned (as demonstrated in Glasgow's case) within a larger market agenda characterized by aggression towards marginalized populations, as well as landscapes of gentrification, its humanistic elements have, by numerous theorists, been challenged.

3.8. Postjustice Society

These examples draw attention to two dominant 'veins' of postmodern city planning that have emerged within recent years, and highlight the ways in which culture is, within this turn, becoming instrumentalized, and biopoliticized, within a market-based logic. At the core of such re-positioning strategies is a recognition of culture as a meaning-maker,

and the exploitation of its meaning-making capacity towards the economic re-invention of urban locales. Such re-invention has, in spite of its documented problems of gentrification and exclusion, grown to be accepted as a core and necessary activity of governments aspiring to compete on the new-world stage. By activating re-invention initiatives through symbolic warfare, in which only the 'coolest' survive, governments play a deadly game of one-upmanship. At stake in this game is nothing less than the freedoms that have, for the past two centuries, been considered necessary for, and endemic to, democratic culture and society. In the erosion (or aggressive repudiation) of these freedoms we see, perhaps, the rise of a new kind of society – one characterized, as is posited by MacLeod (2002), by the term 'Postjustice'.

3.9. Critical Analysis of Culture in the Neoliberal Age

This new and socially corrosive role seen to be played by culture within the 'postjustice society' brings to fruition many of the fears articulated by Frankfurt School theorists - whose writing, responding to the chaos, genocide and widespread propaganda of WWII and to a perceived paradigm-shift in the commodification of the individual and the collective imagination - attributes to culture a leading role in the enactment of regressive and socially-degenerative governance regimes. Adorno and Horkheimer (2002) observe as endemic to new-world manifestations of culture a 'stripping away' of something authentic to the human spirit – an act that leaves humanity alienated from itself: "The most intimate reactions of human beings have [through the act of commodification] been so thoroughly reified that the idea of anything specific to themselves now persists only as an utterly abstract notion" (p.136). Walter Benjamin, (1936) as well, asserts as an outcome of culture's role in the commodification of art, aesthetics and experience the propagation of widespread alienation, coupled with the debasement of what he calls the 'aura': "for the first time ... man has to operate with his whole living person, yet forgoing its aura" (Section.ix). In Benjamin's view, this loss of the aura through the use of culture as a commodifying agent amounts to "a decoupling of the creative work from its place in ritual (Section iv). Such a decoupling produces a self-alienation so profound, in his view, that mankind can and must now "experience its own destruction as an aesthetic pleasure of the first order" (Epilogue).

This line of reasoning is continued by various present-day Marxist theorists such as Fredric Jameson (1991), who recognizes widespread alienation to have occurred as a

result of the post-industrial era's cultural commodification of place and experience. This commodification has occurred, he claims, in such a way as to cause subjects to lose touch with the 'map' through which they are able to position themselves within a larger context, and in relation to larger meanings. He points to a new architectural trend within the neoliberal era - the development of 'cities within cities' – such as the Bonaventure Hotel in Los Angeles (a construct not unlike the Festival Marketplace) - as demonstrative of this change. Such 'replicas' of communal space in their replicated and consumerist qualities serve to alienate subjects – detaching them from an understanding of their place and context. Culture is here implicated in the cultivation of selves that are removed from themselves; of identities pulled from their roots and dis-attached from a sense of meaning and purpose. In the rise of biopower, and of neoliberalism generally, then, we see the blossoming of a new kind of society whose manifestation attributes to the writings of Frankfurt school theorists, and critical Marxist theorists such as Jameson, an element of prophetic foresight.

3.10. Creative Cities - The Logic of Late Capitalism

Having taken a tour of some emerging trends over the past half-century as related to the use of culture as a governance tool, we now come full-circle again to the Creative Cities script, and to the question of what factors contributed to its dramatic uptake on the world stage. Far from materializing from thin air, the Creative Cities phenomenon can be seen to have been produced by a collection of events, discourses and assumptions rooted in the 'neoliberal turn'. This includes the rise of the city as an important geo-spatial and economic unit within the new postindustrial market paradigm; an emerging focus on downtowns as symbolic representations of municipal identity and status; a shift towards postmodernism as a dominant logic and aesthetic within planning and architectural contexts; the rise of culture, and of symbolic forms of communication as a commodity and biopolitical governance resource and a move away from a concept of government premised upon the 'welfare state' and concerned with issues of social justice towards one rooted in 'entrepreneurialism'. Richard Florida, in *Rise of the Creative Class* (2002) presents the creative cities concept as 'an idea whose time has come'. From our brief examination of the historical forces that influenced its uptake, this appears indeed to be the case. In many ways, in fact, the creative cities script can be seen to exemplify a new-world governance strategy – one rooted in the commodification of the 'self', and of collective experience through culture. Fitting neatly into many of the indexes commonly

used to describe the neoliberal paradigm, it might aptly be labeled (as does Frederic Jameson (1991) with the term 'postmodernism') an expression of the logic of late capitalism.

Chapter 4. Social Democratic Potentials

Having analyzed the creative cities construct – drawing into focus an array of incriminating perspectives including its propensity to enact widespread polarization and gentrification, and acknowledging the way in which it fits into and expresses a particular logic endemic to capitalist frameworks of governance, I now switch gears to explore some of the counter-arguments constructed by theorists and policy actors who, while recognizing the movement’s documented injustices, see within it something that can be salvaged within a regenerative social democratic project. Following from such criticisms as were issued by Stevenson (2007), for whom the construct’s humanistic claims are seen to mask an essentially hardline market agenda, this switch to the positive runs the risk of ‘playing into’ and/or reinforcing what many see as a scam – one whose massive global uptake has had profound impact on the ways in which governments manage and motivate their populations, and whose rhetoric plays perfectly into what some have termed ‘ponzi-neoliberalism’ (Walks, 2010).

Here I pull back layers, uncovering amidst a sea of critical observations a handful of cautiously hopeful viewpoints that recognize within the movement the potential for, if not the widespread actuality of, the creation of new and emancipatory social realities. While some of these viewpoints emanate from high-level international policy bodies – notably from policy documents produced by UNESCO and the European Commission and Council (n.d.) – others have arisen from outside the global north, and in particular from small city contexts. Here has arisen the notion that the movement’s economic agendas can in fact be brought into alignment with, and subservience to, larger social-democratic goals. In certain contexts, the creative cities construct has been (and can be) re-created, according to these proponents, in such a way as to become a vehicle for sustainable development.

4.1. The Birmingham School & the Cultural Turn

My approach in this exploration takes inspiration from Birmingham School cultural theorists (Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies - England) who, during the late 60’s, 70’s and 80’s, engineered what is often considered a landmark shift in the way in which culture was conceptualized. The work of such theorists as Richard Hoggart, E.P.

Thompson, Raymond Williams and Stuart Hall - all of whom were involved in the school during these eras (Seiler, n.d.), is seen widely to have negotiated a shift in culture's definition –from one rooted in Arnoldian assumptions to one coterminous with a 'whole way of life'.

The school in its early days staked its roots heavily in Marxist traditions – focusing on culture as an expression of class-related power relations. Founders Raymond Williams and Richard Hoggart attempted to “engage culture not in the elite parochial sense of Arnold, Leavis or Elliot [ie: 'high culture'] but in the sense of mass or working class culture” (Carnie, 2002, para.8). This approach to culture was at first rooted in orthodox forms of Marxism, which positioned culture as subject to the social relations produced and reinforced by the economic base (Althusser & Balibar, 1968, p.106-7). Here, culture was seen as an expression of societal relations produced thorough and by the class-based divisions brought about by capitalism. The work of these theorists focused heavily on expressions of 'mass culture' – Hoggart and Williams pursued this line of research in contrast to “the elite or high culture traditionally [dominantly] viewed as the only culture worth studying” (Carnie, 2002, para.22). In contrast to thinkers such as Adorno and Horkheimer, whose work tended to view individuals as passive recipients of cultural norms and behaviours, Hoggart and Williams' work explored the ways in which people relate to the cultural commodities that they are confronted by from day-to-day”. They were interested in “how popular culture is created but also how it is received and contested by different groups – how it acts as a site for a struggle for cultural *hegemony*” (Carnie, 2002, para. 23; Gramsci, 2000, p.249). This work, while it opened opportunities for theories surrounding cultural agency and empowerment, was at the same time limited by its paradigmatic subscription to a base/superstructure model – one that framed cultural debates through the lens of class.

This mould was later challenged by other theorists within the Birmingham school, leading to an opening in the field, and a move away from an orthodox Marxist approach to cultural study. This opening was evident, for instance, in the school's shifting approach to the notion of 'organic intellectual' – a concept coined by Antonio Gramsci referring to a particular kind of intellectual who was identified with an underclass and articulated its interests and political objectives (Crehan, 2016). As the school developed, its proponents “appropriated and expanded Gramsci's notion of organic intellectual (as it did with his concept of hegemony) beyond the scope of class to include the power

relations of sex, gender, race, ethnicity, age, consumerism, meaning and pleasure” (Carner, 2002, para.44). Here, culture became detached from an exclusive affiliation with class relations and was no longer subordinated to social relations produced and reproduced by the economic base. Culture became, rather, a site of struggle (in and of its own accord) through which was negotiated multiple different relationships of power (para. 44).

This shift in the way in which culture was conceptualized – including both a recognition of culture as a site of agency / counter-hegemonic activity, and of its centrality in struggles over multitudinous forms of power imbalance extending beyond class, was at the core of the Birmingham School’s ‘cultural turn’. Here, culture gained autonomy as a site of resistance and empowerment – inclusive but also transcendent of power relations rooted in class.

Stuart Hall’s famous piece *Encoding and Decoding in the Television Discourse* (1973), reflects this shift. Hall argues that a distinction should be made between the encoding of texts by producers, and the decoding of texts by consumers. This distinction draws attention to the “ability of audiences from a multitude of different power identities – including from different genders, races, ethnicities, ages, etc....to produce their own readings and meanings, to decode texts in aberrant or oppositional ways, as well as the ‘preferred’ ways in tune with the dominant ideology” (Durham & Kellner, 2006, p.95).

This perspective allows us to decode culture itself as not only a class-based ‘market’ resource, but also a democratic (ie: ‘from below’) resource through which the struggles of marginalized agents can be enacted. Acknowledged in this act is culture’s role in producing counter-hegemonic discourse, and in challenging the status quo. Writing in the 60’s and 70’s, in eras steeped in social upheaval, Hall shows how culture was, within the civil rights movement as well as within numerous other social struggles, a vital mechanism by which marginalized identities achieved solidarity and the ability to contest established power hierarchies: “Within culture, marginality, though it remains peripheral to the broader mainstream, has never been such a productive space as it is now” (Hall, 1993, para.7). Hall observes this productivity to have arisen as a result of a “cultural politics of difference, of the struggles around difference, of the production of new identities, of the appearance of new subjects on the political and cultural stage” (para.7). Here, culture is seen to produce a social reality in which the agendas and viewpoints of

“marginalized ethnicities, as well as... [those centred around] feminism and around sexual politics in the gay and lesbian movement” (para.7) could be articulated.

Such a role stands in opposition to a determinist (and by many accounts over-simplistic) understanding of culture, in which cultural domination appears as all-encompassing – a repressive wall of class-based homogenization. Critiqued by Hall as a “cynical protective shell”, such a perspective, he claims, prevents theorists from “developing cultural strategies that can make a difference” (para. 8). By reclining into a position that views culture as already and forever imbued with the hegemonic dominance agendas of the ruling class, critical theorists run the risk of sidestepping, or downplaying, culture’s emancipatory potential. Hall and later Birmingham school theorists call, then, for a more nuanced view of both ‘culture’ and ‘cultural hegemony’. As conceptualized by these theorists, cultural hegemony becomes something other than pure victory or pure domination as a zero-sum cultural game” (para. 8). It assumes, rather, a scenario in which the balance of power is constantly being shifted, and in which marginalized groups can potentially change the “dispositions and the configurations of cultural power” (para. 8).

The implications surrounding the Birmingham School’s shifting approach to cultural phenomena for our reading of the creative cities movement is significant. By moving past a view of the creative cities phenomenon as ‘only’ and ‘always’ constitutive of an oppressive biopolitical governance agenda produced by a neoliberal regime engineered by and through a class-based paradigm imposed by the global elite, we can investigate its potential for the generation of alternative social democratic realities.

4.2. Two Examples that Buck the Trend

To begin, I look at two policy dialogues in which creative cities strategy has been reinvented in such a way as to champion and reinforce social-democratic values. The first stems from a string of policy documents and events instigated in the 90’s and 2000’s on an international level – notably by UNESCO and the European Commission & Council – in which culture is attached to sustainability agendas, and through which was created the ‘sustainable creative cities’ movement. The second dialogue stems from the rise of the Local Agenda 21 – a ‘localized’ sustainability agenda whose uptake occurred internationally throughout the 2000’s – particularly in the EU and Canada. Within these

contexts, creative cities strategy has, according to some, been re-purposed and infused with a kind of emancipatory potential – through which is challenged a view of the movement as ‘necessarily’ or intrinsically unsustainable and undemocratic.

4.2.1. UNESCO, European Commission & Council – Culture / Sustainability

An international body designed to “build peace in the minds of men and women” (Milicevic, 2014, para.3), UNESCO’s approach to culture positions it within a sustainability paradigm aimed at securing collaboration rather than (as is the case with numerous creative cities enactments) engendering competition. While economic health is seen by UNESCO as a key dimension of sustainable and peaceful societies, such health is perceived as part of a wider sustainable ecology that includes (as discussed in Chapter 2), social, ecological *and* economic dimensions – and that is underpinned by civic engagement and community development. Through this lens, culture is not viewed “exclusively through an economic prism that puts technological progress to the fore” (UNESCO, 2002, p.8), but is considered in holistic terms as a source of “innovation, creativity and exchange” (p.7).

In its early thinking about cultural development (ie: throughout the late 80’s and early 90’s), UNESCO reports honed in on culture’s instrumental role in achieving biodiversity/ecological sustainability. In *Cultural Diversity and Biodiversity for Sustainable Development* (2002) the authors bring attention to the role of culture in “combating environmental degradation” – a task achieved through culture’s cultivation of the “full participation of all actors in society, an aware and educated population, respect for ethical and spiritual values and cultural diversity, and the protection of indigenous knowledge” (p.13). The report - as well as other reports emerging in this time-period, such as *Our Creative Diversity* (UNESCO, 1996) - advocates for stronger linkages between biological and cultural diversity to be understood and acted upon. In these documents cultural diversity is positioned as “the best counterpoint to the ideological and technical uniformity that might result if market-driven globalization is allowed to run its course” (UNESCO, 2002, p.16). Here, a call is made for those conducting ecological development & sustainability activities, in particular, to listen to, understand and foster plural cultural identities within development projects, and to acknowledge the unique cultural dynamics at play within stakeholder communities.

In the late 90's, this view of culture and cultural diversity as playing an instrumental role in the enactment of sustainability agendas was to become, within UNESCO and the European Task Force on Culture and Development (1996) reports, more nuanced. Increasingly acknowledged was the interconnectedness of sustainability's three dimensions - social, economic and ecological - and the role of culture as a key variable underpinning (ie: imbricated within and through) them. Within this complexified approach to governance, culture came to be valued not only as an 'instrument' in affecting positive and sustainable outcomes – but an intrinsic good – ie: one whose core values enabled transformations in the way that people conceived of themselves and their communities. As *In From the Margins* (1996), a policy document created by the European Task Force as a compliment to UNESCO's *Our Creative Diversity* (1996), states: "It is, in fact... [the arts and culture's] intrinsic value as sources of creativity and intellectual resources that allows them so powerful an effect on the world they recreate, comment on or criticize" (p.268). The authors of this report (as well as of other reports such as the UNESCO 2005 *Convention on the Protection and Promotion of Diversity of Cultural Expressions*) identify a key paradox – that to be truly effective in mobilizing change in social, ecological and economic domains, culture must first be valued as having intrinsic worth. Here, cultural development was to be re-conceptualized as not only a 'catalyst' for a range of sustainability agendas, but as an 'end' in and of itself.

This 'integrated' approach to culture – including the notion that culture should be valued on its own terms - has in recent decades been advanced by UNESCO as a key governance paradigm. In particular, UNESCO's *Hangzhou Declaration: "Placing Culture at the Heart of Sustainable Development Policies"* (2013), advocates for culture to be positioned at the core of the organization's post-2015 development agenda, and to be included as a component within all of the UN's initiatives. Here is recognized culture's central role within a sustainable development paradigm of "foster[ing] peace and recognition", "promot[ing] inclusive social development, promot[ing] environmental sustainability", "strengthening resilience to disasters", etc (p.3-6). Underpinning this multi-faceted approach to culture's role is, from one perspective, a concern with the democratic and citizen-building outcomes to be achieved through culture's intrinsic communicative dimensions. The report, for instance, shows culture as fostering "civic spaces for dialogue and social inclusion", and as promoting "democracy and... freedom of expression" (p.5) – outcomes that are, it would seem, reflective of a 'mode of thinking

and being in the world' premised upon a concern for others, and a belief in the power of communities to self-determine.

This concern with culture's necessary integration into a wider framework can also, paradoxically, be seen to position it as a governance 'resource' (McGuigan 2005; Miller and Yudice, 2002; Zelizer, 2011, p.249). Here, culture is tasked with providing replacement to the "institutions of assistance" normally operated by government entities – and becomes valued by government for its capacity to tackle social problems, environmental problems, problems related to migration and disaster, etc. Within this paradox, we see how the act of integrating cultural agendas with social, economic and ecological ones can have far-reaching effects – not least of which is a re-positioning of culture as means by which to achieve particular outcomes that are of benefit to government (Yudice, 2011; Burman, 2005).

4.2.2. Sustainable Creative Cities

Within the past decade, a move has been made to apply this thinking to the city as a rising site of governance within the new global paradigm. The term 'Sustainable Creative City' has grown in currency within policy and academic contexts internationally (Nadarajah & Yamamoto, 2006) – prompting the beginning, according to Kagan & Hahn (2011), Scott (2014), and others, of a movement whose premise takes to task the 'unsustainable' dimensions of dominant creative cities phenomena. Drawing inspiration from UNESCO and the EU's emerging emphasis on culture as a development tool and paradigm, from cross-national dialogues happening through such forums as the Asia-Europe Foundation (ASEF/ASEM) – (ASEF/ASEM, 2010) and from academic analysis that frames the concept of the Sustainable Creative City as a 'way forward' in response to the large-scale critiques levied against dominant creative cities applications (Nadarajah & Yamamoto, 2006; Ratiu, 2013) - this emerging discourse re-imagines the 'creative city' as transformed within a framework premised upon emancipatory/participatory democratic ideals.

Proponents of this movement show the 'sustainable creative city', or the city pursuing 'cultural sustainability', as going beyond the kind of "techno-economic ... market-driven urbanization strategies based on Euclidian planning and top-down decision-making" commonly applied within creative cities texts (Nadarajah & Yamamoto, 2006, p. 3).

Drawing to attention to “complex interdependencies ...[between] creativity and resilience in implementing sustainability” (Baycan, Fusco Girard & Nijkamp, 2011, p.33). Fusco Girard (2011), for instance, unravels the ways in which culture and creativity can serve to ‘boost’ the resilience of locales by incorporating participatory, ‘bottom-up’ approaches to governance:

a creative city becomes a city that invests in economic, ecological and social resilience and – in particular – in *cultural resilience*, because cultural resilience allows for creative responses to changes and shocks, sustaining, from the bottom up, technological, economic and organizational innovations” (p.84).

Such resilience is accomplished, he claims, through a new approach to government, and to governance, that moves beyond entrepreneurialism and that establishes a network of meaningful and authentic relationships with those being governed – empowering ‘the people’ to make decisions relevant to its own future.

This ideal, when operationalized, involves (in Fusco Girard’s view) a decentralization of governance power on the municipal level, and the forging of innovative partnerships between government and the non-profit/community sector, as well as with citizens’ groups. Local community here becomes “the collective new subject” through which is promoted the “self-government of local common goods” (p.91). This ‘opening up’ of government is seen to enable a collective production of ‘relational values’ and of commonly held understandings of sense and meaning. Such an act is seen to imbue government/citizen decision-making processes with creative potency. By involving the third sector as an authentic partner, governments gain access to this sector’s interests in and commitment to “long-term objectives... intrinsic values [and] common goods”– as well as to its capacity for innovation and creative problem-solving (p.91). This partnership serves, claims Nadarajah and Yamamoto (2006), as a platform by which to develop a “cultural production system that is universal in form but varied locally”... one in which “sustainable enlightened localism” (p.186) is produced.

Community ownership as a concept forms, then, a key dimension of emerging definitions surrounding the sustainable creative city movement. In a report produced from the 2010 Asia-Europe Foundation summit, in which European and Asian policy-makers assembled to discuss a series of issues surrounding culture and sustainability within cities, the following definition of the movement was developed:

A Sustainable Creative City... embrace[s] participatory, bottom-up, intergenerational approaches where 'trial and error'... experiments are fostered. In such a city, long-term developments and processes are regarded as important, rather than products. The whole city is mobilizing creative potential to 're-invent' the 'logic of the house' or "oikos logos"... Viewed as living organisms, sustainable creative cities build on their capacities and resources to create tangible and intangible values for the present and the future. Bio-cultural diversity... should be a basis for urban resilience. Sustainable Creative Cities include understanding art as process (i.e.: art as a verb, not only a noun), through infrastructural support, by engaging with spiritual/mental and physical/environmental contexts, how these elements are played out with individual and societal opportunities to learn skills in perception, and an ability to articulate and share common values" (Kagan & Verstraete, 2011, p.16)

The transformation described in this definition, which implicitly advocates a move away from a market-based creative cities paradigm and towards one rooted in sustainability begs, as Kagan and Verstraete observe, for a shift in urban policy and development "away from linear-instrumental policies and strategies, towards transversal, transdisciplinary, non-linear, contextual trial-and-error (ie: 'iterative') approaches marked by serendipity" (p.17). Here is activated an alternate understanding of municipal power that emphasizes citizen engagement and the collective imagination of new pathways forward.

Such an approach to city governance brings to life concepts of 'cultural citizenship' and the 'cultural public sphere', and to the shared and communicative space in which these terms reside. Here, citizens are enabled and encouraged to engage in community interchange (through dialogic deliberation, aesthetic presentation, etc.) with government, and to collectively produce meaning, identity and vision. Culture becomes, in this paradigm, a resource for collectively defining and pursuing a city's potential. It is also valued as an 'end' in and of itself - a modality of thinking that fosters particular ways of being in the world that are, at the core, collectivist, democratic, and concerned with both the longevity engagement/activation of communities.

4.2.3. Agenda 21 & Sustainable Community Planning

Alongside the recent rise of the 'Sustainable Creative Cities Movement' is another line of policy summarized by the term 'Agenda 21'. This movement, which started in the early 2000's and rose to prominence as an approach to municipal governance globally, has its roots in an international dialogue spearheaded by the UN who, at its 1992 Conference

on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro, created an agenda for the 21st century that advocated a shift towards a sustainability governance paradigm (United Nations Sustainable Development, 1992). Part of this agenda included a role for local government in engendering forms of sustainability that would, in-turn, further a globalized sustainability vision. This included translating sustainability into a “locally defined and locally acceptable construct” that would “resonate with people, their local community and their own environments in such a way as to carry conviction, hope and involvement...” (Voicey et al., 1996, p.35) Such sustainability, it was argued, should be “linked to empowerment, sharing and effective democracy” with the aim to give all people “ a stake in the global Agenda 21” (p.35).

In actuality, these recommendations comprised a small part of the report, and were seen by many as almost incidental in relation to the recommendations geared towards national and international levels of government. One of the surprising outcomes of the summit, then, according to Selman (2010), was the way in which the ideals surrounding Agenda 21 were taken up by municipalities and localized government agents throughout the globe (Selman, 2010). This uptake came to be commonly referred to as ‘Local Agenda 21’ or ‘LA21’.

This uptake involved a shift in thinking around local governance that addressed local sustainability within a wider context that included not only environmental issues but social, cultural and economic issues, and issues of active citizenship (Selman, 1996). Here, local sustainability policy was to become concerned not only with ‘quality of life’, a “concept which studies have shown to relate to environmental quality, crime, local health care, education, employment prospects and housing availability” (Selman, 2010, p.535)... but also with the reinvigoration of active citizenship – particularly in relation to local governance. In this agenda, culture grew, in some instances, to be seen as a vehicle by which citizen engagement could be fostered and produced. Activated within and intersecting with the LA21 discourse were the discourses of community development (Jackson & Morpeth, 2002, p.120), community economic development (p.123-125) and place-based development (UN Committee on the Geographic Foundation for Agenda 21 et al., 2002, p.21) – all of which champion the possibility of endogenous and sustainable development as a means to bolster local resilience in the face of the economic and cultural sea-change brought about by globalization.

Within Canada and in Europe, the rise of LA21 has been seen to have informed the growth, in recent years, of sustainability-based planning initiatives on the local/municipal level (Duxbury, Cullen & Pascual, 2012). Canada's federal government in 2005 fuelled this shift by offering incentive (through the introduction of Gas Tax exemptions) for communities to develop Integrated Community Sustainability Plans (ICSPs) – that is – plans developed “in consultation with community members, for the community to realize sustainability objectives it has for the environmental, cultural, social and economic dimensions of its identity” (Union of British Columbia Municipalities / Canada, 2005, p.6). Following from this incentive, communities across the country began, in the mid-2000's, producing ICSPs – and over 1200 plans have now been filed (University of Alberta: Alberta Centre for Sustainable Rural Communities, 2014). These plans speak to a landmark change in local governance logic – in which values of economic development are positioned within a larger ecology involving social, cultural and ecological/environmental dimensions, and through which ‘participatory’ and citizen-centred avenues of decision-making are being explored.

The ease with which the ICSP planning process was taken up by Canadian municipalities was facilitated, it seems, by a movement occurring throughout the 80's and 90's referred to by Edwards and Von Hausen (2013, p.17) as the ‘sustainability revolution’. This movement, which would come to be characterised as ‘sustainable community development’, pursued “a broader form of community involvement in setting the community's vision and objectives, in selecting strategies, and in providing resources than characterized many other experiences in local development in the 1970s and 1980s” (Pierce, J.T. & Dale, A., 2011, p.84). Characterized by a “greater integration of economic, social, cultural, and environmental values and by a relatively decentralized approach to planning and management”, this movement was to radically challenge single-sector approaches to planning characteristic of municipal governance structures in earlier decades (p.84).

Following from this shift, planners began to experiment with notions of integrated governance. An example of this includes the establishment of ‘round-tables’ – a term used to convey the notion of multi-sectoral, decision making”:

Almost all provinces and territories have formed such round tables, following the lead of the federal government and its National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy. In turn, a host of local and regional round tables have been formed. Typically, they are composed of

government officials along with representatives of industry, environmental organizations, academia, and the public. Among the most active have been the round tables in British Columbia, including one struck in 1990 for the region surrounding the province's capital city, Victoria, known as the Capital Regional District Round Table on the Environment. (Hodge & Robinson, 2013, p.220),

Embodied within this move was the pursuit, as well, of a bottom-up, endogenous, form of governance and development (Bryant, 1994, p.603). While most conservation strategies in Canada had, prior to this shift, been “developed at the provincial or national level, accepting jurisdictional boundaries rather than using regional or ecosystem planning units”, and while environmental management had been framed within a “single-sector approach to reporting and analysis”, this new framework encouraged a “holistic description of ecosystems” that would bring environmental agendas together with social and economic ones – prompting a concern, within planning, for the integrated approach to development (Hodge & Robinson, 2013, p..219).

Beginning in the 80's and 90's, then, local governments started working with sustainable community development principles in their approach to governance. This work, it seems, set the stage for the widespread uptake of the ICSP governance process, and of Local Agenda 21 principles, starting in 2005.

Local Agenda 21 has become a major component, as well, of municipal/local policies within EU communities. While the circumstances surrounding its rise to popularity differ -the incentives made by the Canadian government to spur movement towards a sustainability paradigm were replaced, in the case of the EU, with bottom-up, locally-driven initiative (Duxbury, Cullen & Pascual, 2012, p.14) - the theory has had a similarly-profound uptake – with over 4,000 communities having signed onto its premise (Evans & Theobald, 2003, p.781). Based upon the results of the Local Authorities' Self-Assessment of Local Agenda 21 project, through which was conducted a “Europe-wide research programme... [investigating the] LA 21 initiative”, Evans and Theobald observe “significant levels of commitment to the LA21 process amongst European local government, and some notable achievements in sustainable development policies within a very short space of time” (p.781). While the widespread application of this theory has brought to the fore a number of contradictions (see Duxbury, Cullen & Pascual, 2012, p.11), it is, on the whole, seen by many as “an effective policy vehicle for encouraging and supporting sustainable development initiatives at the local level” (Evans & Theobald, 2003, p.781).

While culture as conceived in the Sustainable Creative Cities movement is seen to play a vital and transformative role in re-engineering modes of thinking and being so as to produce new sustainability and democratic potentials, within Agenda 21 it is in many cases positioned as ‘one part’ of a larger ecological system; as a ‘pillar’ of sustainable development policy (ie: siloed and relegated to its own chapter of municipal plans) rather than a ‘lens’ whose application impacts all decisions and informs the way in which collective deliberation occurs (Duxbury, Gillette & Pepper, 2007, p.5). Of concern within some LA21 projects, then, is a tendency to revert to a view of culture as purely ‘instrumental/functional’ – thereby negating its potential as an intrinsic good, and as a ‘way of thinking and being’. As Duxbury, referring to the LA 21 uptake in Europe and Canada, observes:

On one hand, conceptual linkages between heritage conservation, preservation, integration of cultural facilities in citizens’ daily life, and sustainability...suggest... a promising pathway... on the other hand, a prevailing change of discourse from *conservation/preservation* to *rehabilitation* is creating a situation where the focus is shifting from ‘cultural value’ to ‘function’ as the main criteria of urban renewal decision-making” (Duxbury, Cullen & Pascual, 2012, p. 11)

Recognizing these contradictions, what has emerged for culture through Local Agenda 21, it might be said, is a platform of possibility – a stage developed around concepts of sustainability, and of democratic forms of community expression, through which it is to some degree (whether explicitly or implicitly) positioned as having value. The potential here is that culture might, through the vehicle of Local Agenda 21 and the changes it has enacted to local governance logics and power structures, come to be seen as a fundamental catalyst for the emergence of new emancipatory social-democratic potentials.

4.3. What types of culture should sustainable creative cities support?

One of the key questions that emerges when municipalities begin thinking about culture in the context of sustainable development asks: given the presumption that some cultural forms fulfill (or embody) sustainable development objectives more fully than others (Kagan & Hahn, 2011, p.18), how should municipalities configure policy and resource supports to enable sustainability-nurturing cultural forms to flourish?

This question has been engaged by theorists and practitioners alike. Australian theorist/practitioner Jon Hawkes asserts that culture, within a sustainable development context, necessarily serves as catalyst for the expression of community values, and that this expression is key to the development of a democratic public sphere: “The government of a society cannot be fully democratic without there being clear avenues for the expression of community values, and unless these expressions meaningfully affect the directions society takes” (2002, p.10). Hawkes goes on to state that cultural vitality is “essential to a healthy and sustainable society...” (p.10). Within this quest for democratization, Hawkes turns, in particular, to anthropological forms of cultural expression – viewing these as enabling the types of interchange that make for a rich and vital public sphere (p.11). He engages this belief within the realm of arts policy and funding, and advocates for local Government prioritization of ‘participatory’ forms of creative practice over ‘professional/Arnoldian’ forms – with an aim to build citizenship and activate communities: “Participatory arts is an enormously useful tool in the community-building process. Indeed, it is the foundation of community-building” (p.10). Hawkes (2004) goes on to condone what he sees as a widespread misallocation of cultural resources within municipal governments – characterized by the prioritization of professional (ie: Arnoldian-based) arts organizations and initiatives over those rooted in anthropological epistemologies:

...most of what goes under the name of cultural policy is arts (and heritage) policy – and bad policy at that. Bad because, by and large, it focuses on supporting the activities of professional artists, developing audiences/markets for their products rather than recognizing, valourising and nurturing the productive and creative capacities of ordinary people (para 22).

To make good on culture’s potential as a catalyst for public-sphere- and sustainable-development, Hawkes proposes a radical shift in dominant cultural policy and funding models – including a turn towards the anthropological/participatory, and away from the Arnoldian/professional. The impacts of such a shift on a given city’s arts scene are potentially significant (and jarring). Ultimately, though, such a shift leads (in Hawkes’ view) to the emergence of new roles for, and an elevated positioning of, culture within a democratic sustainable development agenda.

German cultural sustainability theorists Sacha Kagan and Julia Hahn (2011) present an alternate view on culture’s role in sustainable development agendas – one that highlights the ecological attributes of a democratic, sustainable development framework, and the

need for governments to cultivate particular forms of literacy, and creativity, through cultural support and investment. Like Hawkes, Kagan and Hahn recognize the value of anthropological expression (particularly diverse forms of such expression) in creating sustainable outcomes:

Cultural diversity, like biodiversity, is indispensable to the resilience of the human species on Earth... Sustainable systems can only exist as long as diversity is preserved, so that the shocks of the unexpected may give way to the responses of resourceful social and ecological systems (p.18)

These theorists perceive such diversity as springing primarily from “informal networks and cultural *scenes* of a city” (p.21). Such places, they claim (rather than those formally- and institutionally- constructed) embody an “openness to disturbance, and therefore the potential for emergence, is the richest” (p.21). Kagan and Hahn advocate for sustainable creative cities to allocate resources towards fostering this atmosphere of openness – “a learning culture in which continual questioning is encouraged and innovation rewarded” (p.21). Here we see a prioritization of ‘informal’ and/or ‘non-official’ forms of cultural expression arising from a community’s vernacular interchanges - forms that, by way of their diversity and inclusiveness are seen to catalyze a ‘thick’ sense of community identity and belonging, and a robust public sphere. We also see advocated a role for government in supporting not only diverse cultural expression itself, but the conditions by which such expression occurs.

While Kagan and Hahn align with Hawkes in their emphasis on anthropological forms of culture, they also see a role within sustainable development for ‘professional creatives’ – presuming the dominant conception of creativity as an ‘autonomous act’ is re-thought. These theorists put forward a view of creativity that follows “an ecological paradigm more compatible with the search process of sustainability” (p.21). Artists working within this paradigm engage with “local contexts and neighbourhoods, and all local communities (i.e. both human and other living species)” as equal partners. Within this dialogical relationship, insights emerge that are conducive, they posit, to a sustainable development paradigm. Such a view challenges dominant conceptualizations of the artist as autonomous producer:

...the search for sustainability imposes certain limits to the autonomy of artists and ‘creatives’, who can no longer be considered as fully irresponsible and individualistic agents allowing their cultural capital to ground processes of gentrification.... On the other hand, the search for sustainability also requires an evolutionary openness to the ways of life,

which are both locally sustainable and informed by the global dimension of sustainability. In this respect, creativity is also an imperative for sustainability, and artists and other 'creatives' should be given the necessary opportunities and degree of autonomy so as to foster creative local developments.

Kagan and Hahn go on to show a necessarily dialogical relationship between artistic practices and local community sustainability agendas: "the kind of autonomy that is required is less the modernist autonomy of art for art's sake, and more the *dialogical* autonomy of trans-local interdisciplinary teams engaged for the self-management of local communities (p.22). Wendy Culkier reinforces this view – claiming that creativity within a sustainability (or in her words social innovation) paradigm must be intentionally relational: "When we talk about using relational art as part of social innovation, it's really about being more intentional about how we involve art, how we allow artists and audiences to co-create meaning in order to advance social goals" (Madeleine Co, 2015). In Kagan, Hahn and Culkier's views, then, artists and arts institutions (both Arnoldian and anthropological) assume roles as "skilled practitioners of interdependence" (Kagan & Hahn, 2011, quoting Kelley, p.24). Their work, within a sustainable development context is seen necessarily (and intentionally) to contribute to the "ecological literacy...[and] literacy of complexity" (p.18) endemic to this paradigm.

Yet another view put forward by Wilson (2010), as part of the Asia-Europe Foundation's 'Connect 2 Culture Research Team', shows how art practice generally (not recognizing a distinction between anthropological and Arnoldian) offers (or can offer) new ways in which to engage with the 'wicked problems' (Rittel & Webber, 1973, p.160) with which sustainable development is concerned. Artists who turn to issues of sustainability because they "feel the need to take a stand"; and who "engage with these topics because they are the current challenges to our humanity, and thus form the essential material with which ...[to] reflect contemporary life" (p.9) – are seen as key allies within (and instigators of) sustainable development agendas. Building on this view, Greg Van Alstyne (Madeleine Co, 2015) speaks to the potential for art (again – not differentiating between anthropological and Arnoldian) to bring an element of courage, and of risk-taking, to sustainability debates: "If art has something to offer, what does it have to offer? It's courageous. Art is not intimidated by what other people think. So it's radical. And it always has been... in terms of questioning inherited values, for propositioning something different". Here, then, we see advocated a recognition of art's role in challenging dominant value systems, and in putting forward new visions for transformation.

Yet not all art is created equal in its ability to challenge and imagine. As Kyrstyn Wong-Tam (Madeleine Co, 2015) observes: “Not every...gallery or museum venue is the same... there are those that are very interested in pushing the envelope, and then there are those that just sort-of hang the pretty flowers”. Cultural policy and investment strategies within municipalities pursuing sustainable development paradigms should, according to this view, nurture those organizations, initiatives and events that foster courageous, imaginative thinking so as to cultivate a ‘generative’ public sphere.

This line of thinking advocates, then, for artistic practice as a vehicle for transforming perceptions and ushering in new possibilities congruent with a sustainable development paradigm. Hawkes, Kagan and Hahn see as crucial to this task the development of anthropological modes of cultural production – through which are developed participatory, democratic subjectivities. These theorists differ, however, in their views on Arnoldian culture and professional arts practice. While Hawkes bemoans what he sees as a widespread over-subscription of local governments to Arnoldian-based cultural forms, Kagan and Hahn call for a re-imagination of these forms, and of creativity generally – and an activation of these as a means by which to engage with the essential complexity, ecological mindset and ‘dialogism’ endemic to a sustainable development paradigm. Wilson (2010) posits that it is not only the way in which artists interact with communities that is of value to sustainable development agendas, but also the content of the work (ie: its alignment with sustainable development agendas), and the courage it engenders.

4.3.1. Culture In, For, As Sustainable Development

Feeding into (and helping to frame) this generative potential for cultural sustainability is the work of COST Action IS1007– a European-based research network focusing a multidisciplinary perspective on the “relationship between culture and sustainable development” (2015, p.6). In a document produced following from its 4-year research agenda (2011-2015)- *Culture In, For and As Sustainable Development: Investigating Cultural Sustainability* – the theorists put forward a three-tiered classification of culture’s relationship to sustainable development that they see commonly played-out within municipalities and other governance entities. The first tier, culture *in* sustainable development (ie: the 4-pillar model), shows culture as embodying a “supportive and self-promoting role, which simply, and fairly uncontroversially, expands conventional

sustainable development discourse by adding culture as a more or less self-standing or freestanding 4th pillar” (p.28). The second tier, culture *for* sustainable development, offers more hope for culture’s capacity to create alternative solutions to the status quo. Here, culture is seen to play a “framing, contextualizing and mediating” role in enacting sustainable development agendas, and is positioned as an “influential force that can operate beyond itself” (COST Action, 2015, p.8). Culture is valued for its ability to navigate, interpret, perceive, contest and negotiate different understandings of sustainable development. The third tier - culture as sustainable development – is one that appears to resonate with the descriptions of cultural sustainability offered by the above-mentioned theorists. This model places culture at the core of sustainable development agendas – in the place where “new values, new ways of life and (perhaps) utopian visions of a sustainable society” are formed (p. 31). As sustainabilities imply “making connections between people and the worlds they inhabit and use” (p.32), priority (in terms of civic policy, funding, etc.) is advocated by these theorists towards cultural production that is deeply imbricated in the life-worlds of communities, and integrally connected to a larger ecology of agendas and ways of knowing. Here, culture “represents both problem and possibility, form and process, and concerns those issues, values and means whereby a society or community may continue to exist” (p.32). Such a view, which in many ways echoes Kagan and Hahns’ assertion of culture’s necessarily ecological, inter-relational and intentional dynamic, appears as a radical alternative to a view that would propagate culture as necessarily solipsistic –concerned with the maintenance of the (largely Arnoldian) status-quo. Municipal leaderships pursuing this paradigm prioritize cultural forms generative of a “fundamental new processes of social learning that are nourishing, healing, and restorative” (p.32).

4.3.2. Cultural Sustainability & the Birmingham School

Such a view of culture echoes back to the Birmingham school, and to the ‘cultural turn’ of the 60’s, 70’s and 80’s in which culture was re-positioned as a “less exclusive, more democratic...” (Procter, 2004, p.38) construct concerned with the “power of the people to express and determine their own feelings and actions” (p.38). This view recognizes human experience as “the central agent in creative and historical processes”, and draws attention to the “ability of audiences to produce their own readings and meanings, to decode [and produce] texts in aberrant or oppositional ways, as well as the ‘preferred’ ways in tune with the dominant ideology” (Durham & Kellner, 2006, p.95). As with the

Birmingham School theorists, the above-cited cultural sustainability theorists position culture as a democratic (ie: 'from below') resource through which the struggles of marginalized agents can be enacted. Culture is here implicated in producing counter-hegemonic discourse, and in challenging the status quo. Such a view assumes a perpetual struggle in which the balance of power is constantly being shifted, and in which marginalized groups can, through anthropologically-motivated forms of expression, can change the "dispositions and the configurations of cultural power" (Hall, 1993, para.7).

4.4. Sustainable Creative Cities – Case Studies

The Sustainable Creative Cities construct is in many ways an emerging paradigm. While championed internationally by UNESCO, and by various independent academics and communities throughout the globe, and while being taken on by a handful of local governments, there has yet to be developed a comprehensive body of analytical work related to the concept. As Nadarajah and Yamamoto (2006) observe, "there is a dearth of studies and writing that articulate a cultural theory of a sustainable city in which (local) culture becomes a value of its own, or something merely seen as opposite to globalization and responding to it, or something of economic value, or treated as postmodern reading of a text" (p.9). The few case studies that do exist, however (See Choe's (2006) study of Cheongju, Korea; Tiwari's (2006) study of Patan, Nepal; and Sasaki's (2006) study of Kanazawa, Japan), hint at the theory's potential for enacting remarkable urban transformation of a kind that does indeed foster resilience in the face of the widespread alienation brought about by neoliberalism's globalization paradigm. Here, a glimmer of hope is offered for the creative cities discourse as a transformative mechanism by which communities can pioneer, amidst and through the challenges brought about by globalization, a new way forward.

4.5. Small Cities a Site of Innovation

Thus far, we have seen how concepts of sustainability, and of democratic engagement have emerged within local/municipal planning contexts beginning in the early 2000's and up to the present, and how culture has, to varying extents, been transported from the 'sidelines' to the 'centre' of planning policy – conceived both as an instrument and conceptual pillar in the development of sustainable futures and as an intrinsic good, and

'lens' through which particular collective logics and 'ways of being' can be fostered. We have examined this transition in broad strokes – without acknowledging, for instance, the role that size of community plays in the construction of particular change agendas. One of the interesting and often-understated discoveries that emerges from a look at cultural innovations on the local level, however, is the role played by small cities and rural locales in pioneering new cultural democratic and sustainability potentials. Duxbury, Cullen & Pascual (2012), in their study on Local Agenda 21 as enacted within Canada and Europe, show that “In both Canada and Europe, holistic considerations of sustainability are often more pronounced in smaller communities” (p.11). These theorists posit these considerations to have emerged, in particular, within small communities facing 'moments of crisis' – presumably those facing significant threat of decline due to globalization realities. The holism brought to bear within these planning processes is, perhaps, indicative of the intimate connections to be found within rural communities (ie: the “small distance and many bonds [to be] found between... local actors” (Lorentzen & Lansen, 2012, p.26); also...of the “fluid social systems and self help approaches to ... community development” (Parkins & Reed, 2012, p.6) at play.

The idea of the small city 'leading the curve' on sustainable creative municipal development agendas is, in many respects, novel. Creative cities theory has traditionally had its roots (ie: been conceived and pioneered) within mid-sized and large urban centres (Ratiu, 2013). Furthermore, the rubric used to evaluate the success of creative cities (ie Richard Florida's key indices of 'technology, tolerance and talent') have been seen to enact a “systematic bias against smaller centres”... that is “frequently woven through entire studies, not just singular indicators”. (Lewis & Donald, 2009, p.35). Bell and Jayne (2010) challenge, for instance, the applicability to small city contexts the movement's advocacy for creative industries spatial agglomeration, its depiction of the creative worker as 'quintessentially urban', and its conception of creativity as being “at home in the city” (p.210). Other theorists, such as Luckman, Gibson and Lea (2009), challenge the applicability of the movement's perceived economic functionalism to the complex social dynamics embedded in small city contexts. While the Creative Cities movement is seen to revolve around the development of creative industries, the generation of new kinds of investment, attraction of certain types of economically-advantageous migrants and encouragement of greater entrepreneurial exchange between commercial, government and research-centred institutions (p.71), such agendas have been perceived as overly narrow in their application to small-city contexts.

Within an economically driven conception of creative cities theory, there exists a danger that an “increasingly formulaic creative city agenda is imposed upon places in a damaging and/or unrealistic manner” (p.71). This danger is particularly relevant within small city contexts, in which the qualities of place and dynamics of community figure prominently in the life-worlds of inhabitants, and in which economic imperatives are seen often as intertwined within a complex network of social, cultural and environmental factors.

Yet such indicators are seen as part of a system that, although paying lip service to “culturally distinctive, novel and even ‘transcendent’ communities that prioritize liveability”... in actuality “fail to include liveability and sustainability measures that may be important components to smaller cities” (p.7). This failure places small cities often on the ‘outskirts’ of dominant creative cities innovation paradigms, and promotes a conceptualization of such locales as ‘losers’ in the high-stakes game of market-based knowledge economy competition (p.7).

It is no wonder, then, that small cities have arisen as sites of innovation as related to the inclusion of sustainable cities discourse in municipal development domains (Duxbury & Campbell, 2011, p.111). Because the creative cities script has not been substantially embraced by small city development contexts, space has been left for alternate narratives to emerge. The Brundland Commission (1987) shows the small city as a promising site for cultural sustainability innovation – claiming that by expanding sustainable development focus to include the small city, some of the pressures faced by large urban centres in enacting sustainable development goals can be reduced (United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987, para. 54). Supporting this premise is a body of research showing small cities, in comparison to large, as possessing particular assets, approaches and epistemologies that position them as ideal hosts for sustainable development agendas.

Calls have been made for new evaluation rubrics to be developed surrounding the creative cities phenomenon that move beyond an obsession with “capital model’s persistent emphasis on short term, concretized growth strategies” (Lewis & Donald, 2009, p.8) as frequently enacted by large cities, and towards such concepts more prominently deployed within small city governance contexts – such as ‘sustainability’ and ‘quality of life’. Lewis and Donald argue for using “liveability and sustainability” rather than “tolerance, technology and talent” as a starting-point for an evaluation framework

that would apply to small and large cities alike (p.10). Within such a rubric, we see a new way of looking at, and defining success within a creative city – one that values ‘local knowledge’, and accommodates such factors as scale and geography.

While small cities have been identified as existing in a ‘third space’ (Bhabba, 1994), “positioned as they are in the shadow of large cosmopolitan cities but still bound by rural history and traditions” (Dubinsky & Garrett-Petts, 2002, p.334), they also possess unique cultural assets, relationships and ‘ways of thinking’ that when activated within a sustainability paradigm, can yield tremendous value. Ginny Ratsoy (2005, p.217) speaks to a particular “way of seeing” embodied by those on the margins but attuned to their position in relationship with the centre: “The small city’s very mediality and peripherality predispose it to flexible representation – and to unique ways of seeing”. From this marginal view-point, claims Rob Shields (1991), the “relativity of the entrenched, universalizing values of the centre” can be exposed, along with the “relativism of cultural identities” (p.277). Such a position, observes Ratsoy, engenders unique possibilities for escape, refuge and self-discovery (Ratsoy, 2005, p.217).

Will Garrett-Petts and Lon Dubinsky (2005) show how such ways of seeing stem, in part, from a spirit of resistance cultivated within small cities – in which dominant development themes activated within large urban centres are viewed with scepticism by those situated on the geographic ‘fringe’: “[a]ny constructed theme that is perceived as imposed on a community from an elite group of citizens or city leaders is not likely to attract positive attention” (p.10). These theorists go on to highlight the imperative within many small city contexts, of the ‘local’:

If smaller urban centres are to prosper and maintain their identities in the face of mass cultural influences and big-box retailing, they need to think critically about notions of scale, space, and place. To tell their own stories, small cities need to listen to the vernacular, to local examples and voices (p. 1).

Here, then, the centrality of the local, of the vernacular, is seen to engender a particular attitude, or stance within small cities that both challenges dominant development theory (including creative cities theory), and promotes alternatives rooted in a high valuation of the ‘local imagination’.

Perhaps it is, in part, this focus on localism that enables small cities to emerge as leaders in the realm of citizen engagement and democratic activation. Poul Erik

Mouritzen (1989), in his study comparing democratic engagement in small versus large urban centres, finds that small cities provide “the ideal place for education to democracy”... in their ability to provide “opportunities for participation”... and “feelings of efficacy” (p.664). Large cities, on the other hand, are seen in this study to produce symptoms such as “alienation, cynicism and frustration” (p.664) – perhaps due to the fact that “Government leaders and bureaucracies cannot be controlled and influenced and people develop feelings of mistrust and inefficiency”.

Additional evidence exists showing small cities to be better-equipped than large to incorporate culture as an essential component of sustainability agendas. In a Canadian study conducted by Duxbury and Jeannotte (2015) examining over 100 Integrated Community Sustainability Plans (ICSPs) produced by cities across the country (following from Country’s 2005 incentivization of such plans through gas tax revenues), the following observation was made:

Large communities were the least likely to include culture in their vision for sustainability. Less than half (45 per cent) did so, compared with 59 per cent of medium-sized communities, 76 per cent of small communities and 70 per cent of very small communities. This finding suggests that local culture is perceived to play a more central role in the sustainability of smaller communities than in larger ones, and that this value is worth expressing in a visionary way (p.154)

This research is directly applicable to my examination of three Canadian small cities and their enactment of ICSPs (and other similar sustainability-based policy constructs). The existence of a different ‘way of being’ within small cities (Canadian cities in this case), where the lines that divide cultural, democratic and sustainability-based forms of development are, in comparison to large cities, less rigid or pronounced, places them in a potentially advantageous position as related to their sustainable development capacity.

Having outlined this premise, I would be remiss in failing to point out that these same ‘ways of being’ are, in contradictory fashion, implicated within some small cities contexts in countering agendas related to creative sustainable creative development. As Isabel Ferreira and Nancy Duxbury (2017) observe: “...the specific conditions of small and medium-cities are also connected to a cultural conservatism and traditionalism that may lead to a crystalized self-image” (p.46), and to modes of behavior that reflect a “small mindedness and parochialism” (Hristova, 2015, p.49).

Adding to this view is the notion that small cities are lacking in the type of plurality that lends itself to sustainable development agendas. Given the qualities of sustainable development we've discussed – summarized in this definition by Polèse and Stren (2000):

Social sustainability for a city is defined as development that is compatible with the harmonious evolution of civil society, fostering an environment conducive to the compatible cohabitation of culturally and socially diverse groups while at the same time encouraging social integration, with improvements in the quality of life for all segments of the population (p.15-16)

... we cannot conclude that small cities can, be seen as universally, or innately, qualified to pursue and embody sustainable development principles. While many appear to possess catalytic conditions, or variables, that provide for the possibility of such development, other factors must come into play so as to allow the seeds of cultural sustainability to grow. The search for these additional factors underpins my case studies research and analysis.

4.6. Neoliberalism a porous concept?

To conclude this chapter, I return to our overview of neoliberalism, and to questions surrounding creative cities as produced within and through neoliberal logics. Given the reversals examined, in which dominant market-based logics have, in certain instances, been replaced with ones rooted in sustainability and democratic community-based activation, we must now re-examine the connections between these two phenomena so as to position the 'sustainable creative city', and sustainability-infused creative cities agendas at large, within a wider framework of understanding.

In Chapter 3, I referenced David Harvey's definition of neoliberalism, which shows the a widespread globalized trend involving the liberation of "individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets and free trade" (Harvey, 2007, p.2). I showed how, within this framework, individual rights have risen in status over those of the collective, and how the state has come to assume a new 'entrepreneurial' role in the fashioning of new realities. Underpinning this new market-based paradigm, seen to disproportionately benefit 'creatives' as members of an elite global class, is a view of advanced capitalist society as constituted, through and through, by market-based logic. Here, neoliberalism

appears as a “monolithic, homogenous and inexorable economic force that proceeds undifferentiated regardless of its geographical points of contact” (Springer, 2009, p.481).

Other understandings of neoliberalism exist, however, in which the phenomenon is seen as both historically produced, geographically distinct, and as ‘open’, in certain instances, to logics that apparently run in opposition to those engendered by a free-market economy. Theorists Van Houdt and Schinkel (2013), for instance, draw attention to a rising phenomenon which they call *neoliberal communitarianism* – that is: a trend in which free-market logic is coupled with “the stimulation of ‘active citizenship’, and the rational governing of community with a rhetoric of the spontaneous work of community” (p.495). Such a trend, which they see as played out in the penal system (for instance, in the rise of neighbourhood-produced solutions to crime, and community-based preventative strategies for at-risk youth, etc.), as well as within numerous other facets of society, shows neoliberal market-based rationality as running alongside the kind of humanist rationalities that, on first glance, appear to conflict with its core tenets and beliefs.

Similar rationalities are identified by Hardt and Negri – whose works *Empire* (2000) and *Multitude* (2005) assert both the existence of both a globalized hegemonic force premised upon a market logic, *and* the potential within this force for the construction of alternative rationalities and governance approaches. Using Foucault’s term ‘biopower’, they show how “dominant ideologies now secure the citizenry’s subordination to state power” – doing so mainly “by means of internalizing various mechanisms of control” (Lewis, 2002, para.19). But while biopower is seen to regulate, and dominate social life from its interior, “following it, interpreting it, absorbing it, and rearticulating it” (Hardt & Negri, 2000, p.23-24) it is also seen by these theorists to hold emancipatory potential – so that “if bodies and brains can serve as sites for internalized oppression, they “might also become vehicles for liberation” (Lewis, 2002, para.20). Hardt and Negri show such liberation as stemming from the ‘multitude’ – that is, from an “internally different, multiple, social subject whose constitution and action is not based on identity, or unity (or much less, indifference), but on what it has in common” (Hardt & Negri, 2005, p.100). They see ‘biological productivity’ within the multitude – claiming within this construct an inherent decision-making capacity. In other words, biopolitical governance can be accomplished both ‘from above’ – enacted by governments upon populations - and ‘from below’ – used as a tool of ‘the people’ in the enactment of collective resistance to domination and the

articulation of alternative realities (Negri, 2003, p.263). This understanding of biopower is asserted, as well, by Blencowe (2012), who attributes to the concept a 'productive potential' through which can be created 'new, embodied experiences" (Federman, 2012, para.4). Blencowe advocates for the historicization of biopower's "central meaning of experience and of subjectivity" (para. 9) – that is to say, for the recognition of biopower as a phenomenon historically, rather than metaphysically or transcendently, produced.

In determining how we look at neoliberalism and biopolitical governance regimes, Purcell (2008) cautions against an overly structuralist, or reductionist approach: "there is a danger that as we develop a robust critique of the various injustices of neoliberalization, we will focus only on the doors it is closing." (p.3) Purcell advocates, rather, for an approach that recognizes the "contradictions of, and the emerging resistance to, neoliberalization" (p.3), and (as with Blencowe, Hardt and Negri) for a view of this phenomenon as 'historicized' (p.3). Through such an approach, one might perceive, within what appears on first glance as a monolithic and all-pervasive power structure and logic, the existence of alternative and potentially radical oppositional logics, or 'nodes'. By viewing the creative cities movement through this lens, taking into consideration the Birmingham School theorists' assertion of the possibility at all times of human agency, as well as the glimmer of hope offered within 1970's community-based models of cultural intervention, we might, within a cityscape seen initially as paved over with the logic of market-based reason, see signs of life emerge - through cracks in the pavement.

Chapter 5. Methodology

Moving now into the empirical part of this research, I here examine three small city policy environments in British Columbia -Prince George, Kelowna and Kamloops - applying the debates, lessons and theories outlined within the first part of this dissertation to these so as to gain insight into the challenges and potentials faced by small city governments in enacting cultural sustainability agendas.

The central research question posed by this dissertation asks: *What can the governance practices of small cities tell us about the challenge of using cultural policy to develop a fuller and richer sustainable culture?* I begin my investigation by presenting a rationale for the study of Canadian, and British Columbia small cities, in particular. Following from this, I speak to the process used to select these particular case study cities - including the definition of 'small city' deployed in the selection process. I outline the ways in which 'policy' and 'indicators frameworks' are conceptualized and used throughout this research in relation to cultural sustainability agendas, and identify research strategies used throughout the study. I then zoom in to identify the timeframe and research questions that frame the study. Finally, I speak to the epistemological orientations (and conflicting agendas) guiding my research and interview process, and to my dual role in this process as researcher and cultural management practitioner.

5.1. Why study small cities in Canada?

The Canadian context provides a relevant starting-point for an examination of the effects of large-scale sustainable cultural development policy shifts within cities. Here the principles of sustainable cultural development were, in 2005, systemically and nationally enacted through the federal government's incentivization of Integrated Community Sustainability Plans – the framework of which included culture as a key component of sustainability agendas (see chapter 4). Given the systematic way in which these agendas were taken up by cities across the country, various theorists (notably Duxbury and Jeannotte, 2015) have called for research to be conducted that examines the impacts of the resulting shift. Researchers can now look back to over a decade of cultural development activity so as to assess the varying impacts had by ICSPs (and

related policy), and can assess both the localized and systemic effects of this policy action.

5.1.1. Why British Columbia?

British Columbian cities provide an interesting starting-point for research in this area. The province has witnessed, throughout the past 30 years, a rapid cultural diversification of its population. The 2011 Census shows significant numbers of Aboriginal peoples as residing here – over “17% of the Aboriginal Identity population in Canada” (Statistics Canada, 2016a). This population group grew 38 per cent over a decade to hit 270,585 in the 2016 census” - a growth rate more than “three times B.C.’s population as a whole” (Penner, 2017). Furthermore, British Columbia is now “the most ethnically diverse province in Canada ... [a]lmost 30 percent of British Columbians... immigrated to B.C. from another country... Just under one-quarter of the people in B.C. are a visible minority” (British Columbia, n.d.). This said, cultural diversity is concentrated to a large extent within large urban centres within the province; “Metro Vancouver has become one of the most ethnically diverse cities on the planet, while the rest of B.C. remains relatively homogenous” (Todd, 2015). The question of how small city cultural managers (those situated in a peripheral relationship to diversification centres) address the potential for cultural diversification - is one that again underpins my research.

Considered in tandem with this expanding cultural diversity is B.C.’s growing arts scene. According to a study conducted by Hill Strategies Research Inc. (2009) examining arts employment within and between provinces based on the 2006 census, British Columbia had, out of all of the provinces, the “largest percentage of its labour force in art occupations (1.08%)” - a number that positions it at a level “well above the Canadian average of .77%.” (p.1). This figure is significant, particularly given the state of provincial support for the arts. In 2009/10 the Province of BC was ranked in last place (at \$206 per capita verses the \$309 national per capita average) among the provinces for its arts spending (Beale, 2013, p.159). 2010/2011 saw a surge of provincial funding allocated to culture – directed towards the Cultural Olympiad and largely centred in Vancouver. This surge was followed, it should be said, by significant funding cutbacks – announced “three weeks before completion of the Cultural Olympiad” (Low, 2012, p.511). The Olympiad made numerous claims surrounding its capacity to raise awareness surrounding the Vancouver arts scene through international press coverage; the extent

and benefit of which was, through a newspaper content analysis study performed by researcher Duncan Low, challenged (p.511).

Yet while provincial spending on arts specifically, and culture generally, remains low, the picture becomes complex when examined in concert with municipal arts investment – which rose sharply in the 1990’s” (Marontate & Murray, 2010, p.334), and continues to rise into the present. Marontate & Murray attribute this trend to an “American-tinged populist home-rule movement in BC municipalities” that took place early in the 20th century [and] that, having declined in the 1920’s, left as one of its remnants a “permissive stance” by the province to municipalities. This history suggests, they observe, “a ‘deep devolution’ of cultural and social welfare responsibilities to cities, which then directly bargain with the province for access to resources” (p.334). “It is no accident [claim Marontate & Murray] that BC Cities have been leaders in the Creative City Network of Canada” (p.334). Vancouver was an “early proponent of Creative City approaches to urban planning in Canada”... and “Vancouver and Victoria are said to lead innovations in provincial cultural administration” (p.334). Furthermore, BC is home to a disproportionate number of ‘Cultural Capitals’ in the small/rural category - a Canadian Heritage classification created to endorse and encourage successful small city cultural development (p.334). Here, then, we see British Columbian cities (both large and small) as systemically enabled to play leadership roles in arts and cultural development domains.

5.2. What is a small city?

Small city definitions differ substantially among academics, researchers and policymakers; and each definition highlights different characteristics. Bonifacio and Drolet (2017) ask: “Is a small city a geographic concept, such as a location on a map? Or is it a social representation, a culture or a way of life? Is a small city a function of population density, population size, distance from an urban area or distance to an essential service?” (p.4). The degree to which a particular location is seen as ‘urban’ is assessable, according to Stats Can, by various criteria – including population size, population density; and an abstract ‘functional’ measurement that accounts for “linkages between where a person lives and where they work, shop, access health care, recreate, what can be called a person’s activity space” (Purderer, 2009). The selection of any

one, or a combination of these assessment tools in the definition of 'small city' is dependent upon context and analytical need.

Population size marks the most standard mechanism for defining small cities – though within this category definitions vary. According to Viaud (2008, pps.7,9), small cities are 'small municipalities between 100,000 and 10,000 people". Bonifacio and Drolet (2017), however, advocate that this category be expanded to 200,000 – recognizing a host of similarities between cities falling both below and over the 100,000 mark. I've chosen to alter this definition further – and (for the purposes of this study) to define small cities as those housing populations of 75,000 – 200,000. This definition allows for focus to be placed on population centres that are large enough to house a baseline-level of cultural services infrastructure. I've also chosen to select cities for this study that are at least 3-hours driving distance from large urban centres (specifically – from Vancouver and Victoria). This criteria eliminates 'corridor' cities as potentials for study (ie: Coquitlam, Maple Ridge, etc.) – recognizing a unique set of influences within such cities that position them in substantially different cultural policy terrain than their less centralized counterparts. In developing this criteria, I wanted to select cities that exist as spatial Others - not "on the edge with the large city as centre" but existing both, and simultaneously, as "edge and centre" (Ratsoy, 2005, p.207).

It is important to note that this use of the small city as a primary unit of analysis trains my research eye squarely on municipal governments as focal-points. While this selection criteria allows me to focus in on the actions of governmental bodies in relation to their governed populations, it at the same time inhibits focus on the relationships between these governments and a wider network of governments/populations (ie: neighbouring cities, towns, rural areas). This advantage, then, of being able to hone in on a particular government's relationship with its cultural entities and citizens can also be seen as a limitation – one that could be addressed through additional research that examines these cities within a wider geo-spatial and political context.²

² Note – the Prince George study includes, in addition to City of Prince George analysis, analysis of policy and financial support provided by the Regional District of Fraser Fort George (RDFFG). This exception was made given the relevance of the RDFFG to the Prince George cultural scene – a relevance not found in the other case studies. The

5.3. What is Policy?

'Public Policy', constitutes a governance tool used to shape the development of municipal cultural scenes. This term is defined by COST Action researchers (2015) as:

principles, documents, rules and guidelines that are formulated or adopted by.... [governments] to reach their long-term goals, and more specifically, strategies, decisions, actions and other 'systems of arrangements' undertaken to solve a collective problem with the help of human, financial and material resources (p.38).

Policy within this definition is created through top-down intention (ie: derived a way for municipal leaders to control and monitor their aims, objectives and outcomes); and/or bottom-up development (ie: through collaborative and consultative processes). It can include formal principles, documents, rules and guidelines – such as strategic plans, policy statements, etc., as well as informal communications – such as the undocumented agendas communicated by city staff to cultural development stakeholders.

Public policy is shaped by, and helps to shape, public opinion. Tony Meppem (2000) speaks to the ways in which the widespread use of public consultation processes by governments creates a 'façade of inclusiveness', serving to "diffuse opposition and therefore enhance legitimacy of pre-determined and structured policy stances" (p.51). Policy is at times, then, used as a mechanism of public relations - a way to placate populations and silence opposition.

While starting with the same definition of policy as that put forward by the COST Action researchers, I narrow its focus to public policy that has been produced by municipal government entities. This includes formally-produced and published 'official policy' documents, as well as strategic planning and procedural documents. It also includes informal communication between staff and the public, and between staff and funded groups. All of these utterances speak to the ways in which cultures of meaning are constructed within and by these governance organizations, and in which particular sets of power relations are developed and reinforced.

analysis is confined to the RDIFFG provision of support to Prince George-centred organizations.

In taking up such a broad definition of 'public policy', I perhaps lose the analytical benefit that comes from the ability to examine one type of policy against another similar type. On the other hand I gain, it seems, a more holistic view of the spectrum of utterances issued by a particular governance institute (both formal and informal), and can discern the ways in which these collectively help to define, catalyze and contest agendas rooted in cultural sustainability.

What are Indicators Frameworks?

Indicators frameworks are defined as policy-derived frameworks that “analyse the performance of economic, social and cultural systems over time to predict performance for the future” (Badham, 2015, p.209). The role of such frameworks is to enable decision-makers to examine and measure performance against pre-stated policy agendas so as to determine particular courses of action. Indicators stem, it should be said, from an evidence-based policy production framework endemic to 21st century neoliberal governance regimes. Cultural indicators, for instance, are often thought “to enact a neoliberal logic in which funding of cultural activity is seen as an investment with possible kinds of quantifiable yield, rather than as a subsidy of something inherently worthwhile” (Redden, 2015, p.44). Furthermore, indicator frameworks are often represented by government as objective, non-ideological decision-making processes. Observes Blomkamp (2015) – “the use of scientific evidence is supposed to make government more rational and modernized (p.29). Within this framework, indicators provide a “seemingly impartial and open way to administer [public] programs and help to reduce the complexity of decision-making’ (Innes, 1990, p.274). Such claims of objectivity, however, are refuted by numerous critics. Belfiore and Bennett (2007), for instance, argue that such “ideology-free” approaches to policy- and indicator-making in fact turn questions of value into questions of measurement that are largely technical in scope (Belfiore, 2012, p.5). These theorists highlight the ways in which the emphasis on measurability; on the “cult of the measureable”, and on accounting for what ‘can’ be measured rather than what ‘should’ be measured, has obstructed and diminished debates about value – making ‘measurability’ a dominant, albeit often incoherent, value in and of itself.

Within the cultural domain, indicators have been widely critiqued for their failure to adequately account for the ‘intangible’ values underlying cultural (including artistic) creation and production (Woolcock & Davern, 2015, p.154). Stand-in measurements

including items such as 'attendance' are often used to represent markers of success or failure, and frequently fail to capture the values integral to the organizations and initiatives being measured (p.154). The widespread substitution of 'easy measurements' for ones that attempt to understand the deep-rooted values and value-shifts produced through culture, serves as an ongoing concern (p.154). Jim McGuigan (2004) states: "Any discussion of public cultural policy – whether in the narrowest sense of arts patronage or in the broadest sense of reforming the social – must, at some point, address questions of value" (p.14). It follows that indicators should, in addressing cultural 'progress', venture into the complex terrain of values identification and assessment.

Emerging work on indicators development within a cultural sustainability context highlights the potential of such frameworks to, through the systematic inclusion of a wide range of community voices in the setting and monitoring of culture-related goals, address the question of 'what should be measured' within a democratized and participatory context. Examples include the Most Significant Change (MSC) model - a story-based, participatory form of evaluation originally designed to monitor and evaluate a complex "participatory rural development program in Bangladesh" (Serrat, 2017, p.36; Tools4Dev, 2017); and the European Commission's ESDins project - an initiative designed to "explore useful indicators which can measure values components of...sustainable development projects" (University of Brighton, n.d.a, para.3). Such models and initiatives, while laborious in their insistence upon 'wide' and 'deep' stakeholder participation, are seen by theorists Woolcock and Davern (2015) to offer a "genuinely democratic approach to measure progress" (p.155). Although such approaches to indicators development currently reside on the 'fringes' of municipal policy evaluation models, they show a form of governance that not only endorses anthropological and democratic forms of cultural production, but that reflects these same values systemically – through the transformation of established administrative frameworks that challenge standardized modes of policy consultation and indicators measurement.

Within the broader category of 'public policy', then, I look at indicators developed by governments (through both formal and informal communications) – as signifiers of the ways in which these governments define, catalyze and contest agendas rooted in cultural sustainability.

5.4. Why examine Prince George, Kelowna and Kamloops?

Having narrowed my research to British Columbian small cities between 75,000 and 200,000; and those sufficiently removed from large urban centres, I include as a key selection criteria municipal commitment to cultural sustainability – as demonstrated via the production of public policy committed to this concept. Important here is a commitment, through policy, to a sustainability agenda – and to a role for culture within this agenda. The way in which culture is conceptualized in relation to sustainable development goals and agendas forms a key point of exploration within my research.

The selected cities – Prince George, Kamloops and Kelowna, were the only cities within B.C. seen to comply with the above-mentioned selection criteria. Nanaimo was a contender, but due to its proximity to both Vancouver and Victoria, was excluded from this study. The selection of three cities allowed, I felt, for loose comparisons to be made that would enable the resulting research to resonate both within and outside of these localized contexts.

5.5. Timeframe

This research focuses on public policy produced between 2004 and 2017. This timeframe allows for exploration surrounding the ways in which policy approaches were impacted by the 2005 implementation of the Federal Government's ICSP incentive/initiative. It should be noted that this timeframe is loosely applied - several of the case studies acknowledge major events prior to 2004 that have impacted upon 2004-2017 cultural sustainability initiatives.

5.6. Research Questions

The primary research question posed at the centre of this dissertation asks: *What can the governance practices of small cities tell us about the challenge of using cultural policy to develop a fuller and richer sustainable culture?*

Following from this central question are a series of sub-questions, as follows:

- How do small city governments, through public policy and indicators frameworks, define, catalyze and contest cultural sustainability agendas?

- How are the cultural sustainability agendas fostered by small city governments interpreted and received by funded organizations?
- How are anthropological versus Arnoldian understandings of culture implicated within small city cultural sustainability agendas?
- What values and qualities underlie sustainable creative city-building on the small city level?
- What happens next for the sustainable creative cities movement?

Within my research process, I deploy all of my research tactics and strategies to answer these questions – which are, by nature, inter-connected.

5.7. Interpretive / Critical Analysis

In both the active research stage of this study and in reflection, I deployed a number of lenses to the material brought forward in order to conduct an interpretive and critical analysis leading to the generation of new insights. The number and ‘reach’ of these lenses speaks, perhaps, to the essential complexity existing within these municipalities as ecological organisms – and the need to assume different positions and logics within the examination process so as to honour this complexity.

My approach in using these lenses operates under the assumption that “access to reality... is only possible through social constructions such as language, consciousness shared meanings and instruments” (Research Methodology, n.d., para.1). Researchers cannot, it is acknowledged, describe all aspects of a given context. Given this assumption, a researcher must decide what to say depending on the audience, context and emerging story (para.1). Such a stance positions the researcher as a creative participant, alongside those involved as interviewees, in the construction of reality - rather than as an objective observer of ‘data’. Here “there are no predefined dependent and independent variables, but a focus on the complexity of human sense-making as the situation emerges” (Mubarak, 2010, p.3). In this way, my research can be classified as ‘interpretivist’ – focused on meaning-making and deploying multiple lenses “in order to reflect different aspects” of the issues being explored (Research Methodology, n.d., para.1).

Additionally, my research approach, and the lenses I used for interpretation, can be classified as 'critical/emancipative'. Within this paradigm, researchers are seen to challenge "the restrictive and alienating conditions of the *status quo*" – striving to "eliminate the cause of unwarranted alienation and domination and thereby enhance opportunities for the realization of human potential" (Mubarak, 2010, p.3). This project's concern with cultural sustainability embodies an agenda rooted in the pursuit of new ways of seeing that (potentially) challenge the status-quo and contribute to the emergence of a more democratic, sustainable and culturally rich society.

In both my critical and interpretive work, I am inspired by the work of Barney Glaser (2001), whose notions surrounding Grounded Theory have challenged canonical approaches to method rooted in the assumption that theory must predate data. Glaser shows how data itself can generate theory - data can 'speak for itself', rather than become subsumed by abstract theories. Glaser's proposed research methodology involves "...a process of close textual analysis of interview transcripts, with attention to the languages and categories used by respondents to describe their cultural worlds" (Yue & Kahn, 2015, p.281). Glaser makes the case that theory derived from research data is often-times more sound, and useful, than that derived from abstract reasoning - because it springs from life-world.

While my approach is more curiosity-driven than systematic (ie: I place more weight on intuitive turns, perhaps, than Glaser; and operate without a formalized coding system), I nonetheless adhere to the principle of 'dialogism' within in his work – that is, the belief in the possibility of a dialogic relationship between the researcher and the 'research subjects/ material'.

Evidence of this approach is seen, for instance, in the fact that my central research question was altered several times throughout my study – as new data (insights) came to light. The final research question was defined after my collection phase had occurred, and I was able to look over this material so as to recognize themes, patterns, etc.

Having acknowledged my respect for grounded theory, it is important to note that 'pure groundedness' is not possible within a research process - as the act of sense-making springs from conditioning, and the ways in which we are brought up to see the world. My conditioning stems, in part, from the university context - in which I was trained to think and analyze in particular ways, and through particular lenses.

In combining the application of 'condition-based' lenses, then, with a dialogic, grounded approach in which data is allowed to shape the fundamental research purpose and question, I arrive at a hybrid methodology that is both 'bottom-up' and 'top-down'. Here, in this place characterized by the existence of forces of both structure and agency, I conduct the messy task of meaning making.

A non-exclusive list of the lenses used in inciting, interpreting and constructing meaning from data is as follows:

- Neoliberalism - considering the ways in which neoliberal market agendas shape and permeate the governance structures and populations examined within the case study cities;
- Public Sphere - considering the ways in which public spheres are, through the cultural and sustainability projects and governance structures, nurtured and or diminished;
- Biopower – considering the ways in which biopolitical agendas are expressed through governance structures and mandates;
- Cultural Sustainability Theory: considering the complex relationship between culture, sustainability and democratic development agendas as played out in the case study cities. This includes -
 - Considering the degree to which 'anthropological' vs. 'Arnoldian' cultural agendas are prioritized within sustainability frameworks, and the implications of this prioritization;
 - Considering the degree to which an ecological mindset is fostered within each case study through government and stakeholder actions;
 - Considering the ways in which culture is positioned 'in, for and as' sustainable development within each study
 - Considering the role of policy and indicators frameworks in shaping and expressing each municipality's approach to cultural development
- Small Cities theories and theories of urbanization: considering the ways in which small cities differ from their large city counterparts, and the unique challenges and possibilities existent within such cities that support or hinder a sustainable cultural development agenda.

These lenses are applied to the material generated through my empirical research – to policy and indicators frameworks, historical and communication documents, interview texts, etc.

5.8. Qualitative Research Dilemmas

My engagement with grounded theory and with the above-mentioned analytical lenses is framed within a wider set of debates related to qualitative research. Throughout the last five (or more) decades, springing in-part from movements within the academy surrounding the 'politics of representation', positivist approaches to qualitative research have become problematized (Bhattacharya, 2017, p.8; Denzin & Lincoln, 1995, p.350). Amidst growing recognition of the researcher as occupying an innately biased role, and of reality as something constantly morphing and multi-dimensional, approaches emphasizing the role of researcher as 'impartial' agent observing 'existing' cultural phenomena have been challenged. Furthermore, the power dynamics between researcher and subject has been acknowledged. Observes Clifford Geertz (1983):

The end of colonialism altered radically the nature of the social relationship between those who ask and look and those who are asked and looked at. The decline of faith in brute fact, set procedures and unsituated knowledge in the human sciences, and indeed in scholarship generally, altered no less radically the askers' and lookers' conception of what it was they were trying to do. Imperialism in its classical form... and Scientism in its impulses ...fell at more or less the same time (p.131-132).

Through this fall, positivist traditions surrounding qualitative research have been challenged, and new traditions have emerged – many of which have deployed lenses propagated by such movements as constructivism, critical theory, feminism, etc. (Denzin & Lincoln, 1995, p.350). Many such lenses position the researcher as an active participant in the construction of reality.

Coinciding with the emergence of these new research methods has been a quest to develop appropriate evaluation methods for them. Some theorists have attempted to maintain traditional standards of scientific rigor, as propagated within a positivist and quantitative research traditions. The concept of reliability (replicability of results), for instance, has been reinforced within the context of qualitative research domains – with theorists offering forward a range of assessment paradigms. Evaluative strategies promoted by Dixon Woods et al (2004), for instance, place emphasis on consistency (replicability) in methodology, while those of Lincoln et al (2011) emphasize consistency (replicability) in interpretation of results. Silverman (2009) puts forward five approaches to enhancing the reliability of both process and interpretation results in qualitative

research – through refutational analysis, constant data comparison, comprehensive data use, inclusive of the deviant case and use of tables. Within such models, qualitative researchers are incited to apply many of the same tools used by quantitative research so as to ensure replicability (and consistency) within their research and findings.

Others have argued that the concept of replicability does not translate well from the quantitative to the qualitative paradigm. Stenbacka (2001), for instance, argues: “It is obvious that reliability has no relevance in qualitative research... If a qualitative study is discussed with reliability as a criterion, the consequence is rather that the study is no good” (p.552). Such a view takes into consideration the “intersubjective nature of qualitative data collection, the iterative nature of qualitative data analysis, and the unique importance of interpretation as part of the core contribution of qualitative work” (Tsai et al, 2016, para.8). Attempts to apply evaluation protocols that do not account for these factors are seen by proponents of this view to fall short. Here is acknowledged the fact that many qualitative researchers see their transcript data as “an encoded account only decipherable to the individual who collected it” (Broom et al, 2009, p.1170). The notion that another researcher can look at the data retrieved through intersubjective, interpretive methods and come to the same conclusions is, in this context, problematized.

What, then, is a qualitative researcher to do? By what standards is their work to be evaluated? Drawing from the ongoing debate now waging across multiple qualitative research domains in which this question is pursued, and in which varying approaches are put forward in response, it is worth noting here a few key criteria that have emerged in relation to my own research process. These serve, perhaps, to provide a loose framework (if not a comprehensive matrix) by which quality can be assessed.

It is believed by some that triangulation – the act of deploying multiple research methodologies in attempt to understand a given phenomena, can be used to promote quality within qualitative research by enabling researchers to explore, and understand different dimensions of a research topic, thereby strengthening their findings and interpretations (Flick, 2018). While this strategy is seen by some (Maxwell, 2005) to reduce “the risk of chance associations and of systemic biases due to a specific method”, and to allow “a better assessment of the generality of the explanations that one develops” (p.112), others have argued that it such an approach does not automatically increase validity – as methods that are triangulated may “have the *same* biases and

sources of invalidity” (p.112). Acknowledging this counter-argument, I nonetheless deployed triangulation within this study through the combination of documentary research, interviews and critical analysis. These methods were brought together to create case studies through which my findings emerged.

Many qualitative researchers support the notion of self-reflexivity – the act of self-examination in relation to research - as a key and necessary component of the research process (Finlay & Gough, 2008). Such a view acknowledges that different researchers carry different lenses through which they produce different data and interpretations. Researchers are encouraged to engage in an act of self-reflection upon personal bias – evaluating how the such bias may have affected their results (Nicolson, 2008, p.133). Throughout my research, I was keenly aware of various of my biases – developed through such situations as my dual role as academic/practitioner, my postsecondary training and my personal fascination with counter-neoliberal and community development agendas (explored later in this chapter). The ways in which I incorporate self-reflexivity can be seen again to present a measurement tool by which this work can be assessed.

A third evaluation method, rhetorical evaluation, characterizes the “impact and substance of the research”. In speaking to this criteria, Geertz (1988) poses a central question - “How (why? In what way? Of what) does all this resolute informing inform?” (p.64). Here Geertz makes the point that the value of research (both quantitative and qualitative) is decided by the context and rhetorical landscape in which it is produced. In this view, research serves as a bridge – connecting the reader with the subject of the research in ways that impart new knowledge and understanding within a particular contextual framework. This role, along with the rhetorically-constructed assessment of the bridge’s value within a given context, mark what Geertz sees as the most important evaluation criteria of a given research project: “The imaginative construction of a common ground between the Written At and the Written About... is the *fons et origo* of whatever power anthropology has to convince anyone of anything” (p.144). He goes on to state: “The capacity to persuade readers.. that what they are reading is an authentic account by someone personally acquainted with how life proceeds in some place, at some time, among some group, is the basis upon which anything else ethnography seeks to do... finally rests” (p.143). Here, then, we see emerge an assessment protocol that prioritizes the rhetorical evaluation of research in relation to context. This

dissertation, insofar it is evaluated for its contextual significance by an academic panel, is subjected to this evaluation criteria.

5.9. Case Studies

A case studies methodology constitutes my primary research approach. A long-held staple (if often underplayed and contested) of social sciences research, this approach allowed a depth to be activated in my interaction with each community -acknowledging the interconnectivity present between subject and context (Gerring, 2006, p.11; Mills, Durepos & Wiebe, 2010). Such an approach enabled, it seemed, an honouring of this complexity – and of the ‘thickness’ (Stake, 2008, p.139) through which decisions and agendas are, within the real-life governance contexts, made manifest.

Mills, Durepos and Wiebe (2010) define case studies research as an approach in which focus is placed “on the interrelationships that constitute the context of a specific entity (such as an organization, event, phenomenon or person)”. They highlight as a key element of this research the “analysis of the relationship between contextual factors and the entity being studied”. Case studies researchers uses the insights generated through the interaction between subject and context to generate theory – and/or to contribute to extant theory. This approach, they claim, allows investigators “to retain the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events” – to look at a phenomenon “in depth and in its real life context, especially when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident” (p. xxxii).

While in one sense the case a studies approach acknowledges the lack of boundaries between phenomenon and context, it at the same time, and paradoxically, imposes boundaries. Robert Stake (2008, p.121) shows as necessary within such research the existence of a “specific, unique, bounded system” – one that he claims allows a researcher to deeply examine a multitude of variables impacting upon, and produced by, this system in its relationship to a particular issue or set of issues.

Case studies stand apart from a number of other prominent research methodologies - including ‘the experiment’- which “deliberately divorces a phenomenon from its context”; ‘historical analysis’, which does address “the entangled situation between phenomenon and context” but usually within non-contemporary frameworks; and surveys, which attempt to deal with both phenomenon in-context, but on a limited scale (Yin, 2009,

p.18). While they can incorporate all of these methods, case studies at the same time allow for a larger story to be told – one that both honours the complexity of the life-world, and that positions fragmented data in relation to a larger whole.

The multiple case studies developed through this dissertation are classified as 'instrumental' (Stake, 2008, p.123) rather than intrinsic, in that they serve to illustrate a larger external interest. Here I look at the ways in which the forces of neoliberalism, and of cultural, democratic and sustainable development, are expressed within and through particular small city governance contexts.

Furthermore, these studies can be classified as 'narrative inquiry'. Within my approach I "exercise a way of thinking about and studying experience" that follows a "recursive, reflexive process of moving from field (with starting points in telling or living of stories) to field texts (data) to interim and final research texts". Within this method, the commonplaces of "temporality, sociality and place create a conceptual framework within which different kinds of field texts and different analyses can be used". Through this inquiry, I shape "new theoretical understandings of people's experiences" (Clandinin & Huber, 2010, para.1).

Several key issues stemming from case study methodologies are worth noting. The first pertains to proximity - the degree to which researchers are considered 'outsiders' to the subjects interviewed. Within my research, I was at the same time insider (via my standing as a cultural manager working within a B.C. small city context) and outsider (given my lack of prior connectivity with the communities examined). The challenges presented by this dual relationship are more fully addressed in the 'Research/Practitioner' section of this dissertation, chapter 5.11.

A second issue stemming from this approach pertains to ethics. Case studies researchers often, by necessity, develop a strong rapport with research subjects – leading to a level of vulnerability. Given that such researchers "learn a lot about participants, more than participants may realize"... a key challenge they face is "to be appropriately alert and protective without lapsing into paternalism" (Mabry, 2008, p.221). Within my own study, participants were alerted to potential vulnerabilities via an ethics form that they read and signed prior to interviews, and through a verbal description of my research process. Nonetheless, in reviewing the interview data and in determining the ways in which this data was presented, I had to make difficult decisions - at times

eliminating comments holding the potential to adversely impact upon participant situations. At the same time, I had to guard against an overly-cautious approach to this data, in which participant insights – all of which were given with full knowledge of the public platform in which they would be communicated - would be systemically undermined through an excessive ‘toning down’ (via elimination) of potentially difficult content.

In summary – the case studies approach allowed me to tap into, and collaboratively generate new narratively-derived insights surrounding, the complex world of small city municipal governance as related to cultural sustainability. Through engagement with these municipal governance worlds, this approach allowed me to build a narrative leading to the production of new knowledge. Within this process, I navigated challenges surrounding proximity and ethics – all the while seeking to understand the larger forces impacting upon these cities in their cultural sustainability policies and agendas.

5.10. Research Tactics

Tactics used to explore the research question through case studies include:

Documentary Research, Interviews and Critical Analysis.

5.10.1. Documentary Research Analysis:

Examined here were documents (most produced between 2004 and 2017) related to municipal goals and governance agendas surrounding culture, including:

- historical, archival and public communications documents, including local press coverage, that help to frame (and give context to) a given municipality’s views on, and commitment to culture as part of a sustainable development agenda.
- planning documents (Integrated Community Sustainability Plans (ICSPs), Official Community Plans, Strategic plans) outlining a commitment to sustainable and cultural development
- financial documents, including municipal budgets, financial plans, etc., that show investment in culture and sustainability

5.10.2. Interviews

Interviews with cultural policy stakeholders were conducted throughout a three-week period - between April 18 and May 6, 2016 (one week per city). Individuals selected for interview were, for the most part, identified prior to field research using web searches and community directories, as well as historical documents related to cultural policy and ICSP development. Additional interviewees were identified in the field when discovered to be integral to particular cultural policy development processes.

Ten to fourteen interviews were conducted in each location. Interviewees (see Table 1) were selected based on their presumed ability to provide insight into the municipal/regional cultural policy processes at play within their respective cities. This includes:

- individuals involved in municipal/regional governance and administration – such as city administrators, municipal cultural managers and planners;
- individuals involved in cultural tourism and development - such as business improvement associations, tourism agencies and economic development associations;
- individuals representing cultural organizations funded by municipalities - whose work constituted a focus of cultural policy (these tended to be the highest-funded cultural organizations, such as the public Art Gallery, Theatre, Museum, Symphony Orchestra, Arts Council, etc.).
- an additional category of interviewee – University-based researchers/professors – was included– acknowledging the university as an often 'invisible' source of cultural development and transformation within small cities

Table 1

Interviewees by City, Name, Title and Organization.

PRINCE GEORGE	
Budde, Robert	English Professor, UNBC
Calogheros, Tracy	Chief Executive Officer, The Exploration Place
Elder, Jeff	Cultural Coordinator, RDFFG
Grinhaus, Jack	Artistic Director, Theatre Northwest
Hofstede, Doug	Community Coordinator, City of Prince George
Holmes, Carolyn	Managing Director, Two Rivers Gallery
Hummel, Erica	Chief Executive Officer, Tourism PG
Stewart, Jeremy	General Manager, PG Symphony Orchestra
Van Mook, Colleen	Executive Director, Downtown Prince George
Young, Wendy	Director, Studio 2880
KELOWNA	
Brennan, Katie	Director, Arts Council of the Central Okanagan
Cadger, Neil	Professor, UBCO
Cameron, Nancy	CEO, Tourism Kelowna
Digby, Linda	Executive Director, Kelowna Museums
Griffiths, Corie	Director, Central Okanagan Economic Development
Holmes, Nancy	Creative Writing Professor, UBCO
Kochan, Sandra	Cultural Services Manager, City of Kelowna
LeBlanc, Patrick	Executive Director, Rotary Arts Centre
McCoubrey, Sharon	Board Member, Arts Council Central Okanagan
McParland, Lorna	Executive Director, Alternator Centre
Moore, James	LR Planning Manager, City of Kelowna
Nagy, Nataley	Executive Director, Kelowna Art Gallery
KAMLOOPS	
Anderson, Jim	Venture Kamloops
Berger, Barbara	Recreation, Social Development and Cultural Manager, City of Kamloops
Casorso, Jennifer	Social & Community Development Supervisor, City of Kamloops
Chrumka, Margaret	Executive Director, Kamloops Art Gallery
Cyr, Julia	Manager, Kamloops Museum and Archives
Dickinson, Monica	Director, Tourism Kamloops
Garrett-Petts, Will	AVP Research, Thompson Rivers University
Graden, Cara	Culture & Heritage Coordinator, City of Kamloops
Humpherys, Kathy	Executive Director, Kamloops Symphony
Pooler, Gay	General Manager, Kamloops Central Business Improvement
Sinclair, Kathy	Executive Director, Kamloops Arts Council

Interviewees were asked to speak to the history and trajectory of cultural sustainable development policy within their respective municipalities. While the interview questions were based loosely on a template (see Appendix A), I felt it important to leave room for dialogue and discussion - and for tangential forms of conversation to emerge that might provide insights beyond those achievable through the pre-defined dialogue. Indeed, some of the most notable insights emerging from the interview process occurred during these times of unscripted tangency.

Interviews were audio-recorded, and later transcribed. The transcription text was reviewed several times, and key themes/ideas were brought forward. These themes were to become a loose coding system that contributed to an organizing framework. After examining the frameworks emerging from all three case studies, I organized them in such a way as to present data within a similar infrastructure – allowing for a level of comparative insight to emerge from their juxtaposition. Interview texts were triangulated with written policy documents and budgetary information within the case study format to achieve multiple perspectives on the same phenomena.

5.10.3. Exclusions

Excluded from this list of interviewees are numerous parties whose insights would undoubtedly have enhanced the depth and rigor of these cases. These include: representatives of local First Nations Bands and cultural initiatives; representatives of local ethnic cultural groups and immigrant services; representatives of local community development organizations; politicians; participants of cultural initiatives – ranging from youth to seniors; etc³. Indeed, the time-allocation available to me within the interview process appears, on some level, as insufficient to the task at hand – that of capturing the essentially complex, multifarious and contradiction-laden stories of these municipalities' cultural development trajectories. Additional time spent within each of the three case study communities would have helped to deepen and complexify these narratives.

³ A more fulsome investigation of views held by local Indigenous cultural leaders as related to each City's 'officially-sanctioned' (via funding and policy support) cultural policy framework is of particular import, and may form the basis of future studies. I made a decision to focus my research interviews in this investigation primarily on cultural groups receiving funding from the City, as well as on the municipal actors responsible for cultural policy and budget allocation.

5.11. Researcher / Practitioner

It is worth noting one additional lens deployed throughout my analysis is distinguishable from the others in that it is 'lived' rather than theoretical. Here I refer to my dual role as researcher and practitioner of cultural management. Having spent over 12 years managing arts organizations, and currently serving as the Director of a public art gallery within a small, B.C. city (Comox Valley Art Gallery), my view of the three distinct cultural eco-systems examined was inevitably positioned against the backdrop of my hands-on development experience. On one level, this dual role allowed me to witness patterns across a territory larger than that defined by my research agenda, and to understand through first-hand experience the challenges, opportunities and 'lived-realities' existent for those interviewed. This position also, however, presented some challenges.

One of the key challenges I faced was a struggle surrounding my own power – as a non-resident of these communities, and as researcher hailing from colonialist educational background – to 'write' the stories emerging from these communities. My work as community arts manager is premised upon the belief that communities can and should be enabled to write their own stories – drawing upon often-latent, localized resources to create narratives leading to change and transformation. Given that I identify, as cultural manager, with what might be seen as a widespread resistance within many small communities to the 'outsider as expert' syndrome, I felt myself assuming, within the interview process, an awkward and ethically challenging stance surrounding my own (socially presumed - by way of academic standing) role as 'expert'.

A second challenge I faced as related to my double-sided identity pertains to the notion of anthropological versus Arnoldian forms of cultural expression. While I theoretically appreciate the distinction between these two forms, my lived reality positions me amidst cultural forms to which I am hard-pressed to apply these labels. When confronted, for instance, with a performance by a professional artist whose First Nations identity and intensive, on-the-ground interaction with local community groups forms an integral part of the 'Arnoldian' experience, these categories appear as overly blunt, inadequate tools to describe the multitudinous dimensions of the work being accomplished.

And yet, the power and currency of these terms as markers of two sides within a contemporary debate persists. This debate, now being played out within Canada's national arts scene, pits anthropological expression against Arnoldian – arguing for room

to be made within the nation's 'houses of high culture' for expressions rooted in localized place and diverse communities. To illustrate this debate, Canadian art curator Andrew Hunter's public resignation in 2017 from the Art Gallery of Ontario (AGO) is worth considering. In his October, 2017 letter to the Toronto Star, Hunter called the AGO an institution "guided not by public participation, but by the generic, elite consensus that rules the global art market, which sees product over public good". In particular, Hunter takes issue with the institute's "lack of deep engagement with Canada, Canadian art or the diversity of this community" – noting that "for Indigenous peoples, people of colour and many youth, these institutions remain unwelcoming spaces of trauma – spaces where their marginalization remains at the core..." (para.16). This same critique is at the centre of a series of public letters produced by and in response to Indigenous Curator France Trépanier in her February, 2018, resignation from Open Space gallery in Victoria. Here, Trépanier takes issue with the organization's faltering commitment to Indigenous representation and inclusion. Trépanier's letter was taken up by the Aboriginal Curatorial Collective, who called for a boycott of Open Space – one that was later, through the organization's apparent compliance with a set of demands issued by the Collective, lifted (Trépanier 2018; Windatt, C., Morin, P., Myre et. al, 2018). These instances are by no means isolated. Prompted, perhaps, by the power and potency of Canada's Truth and Reconciliation Commission in its recommendations for change and transformation (2015), contestations surrounding the systemic exclusion of diverse voices from Canada's national art scene have risen to the fore –and have been taken up by numerous individuals and institutions in a call for change. This debate calls for a shift in priorities – one that allows the anthropological expressions of diverse cultures to become recognized by established cultural institutions as 'legitimate' expressions of culture – alongside (and in some cases overtaking) expressions rooted in Arnoldian logics and Eurocentric ideas of 'excellence'. Given the currency of this debate, then, I maintain these categories throughout my piece - believing them to provide powerful anchor-points that help to define two opposing extremities within this admittedly complex landscape.

A final challenge pertains a key recommendation stemming from this research – one that advocates municipal leaders undertake an examination of their cultural funding priorities, policies, and agendas – making radical transformations as needed so as to allow for stronger cultural sustainable development agendas to emerge. Such a proposal flies in the face of a dominant argument used commonly within the arts community in the face of widespread funding cut-backs - which essentially advocates, generally and without

discernment, for “more funding for arts” (Eggertson, 2011). This argument rarely discusses what kinds of arts initiatives should be resourced and for what reasons; nor does it speak to the role of the arts in relation to ‘culture’; nor does it specify a role or function for arts within a wider sustainability agenda. Furthermore, this argument, as it is commonly made, does not question the extent to which particular funds or policy initiatives, and their associated artistic outputs, serve to challenge or reinforce dominant neoliberal paradigms, and/or cultivate public spheres.

While as researcher I am critical of this dominant argument, the story is different when I wear my cultural practitioner hat. Indeed, I am implicated in using this argument on numerous occasions – in public discourse pertaining to the work produced through my represented organizations, in presentations to City Councils, etc. Furthermore, I am implicated in publically endorsing an extended version of this argument - which highlights the economic benefits brought by the arts to a given community. Here I play into dominant neoliberal and managerial logics in attempt to secure increased government and community support for the organizations I represent.

Given these dual roles, then, I find myself in an ethically challenging place- whereby the ideals I publically espouse as a cultural practitioner conflict with the ideals I have come to assume as a researcher. My advocacy as researcher for a fundamental re-think of municipal approaches to culture challenges a system of assumptions and logics to which I, as a cultural practitioner, subscribe. This is a bloody, and non-satisfactory, battle.

5.12. Conclusion:

The process of meaning-making as related to the data that has emerged through my research process is complex, multi-faceted, and ontologically messy. Multiple lenses are used to examine the emerging data – recognizing the inability of any one (or indeed of the ensemble) to capture the complexity and nuanced narratives working within each community. Throughout the process, I’ve been confronted with numerous challenges related to my own role and purpose – particularly given my dual roles within the field. Notwithstanding these acknowledgements, I feel compelled by the insights that have emerged to share this process and journey. My hope is that in my quest for culture-based forms of sustainable development and transformation, I am seen to honour, rather than undercut, the communities that lie at the heart of this project.

Throughout the next three chapters (Chapters 6-8), then, I present my empirical case studies research, in which I examine the municipal ecologies of Prince George, Kelowna and Kamloops- paying attention to the role of municipal governments in developing cultural sustainability potentials. Through these case studies, a series of insights are gleaned – which are further unpacked in Chapter 9 – Reflections. Chapter 10 concludes the empirical research portion of the dissertation, and brings the dissertation as a whole to a close.

Chapter 6. Findings: Prince George

6.1. Municipal Context

Prince George is a population-centre of approximately 74,000 (Statistics Canada as cited in Pawliw, 2017) – located in the interior of B.C. on the traditional territory of the Lheidli T'Enneh (2017). The City is known both as the 'gateway to the north' (Rural and Remote Health, 2017), and as the "Northern Capital of BC". Situated at the confluence of the Fraser and Nechako rivers, and at the intersection of Highway 16 and Highway 97, the City is a service and supply hub for a wide swath of territory in Central and Northern B.C.

In the 60's and 70's, the City became a boom town due to the development its pulp and paper manufacturing plants. By the 80's it had grown to be the second largest City in B.C. (larger than Victoria) (CBC News, 2015, March 6). In 1994, Prince George witnessed the opening of its UNBC campus – an act that would bring students, faculty and research projects into Prince George from across Canada, and lead to multi-level partnerships with other cities and universities (UNBC, 2017). This move would constitute Prince George as a 'university town' – and would help to diversify its economic base.

During the late 80's and 1990's, the Mountain Pine Beetle epidemic afforded the forestry industry a short-term boom as companies rushed to cull dead standing trees before they lost their value. Since then, however, the economy has been plagued by the closure of a significant number of saw mills. As one resident observes: "There was a time when there were something like 650 mills around Prince George. They consolidated down to 26. Now there's probably something like 5" (Halseth quoting research participant, p.56, 2016). While forestry still remains an important industry in Prince George, the closure of mills has necessitated new economic strategies to be developed - one of which includes the provision of administrative, government and social services. Situated in Prince George's downtown are a wide range of service providers – including those related mental health and addictions, homelessness, family services, health services, etc. These support residents of Prince George, but also draw clients from throughout Northern B.C. (Curry & Llewellyn, 1999, p.87).

While the City regularly attracts individuals in need of these services, one of the economic challenges faced by the City is its function as a pass-through point, rather than a stopping-point, for tourists. The city is located as a 'gateway' to wide swath of lakes and rivers; visitors from afar seeking wilderness and outdoor adventure often traverse the city on-route to these destinations. Investments in culture have formed part of the City's strategy to retain passers-through. Culture, here, is seen to both increase the desirability of prince George as a destination (ie: a way to get passers-through to stay an additional night) (J. Elder, personal communication, April 22, 2016), and also to cultivate an understanding of prince George as a 'sophisticated' place – a metropolitan centre that boasts cultural amenities that raise its profile and status. So while the city struggles to attract and retain wealthy tourists, it quite readily attracts impoverished and street-involved persons – what several interviewees quite shockingly referenced as 'the undesirables'.

13% of Prince George's population base identifies as First Nations/Aboriginal, according to Statistics Canada (2011a) data - Aboriginals comprise 4.3% of the total Canadian population (Statistics Canada (2011b)). This number is significant, and presents particular opportunities and challenges for the cultural sector in its programming and governance agendas.

An additional observation worth flagging is the city's reputation as one of Canada's 'most dangerous cities' - due in-part, perhaps, to its service-provision function, there exists a high crime rate (114% above the national average) (McQueen & Treble, 2011). Coupled with this rate is the positioning of Prince George along Highway 16 – a road famously known as the 'Highway of Tears'. The disappearance of 18 confirmed, but what some say is as high as 40, largely First Nations women along this highway - vanished or murdered between 1969 and 2006 - hangs as a dark cloud over the City and creates challenges (beyond the social impacts on individuals and communities affected) as related to its civic pride and identity (Carrier Sekani Family Services, 2017; The Canadian Press, 2015). The City's morale and pride was to receive a boost in 2015, however, when it was host to the Canada Winter Games. This event was to benefit the cultural community as well, and was to provide incentive for a marginal increase in cultural support (\$60,000 in events-based funding was instigated in 2016 by the City in partnership with Tourism PG – designed to nurture events that contribute to celebrations of PG) (City of Prince George, 2017). The creation of this grant speaks to the linkage

recognized on both City and Tourism development levels between civic pride/identity, tourism attraction and cultural activity.

6.2. Economic/Tourism Approach to Culture

Following from the closure of many of its mills, Prince George has taken measures to diversify its local economy – moving from a “mainly forest-based economy to a city that has a strong natural resource base, but also supplies goods and services for a broad range of sector activities throughout Northern BC” (City of Prince George, 2017, p.4). The region’s largest employment sectors include: “Wholesale and Retail Trade; Manufacturing; Healthcare & Social Assistance; Construction; and Forestry, Fishing, Mining, Oil & Gas”(p.4). Culture and Tourism are positioned as vehicles to increase the attractiveness of Prince George, draw new investment into the region and distinguish it from other Northern population centres. Observes Erica Hummel (Chief Executive Officer, Tourism PG):

A lot of our branding and our messaging is all about this dichotomy regarding culture – the urban experience versus the rural experience. The whole urban drive in the North is that PG has the symphony and theatre... we have the things that other communities in the North don't have... they all have wilderness, trails, lakes and rivers – but in PG you can have that experience of a cultural event as well as wilderness (personal communication, 2016).

Not only does culture help to distinguish PG from other northern population bases, it also, in Erica’s view, helps to increase pride of place:

PG has, in the past, had an image problem... definitely... from people inside and outside the community. We weren't very proud. What they saw on media is that we were the crime capital of BC. We spent the first few years trying to improve that image. There was a campaign led by locals sharing the best places to go, things to do – those takes were the foundation for our campaign regarding why other people should want to come to Prince George. Local restaurants, the music scene, cultural events helped change the image and perception.... culture was a big part of that shift (personal communication, 2016).

Here then, from an economic development / tourism standpoint, culture is seen to both differentiate and distinguish Prince George from other centres, and contribute to a wider effort to ‘re-shape’, or ‘re-brand’ the city’s image.

6.3. Cultural Sector - Context

Prince George is home to a number of professional cultural institutions – including The Exploration Place (museum and science centre), Two Rivers Gallery, Theatre Northwest and the Prince George Symphony Orchestra, as well as Studio 2880/Prince George and District Community Arts Council, and the Central BC Railway and Forestry Museum. Leading up to 2000, a flurry of cultural facilities development was enacted. The Prince George Conference and Civic Centre (which shares a plaza space with the Art Gallery and is seen by many as the centre of the downtown core), was developed in 1994 (Prince George Conference and Civic Centre, 2017). This was followed by a major expansion to Theatre Northwest’s (2017) performance facility in 1997; the development of a new organization and facility - The Exploration Place in 2001 (The Exploration Place, 2017); and the development of a new facility for Two Rivers Gallery in 2000 (Two Rivers Gallery, 2017). Throughout this time-period and up to this day, it should be said, the Prince George Symphony Orchestra and others have advocated for the development of a Performing Arts Centre– a project that has yet to take on momentum. Notwithstanding this challenge (and obvious gap), Prince George’s cultural scene can be seen, during this time, to have in many ways ‘come into its own’.

Government jurisdiction for cultural funding is shared between the municipality and regional district – with the regional district fronting the largest share of the funding costs. This scenario differs from many cities (including the other two examined in this study) in which the municipality bears the brunt of cultural funding responsibility. This situation evolved in 2006, as the Regional District embarked on its development of the Golden Raven Program (more on this later). The distinct logics driving these two funders present, as we will see, some interesting challenges (and opportunities) for the cultural community.

6.4. Cultural Planning

6.4.1. Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP)

In 2010, the City of Prince George released an Integrated Community Sustainability Plan, which it labeled ‘myPG’. This plan, designed to “help Prince George realize a sustainable future” involved extensive public and stakeholder engagement through

which was developed a vision for the City's long-term future (City of Prince George, 2010 p.2).

While the plan does not speak specifically to a 4-pillar model of development, it does frequently reference culture within the context of social development strategies. A key vision put forward in the plan is as follows:

Our PG will be a safe and stable community with no homelessness and have an urban and *sophisticated culture, with increased multicultural awareness and appreciation*, including more festivals and use of public space. (p.15 – italics added).

Key culture-based goals embedded within the plan include:

- Encourage and support community-driven events that celebrate culture, place and season
- Incorporate Aboriginal culture/traditions into larger events and place names
- Inventory both public and private venues for arts and culture events (including sports) and consider all of these in planning for arts and culture facilities over the long term
- Identify possible arts/culture initiatives and facilities for growing ethnic minorities
- Building the internal capacity of the culture sector, and advocating for strengthening the human infrastructure (p.14)

6.4.2. Official Community Plan (OCP)

In 2012, the City released an updated Official Community plan. This plan also ascribes a role to culture as a contributor to sustainability. Culture-based goals and objectives outlined in this plan are as follows:

- Encourage inclusive community participation in arts and culture that should ensure the social, environmental and economic sustainability of the community
- Support and facilitate the development of events, programs and spaces that celebrate culture, place and season
- Support and promote learning, appreciation and participation in the arts and various cultural aspects and events
- Continue to partner and work with arts and cultural organizations

- Provide leadership in public art planning, endeavour to make space available for public art and encourage private development to incorporate public art
- Ensure arts facilities are available to meet the needs of the community
- Support and encourage accessibility to arts and cultural services for all citizens and visitors
- Support and encourage efforts by community organizations to partner in the maintenance or management of public owned spaces.
- Encourage partners and organizations to celebrate Prince George's Arts and Culture through festivals and events and encourage the delivery of these events in the downtown (City of Prince George, 2012, p.69).

Clearly, the City of Prince George has made a rhetorical commitment to culture within a sustainability context - and has recognized its importance within a wider holistic and community-development agenda.

6.5. Municipality

6.5.1. Cultural Strategic Plan (or absence thereof)

While the City affirms via these strategies culture's value within a larger sustainability and community development agenda, it is notable that the City has yet to invest in a Cultural Plan that would see the key aspirations put forward in these strategic documents taken down to the level of actionable goals and objectives. According to Doug Hofstede, City of Prince George Community Coordinator, as of September, 2018, the City is engaged in cultural mapping as a precursor to a cultural plan, and is intending to start the plan early in 2019 (personal communication, October 2, 2018). Doug also makes the point that while such a plan is needed, it is not the sole driver of action, and that significant agency lies in on-the-ground players making cultural development happen: "there's lots of things happening. Just because we're not putting it on paper in a plan, a specific plan, it's still happening" (personal communication, April 19, 2016).

Acknowledging that the absence of a plan does not signify a lack of cultural activity on the municipal level, the fact that these high-level visioning strategies (documented in the ICSP and OCP) were created over five years ago, and a detailed cultural plan has yet to be put into action, speaks perhaps to a misalignment between the rhetorical versus actual priorities within the City structure.

6.5.2. Financial Context - Municipal

Another misalignment worth noting is the discrepancy between the rhetorical value accorded to culture in these strategic sustainability documents, and the value accorded to culture through cultural grants and funding. Given the positioning of culture in these plans as a key driver of sustainability, it would appear logical for the City to increase its cultural grants budget so as to make good on culture's new-found sustainability-driving potential. Such an increase did not occur. The city's cultural budget following from the 2010 ICSP and 2010 OCP remained relatively constant, and has up until this point not experienced any major increases or decreases – in spite of a 4% increase in the City's population between the years 2011 and 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016). There were, however, some changes to the cultural budget that occurred post-ICSP – a key one being an amalgamation of social and cultural grant categories.

Current social/cultural budget:

In 2016, the City's social/cultural budget (which includes 'myPG Community Grants', community celebrations grants and community enhancement grants) totalled \$405,150. Within this sum, \$259,300 is allocated to 8 groups who are on 3-year funding contracts with the City. This includes three core arts organizations – Theatre Northwest, the Prince George Symphony Orchestra and Studio 2880/Prince George and District Community Arts Council. It also includes various cultural/social service agencies, such as Canadian Mental Health and Multicultural Heritage Society. The remaining amount is allocated to cultural/social groups on an annual basis in a competitive granting process (City of Prince George, 2016).

Why Amalgamation?

The municipality's decision to amalgamate cultural and social grant programs together under a single umbrella is one that stems from the ICSP Process – in which culture is positioned as an 'integrated' force within a wider social landscape. As Doug Hofstede observes:

Our grant system has changed over the last couple of years. We used to have social grants and cultural grants, but now we've amalgamated them both. Basically what we're looking at is grants that help improve the quality of life for the community. And you can look at it from a cultural

perspective, you can look at it from a social perspective (personal communication, April 19, 2016).

Cultural applications made through this process range in scope – they include organizations and projects that are loosely and closely affiliated with social agendas. The level of interest expressed by cultural groups in social engagement is, it seems, increasing. With this increase comes questions surrounding the definitions underlying ‘culture’ and ‘social sustainability’:

It’s interesting because we have a group the community arts council is doing a program where they’re going to kids who are incarcerated and um helping them with their mental health through an artist trying to develop a graphic novel with these kids... so they can tell their own story through graphic novel, so

[S.K.-Interviewer] Is it art practice? Is it community development? Is it social service? ...

That’s exactly the challenge you have... another one... we have a Prince George activators – they work with ex-convicts, um they do a lot of projects ... cleaning up and making the city look nicer. We gave them funding to work with some First Nations clientele to paint murals downtown... so again, art? Is it art? Or is it the social aspect – helping those people pick up their lives? (personal communication, April 19, 2016).

While Doug admits that this amalgamation can at times pose challenges (particularly in the realm of adjudication), he at the same time sees value in its positioning of culture as part of a larger social agenda; a piece of the social whole: “It should be community pride. That’s how I look at it. You’ve made people want to be in their communities, and socialize there” (personal communication, April 19, 2016). Doug is also clear that the funds provided by the City through myPG and cultural/social grants are to be used for the ‘public good’ – rather than to enhance individual exploration or an individual artist’s creative practice:

If it’s art for the sake of art... I’m not sure that that would necessarily be a mandate for government, or municipal government to support necessarily. It’s important, but there always needs to be a public good. If we’re going to fund something, whatever that might be, there needs to be some kind of public good. And with culture, it can easily be that place making, it can be that social connectivity, it can be all those kinds of things, even individual, enhancement enjoyment... those kind of things that you really want to look at. And it tends to be an easy ... that’s why public art is an easy thing for municipalities to fund. It’s tangible, people can see it, they can say it’s good or not, it helps create place, it makes people interact

with their surroundings and that kind of stuff, so it tends to be an easier thing for us to say – great – let’s do public art... whereas funding someone to do their craft... tends to be individual but how does that help the public good? (personal communication, April 19, 2016)

For Doug, and for the City of Prince George by extension, this focus on the social, on cultural/social value, and on community pride, is one that trumps many of the other agendas commonly put forward by municipalities in their cultural funding rationales. Of particular interest is the City’s professed lack of adherence to a tourism and/or economic development agenda as related to culture:

You know it’s one of those things you have to be really careful... you can live by the sword, die by the sword... if you start tying your culture to tourism, if tourism doesn’t go well, then you’ve just shot yourself in the foot... and same with the economic drivers for downtowns and all that kind of stuff.. these are all contributing factors, they should not be the end goal (personal communication, April 19, 2016).

Here, then, we see in both the structure of the myPG program, and in the City’s explanation of the rationale underlying these funds, a strong focus on public good, social benefit, and the development of community pride/identity.

While the City’s amalgamation of social and cultural grants can be seen on one hand to contribute to a sustainable development agenda in its focus on culture’s necessarily integrated role, this move can also, paradoxically, be seen to position culture as a governance ‘resource’ (McGuigan 2005; Miller and Yudice, 2002; Zelizer, 2011, p.249). Here, cultural organizations are overtly or covertly tasked with providing low-cost replacement to the “institutions of assistance” normally operated by government entities – and are valued by government not for their cultural work, but for their capacity to tackle problems such as homelessness, racism, youth alienation, etc. Within this paradox, we see how the act of integrating cultural agendas with social, economic and ecological ones can have far-reaching effects – not least of which is a re-positioning of culture as means by which to achieve particular outcomes that are of benefit to government (Yudice, 2011; Burman, 2005). Such a re-positioning may or, more likely, may not acknowledge culture’s intrinsic value.

Other forms of Municipal Support

It should also be noted that the City, in addition to its grants program, provides support to cultural groups in the form of capital/facilities infrastructure. This support comes

through an array of infrastructure venues, and is tailored to each cultural group's needs. Jeremy Stewart, General Manager of Prince George Symphony Orchestra (at time of interview), provides an example of the multifarious ways in which this facilities support occurs for the PGSO:

So we mainly rent our facilities of all kinds from the municipality... effectively they're subsidizing because their market is not competitive. Like we have here an office that we rent year-round, utilities included, and it's like probably pushing 20,000 sq feet, and we rent it for \$7,000 a year... so that's not reflective of market, it's way below. Our rehearsals are done at uh, well this is actually, this is a school district property, the uh Duchess Park Secondary ... but the PG Playhouse is the primary playhouse we use and it's very cheap, our per-seat cost is very low, we can use the space for \$400 , it's a 300-seat room. ... still it's effectively subsidized...(personal communication, April 20, 2016).

In addition to its grants program, then, the City supports cultural groups through the provision of cultural infrastructure at a subsidized rate. This subsidization is difficult to quantify, as it occurs in different forms and is tailored to particular organizations' needs.

Insights from Interviews

To explore the various ways that funded cultural organizations perceive the City's social/cultural program, interviews were conducted with the Prince George Symphony Orchestra, Theatre Northwest and Studio 2880/Prince George and District Community Arts Council. Each of these cultural groups is funded for a 3-year contribution under the City's myPG program. Key insights emerging from these conversations are as follows:

1. City / Cultural Group relationships are key

Both Jeremy Stewart (Prince George Symphony Orchestra) and Jack Grinhaus (Artistic Director, Theatre Northwest) expressed satisfaction with their relationship with Doug Hofestede as their key City of PG cultural contact. Jeremy referred to Doug as a "champion... not just of us but of culture overall in PG"; Jack spoke to Doug's work in helping Theatre Northwest navigate the complex mechanics of City Hall.

2. Rationale for Funding is Unclear

Notwithstanding this positive relationship, all three groups spoke to difficulties they've had in navigating the current cultural/social funding system within the City. Jack from Theatre Northwest points to a kind of 'economic essentialism' within the City's core

culture – one that appears to trump even the ‘social focus’ articulated by Doug in relation to the myPG funding program:

They haven’t quite figured it out I think how to do the artistic funding and what does that mean – and in a city like this that’s built on being a bit of a steel town, sports town, where people think that potholes are more important than art –and you have to be able to combat that reality – but we do bring in between 15,000 and 20,000 people per year. And our argument to the city is the return on investment – they give us \$113,000, we’re bringing in a million dollars to this city every year – you know, it’s a tenth of what’s returning. So for me that’s the argument I’ve provided... (J. Grinhaus, personal communication, April 22, 2016).

[S.K.] It’s leverage

Yeah. So that’s the argument. So there’s the leverage argument, then there’s the return on investment. Because then you see neither of those have anything to do with art. That’s the problem. Again, when it comes to most councils and in any segment, people have less concerns about the artistic reality or component – I could be doing one of the most important innovative plays in history and it won’t change anything in the eyes of the councillors (personal communication, April 22, 2016).

Here, then, the need to present an economic and social-benefit rationale to the City in justification for funding is seen to overshadow, or downplay, the artistic and cultural significance of the work being accomplished.

While for Theatre Northwest the economic and social measurements are seen to trump artistic/cultural rationales, Studio 2880/Prince George and District Community Arts Council sees municipal decisions around cultural funding as being made through an entirely different set of criteria – involving historical back-room agreements. Wendy Young, Director (at time of interview) articulates this perception as follows:

So the previous city councilors tried to say that there was a formula in-place. And I said – what’s the formula please, I’m trying to figure out, and they said it’s based on the bottom-line. I said it can’t be, because our bottom line is bigger than both [of the other funded cultural] organizations... so it can’t be based on the bottom line, and they went back and said – okay you’re right there isn’t a formula. And I said okay so how has this been decided? I said I think it’s been back-room agreements up till now. I said that’s gone to the wayside I said there needs to be a transparent, rational formula for all of the organizations in town, that’s what’s fair, and it should be based on the values of the organization, and the value of the organization in speaking about the community (W. Young, personal communication, April 21, 2016).

Wendy makes the case that a strategic planning process is needed for the City to determine both the value of the work it is looking to support as part of its municipal culture, and the values underlying that work. While historically funding may have been allotted through processes involving relationships, networks, lobbying, etc., she makes the case that a more coherent policy/planning framework is now needed.

Such a process, however, is seen by some as a distant prospect. Jeremy at Prince George Symphony Orchestra has not seen evidence of any type of strategic planning consultation in his time as Director of this organization:

As far as cultural policy at the municipal level, you know, we have um, we have regular direct and indirect contact with, you know, with members of council and mayor, and those conversations are not necessarily the kind of policy conversations that you'd have with a bureaucrat. The main city staff person that we deal with is Doug Hoffstede...and it tends to be pretty general, it's not really the kind of thing where he's saying okay I'm doing a policy consultation, so there have been a couple of city consultation processes that were opened to the general public that we've had tangential participation in, but not invited participation, I'm thinking of Talktober, the myPG process, you know, and it's just something that we haven't been very involved in. They certainly have not asked us any questions about cultural policy during my time as the manager, in any respect (personal communication, April 20, 2016).

Here, then, we see a perceived absence of policy planning conversations, as well as of a coherent rationale for the disbursement of municipal cultural funds. This absence, it should be said, may be diminished as the City undertakes in 2018 a cultural mapping process intended to lead towards the creation of a cultural strategic plan.

3. Cultural and social agenda combination presents a key tension

Following from the move to amalgamate the social and cultural grants, a key line of inquiry in the interview process asked whether funded groups felt the need to accomplish dramatic shifts to their mandate and/or purpose so as to comply with a 'social' as well as 'cultural' agenda and mandate as laid out by the City.

The Studio 2880/Prince George and District Arts Council, for one, claims to be well-positioned to work in this 'in-between' space – having launched a number of programs in recent years that combine culture and social services:

We've got the arts and health stream I was telling you about, and right now we're building a project that is an 8-week module, and the first one is

going to be graphic novels, we're going to be working with youth in custody, and an artist who's familiar with graphic novels, and they're going to do an 8-week module, 8 sessions, 2 hrs per week, and the students that are going to participate get to re-write their story. They get to re-write the endings of their stories. So social justice. (W. Young, personal communication, April 21, 2016).

While Studio 2880 appears as particularly well-positioned to 'bridge' the worlds of contemporary art and community/social development, this bridging is also being accomplished by the professional funded arts organizations – Prince George Symphony Orchestra and Theatre Northwest. While acknowledging the social agenda as a value separate from artistic excellence, the Prince George Symphony Orchestra nonetheless embraces social engagement as a key piece of its mandate:

Our report [to the City] always includes a social impact dimension, and I think that is part of being northern or regional in nature, or I've had the impression of that's the heavy lifting you need to do – something along the lines of, well we're not VSO [Vancouver Symphony Orchestra], so we also need to be part of this other thing, and serve in this other dimension

[S.K.] And is that core to your mandate?

Yeah, I mean, you know I would say that it's core to our mandate because the development of musical culture is something that we definitely talk about.... we can't really choose to sacrifice artistic excellence for any other value, because that is that's why we're a professional orchestra. But it is not the only value and actually building musical culture does develop artistic excellence so in that way, I guess by orienting those values with respect to each other, um, correctly, then yeah – it is core to what we do (J. Stewart, personal communication, April 20, 2016).

Jeremy observes, as well, that the City of Prince George's focus on a social funding agenda sits as a counterpoint to the mandates held by both BC Arts Council and Canada Council for the Arts – both of which place primary focus on artistic excellence as a defining criteria and value:

[the social agenda] doesn't have to be detrimental as long as its recognized that professional arts organizations are funded by other levels of government because of their commitment to artistic excellence. So the BC Arts Council is not evaluating our social contribution and they're not interested. Well I mean, this is another topic, BCAC has told me that we essentially exist to provide employment for Vancouver's freelance musicians. That's .. I mean, that was what our program officer said to me, I wouldn't want to misrepresent what she said, but those were the words that she used. So I thought that was amazing. But that's I mean, I think that from their point of view that's what regional orchestras do in

general...Canada Council doesn't see it that way, but at the same time, if they thought that we were failing on the artistic excellence axis, what would be happening on the social axis would not interest them (personal communication, April 20, 2016).

Within the standard cultural funding triad, then (Federal, Provincial and Municipal), the case is made that the municipal funder – as the entity observing cultural organizations' activities on 'ground-level', is rightfully more concerned with social engagement and public impact than the funders on provincial and national levels. Federal and Provincial funders, in turn, take on the role (via provincially and nationally-selected peer review juries, etc.), to evaluate artistic excellence in an area where municipal funders commonly lack evaluative capacity.

The social justification incited by the City's amalgamation of cultural and social portfolios does not appear as a stretch, then, for either of the two professional arts organizations. Jack (Theatre Northwest) shows how his communication to the City can be easily shifted to focus on the organization's actuation of such a mandate:

I think, for next year... we're going to be arguing quite a bit about community engagement. The idea of going out to these rural areas and helping to develop programs with youth... the fact that we're bringing in shows now for young people...the fact that we're engaging the First Nations community by doing a play called *Dreary & Izzy* which is about fetal alcohol syndrome in the First Nations community – and we had a huge turn-out of people who had never been in this theatre in their lives and finally are hearing their stories told to them. In a city where 15% of the population is First Nations. So why wouldn't we be servicing them. So I think with some of those arguments too about how we're contributing to the community...– I think will help bolster our municipal [funding]– though I don't know (J. Grinhaus, personal communication, April 22, 2016).

This focus on 'social benefit' is not seen by Jack to put the company at odds with its focus on risk-taking and artistic excellence (at least not more than the reality of doing this kind of work in a remote, conservative, location):

I know all the shows I've been doing since I've arrived have really freaked people out, but also I've brought in a completely new audience. And at the same time I'm not doing things that are so off the map – sort of avant-garde naked people crawling over the audience – which is a show I saw in Toronto a few years ago – which shocked even that audience (personal communication, April 22, 2016).

Here, then, we see that the professional cultural groups negotiate their entrance into a matrix defined by a combined social/cultural framework. The need imposed by this

'amalgamation' to articulate their community benefit in a social light is not seen as causing undue impediments to their risk-taking abilities, and is not seen to cause misalignment with their core mandates and missions.

Having said this, it is important to note that while working within the system that has been established, some groups hold out hope for a localized grants system that places value on artistic excellence as a key driving force. Jack Grinhaus, in particular, makes this case when asked about his recommendation for revamping the current funding system:

My recommendation would be to collapse it completely and vie for a federal arms-length branch of the Prince George Arts Council. Not the community arts council... but the Prince George Arts Council – to then be given a certain amount of money per year they can dole out based on applications – professionally written applications – that can dole out the money. Maybe be given \$400,000-\$500,000 a year from the federal government, and then they administer that money outward based on the application needs. Because I don't think people know what they're doing otherwise.

[S.K.] So in that situation you have experts at the helm

That's what I mean. You have officers – dance officers, film officers, visual arts officers, and I know that we wouldn't be able to have such a large organization – but at least the Executive Director would likely have come from a background of arts – arts administration – some form of understanding. Right now I really don't like this idea of having to go and beg and plead for people who don't get what you do. Then the only argument I have is – well, we're bringing back this much money, right? And I mean, it makes very little sense to me – you know,

[S.K.] You can't talk about the real work you do

You can't talk about the real work we do and the context of what it actually does to a community. You know, if you don't get it, you don't get it. And I can't explain that to you, I have to then become scientific and mathematical – which is not what art is based on – not in that way. We're talking about the soul and the heart and the brain, and humanity and growth and love, and the things that – they aren't expressible and so, uh, it does concern me (personal communication, April 22, 2016).

Within these comments, we see evidence of an organization that, while agreeing to work within the mould and paradigm presented via the cultural/social grants framework, recognizes that the system itself is compromised; and that a wholly different system is needed in order to place value on the core artistic work being accomplished.

4. Relationship with Golden Raven is seen to require a strategic re-think

A final key theme that emerged in the city-funded organization interview process involves the relationship between the City's Community Services division, and the Cultural Services arm of the Regional District of Fraser Fort-George – embodied in the funding / marketing program called 'Golden Raven'.

Details surrounding the history and rationale for this program will be outlined in the subsequent section, however it is important here to note that two of the three City-funded groups interviewed (Prince George Symphony Orchestra and Studio 2880) expressed discontent with their lack of ability to access this program – either via grant funding or via the marketing program that promotes the Golden Raven institutions and 'brand'. This discussion brings to light a divide within the community that has been propagated, apparently, through the closure of access-points to a major cultural funding pot. This divide is seen by some organizations to wreak havoc on a community pursuing a cultural sustainability agenda, in that it propels an inequality within the sector, and dampens efforts to pull together resources and collaborative energies towards the making of a commonly shared cultural future.

6.5.3. Summary

The City of Prince George put forward, in its 2010 ICSP and 2012 OCP, a strong vision of culture's leadership role within a sustainability framework. In spite of this move, the City has yet to make good on this rhetoric via financial investment or a cultural plan (though a cultural plan may be shortly forthcoming); it did, however, take the step of amalgamating social and cultural grants – a move that was not (contrary to logical assumption) seen to place funded groups into misalignment with their mandates.

Stresses within the system are arising, however, from: the building of silos via the establishment of unbalanced access to funding pots; a perceived lack of strategic direction for the cultural sector on the municipal level; a perceived lack of understanding of the cultural sector on the municipal level (notably represented in the 'economic essentialist' logic embodied within Mayor and Council); and the inability of cultural groups to communicate, within this system's logic, their core values – particularly artistic values.

6.6. Regional District of Fraser Fort-George

Within the Prince George cultural policy and funding landscape, the City of Prince George is one of two key cultural development partners – the other being the Regional District of Fraser Fort-George (RDFFG). While throughout B.C. Regional Districts support cultural agendas in various ways, within the three cities examined as part of this study, the RDFFG's role is unique – it is the only Regional District to play a major developmental role in cultural funding and planning.

6.6.1. Financial Context

Compared to the \$420,000 allocated by the City of Prince George towards cultural/social grants in 2016, the RDFFG allocated, in 2016, \$1,758,000 in organizational cultural funding (the RDFFG refers to this funding as 'service agreements' rather than 'grants') – of which \$1,430,000 was allocated to the Prince George-Centred organizations – Exploration Place, Two Rivers Gallery and the Central BC Railway and Forestry Museum (funding breakdown separated by organization in RDFFG 2016 Annual Cultural Report; tallied by author). These numbers are significant, in that the RDFFG's Prince George cultural contribution is more than triple in size the cultural/social funding pot managed by the City.

Eight groups are funded by the RDFFG – and are collectively referred to as the Golden Raven. This includes 3 Prince George-based organizations (those mentioned above), as well as 5 regionally-based groups (ie: museums, galleries, etc. located in small population centres throughout the district). Two additional groups from outside the region have, since the program's inception, been bought into the marketing segment of the Golden Raven program, and despite being unfunded by the RDFFG, are promoted as part of the 'Golden Raven' circle on a pay-to-play basis. While I could find no specified criteria for program eligibility, it is notable that all of the groups funded through the Golden Raven are either museums/heritage sites or galleries; no performing arts groups are included. Furthermore, the criteria that each of the funded groups, and particularly the large Prince George-based groups, in some way provides a 'regional service' (ie: conduct activities in communities throughout the region and not only in their own municipalities) appears to be an unwritten funding criteria.

The RDFFG supports the Golden Raven circle through various mechanisms in addition to the provision of 'service agreements'. The organization owns some of the buildings that house funded cultural organizations. It has developed an endowment fund to assist with unexpected and/or emergency costs borne by the funded organizations. It also plays a role in coordinating the sharing of services, resources and knowledge between funded groups (via a full-time Cultural Coordinator), and manages a \$75,000+ marketing fund designed to raise awareness around, and to profile, the groups funded as part of this circle (RDFFG, 2017).

6.6.2. Cultural Plan - Vision and Goals (Golden Raven)

The RDFFG funding matrix was established in 2006 through a process of political lobbying and strategic planning. Within this process, a vision for the program was put forward in its Cultural Strategic Plan that outlines the Plan's formal intent and purpose:

Vision Statement

1. The RDFFG is recognized locally, provincially and nationally for the high quality and diversity of its cultural offerings.
2. Residents in large numbers attend the events and facilities and are active in telling visitors to the region about the cultural activities offered throughout the RDFFG.
3. Both domestic and international cultural tourists have put the RDFFG on their lists of places to visit, creating significant positive economic impact within the RDFFG
4. The cultural institutions and events are experiencing sustained growth due to cultural groups working together collaboratively and cooperatively in planning and developing institutions and events
5. The cultural vibrancy of the region has resulted in new businesses locating in the RDFFG and existing businesses and institutions are able to attract a qualified work force (Miller Dickinson Blais, 2015, p.16-17).

6.6.3. Definition of Culture

A few key points can be made in relation to this vision. First, the vision includes an explicit aim towards 'quality' – the idea being that the Golden Raven brand carries with it a kind of 'gold-star' standard as related to the quality of cultural offerings. This notion is reflected by Colleen Van Mook who, while in her interview was speaking as Executive

Director of Downtown Prince George (Business Association), harkened back to her time as a municipal (City of Prince George) employee involved in the creation of the Golden Raven brand and concept:

when it [the Golden Raven concept] was sold to us, it was like – if you could meet these standards, or you were part of this program, they called it the ‘red chair’... then there would be this branding where, by knowing that I had the ‘Golden Raven’ as my [brand]– that I could use that logo. It meant that I had achieved some kind of status – in terms of cultural delivery. That’s how I understood it... I don’t know maybe it never went that way. ... what you would do to sell tourism is that you could kind-of – you’d ... have a map of all of these golden raven locations (personal communication, April 20, 2016).

This focus on quality (and on tourism), as we will see later in the funded organizations’ response to the plan, is one that has become problematic –some of the minimally-funded groups within the Golden Raven circle have struggled to keep their doors open, let alone accomplish rigorous curatorial/museological standards.

A second key focus articulated in this vision pertains to culture’s role as an attractant of tourism and economic development. Points 2, 3 and 5 of the Vision speak to culture’s role in bolstering tourism, and increasing the desirability of place so as to increase its investment and labour-attracting potential. The RDFFG-developed cultural plans springing from this vision (including plans produced in 2006, 2011 and 2016) go so far as to advocate a ‘regional story’ be created so as to further bolster tourism by bringing all of the groups together under a unifying thematic – such that each group’s story would be positioned in relation to those of the others (Millier Dickinson Blais, 2015). This focus on tourism, and on the development of a tourism-friendly story is again, as we will again see in our examination of responses to this policy, controversial.

A final dimension worth noting is the intent, embedded within this vision statement, to engender collaboration and participation between RDFFG-funded groups. For some, this focus on collaboration was seen as the key impetus for the program’s development. Tracy Calogheros, Chief Executive Officer of the Exploration Place, gives this account of the program’s start-up:

Well, I was involved in crafting the initial idea. Because the Regional District was funding all of us independently, and every year you’d go and so it became adversarial – all of these other organizations that we should be working together with were all competing for the same dollars. And we were very successful at it, but I never felt that it was really helping the

other sites. So we had started, back in the 90's, we had started providing this function of support for our brothers and sisters out in the region – but it was getting that the demands on my staff time was so high that I couldn't continue to do the work that they needed but I know those organizations couldn't make it on their own. So I went to the Regional District with the help of one of my board members at the time, and we just basically laid it out on the table for them. This is costing Exploration Place x number of dollars, we can't afford to subsidize this anymore, we need to find efficiencies, we need to find ways to work together. So the primary thrust was to develop a curatorial program that would be region-wide and that would drive all the various institutions' collecting policies. I wasn't thinking art at the beginning, I was thinking heritage institutions. And, um, we wanted to be able to get multi-year funding so it wasn't going to be an annual trip to the well and hoping for the best, and it was also about finding ways to not have exploration place doing all the subsidizing for these other institutions. Basically what I said to them is – either you need to fund us to do that, or... you need to hire the person to do it. It needed a job – a full-time job, and that's Jeff [Cultural Coordinator] now. So my goal all along was either to get them to hire a cultural bureaucrat or give me the salary money to manage all of that outreach. They decided to keep it in-house – hire a staff-person themselves, and Jeff's job since then has been to sort-of steer that plan (personal communication, April 22, 2016).

Here, then, we are presented with a 'back-door' view of the Golden Raven's formation, which shows it arising out of a very practical need to connect and coordinate the activities of the RDFFG-funded groups. This collaborative agenda, while seen largely as successful when applied to those working within the Golden Raven circle, has come under fire – notably from organizations positioned outside the Golden Raven circle, whose lack of entry-prospects into RDFFG funding is seen as a major hurdle to effective collaboration within the sector.

The cultural plan that spearheaded the Golden Raven program, first produced in 2006, underwent a review process in 2011 and again in 2016. Throughout this time-period, a series of stated goals was achieved (one of which included the hiring of the Cultural Coordinator position). In spite of these shifts, it is worth noting that there have, since the program's inception, been no new groups added to the Golden Raven funding circle – nor has the funding of any of the existent groups been dramatically reduced or removed.

6.6.4. Insights from Interviews

Many of the RDFFG-funded groups interviewed expressed appreciation for the funding and services provided to them through the Golden Raven program: "I think that we're very lucky to have the regional district core funding and we know that, a lot of places

don't have that" (C. Holmes, personal communication, April 20, 2016). This said, there also exists a line of critique (both from within and outside of this group) that observes the program as failing to meet its potential. Key ways in which the program is seen to fail are summarized under the following headings: quality control, tourism/economic draw and collaborative potential.

1. Quality control is a challenge for the funder

As a function of the Regional District, the Golden Raven program distributes funds on a regional basis – funding is (loosely) distributed out to the various centres based on population size. This distributive reality makes for a difficult and politically charged situation in that the distributive aims of the program tend to take precedence over quality-related aims. Tracy Calogheros (Exploration Place) shows how this tension plays out within the local political landscape:

So the [Regional District] directors sit around a table, and the way I understand it is, you know, if McBride's getting \$30,000 for their museum, then Mackenzie is going to get \$30,000 too. And it's really more about that. They're not looking at it going, gee, I think this one's doing a lousy job we'd better cut them, and this one's doing wonderful work.

I have said all along that the regional district has the stick. It has the money. If there are [funded organizations] not doing what needs to be done in terms of meeting mission, mandate and performance, they shouldn't be funded. Try to tell that to the politician who's trying to get elected in this small community is the issue (personal communication, April 22, 2016).

Here, then, we have a situation where the redistributive mandate of the RDFFG comes into direct conflict with one of the key visions of the program – to represent a quality standard. This reality has resulted in a program that is essentially 'frozen' in its scope and reach – one in which the management manoeuvrability of RDFFG staff is significantly compromised. With no appetite for new funding coming from the RDFFG Board, the program continues on, and has done so essentially in static form, for over 10 years. As Cultural Coordinator Jeff Elder notes:

the pie is only so big. I really think that it was sort of happenstance – the organizations that were already being funded were the organizations that continued to be funded – and because there's been no interest or change in that envelope, there's been no ability to expand that (personal communication, April 19, 2016).

The biggest drawback to this model is, it seems, the inability to monitor and/or hold organizations accountable for standards of performance. Tracy believes this lack of accountability leads to a system that provides less than adequate value for taxpayer dollars:

So when I'm performing my function at the Canadian Association of Science Centres or with the BC Museums Association, there are organizations that really should fail. They should be allowed to close up shop, their collections should be transferred – we don't need to have 42 Whistle Stops run by mom and pops with cork boots in them – we just don't, and I have always said that. Why take – if you have 100 bucks, why split it up amongst 100 organizations so no one can really do anything well. Concentrate that money in areas of performance, in areas of excellence, and make a difference with the money you've got (T. Calogheros, personal communication, April 22, 2016).

Yet while it is apparent that quality control is lacking, Jeff makes the point that, for the money provided to many of the smaller groups (which equates to barely enough to keep the doors open), measures of quality should be determined within the context of a larger set of operating parameters that account for a community's size and cultural development prospects:

most of the sites are just hoping that they can continue and you know, you must know that each year, oh my god I made it through another one, I think it's really like that, they're not sitting back resting on their laurels

[S.K.] It just takes all your energy to stay alive, right?

That's it exactly. We only give them just enough, and there's Tracy sitting there, she needs a new chiller or HVAC system, and the building's got problems, and I mean they don't make a lot of money, they do it because they love it... and the turn-over, the staff turn-over is fairly high in some cases...(J. Elder, personal communication, April 19, 2016).

Compounding these issues is the fact that recognized/standardized performance measurements vary significantly between museums and galleries, and also between community galleries and professional contemporary galleries. Tracy, for one, believes that the cultural and heritage domains are sufficiently distinct to have separate performance standards articulated for each:

So I'm feeling like trying to fit the visual arts into the heritage function – while I see the value and the role all the visual arts play – its like it needs its own function – and so maybe the solution is to take the heritage group with what their funding is as one pool, and then you have a visual arts group with– with what their funding is as a separate pool, and then you

could start to think about – well why fund visual arts, why fund heritage- there are different reasons to fund both – some are cross –over, but there are different reasons. And then within the heritage function you have a very clearly-defined parameter. If you're a collecting institution and you're dealing with history and heritage – whether it's natural history or human history, you fit within this function. But it eliminates the debate around the Symphony and the Theatre. Then when you're talking about a visual art function, okay this is visual arts, it would probably include performing arts, but they would have to create their own defined function. You look at BC Arts Council and that's how they do it – they have separate functions for visual arts and heritage (T. Calogheros, personal communication, April 19, 2016).

Recognizing these complexities, Tracy nonetheless advocates for progress to be made in an agenda focused on quality control – acknowledging that political outfall that will likely ensue:

I think the discussion could certainly happen. I think it would be very politically disruptive. But that's never stopped me. You want ultimately... our job always is, to give tax payer best value for their dollar. So for that 40 odd percent of what I'm bringing in in Regional District dollars, I need to deliver the best possible product along with the contemporary interests of culture and society (personal communication, April 19, 2016).

Here, then, we have a call for the Regional District to enter into a complex and politically-charged conversation about the ways in which culture is evaluated, and in which performance measures are set. The District's reluctance to date to have this conversation has resulted, according to Tracy, in bureaucratic complacency– whereby groups are becoming 'settled' in their receipt of funding. Through this complacency and lack of performance assessment, a disservice is being done:

it's like we're all mired in middle management. And – Jesus, it's the whole reason I'm in arts and culture is because I can't stomach that. And it's this bland, white-bread kind of here's your money, go do your thing... (personal communication, April 19, 2016).

Engaging head-on with this political quagmire is, in Tracy's view, the way to break through to a new hope and future for the program – moving into a more productive relationship where performance and excellence, within a cultural ecology, matters.

2. Should tourism persist as a key objective?

A second key area of the Golden Raven program identified by interviewees as failing to meet its potential involves its positioning of culture as a driver of tourism. This agenda is evident in the vision of the program which places strong emphasis on cultural tourism. It

is also evident in the RDFFG cultural planning strategies in which cultural tourism constitutes a key strategic goal. And it is evident in the operational parameters of the Golden Raven program – within, for instance, the \$75,000+ allotted to on-the-ground marketing initiatives aimed to build the cultural tourism prospects of these groups.

While some Golden Raven groups are well-positioned to attract and develop cultural tourism (particularly the smaller, more remote groups), other groups are not. Two Rivers Gallery, the second-highest funded Golden Raven site, makes it clear that cultural tourism is a sub-section of its work, rather than a driving motive and objective:

[S.K.] within the economic section [of the cultural strategic plan] there's a huge focus on tourism and attracting tourism to these places. And it seems to me that that's the dominant lens that the program is being fashioned through, or the rationale by which its being justified.

Well perhaps. For us that doesn't mean that much. I mean, for us it's the funding and the serving our Prince George customers and our regional clients. We'd love to get more tourists in, but it's not a huge thing (C. Holmes, personal communication, April 20, 2016).

Likewise, Exploration Place, the highest-funded Golden Raven -site, shows the program's focus on tourism attraction as not core to its own outreach activities: "it's not to say that you don't recognize tourism as a part of the rationale, but it's what's at the core of that rationale" (T. Calogheros, 2016).

Building on these points, Rob Budde, local poet and UNBC English Professor, puts forward the notion that cultural tourism doesn't, in fact, 'make sense' within the ecology of Prince George:

I don't think a tourist from let's say the lower mainland is going to come to an arts event – come to Prince George for an arts event – that doesn't make any sense whatsoever, right? They're going to come for... lakes, you know, they're going to come for mountains, they're going to come for fishing – they're going to come for other things. So my approach has always been to gear arts event towards the health of the community, right? (personal communication, April 20, 2016).

The fact that neither of the two highest-funded RDFFG Golden Raven sites places a core priority as cultural tourism is significant, and begs the question – why is cultural tourism so valued within the RDFFG's planning and visioning documents?

One of the surprises I encountered in the interview process is the notion that the cultural tourism framework was not endogenous to the Golden Raven's original intent and purpose; but was added onto the program as a way to boost its 'saleability' to local politicians. Jeff Elder speaks to this history:

[S.K.] Reading though the plan, what I observe is – this is all about tourism, this is about catching the tourism dollar ... I'm not seeing a lot in the plan around marginalized communities engaging with culture, there's references here and there...

I think you're probably very right there. That's a very interesting viewpoint. I think maybe it comes from the political origins of this fellow Don Bassermann [former RDFFG Council Member who played a key role in spearheading the Golden Raven policy]...I have talked to him when I started this job and he gave me some of his ideas, but – politicians do think that way. And in the North, well it is everywhere, but again with, I think, if you think that 2008 was the economic downturn, that's when this started... and sometimes it's a way to say –just my top of my head – justifying culture. It's like... oh my god our mill closed, and you want me to spend how much on a museum? I think a lot of people do have trouble getting their heads around that just as they might funding an art gallery or a symphony... so we always try to tell that story, but you're right it probably does have that focus, even though the Art Gallery and there are others, do an amazing job working with people with health issues, and/or the smaller sites, like Whistle Stop, get a grant to work with seniors, and capture some of those memories...but yeah, you're right, the Cultural Plan... maybe it's again this concern that we've gotta get the Board to approve this again, it's a big chunk of cash, and you can't just have the warm and fuzzies, which is a terrible way, because I know what you mean, that without culture, yeah, what would we have, you know? (personal communication, April 19, 2016).

Here, then, we see the focus on cultural tourism as arising as a mechanism to pitch the funding demanded by the program to a political audience – in such a way that the 'return on investment' is made clear. This apparent need to bolster the program's investment logic echoes the same observation put forward by Jack Grinhaus earlier in relation to his need to use economic arguments to sell Theatre Northwest's benefit to local politicians.

Tracy Calogheros, on the other hand, cautions against highlighting such an argument to the detriment of arguments focusing on social/cultural benefit and development:

I think people sell politicians short... They're getting into politics because they want to help their communities, they want to grow their communities, so they're already thinking about more than just new dollars in. New dollars in are attractive – so those tourist dollars are great. And if you've

got a great functioning museum or art gallery – yeah you're going to stop those people... (personal communication, April 22, 2016).

Here, then, a key question arises— given the fact that cultural tourism is not front-and-centre in the activities accomplished by either Exploration Place or Two Rivers Gallery - is cultural tourism the appropriate frame for the Golden Raven program? Does this concept adequately represent the program's primary drive and rationale, and its intended purpose? Or does the predominance of the cultural tourism agenda detract from a discussion on the deeper values held by these groups, and a more accurate understanding of the ways in which they interact with their communities?

3. Collaborative energies are stifled by cultural funding silos

A third key critique of the Golden Raven program brought forward in the interview process - one already highlighted to some extent in the Municipal funding section - uncovers its propensity to starkly divide a small cultural community by way of funding exclusion.

It must be noted that there are many factors to consider when making a comparison between cultural funders such as the RDFFG and City of PG – including such factors as the funding subsidies provided to organizations renting/leasing space, the value of marketing and coordination dollars allocated to a given program, etc. Without getting into these details (a process that would require in-depth consultation and definition of terms with both funding institutions at the table), we can nonetheless observe that when it comes to multi-year operating funding for cultural groups, the RDFFG groups receive higher funding than those funded by the City (see Table 2)

Table 2

2016 Operating Grant Allocations to key funded cultural institutions: RDFFG & City of Prince George.

RDFFG Golden Raven	2016 Operating Allocation
Exploration Place	\$750,000
Two Rivers Gallery	\$490,000
Central B.C. Railway and Forestry Museum	\$190,000
City of Prince George	2016 Operating Allocation
Theatre Northwest	\$113,000
PGSO	\$58,000
PG Arts Council	\$43,800

Note: Data extracted from RDFFG, 2017 and City of Prince George, 2016

This distinction in funding has resulted in two of the City-funded groups (Prince George Symphony Orchestra and Studio 2880 / Prince George and District Community Arts Council) crying foul. Wendy Young (Arts Council) shows this discrepancy as creating barriers to effective collaboration:

If I had the keys to change that program, I would re-build their policy, and build a mechanism that would allow for other organizations to be brought in. right now there isn't. That's a locked door with the keys thrown away – is how the outsiders feel. It shouldn't be that. You're building silos where we don't need them. They should be taken down (W. Young, personal communication, April 21, 2016).

The Prince George Symphony Orchestra, as well, advocates for an opening of the Golden Raven fund – claiming that the work it does (and could do more of) is easily tailored to a regional audience:

The Symphony wants in, I know that the Community Arts Council wants in... because we feel like we are providing services that um that aren't available regionally except through us...But you know, we would absolutely welcome touring and if there were funds that... would even assist with that, and the rest, the difference, could be made up by our own operating budget... (J. Stewart, personal communication, April 20, 2016).

6.6.5. Summary

While the Golden Raven program has achieved successes in fostering collaboration and partnerships between RDFFG-funded groups, the stark line it draws between 'haves' and 'have-nots' within a small cultural ecosystem is notable. Given the emphasis Jon Hawkes places on collaboration and collective action within a cultural sustainability ecosystem, this lack of inclusivity is notable.

6.7. Critical Evaluation of Prince George Cultural Ecology

Up to this point we have examined the key funding infrastructures at play in the delivery of a cultural sustainability paradigm. We've seen the City of Prince George's rhetorical tributes to such a paradigm fall flat in terms of funding deliverables. We've seen a divisiveness within the cultural community – brought about in-part by lack of access to Regional District funding for some organizations. Furthermore the interviews have brought into question the tourism agenda driving much of the Regional District's cultural program.

Stepping back for a moment from our analysis of individual funding mechanisms, I now wish to draw attention to a key line of critique that pertains to the Prince George arts ecology as a whole.

This critique, expressed by Rob Budde (local poet and UNBC English Professor), brings to light the various ways in which power and colonial agendas are carried out through the Prince George arts sector. Budde advocates for stronger diversity to be represented in the city's cultural leadership circles, and for a thoughtful acknowledgment of the stories that have both shaped, and scarred, the community:

I do know I'll say this – if you look at let's say Exploration Place and Two Rivers Gallery and the PGSO, um, you can sort-of see, how to phrase this, number one – there is a lack of diversity I suppose inherent in those institutions, right? Both in terms of class and I would say race, right? Um,

and there are again there's gestures but in terms of – there's a very sort-of... how do I phrase this – it's hard because I appreciate those institutions, but you know, especially over the past while I've been becoming more and more aware of sort-of um, neo-colonial stances, right? And institutional um, models and..

[S.K.] Even though within two rivers there is extensive First Nations programming, and the Exploration Place houses a Lheidli T'enneh collection, you're talking about an over-arching feel or,

Yeah. In terms of the administration. I mean it's here [UNBC] too. I mean, and there's a lot of work to be done here, right?... in an institution like this is... European founded, right? And administrators are still formally older white males, right?

[S.K.] I guess you're pointing to a real question of the leadership as being fairly homogenous

Yeah, yeah. Yeah.

[S.K.] Even though the programming might incorporate or pay tribute or recognize diverse populations and views, the leadership –

Which is a positive thing. But there's only so much that a kind of tokenism can do in terms of changing an overall sort-of social/cultural landscape, right?... So there's things that are – I mean, just the awareness of the difference between you know, an art show in that environment with all its trappings and um, and you know, something like they're doing a lot of experiential courses out of the First Nations Studies Department here – so one of them was to build a pit-house on campus here. And there's one starting in a couple of weeks on moose-hide tanning. Now right there you have a kind of collision between culture and you know, is that art? You know, I would say yes, but just a different vision of art, right? Um, and certainly nothing – like a tanned moose hide – would ever appear in the Art Gallery – but how crucial is that, right? And the pit house is not going to be you know, be featured in an architecture class here but how important is that?

[S.K.] So you're running into these different definitions of art as an anthropological expression as a way of life – versus as an idea of excellence that is 'the best that humanity has to offer' – two definitions colliding on the programming level. ⁴

⁴ I realize (in retrospect) that the categorization of cultural practices such as moose hide tanning and pit-house construction as anthropologically motivated cultural forms is potentially problematic. Whether the practitioners engaged in this work would position their activities as a 'way of life', or as Arnoldian – 'the best mankind has to offer' (historically defined within a Western/Euro-centric lens), is an outstanding question. Indeed, my propensity to categorize these activities as anthropological and 'lived' shows, perhaps, my own bias as a researcher hailing from a western/Arnoldian tradition of cultural production. Perhaps I am, by making such a distinction, inadvertently reinforcing these categories, which are in real life less rigid and more complex, perhaps, than this binary allows.

Right, exactly. And, you know, one of the first things I talked about was that writers and storyteller festivals, right? And that collision coming there between, you know, the published First Nations author and the local Elder who's telling a traditional story. I can get funds easily with the writer with the book – hard to get funds for the Elder. Right? Really hard. I pretty much have to fund it myself and steal it from other things. It's not recognized – whereas the book publication, you know, Canada Council is – there are some ways in which it is starting to recognize storytelling, but it's a lot of hoops and a lot of convolutions.

[S.K.] So in terms of the way that that tension plays out in municipal policy for instance, if you could put forward a recommendation in terms of how to embrace or otherwise address that tension, on a policy level, what would you say?

Well, I mean, I would get someone like Jennifer Pighin (local First Nations cultural advocate) in more of a leadership role – so I would allocate... funds you know from this municipal body to projects – I would build a committee coming out of – let's say the Band Council – having to do with Lheidli T'enneh art and culture – a committee headed up by Jennifer Pighin – to then – because they would have the awareness – the cultural and historical awareness of what would be valuable for that community.

[S.K.] You're talking about first of all giving over some power

Yeah ...

[S.K.] And then with the power some resourcing of that leadership.

Yeah. And it just means you know, it's a bit like the way they – the First Nation – runs the experiential courses – like they have to deal with the –

While on one hand making this observation, I at the same time acknowledge a growing movement within contemporary Indigenous cultural production contexts (in Canada and beyond), in which Indigenous cultural producers symbolically dis-associate their work, developed through particular forms of cultural and ceremonial practice, from 'big C' categories of culture. "There is no word for 'art' in my language" is a phrase that has been coined by this movement to indicate "an Indigenous rejection of how Native arts are perceived in non-Native contexts such as museums, cultural centers, galleries, and scholarly texts – contexts that imbue fine arts with the Western values of individualism, commercialism, objectivism, and competition, as framed by an elitist point of reference" (Mithlo, 2012, p.113). This movement's categorical rejection of the term 'art' is seen by Mithlo as a refusal to be "co-opted into a more narrow definition of what is an intrinsically more holistic enterprise... [and therefore, as]... an effort toward self-determination" (p.113). Many Indigenous artists are, of course, producing art within museum and gallery frameworks – many are challenging commonly-held perceptions of 'art' within these contexts. Observes France Trépanier (n.d.): "Indigenous arts occupy the full spectrum of practice – sacred and ceremonial, customary and contemporary" (para.3). Still, however, there persists a movement that holds to the view that many Indigenous-led ceremonial and cultural practices "do not smoothly translate into the concept of art, as we know it from a European perspective" (para.3).

In acknowledging my own bias within this conversation, then, I also acknowledge a tension in which the binary of antropological/Arnoldian is at one and the same time inadequate to describe a complex landscape of cultural creative practice, and also fully appropriate in its description.

the institutional structure, like it has to be an accredited course, and it has to be graded and stuff like that – so how do you get an Elder to teach a course like that? Well what they do is they partner up an Elder with a faculty member – so the Elder's doing the teaching, and the faculty member handles all the bureaucracy, right? So the teaching can happen unburdened. So it's sort-of like that – giving the power to an Elder – the Elder society – committee you know, sub-committee of the Band Council, um, but giving them power to assess things.

[S.K.] you're kind of tapping into the question – if you really want to engage First Nations Populations – do you really want to go there, because there is a cost to you – which is the forfeiting of control and power...

Right, yeah. I don't know – I know there's some really good people on our City Council right now – Jillian Merrick I really like her awareness – and Kohler – and I think they have good sensibilities, um, I think there has to be structural change, not just the kind of superficial gestures – which are a beginning I suppose. You have to start somewhere. So I guess that's a start, but... yeah.

[S.K.] Something that struck me when I was in the meeting with the Golden Raven circle - the group wants to come up with a cohesive story that binds their organizations together – that then acts as a tourism draw. And so they've agreed to strike a committee to develop this story to then bring back to the group.... The process itself um, I was surprised with, because what is storytelling and who has the right to tell that story, and ... how is it developed - with or without consultation – because this is a sacred trust – I mean, telling stories is a sacred trust

And a cohesive story – right there – that's so... loaded. Like – so, is a cohesive story – is it going to talk about, you know, the Lheidli Village being burned out – is that going to be part of the story? It's not a happy story,

[S.K.]...To try and define a central theme like creativity or resilience or something like this that they can hinge – or having prince George as a transportation centre. It just – yeah – it strikes me that what we're talking about is deep engagement – and then how do you connect those cultural institutions deeply with issues that matter in this community – rather than superficially – through a tourism agenda.

You can't – not with a tourism agenda. Because – I mean, a deep sort-of awareness of the story of this place, this land, right, would involve things that aren't very tourist-friendly. Um, it would involve you know, transportation, it would involve industry, it would involve window dressing, the colonial story – that's what a touristy story would have to be. But is that good for this community? No. not at all. Not at all. (R. Budde, personal communication, April 22, 2016).

Several points are to be gleaned from this segment of the interview. First – Budde advocates for a form of self-reflexivity to be developed within the sector that looks critically at the power structures embedded within the system and paradigm. A critical examination of these structures might lead towards their re-working to the benefit of a more diverse cultural ecology. Second, Budde brings to light the potential of tourism as a destructive force within a community – one that can obscure real and pressing issues of relevance to a community. And third, this interview brings forward the need to re-think the diversity agendas embedded within many cultural institutions – with an aim to include diversity (and First Nations agendas, in particular) on a leadership level.

6.8. Conclusion

Prince George's two-tiered funding system, while a boon to some organizations, is seen by many to cause divisiveness within the cultural community – and to pose barriers to effective collaboration between groups. This reality, coupled with the City's lack of strategic direction (and additional funding) for the cultural sector, and the Regional District's over-emphasis on tourism as a driving rationale for cultural development, pose real hurdles to the enactment of a cultural sustainability agenda. Further contributing to these hurdles is the cultural system's failure to address its colonial history on a leadership level. If Prince George cultural leaders are serious about the pursuit of cultural sustainability, it appears that significant investments in time, planning and dialogue are needed in order to create the conditions by which such sustainability might occur.

This said, the City's amalgamation of social and cultural grants speaks also, perhaps, to an attempt to make culture 'count' within a wider community development agenda. Here, culture is integrated into a larger plan and purpose, and is encouraged to 'cross lines' (into social service domains) in order to ensure its relevance within and to this agenda.

While recognizing this positive potential, I am left, nonetheless, with a lingering question that asks whether the moves made by the City to integrate culture into social agendas have, in fact, had the effect (intentional or not) of re-shaping culture's collectively-understood value in such a way as to diminish its intrinsic worth, and to re-position it, rather, as a market resource.

Chapter 7. Findings: Kelowna, B.C.

7.1. Context

Kelowna, B.C., located on the traditional territory of the Syilx Nation, is currently British Columbia's 'fastest-growing city' – and the third largest metropolitan area in B.C (Duncan, 2017). The City's population base is just over 127,000 (Statistics Canada, 2016b); or over 150,000 if looking at the wider population centre (Statistics Canada, 2016c), and is located a 4-hour drive from Vancouver –close enough to this major urban metropolis to be impacted by Vancouver's cultural politics and direction, but far enough away so as to remain relatively distinct.

The tourism industry is a key economic driver in Kelowna – the city and area host numerous tourist attractions – in summer, boating, hiking, golf and biking are popular; skiing is a key activity in the winter at the nearby ski resorts; and wine production has become a staple of the economy with Kelowna boasting international recognition in this domain. Kelowna's tourism industry is estimated to attract 1.9 million visitors annually; produce 8,350 direct jobs; generate \$337 million in visitor spending and contribute \$1.25 billion in total economic output to the provincial economy (InterVISTAS, 2017, p.v, vi).

The University of British Columbia Okanagan campus was established in Kelowna in 2005 – assuming a research-intensive agenda. This institute would, adding to the academic activity within the existing Okanagan College, grow substantially throughout the coming decade, and contribute significantly to research and development within the Okanagan, as well as to employment opportunities in the City (University of British Columbia, 2013, p.3-4).

The City of Kelowna was developed as a colonial outpost around the turn of the century. During this time, land companies deliberately recruited immigrants to Kelowna that were: "middle and upper class, white British gentry" (L. Digby, personal communication, April 27, 2016). This intentional development continues to be manifest in the City's racial demographics – current statistics show the total population as 90% white (World Population Review, 2017). Baldwin, Cameron and Kobayashi (2011) make the case that "whiteness not only remains the organizing principle of the city but continues to be secured through reproductory politics of place such as targeted labour recruitment

programs” (p.130). These theorists claim that “whites enlist the support of non-whites to maintain Kelowna as a white space” (p.131) –systemically relegating visible minorities to ‘migrant worker’ jobs rather than inviting them to participate in the economy and community as permanent residents and citizens (p.131).

Another key trend that has impacted upon Kelowna’s development trajectory is the rise in age of its citizens. Throughout recent years, the City has become known as a retirement mecca – the number of its residents over the age of 65 now totals 22%, in comparison to the provincial average of 18% (Statistics Canada, 2016c). This demographic shift is, in part, due to Kelowna’s temperate climate being conceived as desirable by ageing baby boomers across the country - also to a widespread perception of the city as a retiree’s ‘playground’ – a place brimming with wineries, scenic landscapes, etc. Compounding this shift is, it seems, a lack (or perceived lack) of opportunities for young people, for whom the large urban centre with its multiple career and cultural offerings provides a logical location alternative: Says Lorna McParland of the Alternator Centre for Contemporary Art: “we have huge brain drain here. People – even if they go to university here – they disappear” (personal communication, April 29, 2016). This out-migration of young people presents, according to Lorna, some key challenges for cultural organizations – particularly those serving young demographics. While some interviewees point to a rise in the cost of housing in large urban centres (particularly Vancouver), and the increasing cultural and economic vibrancy of Kelowna as having an inverse impact on this trend (anecdotal evidence from various interviewees shows Kelowna to be gaining in desirability for young people), the narrative surrounding Kelowna as a retirement hot-spot persists.

7.2. Economic/Tourism Approach to Culture

Kelowna’s lack of diversity, coupled with the City’s rapid growth trajectory and technology and tourism drive are seen to pose key challenges to its identity, and also to engender an approach to culture in which creative class narratives play strongly. A report commissioned by the Central Okanagan Economic Development Commission (2018), positions Kelowna as a rapidly-growing, youthful, entrepreneurial centre. The report, *Kelowna and the Okanagan: Thriving on a National Level*, describes the area as “a hub for the tech industry” [and as a] “hotbed for those who enjoy local craft beer, food and wine, beaches and boats...”. It positions Kelowna as the “3rd largest census

metropolitan area in BC” and the “#1 entrepreneurial region in Canada” - in which are hosted “633 tech companies” producing “\$1.3 Billion” in annual tech economic impact”. This research is supported in an article by Fosset (2018), in which Kelowna is positioned as a city on the leading edge of Canadian tech innovation: “In recent years, the city of Kelowna has grown into a mighty purveyor of technology, becoming one of, if not *the* favoured place for all sorts of astounding companies and opportunities to appear”.

Interviewees coming from an economic/tourism development background reflect this narrative. Corie Griffiths, Director of the Central Okanagan Economic Development Commission, says:

in looking at some of the demographics that exist in this region, and the lack of diversity in this region – both by ethnicity as well as age, and interest, we really followed a lot of Richard Florida’s creative class thinking, and using that to create some of our initiatives in how to drive growth specific within the development of people in a community... we’re [now] back again looking at a labour shortage – and how do we attract people – how do we attract the mobile worker that can work anywhere? How do we attract location – independent entrepreneurs, as we kind of title them, and the existence of culture in the region is a big piece of that (personal communication, April 27, 2016).

From this viewpoint, culture is seen to harbour a kind of ‘magnetic pull’ – in its ability to draw particular kinds of knowledge-economy workers and entrepreneurs into the area.

Culture is also, from this same viewpoint, seen as a key driver of tourism – a mechanism by which to increase the city’s ‘cool’ factor. Nancy Cameron, CEO of Tourism Kelowna (at time of interview), observes the following:

for the young people who are involved in high-tech for instance, those – you know the streaming café and it’s kind of underground music scene and all of these cool little things that are happening around Kelowna – that’s lifestyle for them – it’s the same thing for tourists – they look for those kinds of activities, and for those kinds of secrets that kind of percolate the destination – they become the essence of the destination – so it’s very very similar – those kinds of offerings are important for tourists... when they get here that’s what fills out their experience and makes them surprised – they go ‘wow that’s such a cool place’ (personal communication, April 28, 2016).

Here, then, we see culture's role valued by Kelowna's tourism and economic development agencies for its propensity to attract creative class workers, and to thereby fuel Kelowna's growing economy.

7.3. Cultural Sector - Context

Cultural development has been enacted by the City of Kelowna through several phases. The 1990's and early 2000's saw a burst in cultural facilities development, with the City investing in key infrastructure projects – including facilities for the Okanagan Regional Library – Kelowna Branch (1996), the Kelowna Art Gallery (1996); and the Rotary Centre for the Arts (2002). These facilities were developed in a cluster downtown, alongside a cluster of cultural facilities that had been developed in the 1960's - Kelowna Community Theatre and Okanagan Heritage Museum (S. Kochan, personal communication, April 26, 2016).

As the Rotary Centre for the Arts was nearing completion in 2002, the city began to consider this cluster of cultural amenities a 'cultural district'. The impetus for this packaging occurred, in part, due to a growing realization by City leaders of the value and potential of 'cultural tourism'. At the time, the City had hired as its Manager of Arts Development, Steven Thorne – an individual with a background in cultural tourism whose work for the region would shine a strategic light on cultural tourism potentials. According to current Cultural Services Manager, Sandra Kochan:

Stephen has been very influential nationally in terms of bringing cultural tourism into the spotlight, and I think Stephen was able to really get the council of the day very interested in the concept of cultural tourism, and the idea that a centralized precinct would assist in driving cultural tourism (personal communication, April 26, 2016).

Not only did a focus on cultural tourism help to develop the concept of a cultural district (solidified through a Cultural District Plan released in 2000) – it also enabled the development of funding for festivals and events: “for the day it was pretty significant money... between 100,000 and 200,000 dollars... so that was used as seed money also to drive events that would feed cultural tourism (personal communication, April 26, 2016)”. Furthermore, the City had developed a public art program during this time that was also seen as a way to attract and retain cultural tourism. By the time the Rotary Centre for the Arts was completed in 2002, then, the City had engaged with a cultural

tourism rationale as a key focus, had created a cultural district plan and was rationalizing its cultural expenditures to a significant extent through a cultural tourism lens.

A shift occurred in the way in which the City rationalized its cultural investment when, in 2004 Sandra Kochan came into the role of Public Art Coordinator (later to transition into the role of Cultural Services Manager). Sandra's argument for cultural investment was tied to Hawkes' sustainability paradigm:

my work was really driven by what I was learning by Jon Hawkes, how culture was being positioned as a dimension of community sustainability, so I was trying to change the conversation about culture as a ... rather than having it perceived as a luxury you can add on once all the other work is done... to having it considered as a really vital part of community vibrancy, quality of life (personal communication, April 26, 2016).

Sandra's approach would focus cultural investment rationale on the benefits to be derived by locals rather than by tourists:

So cultural tourism was definitely on the radar through all the work that Stephen had done. It is reflected in the cultural plan, but in terms of a role for local government, it's not really our job to do tourism marketing... Our role is much more directly connected to the community itself. We are here to serve residents not visitors. I had to make that decision early on – although cultural tourism is an opportunity it's not going to be a main focus (personal communication, April 26, 2016).

Here we see expressed a commitment to a locally-based sustainability model in which culture is positioned as a key pillar.

Given the inherent tension that exists between sustainability and creative class models of cultural development (discussed in chapters 2-5), Sandra's turn towards the cultural sustainability paradigm within an organizational framework focused previously upon cultural tourism, and within a municipal services ecology that places value on class theory and positions culture as an important economic development driver, appears as somewhat radical. Sandra speaks to how this transition was seeded in the political minds of the day...

I remember one meeting and I think it was in 2005, in the Laurel Packinghouse, and members of Council were there, and spending some time talking to the group about culture as the fourth dimension of sustainability – totally based on Hawkes' work and I remember seeing heads nodding and light bulbs going around the table... that 'oh, this is another way to think about and look at what culture does in our

communities'. So it's not culture as economic development, it's not culture as tourism, it's culture as part of what makes a community great. I've met Jon Hawkes a number of times, I've done a lot of research into the work stimulated by him being done in New Zealand and Australia and I was really inspired by that, and it was a way to start a different kind of conversation here (personal communication, April 26, 2016).

From a birds-eye view, then, we see a major shift occurring in 2004 with the cultural tourism/creative class logic being surpassed (but not, it would seem, replaced) by a cultural sustainability logic within the Cultural Services Department of the City.

In what follows, I review some of the key goals and objectives outlined in both Kelowna's OCP and Cultural Plan – taking into consideration the ways in which the language and logic of cultural sustainability is, within each, expressed. I'll also look at the Cultural Services budget in 2012 (when the Cultural Plan was produced) and 2016, and make observations on how sustainability priorities have played out. Following this, I'll present the findings from my interviews with stakeholders in the cultural sector.

7.4. Cultural Planning

7.4.1. Official Community Plan

Kelowna's Official Community Plan was created in 2011, and reflects a broad vision for Kelowna from 2011 up until 2030. This plan places a focus on sustainability as a key goal – with the introduction identifying Hawkes' 4-pillar model of sustainability as a defining paradigm: "A sustainable city is designed to create the best balance between environmental protection, economic growth, social development and cultural vibrancy" (City of Kelowna, 2011, ch.1 p.3).

Notwithstanding the introduction's affirmation of culture's role within a sustainability agenda, very little within the plan speaks to culture's role as a force for sustainability. Instead, culture is positioned as a force for economic growth:

Culture plays a significant role in economic development since the creative economy is one of the key elements of a dynamic business environment. Cities can only thrive if they are able to attract a diversity of people. Cultural amenities can help attract people of all ages, educational backgrounds, ethnicities and walks of life to live in Kelowna – the achievement of which will be key to Kelowna's economic future" (City of Kelowna, Ch. 9, p.3)

Furthermore, the cultural goals identified in the plan reflect a kind of 'status-quo' positioning for culture; one that aims to maintain and develop cultural activity, but that does not show any particular relationship between culture and sustainability:

Objective 9.1 Provide public art & cultural opportunities

Policy 1 Public Art. Public art will be given priority in areas of high pedestrian use and/or vehicular travel, as advised by the Public Art Committee and/or City policy and plans

Policy 2 Public Art Fund. Contribute, from general taxation revenue, up to a maximum equal to 1% of the City's annual budget to maintain a Public Art Program. The public Art Fund is to be used to fund civic public art commissions, as well as to provide matching funds to encourage the provision of public art by the private sector within publicly accessible portions of developments.

Policy 3 Cultural District. Continue to develop and enhance the Kelowna Cultural District as a centre for arts and entertainment, and a catalyst for community cultural development through facility, project and operating grants, coordinated marketing and product development, and strategic planning for capital investment in existing and new supportive infrastructure.

Policy 4 Cultural Service Delivery. Support cultural service delivery in all areas of the city, particularly the downtown and other Urban Centres.

Policy 5 Financial Support. Continue to support community-based arts organizations through grants, incentives and other means.

Policy 6 Cultural Resource Management. Require cultural resource management to be integrated in the development and review of pertinent plans.

Objective 9.2 Identify and conserve heritage resources

Policy 1 Heritage Register. Ensure that the Heritage Register is updated on an ongoing basis to reflect the value of built, natural and human landscapes.

Policy 2 Heritage Resource Management. Require heritage resource management to be integrated in the development and review of pertinent plans.

Policy 3 Financial Support. Continue to support the conservation, rehabilitation, interpretation, operation and maintenance of heritage assets through grants, incentives and other means.

Policy 4 Conservation Areas. Development in the Abbott Street and Marshall Street Heritage Conservation Area... will be assessed...

(City of Kelowna, 2011, ch.1, p.4-5).

A reading of these goals yields some key insights. First – culture is not, other than through its existence, presumably, as a sustainable development force in its own right, tied to the concept of sustainability. Second - the plan appears to be more focused on maintaining culture as it currently exists rather than on proposing a new or modified role for culture within a sustainability context (Policies 1-6, for instance, speak to the maintenance/development of the sector; the policies do not suggest new approaches to cultural development congruent within sustainability principles or a sustainability paradigm). And finally – while the plan does not tie culture to sustainable development, it does pay tribute to a key ‘principle’ of sustainable development by mandating that cultural resource management become more integrated in the development and review of pertinent plans.

In attempting to understand the impact of the OCP within the City’s cultural development trajectory, I draw on my interview with James Moore – Long Range Policy Planning Manager with the City of Kelowna. When asked about the significance of the 4-pillar sustainability model as articulated in the plan, James says the following.

When the OCP was created... in 2011... sustainability was still the paradigm that everybody was working with. The lingo was all about the 4 pillars or the 3 pillars, or the 4-legged stool or whatever it is, and that’s what everybody was working with. So everybody in their OCPs at the time had to address... if you had a good OCP you had to address all 4 pillars (personal communication, April 25, 2016).

James goes on to say that the cultural sustainability concepts that took the planning world by storm in the years leading up to 2011, were to be replaced soon after with an alternate paradigm.

[the sustainability paradigm is] heading out. And I would definitely say that the focus across the board internationally, U.S., Canada and internationally about sustainability was at a peak when our last community plan was done. Now it’s moving into ‘resiliency’. That’s the new tag-word.

[S.K.] So ... can you summarize what the difference is between sustainability and resiliency?

...you would have to say ultimately they're inherently linked. In a lot of ways they're just different brands for some of the same stuff... sustainability came out of much more of an environmental ethic... resiliency comes out of an emergency management ethic. So it comes out of disaster relief and stuff like that - that's where the term resiliency first came from - how do you start building a community that can withstand natural disasters. So ... now it's been adapted to start thinking about much broader kinds of resiliency - how do you build a resilient community not just against natural disaster but change overall?

[S.K.] Globalization forces?

Yep. And that implies a major link to a sustainable community. Sustainability and resiliency are often linked. One could argue that if you're sustainable community where you're achieving your 4 pillars, you're probably well-positioned to be a resilient community. The change is that resiliency doesn't divide between the 4 pillars, it doesn't have the 4 pillars so expressly put in there, so culture for instance doesn't have its own pillar in resiliency (personal communication, April 25, 2016).⁵

The alleged shift away from the sustainability to a resiliency paradigm is interesting to note, and I wanted to understand it further:

[S.K.] Is culture in a resilient framework seen to be integral to the whole? Is there a more integrated sense of development than is the case in a sustainability paradigm? Or is culture kind of lost?

My gut is that, we're just getting into it, but my gut tells me it [culture] might get shuffled under, for things like transportation... and those kind of things

[S.K.] Because it's about emergency, it's about what do we do to survive, and culture is often seen as a peripheral...

But I think if you were going to ... there's no way in Kelowna that we will be moving forward with a concept of resiliency that doesn't involve culture. That might be a broader trend, but there's no commitment we're making to saying our city is going to be all about resiliency.

[S.K.] We're talking about broad trends, and I understand that.

I think you're right - the broader trend would probably I would argue that in what I've seen of the broader trends, culture is not an integral part of it [the resiliency paradigm]. It's mostly focused... I think I've seen some bits here and there, but it's much more focused on infrastructure and the built environment, energy, that kind of thing. You know, what's going to

⁵ James Moore references the concept of resilience within small city development contexts. There exists a full body of literature rooted in the concept of resilience as related to municipal development contexts. I was unable to take this literature up in this dissertation, but wish to acknowledge its existence.

happen when sea levels rise, or you're in draught, or technology changes, or those kind of things (personal communication, April 25, 2016).

Here, then, James positions the cultural sustainability focus evident within the Kelowna's 2011 OCP as reflective of the dominant municipal planning paradigm at the time. The pressure placed on planners to replicate particular norms and to reflect (if only rhetorically) particular paradigms may explain why the plan references sustainability principles in the introduction, but does not provide depth of engagement relating to culture and its sustainable development potential.

James' subsequent observation that the sustainability paradigm is now giving way to a new 'resilience' paradigm (in which culture is perhaps downplayed in relation to agendas involving 'hard infrastructure' and an ethic surrounding 'emergency preparedness') again shows this OCP as very much responding, in 2011, to the major forces, or principles, guiding planning practitioners at the time. One might go so far as to call this document 'superficially responsive' to planning trends - such that the sustainability rhetoric presented in the introduction does not, within the plan, play out in a deep-rooted conceptual valuation of culture's role in a sustainable development context.

One final observation stemming from my interview with James as related to the OCP – he notes that the document (and OCPs generally) struggle to adequately account for cultural agendas and goals; they often do not easily link up with other planning documents:

[S.K.] [The Cultural Plan] produced in 2012... would have been positioned under the sustainability framework of the OCP?

There are links between the cultural plan and the OCP...OCPs struggle a bit to deal with culture... because OCPs have a bit of an identity crisis... they're mostly used in land-use. So they're mostly used in addressing the built form of the community. Uh, you know, to integrate land-use and transportation maybe, financing and built form, parks, ... getting into the ...they're really good at dealing with development and where the city's going to put infrastructure.

[S.K.] Which is the planning lens really, I mean, planning has been very strongly attached to concepts around land-use, so the attempts to infuse a more people-centric understanding of development are sometimes met with resistance right?

Well just a lack of understanding. And I'm probably typical of that (personal communication, April 25, 2016).

Here we see an admission that city planning and cultural development structures generally, and in Kelowna specifically, are often non-coherent with one another. In particular, OCPs (and by extension, I propose, ICSPs) as stemming from a planning logic struggle to deal with the intangible dimensions of place addressed within a cultural development paradigm.

Through this interchange, then, we see that while Kelowna's OCP pays tribute to a 4-pillar model of sustainability, the cultural dimensions of this model, for one, appear as under-conceptualized, and as poorly linked with a wider sustainability agenda. Furthermore, the mechanics of the planning and cultural departments within Kelowna in particular, and Canadian Cities generally, are seen as harbouring an awkward relationship with one another – in that the logic premised upon physical development occupied within a planning paradigm is at-odds with one focused on people-centric and intangible development foregrounded within a cultural development paradigm. James notes that this situation is changing – planning schools are increasingly producing graduates who have been indoctrinated into more 'humanistic' understandings of city development. He also, at the same time, acknowledges that the challenge to link culture into a municipal mechanics based predominantly on land-use logic persists.

Overall, then, it is useful to note that the OCP, while paying tribute to a concept of cultural sustainability, struggles to adequately conceptualize culture in its linkages with a sustainable development paradigm.

7.4.2. Cultural Plan

Kelowna's Cultural plan "Thriving, Engaging, Inspiring" was developed in 2012 (one year following the OCP) by Sandra Kochan through a process of research and community consultation. This plan, a 120-page document, provides an extensive set of goals and objectives related to cultural development over a 6-year timeframe. The plan also provides a conceptual foundation for the deployment of culture within Kelowna's municipal setting. In what follows, I look first at the ways in which culture and sustainability are conceptualized in the plan; and then at the key goals and objectives put forward within it.

The plan begins by staking out a definition for culture. Rather than providing a single definition, the plan references a variety– all of which present culture as an anthropological force. For example:

Culture... is.... The whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual, and emotional features that characterize a society or social group. It includes not only arts and letters, but also modes of life, the fundamental rights of the human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs”. (United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization [UNESCO], Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies cited by Kelowna, 2011, p.3)

And...

‘Where I came from, where I’ve been, where I’m going, what I believe, how I express myself and all others in my community and their beliefs, too” (Local Resident cited by Kelowna, 2011, p.3).

In these quotes, we see the City’s intent to assume a definition culture that moves beyond ‘arts’ and ‘heritage’, and that embraces a broad spectrum of community expressions and interchanges. This focus on lived (anthropological) culture is in-line with Hawkes’ cultural sustainability paradigm. It recognizes culture as both stemming from artistic expression – and as comprising the sum of our collective interactions with one another. Indeed, the plan opens with a quote by Hawkes that provides this same orientation “Culture is not a pile of artefacts – it is us; the living, breathing sum of us” (J. Hawkes as cited in Kelowna, 2011, p.2).

While the Cultural Services department aims, it seems, to move towards an anthropological definition of culture, this commitment is on some level challenged through an examination of its operating and grants budgets in 2012 (just after the plan was produced) and 2017. Budgetary figures from internal/unpublished documents for both of these years show 79% or more of the department’s distributed funding as going towards arts/heritage organizations and projects⁶ (S. Kochan, personal communication, October 16, 2017 & December 15, 2017). This finding brings into question the level of

⁶ This figure was drawn from 2012 and 2017 City of Kelowna – Cultural Investment Per Capita documents – internal unpublished documents provided for the purpose of this research. The 79%+ figure came from adding the line-items that tie funding to arts / heritage organizations and projects (includes heritage building grants and public art program). The Cultural Services Administration budget was excluded from the total Cultural Services budget, as this line-item is non-distributed funding.

priority placed by the city on funding anthropological expressions of culture; it also speaks to the strength of historical precedent as related to funding priorities.

Furthermore, it is worth noting that in-line with the prioritization of arts and heritage agendas as seen in the Department's budget, the Cultural Services Manager has placed operational parameters on the definition of culture. This includes, for instance, a commitment (as-per Jon Hawkes' theories) to culture as a separate development pillar – removed from a social development agenda:

one discussion point that I continue to come back to after talking about culture as the fourth dimension for more than 10 years, is that there is a tendency to conflate the social with the cultural. And I continue to have that debate... every time I hear someone saying that, I will say you know they are quite separate and distinct. And that's fatiguing I wish we were over that (S. Kochan, personal communication, April 26, 2016)

So while the plan presents culture as an all-encompassing good; a way of being, or living, an expression of the sum of us; the reality within the City is that there are, in practice, some tighter definitions being used – ones that (through fiscal management practices) prioritize arts and heritage organizations, and another that clearly distinguishes the cultural from the social domain.

Another notable observation related to the plan's conceptualization of culture pertains to the way in which culture is linked with sustainability agendas. On the whole, cultural sustainability within the document's rhetoric is framed as: 'sustainability of the cultural sector'. Consider the following quotes:

...it is our hope that this plan inspires new ideas for community participation and identifies new ways in which the city can *play a supporting, sustaining role for culture in Kelowna* (City of Kelowna, 2012, p.5, italics added)

[the City will]...provide affordable professional development and learning opportunities which will *enhance capacity and sustainability for non-profit organizations* in the cultural sector (p.23, italics added)

City Council will encourage the provincial and federal governments to *sustain a vibrant cultural community* through appropriate levels of investment in arts, heritage and culture. (p23, italics added).

Here it is assumed that culture, by its very existence, contributes to a sustainability agenda – an assumption that is (later in this chapter) challenged by some interviewees.

A final observation surrounding the ways in which culture is positioned within the plan notes the ease with which sustainability and economic agendas are positioned together. Consider the Executive Summary's opening statement:

Culture makes many contributions to Kelowna's quality of life. It creates a place where people want to live, celebrates diversity, attracts and retains talent, fosters entrepreneurship and innovative businesses, cultivates collaboration and partnerships, and builds an authentic, shared identity. Culture is also an important economic driver in Kelowna, creating jobs and generating \$143,8 million annually (City of Kelowna, 2012, p.5).

Also consider the following quote – used as a prelude to the Introduction:

The focus of Economic Development Strategies is shifting. As cities and city regions grow in importance in the global economy, more attention is being given to creating an urban environment that provides a high quality of life and quality of place for residents as a way to ensure that a city can attract the best and the brightest to its workforce (City of Kelowna, 2012, p.6 – quoting Economic Development Commission of the Central Okanagan).

Here we see a direct link being made to a creative cities paradigm and logic – one that places focus on the role of the arts as an attractor of creative class workers and, in turn, economic investment.

While many interviewees acknowledged the need to present clear economic impacts within the plan (recognizing the plan's role as a 'justifier' of culture's value to key decision-makers), it was felt by some that the plan gives too much credence to an economic rationalism that, in-turn, diminishes the non-monetizable, non-market-based work being done as a core part of cultural organizations' mandates and value systems; and the 'non-growth' principles underlying the sustainability paradigm. This includes the diminishing of the value of artistic expression, as well as of community development. The positions of Kelowna interviewees will be explored further later in this chapter.

In short, then, the Plan's rhetoric surrounding culture is seen as a) emphasizing (though not fully actualizing) an anthropological definition of culture; b) conceiving of cultural sustainability as 'sustainability of the cultural sector', and c) including, as a key motivational force alongside sustainability, that of economic growth.

Vision and Goals

The City of Kelowna's Cultural Plan: Thriving, Engaging, Inspiring, puts forward a series of goals – as follows:

- Goal 1: Enhance Existing Municipal Cultural Grant Programs
- Goal 2: Optimize Existing Cultural Facilities
- Goal 3: Find More & Different Kinds of Affordable Cultural Spaces
- Goal 4: Integrate Heritage As Part of Cultural Vitality
- Goal 5: Enhance Cultural Vitality at Street Level
- Goal 6: Build Personal Connections to Cultural Vitality
- Goal 7: Improve Data Collection and Measure Progress with a Cultural Report Card
- Goal 8: Cultural Leverage in Tourism and the Economy
- Goal 9: Convene and Connect the Cultural Community
- Goal 10: Walk the Talk – Integrate Culture into Plans & Processes and Use Innovative Funding Approaches (City of Kelowna, 2012, pps. 57-66).

In examining this goals framework, some key observations arise. First – it is noted that a significant number of the Goals (1-6, pps.57-62) are oriented towards sustaining and developing the existing cultural community. This includes sub-goals such as: “increase annual operational funding for professional arts organizations by 30% of current levels for the next three years” (p.57); “gather information about unmet cultural space needs in the community”; “devise criteria and models by which available city-owned buildings can be offered to the community in a fair and equitable manner” (p.59); “ensure that appropriate levels of funding are in-place to support the Public Art Program in accordance with existing Cultural Policy” (p.61). Little reference is made to sustainability in the Goals section – sustainability, when mentioned, is often referencing sustainability of the cultural sector itself).

Significant references are made, however, to the need for:

- Increased community participation (Goal 6, p.62). This focus on participation is notable, and was highlighted as a source of tension by some interviewees.

- Increased focus on measurement and reporting (Goal 7, p.63). This goal, as well, generated a level of critique in the interview process – with some groups claiming the increased focus on measurement to have created new layers of bureaucratization within the City/funded cultural organization relationship.
- The role of culture in stimulating economic growth (Goal 8, p.64)
- The integration of culture into the City’s planning and decision-making processes (Goal 10, p.68).

The Goals expressed in the plan are in-line with the plan’s rhetoric. Again cultural sustainability is positioned largely as ‘sustainability of the cultural sector’ with significant efforts being taken in the plan to enhance and develop the sector. This includes a focus on participation and measurement. Economic goals related to cultural development are prominently positioned, and occupy significant weight in terms of their action requirements.

Financial Context & Priorities

A comparison of the City of Kelowna’s internal Cultural Budget from 2012, the year in which the Cultural Plan was released, to 2017, shows per-capita expenditure on culture to have grown from \$20.91 to \$23.12, an increase of 11%. The total budget increased from \$2,453,523 to \$2,945,794, an increase of 20% (S. Kochan, personal communication, October 16 & December 15, 2018).⁷ This increase is juxtaposed against the City’s population growth, between 2011 and 2016, of 8.4%. (Statistics Canada, 2016e).

In looking at this increase, several observations are made. First –while laudable, the increase is notably small when considered in the context of culture’s newly-defined role as one of the four key drivers of sustainability.

Second, this increase has occurred predominantly in two areas – Annual Operating Support for Professional Arts Organizations (increase of 47%), and Arts Vest – a program designed to encourage arts organizations to pursue matching sponsorship. A smaller increase of 12% is evident in the Application-Based Arts, Culture and Heritage

⁷ The City’s Cultural Services budget harbours a number of inclusions/exclusions. Of particular note is the exclusion from the cultural budget category (in both years) of facility maintenance provided by the City, and of capital asset investment.

Grants category – this category includes a wide range of cultural organizations and projects – and supports an anthropological, as well as Arnoldian, definition of culture. The selection of these particular areas as priorities for new funding investment reinforces a) the city’s monetary prioritization of ‘arts and heritage’ over ‘anthropological’ forms of culture, and b) the City’s encouragement, through its funding model, of partnerships between arts/heritage organizations and the business community via sponsorship.

Further information about the City’s funding priorities can be extracted from its public issue of grant guidelines. While not all grant guidelines were made publically available, the guidelines for two funding programs provided on the Cultural Services department website emphasize, via their stated criteria, the need for funded institutions to fulfil a ‘public good’. Within the General Operating Grants program, for instance, applications are assessed using the following three criteria:

Program Quality (30%) – the quality of programs and services provided to the community, including the involvement of local artists or other relevant disciplines, distinctive or innovative initiatives, alignment and fulfillment of civic and organization objectives:”

Organizational effectiveness (30%) – sound governance and administration practices, financial health (i.e. realistic budgets with diversified sources of revenue), capacity for growth and adaptation, effective partner/collaborator;

Community Engagement and Impact (40%) – demonstrated audience and public participation, community support, growth, contributions to the health and vitality of the cultural sector, learning opportunities for artists, audiences and participants, enhancing Kelowna’s cultural profile. (City of Kelowna, 2018)

Here we see the strongest assessment criteria (Community Engagement and Impact (40%) revolving around the extent of organizations’ audience development and public participation activities. The Program Quality category (30%) also includes within its assessment criteria a ‘public good’ component – seen in the emphasis placed on the fulfilment of ‘civic’ objectives. A similar weighting, with strong emphasis on public participation, is observed, it should be said, within the City’s ‘Project’ guidelines (City of Kelowna, 2018b).

To conclude - the increases noted between 2012 and 2017, along with the observation made earlier that over 79% of the budget from both 2012 and 2017 is allocated to arts/heritage organizations, shows that arts and heritage constitute a key funding priority;

and that an economic imperative (evident in the encouragement of matching funds through sponsorship) persists. Furthermore, funded organizations (those, at least, applying to the programs mentioned above) are given strong incentive to position their work as a 'public good' (through focus on audience and public participation) – and as contributing to 'civic priorities'..

7.4.3. Summary

In looking at the Cultural Plan's conceptualization of culture, its matrix of goals and the budget data attached to it, some key observations arise:

First - the Cultural plan has yielded a small (11%) Per-Capital Cultural Services Department budgetary increase between 2012 and 2016. Given the focus placed by both the OCP and Cultural Plan on culture's role in creating a sustainable future, the marginality of this increase is significant. Given the growth witnessed within Kelowna, one would expect an equivalent increase in investment to be made in culture.

Second – the Cultural Plan, like the OCP, presumes that sustainable cultural development is achieved largely through development of the cultural sector itself. This view sidesteps the power of sustainability as a concept of transformation – and converts it, rather, into a mechanism by which to maintain the status quo.

Third – an increase in participation in cultural activities is seen as a key goal for the City; this goal appears to be more important to the City than standards of quality as related to culture. Furthermore, the City has placed increased emphasis, it seems, on the need to measure this increase in participation, and on measurement practices generally.

Finally – an economic development rationale continues to exert significant influence upon the development of the City's cultural scene - evident in the Cultural Plan's ready recognition of culture's economic stimulus potential, through the legacy of the Cultural District, and through the power of the economic narratives communicated by Central Okanagan Economic Development Commission and Tourism Kelowna. This rationale continues to shape the City's approach to culture, and its view of culture's role within a larger city ecology.

7.5. Insights from Interviews

Interviewees engaged as part of this research were asked to reflect on the City of Kelowna's cultural development model – and on ways in which the model has changed since the introduction of the 2012 Cultural Plan.

To begin, it is important to note that many of the interviewees identified Kelowna's cultural model as progressive and well-developed. Katie Brennan and Sharon McCoubrey, Director (at time of interview) and Board Member of the Arts Council of the Central Okanagan, respectively, spoke of the cultural plan as a document “that would be really helpful to a lot of other municipalities” (personal communication, April 25, 2016) – showing its leadership role.

James Moore, Long Range Policy Planning Manager with the City of Kelowna, observes that both the “cultural plan, and Sandra's work of the past decade or so, has raised the profile of culture within the city and also helped increase the city's assistance to it, and to work with external cultural organizations – arts and culture organizations throughout the city” (personal communication, April 25, 2016).

Linda Digby, Executive Director of Kelowna Museums, expressed gratitude to the City for engaging the cultural community in dialogue surrounding the future of the sector, and presents the plan as a kind of ‘guidepost’ or ‘reference point’ used in her organization's decision-making process.

... I found it a very important document, ... the amount of commitment that went into it, participation, and consultation that went into it. It's a lot of work to get people to talk about culture, bringing them together, getting them to say these things, it's work that I can't easily do, so it's intelligence there that I can harness... The fact that it's important to our major funder who runs our buildings is a small factor as well, and without any sense of irony, this is a partnership, and I think it's quite fair that the City, our major funder, expect us to respond to the needs and opportunities that were identified. That doesn't mean that we play out – it's not a script, it doesn't tell us how to do, or what to do, just that we're attentive to those needs and aspirations in the community as we set our strategic direction (personal communication, April 27, 2016).

Patrick LeBlanc, Executive Director of the Rotary Arts Centre (RCA), tells how the Cultural Plan provided a guidepost – allowing him to set goals for his organization that would align it with the City's overall vision and direction. In this case, the plan was seen

to enable opportunities for the Rotary Centre to 're-set' its relationship with the city – the partnership between the RCA and City having prior to Patrick's arrival witnessed tensions:

My whole directive has been - let's work with the City, - let's stop confronting, let's stop demanding, let's look forward, let's match ourselves with the Cultural Plan, in my Strategic Plan my first year - it was - okay – what are the City's cultural plan ideas, how does that fit with our Strategic Plan moving forward, let's just get on that track with them, show them that we're on that track with them, and how additional funding would be able to help us sit with that Cultural Plan (personal communication, April 28, 2016).

These statements speak to the ways in which the community-based consultative framework spearheaded by Sandra, alongside her management practices and the development and publication of the cultural plan – engineered a degree of alignment within Kelowna's cultural sector – and raised its profile within the eyes of local decision-makers and beyond.

7.5.1. Critiques

Several key critiques have emerged with regards to the both the cultural plan and the city's cultural development model more broadly.

1. Cultural Scientism impacts on funder/organization relationships

A key critique brought forward in the interview process pertains to the emphasis placed on 'cultural scientism' by the City's Cultural Services Department – seen both in the Cultural Plan and in the interactions had by the department with funded organizations. This term describes “the inappropriate application of methods and approaches from natural science to... the human subject...” (Goldbard, 2015, quoting E.F. Schumacher, p.227). In her 2015 article 'The Metrics Syndrome: Cultural Scientism and Its Discontents', Goldbard calls-out the over-use of cultural scientism as a logic commonly used to justify culture's existence within political and economic structures:

[Cultural Scientism aims] to telegraph an impression of serious inquiry, but seldom learns anything that is actually applied to real-world cultural development challenges... To have meaningful utility, counting culture must be grounded, first, in values and principles. What are the goals of cultural development? How can any research project advance them? (Goldbard, 2015, p.267).

The City of Kelowna's approach to cultural management is seen by some to be rooted in a scientism logic that prioritizes concrete (economic / participation) measurables over human and cultural indicators (ie: value-based indicators). Various groups expressed concern that the City was more interested in 'checking boxes' than in developing an understanding of the stories and dreams fuelling the cultural ecology; and the ways in which these feed into a larger vision.

Patrick LeBlanc (RCA), shows as an example of this logic a request for information presented by the City's Cultural Services department to funded cultural organizations occupying City facilities in early 2016 (labeled an Annual Report). Within this report, a series of organizational data was requested by the City - related to a wide range of measureable indicators. Of this process, Patrick says:

They want us to fit into their very specific plan, with these very specific questions, their very specific numbers, so they can answer the questions they're anticipating. And I get that. That's a very smart way of doing it. If you know the questions you're going to get asked, you ask them. But do you really want to know from us how it's operating, or do you just want us to tell you what you need to talk about? I think they're really not interested in how we operate. And what we have as goals... (personal communication, April 28, 2016).

This Report, then, is seen by Patrick to serve as an example of a larger trend playing out within the City in which a cultural scientism logic is seen to surpass a logic that values community connectedness and artistic quality.. This logic is also, according to Patrick, seen to diminish the value and potential of the stories and visionary worlds experienced within and by the funded organizations:

you know one of the big things they're missing is how easy it is to operate a Centre or how difficult it is – what are your challenges? ... There's no interest in what we would like to do, where we see our growth... There's no interest in our story, or what we could be, or what we envision ourselves (personal communication, April 28, 2016).

It is important to note here that the development of improved data collection and progress measurement mechanisms was identified in the Cultural Plan as a key goal (see Cultural Plan, Goal 7). While the City is, in many ways, making good on its promises surrounding data collection, the above-comments shed light on what is perhaps an unintended consequence of stringent measurement procedures – the diminishment of an aspect of the City/cultural organization relationship based on a shared story, vision and purpose.

2. Attendance measurement takes priority - minimizes risk-taking potential

Another key critique that arose as related to the City's cultural plan and management model pertains to the level of risk-taking that is implicitly or explicitly encouraged and/or enabled through its mandates, plans and activities. To be clear, all groups that spoke on this issue took the position that within the risk taking/attendance dichotomy (in which a higher the level of artistic risk is presumed to negatively affect attendance figures), a focus on audience numbers/attendance remained important.

[S.K.] if you have excellent artistic product but no one comes to see it...

Nataley Nagy: You have a serious problem. Then you don't really know what your community is capable of in a lot of ways.

And Lorna McParland, Executive Director of the Alternator Centre for Contemporary Art states:

If you're not concerned at all about who comes through the door or the level of engagement, you can put really risky stuff on the wall and you've done your job. You can give complete creative freedom to the artists that are showing their work to say – go on, install however you like, we don't care how readable it is to the public, or we don't need to have artists statements – there are small tools that we have through trial through experience – if we want the public to engage in our audience – having clearly written artistic statements, or exhibition statements, or curatorial statements that are written in plain English – that's key for us in our regional context (April 29, 2016).

Acknowledging the need to make art that communicates with an audience, a key thread within this discussion observes that an over-emphasis on audience numbers (and populist programming) can diminish the level of risk an organization is willing to assume. Nataley Nagy (Kelowna Art Gallery), for one, views artistic risk-taking and audience engagement as necessarily connected – rather than diametrically opposed:

[in focusing too heavily on audience/attendance numbers] we run the risk of not ensuring that excellence in programming is sort-of the leader, and community engagement will find its way once you know the right people to prove that there's excellence to begin with... I mean, there's a gazillion painters in this town, I mean everybody comes to the Okanagan to paint the pretty peaches and beaches, as you can only imagine. So that's one element that we want to encourage, you want them to be part of your institution, but that's not necessarily the level at which this institution should be showing (personal communication, April 26, 2016).

For Lorna (Alternator Gallery),

The Cultural Plan has – you know, it has mixed reviews, but it kind of really works for us in some areas, and then in other areas we clearly don't fit. Because the type of work we tend to present is a little bit outside the cultural norm, Kelowna is quite still a conservative city, and so there's a lot of activity that the Alternator does that a lot of people just don't get or don't support or whatever... so in that sense the Cultural Plan it's great to give us kind-of an overview in terms of the community consultation that they did, it's great to have some statistics about kind-of the responses and the needs that have been identified by the community, and that definitely helps us when we are looking to contextualize what we're doing... but there's still lots of areas where we sit outside of it and it's never going to address us until there's a huge cultural shift in Kelowna where what the Alternator does isn't as weird (personal communication, April 29, 2016).

Here, then, the City's strong focus on attendance and levels of community engagement is seen to diminish the ability of funded groups to undertake activities that involve risk-taking and creative experimentation.

The impact of this diminishment can be seen, according to Neil Cadger (Interdisciplinary Performance Professor at UCBO) as the 'dulling of culture's edge' – its ability to pioneer new ways of thinking and being; to uproot established knowledge hierarchies, and to pose radical challenges to dominant paradigms:

you need to have these far-extremes in order to allow the valid or the important focus to shift – because it is groundbreaking ... it's important that that happens because it's on the fringe. The fringe is where it's [cultural investment is] most important (personal communication, April 25, 2016).

Here, then, a question is posed to the City – how to engineer, within its management framework focused heavily on attendance, mechanisms of evaluation that make room for the risk-taking identified as essential within and to the cultural sector.

3. Confusion over the role of culture within a sustainability framework

One final thread arising from interviews pertains to the level at which the City's cultural plan and management model allow for, and enable, possibilities surrounding 'cultural sustainability' to emerge. Within this dialogue, UBCO professors Nancy Holmes (Creative Writing Professor) and Neil Cadger question the City's conceptualization of cultural sustainability as 'sustainability of the cultural sector' – and advocate for the City

to view culture as playing a necessary role in contributing to a larger sustainability discourse rooted in place-based knowledge and experience. Nancy states the following:

My view ... is that the municipal focus on cultural sustainability is about sustaining cultural – a cultural life within Kelowna. That's what they mean by cultural sustainability... no matter what else they may say – I mean I've just filled in the survey about artist places for example, and you know, there was absolutely nothing – although it could have been embedded in some ways in the questions around transit – there was nothing in the questionnaire, or the survey, that you know, elicited your ideas about how you'd be a sustainable artist in the community. Not just how art is sustained in a community. So there was very little about that – so that's sort-of my reading of the City – that they're interested in, you know, the Richard Florida let's be a creative city, let's try to get all these really wonderful interesting vibrant artists to live here so we can get lots of economic bang for our buck, etc. And I think they actually don't think very much about place... (personal interview, April 25, 2016).

Holmes goes on to speak to the consequences of failing to acknowledge place within cultural policy frameworks:

if you're thinking about cultural sustainability beyond simply making a good place for artists to live – and I'm totally for that of course – but if you don't start thinking about how to create audiences and culture that is consumed by the particular place you are in - how sustainable is your culture... in a sense, I mean, unless you start creating stories and images that are of relevance to a particular community – developing those audiences... how do you get local people to consume stories about themselves in this particular place? And to me that seems... that's the first step of being sustainable in terms of culture and being sustainable in terms of place (personal interview, April 25, 2016).

Such stories/images are seen by Nancy to be essential to the creation of a sustainable community paradigm:

My belief is, and I think there's some evidence for that – that if you don't care about your particular place, ... you don't have a vested interest in looking after the water or the land or the species or the animals, or even just the historical – the historical records and... you don't understand why it's important that Indigenous people have a connection to the land. And if we're thinking about British Columbia as a place that has so few treaties, and that, you know, Indigenous people have to be at the table now – we talk about so many things about our land-use, if you don't care about that, how are you ever going to sit down and talk to people... about the value of the land (personal interview, April 25, 2016).

Nancy highlights the importance of these conversations generally – but particularly in Kelowna given the 'retirement paradise' identity the City has assumed:

I think that it's an important thing to give people... a sense that ... this is not just a fantasy land – because especially in the Okanagan – the Okanagan's such a fantasy land. It's a place where you go – you bring your motorboat in the summer, and you, have your little wine fantasies etc., it's a fantasy land. And if we don't start getting the sense that this is a real place – and those are real animals that live out in the hills when you're digging up their land – I don't think you're going to have a very healthy society (personal interview, April 25, 2016).

Here, Holmes points to the possibility that municipalities can help shape, or train, artistic energies such that they are enabled / encouraged to delve into critical and complex forms of inquiry surrounding place.

Neil Cadger echoes this view – highlighting the need to train artistic energies such that the dominant colonial models surrounding culture, community and place can be uprooted and challenged – and replaced with more sustainable models:

the connection with this place, and making the connection between all the people... who inhabit this area, the connection to this place, is very conflicted, and because we're still operating on an outdated paradigm, and a great example of that is the tourism...and the board of tourism, and our economic model which is to sell, it's colonial still, it's like - take the stuff that people see as valuable, market it, and sell it to people from elsewhere.

I think community needs to be connected to place. And... the place that you are in. I think that's – when I talk about my community I'm talking about the people who I share ideas with, work with, but also who I live with... in or amongst (personal communication, April 25, 2016).

Nancy, Neil and various others interviewed expressed a longing for a cultural development agenda to be implemented in Kelowna that would challenge Creative Cities narratives, and that would honour a plurality of stories that explore, and deepen, resident connections with 'this land and territory'.

A change in course?

One positive step, it should be noted, that has been taken by the City's cultural department in re-connecting a cultural agenda with Kelowna's traditional territory and First Nations peoples, involves a partnership with the En'owkin Centre and UBCO's Institute for Community Engaged Research. Sandra Kochan describes this partnership as follows:

we currently have an active partnership with the En'owkin Centre and UBC Okanagan's Institute for Community Engaged Research (ICER) to develop and deliver education resources for City of Kelowna management and staff regarding the Syilx Okanagan nation, reconciliation and building a new relationship. This is a multi-year project initiated by Cultural Services and we are very grateful to be working directly with Okanagan knowledge keepers through two important academic institutions (personal communication, October 16, 2017).

Here, then, we see a turn – in which the qualities of this land, and the history of the First Peoples who reside here, are being acknowledged within the municipal cultural development context. While the results of this partnership are still to be determined, the pursuit of this type of collaboration perhaps marks the beginning of a paradigm shift, in which the principles of cultural sustainability, and in particular a focus on exploring 'hereness' through the building of relationships with local Indigenous groups, are brought to bear within a wider municipal cultural development context.

7.6. Conclusion

Kelowna's history of rapid growth and development, coupled with its growing identity as a 'fantasy' retirement land, and its driving tourism agenda (as well as its lack of synchronicity between cultural agendas and a wider city mechanics), appear to be of little help to a Cultural Services Department intent on creating a cultural sustainability agenda. In many ways, it is no wonder that the Cultural Services Department has interpreted cultural sustainability as 'sustainability of the cultural sector' – other more radical agendas for culture that would challenge dominant narratives surrounding 'the good life' and that would position culture as a key vehicle for exploration and toppling of colonial narratives, would undoubtedly come under fire from dominant political and economic/tourism development forces.

In its propensity to advocate for the cultural sector as a sustainable force on its own terms, and as a pillar separate from social services, Kelowna's cultural model can be seen to echo a 'culture *in* sustainability' paradigm. Here, the cultural sector is largely left alone by the funder (other than having to fulfil criteria related to public accessibility and impact) to do its work. This approach to governance allows the artistic mandates of the funded groups to remain relatively unaltered by the funder. On the down side, there appears to be a missed opportunity for the City to take a leadership role in encouraging, and cultivating, connectivity within and between cultural organizations, and between the

cultural sector and the 'place' that is Kelowna – its history and identity; its 'hereness'. There also appears to be a missed opportunity for the City to collaboratively work with funded groups to explore, develop and tell, broader stories about Kelowna's culture – to explore what culture means to and within this place. Such stories are essential, it seems, in a holistic sustainable development paradigm that must first acknowledge the past and present before setting goals for the future.

Chapter 8. Findings: Kamloops, B.C.

8.1. Context

Kamloops is a city of approximately 90,000 (Fortems, 2017) - situated in the southern interior of B.C. – approximately 4 hours drive to Vancouver, 2 hours to Kelowna and 6 hours to Prince George. The City is located at the confluence of the North and South Thompson rivers, on the traditional territory of the Tk'emlups First Nation.

Pulp mills were one of “the most prominent feature[s] of the local landscape through the postwar decades” (Whitson, 2001, p.160), and were the region’s major employers. This said, the City has, over the last 30 years, undertaken a transformation of its economic base. Thompson Rivers University, formerly College of the Cariboo, became a University College in 1989 – awarding degrees in areas such as Arts, Technology, Applied Computing Science and Tourism; and becoming a full-fledged university in March, 2005 (Thompson Rivers University, 2017). Research infrastructure was expanded in the following decade – presenting new opportunities for engagement with a wide range of outside partners, ideas and development processes. The development of the University has brought young people and new ideas into the city, and has modernized it – bringing it into greater alliance with the knowledge economy.

Another key transformative shift within Kamloops’ economy is seen in the evolution of sports hosting. The City, in 1985, took on the public identifier of ‘tournament capital of British Columbia’ – a brand that brought increased investment by way of increased visitation. In 2001, the City Council of the day expanded this reach by labeling Kamloops the ‘tournament capital of *Canada*’ (Hoffman, 2006, p.190) – again paving the way for economic growth via nationally-derived tournament-based revenues.

While the above-mentioned turn in economic development has moved the City away from its blue-collar roots, its industrial-economic foundations continue to exert a presence. A recent proposal surrounding the development of a copper/gold mine within the city limits (Ajax) brought to bear a heated debate centering upon the city’s desired identity as either an industry base or knowledge-economy base (Bennett, 2017). This debate is seen by many interviewees as a key moment in the city’s development, and as

prompting a need for in-depth community reflection surrounding the potentials and drawbacks embedded within each pathway.

Following from the investments made in sporting infrastructure as part of a wider economic development plan, the City's cultural identity was to become entwined with sport hosting as a key 'brand' or identifier. As Monica Dickinson, Director of Industry Relations and Communications - Tourism Kamloops, observes: "For us – sport is the culture of Kamloops ... when you talk about iconic – the sport environment sets Kamloops apart..." (personal communication, May 2, 2016). This elevation of sports would suggest, at first glance, a struggle for the Kamloops arts/heritage community – whose activities, positioned against this dominant narrative would presumably be overshadowed within the City's identity framework. Yet the relationship between these two domains is a complicated one – with several interviewees attributing the strong development of the City's arts/heritage sector in recent decades to an 'atmosphere of achievement' engendered through the pursuit of sports amenities and experiences:

I think [the sporting culture] establishes a world view, or a climate, where - we tend to take it for granted - that the status quo is not enough, that there's nothing wrong with aspiring to national and international prominence for the work that we do... that our university should not be an isolated university but needs to be connected, and part of a provincial initiative, and that our profs need to be amongst the best in the world, that our graduates need to be among the best in the world, that the shows we bring to our galleries are going to be amongst the best.... (W. Garrett-Petts, personal communication, May 3, 2016).

This 'climate of achievement' is seen, in part, to involve intersections between the sporting and arts/heritage communities. Monica Dickinson (Tourism Kamloops), shows a kind of synergistic relationship between these sectors:

We look at the opportunity to build culture into the sport/tourism experience... from a marketing perspective it's all about that overall visitor experience. So if we can tie in the art gallery doing back-alley mural tours, a visit to an exhibit at the museum, visiting the museum, our first nations culture, absolutely we certainly build all that together as part of an itinerary or overall experience here in Kamloops (personal communication, May 2, 2016).

Cultural practitioners also speak to the benefits of this synergetic co-existence. Kathy Humphreys, Executive Director - Kamloops Symphony, notes: "I would never say that I, you know, wished that we didn't have the Blazers hockey team because it's cutting into our attendance, because I think – I like the view that everything in the community is

important – it’s all connected” (personal communication, May 4, 2016). And in spite of the sports scene’s prominence within the city’s expressed identity framework, many in the arts sector continue to feel valued by key political players:

Kamloops has a really strong reputation as a sports centre, tournament capital of Canada, and I...don’t think they [City Council/administration] try to downplay that, but I also know that there’s a strong feeling that our current city council and our current city administration – that the arts are just as important as sports in this town... (M. Chrumka, personal communication, May 4, 2016).

So while the dominant narrative surrounding sports as a key component of Kamloops’ identity prevails, the development of the sports scene has reaped benefits for the cultural sector, which is also valued within the City’s community and political circles.

This joining of what might otherwise be seen as philosophically distinct sectors is, it seems, quite normal within Kamloops – which might be aptly called the ‘city of synergized differences’. Here, the sporting community, the academic community and the arts/heritage community as well as blue-collar industry appear to co-exist in relative harmony; - these sectors seem to contribute to one another’s successes. Their co-existence is, according to Will Garrett-Petts, Professor and AVP Research at Thompson Rivers University, responsible for a certain humble authenticity that has become part of the City’s lived reality and culture:

...if Kamloops is generally perceived to be a blue-collar city, blue-collar town, that’s as much a choice as it is a reality, and it’s not a bad one... many of us really like that because, you know, sometimes you can think of that as in some ways being more authentic... it’s true to the background and the history, when we have a cowboy festival here, nobody’s particularly embarrassed by having a cowboy festival. It’s just as much in-place as having a National Gallery exhibition at the Kamloops art gallery (personal communication, May 3, 2016).

Here then, in this place of tightly-woven distinct identities and shifting manifestations of economy, Kamloops’ cultural scene has evolved, and according to many interviewees – flourished, over the last 15 years.

8.2. Economic / Tourism Approach to Culture:

Tourism in Kamloops has grown significantly in recent years. Research produced by Tourism Kamloops (2017) using data 2015 data shows the tourism industry to have

generated \$15.7 billion in revenue in that year – fuelled by a “12.3% increase in international visitation from the previous year” (para.6). The City’s rapidly-growing tourism sector has helped to feed economic growth in other core areas such as the resource, agriculture and service industries (para.4); its growth is attributed by Tourism Kamloops to the “prestigious recognition provincially, nationally and internationally as an exceptional sport hosting destination” (para.5). Indeed, the agency claims tourism within the City “contributed more to GDP than any other primary resource industry” (para.6).

My interview with Monica Dickinson (Tourism Kamloops) shows the Agency’s aim to ‘market’, ‘package’ and ‘promote’ cultural experience under a seemingly neoliberal / economic essentialist logic. But it also shows the Agency’s recognition of the limitations embedded within this approach– and its intent to promote dialogue surrounding arts/heritage, culture and tourism such that local connectedness to place, as well as long-term sustainability agendas, are maintained. Monica describes this intent as follows:

From a marketer’s perspective – we like things neat and tidy handed to us with wrap around it – so we can present to the consumer – book now. And that’s it. But I think on the flip side .. a lot of what makes us attractive is our lifestyle piece here. And I guess I’m going to relate this back to our current situation of our trails development...we have active community organizations that are continuing to trail-build, to be stewards of their trail networks, and are really excited about the potential of partnering with the tourism world, but in the same sense are very cognizant that if you open those doors and invite them in that their playground becomes a public entity as opposed to a private lifestyle piece within the community. So yeah – it’s making sure that those conversations are on the table at all times to understand what the expectations of both sides are – so that we’re able as marketers to produce a product and put it out there for consumption, and it is exceptional, and it is at a level that... people will then turn around and promote organically, and authentically, but at the same time, understanding that this is our community, and we’ve worked hard to create this for our lifestyle. And how do you maintain that? (personal communication, May 2, 2016).

Here we see a determination to ‘capitalize’ on local cultural amenities – coupled with a recognition of the need to work with local communities to dialogically determine the appropriate strategies and contexts for such capitalization. Such a view problematizes a pure-economic approach to culture as a resource – showing the need for a deeper level of community engagement surrounding the development and promotion of cultural amenities.

Monica takes this problematization of an economic-based tourism agenda further as she outlines Tourism Kamloops' approach to sustainability agendas:

More so than ever before, we need to be conscious in the planning process of not exploiting the culture and the resources that we currently have, because as you continue to force sustainability, you may be seeking opportunities that aren't sustainable. I don't know if that makes sense – in the fact that – you know, I guess I look at our relations with our First Nations culture, for example...especially from a tourism perspective – authenticity is the root of all real experience, I guess, if you want to put it that way. And I hazard to think that as you look at options for sustainability that you're forcing something that may not organically transpire, or authentically transpire, and from that you're creating something that's not sustainable, really, in the end, right? ... And so... yeah ... we were cognizant - as we plan for the future – what it is that we can continue to deliver that remains authentic, that remains sustainable, and that continues to be respectful of the culture and community that's here (personal communication, May 2, 2016).

These excerpts show a propensity for critical reflection, and a call for dialogue to be had within the local community surrounding the impact of cultural tourism. They show a recognition of the damaging effects that can be had by an economic essentialist manifestation of cultural tourism – including the loss of local connectedness to place, and the diminishment of authenticity through initiatives that promise, but do not deliver, sustainable solutions. This propensity for critical reflection, engagement and critique surrounding culture's economic value is, it would seem, symptomatic of a larger culture or world view within Kamloops that is ecologically-minded, and that marks this community apart from many.

8.3. Cultural Sector - Context

For a city of its size, Kamloops is seen to boast a significant level of cultural activity – accomplished significantly through the following professional arts organizations: the Kamloops Art Gallery, Kamloops Symphony Orchestra, Western Canada Theatre and the Kamloops Museum and Archives, as well as the Kamloops Arts Council, and an array of independent artists and small arts groups. This scene has, over the past 20 years, experienced a maturation such that many of the interviewees portray it as 'flourishing'. Will Garrett-Petts outlines this development trajectory as follows:

...in 1993, we had the Canada Summer Games coming here, and as I mentioned to you it was an infusion of funding but also a an infusion of

ambition and confidence to the community. Starting in the early 80's, many places including Kamloops slowed down there was general economic depression, and there wasn't a sense of optimism necessarily,... towards the end of the 80's that began to change and by 93 when the Canada Summer Games came here, it seemed something of a key moment, and I don't want to make too much of it as being a watershed moment because I'm sure it was a coalescing of all kinds of factors all coming together, but as part of the lived experience of somebody in the community you could definitely feel it. And because of the funding coming in and because of this new sense of optimism, City Council decided that they would take a look seriously at the normal average for cultural funding and raise the funding for culture in the city of Kamloops to around 2% which was a significant increase. It was almost a doubling of the funding, and that too spurred on a new sense of revival and optimism, and it coincided with increased development with the Art Gallery, with the Symphony, with Western Canada Theatre, and also the role of the Museum and Archives, and it was also coincidental with changes taking place in the University which is sometimes a forgotten agent of cultural change...by 93 we were already talking about becoming an autonomous university. So it was a time of ambition (personal communication, May 3, 2016).

Will goes on to convey ways in which this ambition was taken up by the arts/heritage community:

...for example, the Kamloops Art Gallery under the direction of Jann Bailey was instrumental in leading a Venice Biennale contribution. And Jann while she was still Director of our gallery was also the Director of the Museums Association of Canada. For a small place this is a hotbed of activity, and people here are very well connected and they have great ambition that ranges beyond what might normally be expected for a community of roughly 90,000 people....I don't know how many other cities of this size are going to have their own symphony, their own Class A art gallery, their own theatre company that has truly national prominence (personal communication, May 3, 2016).

Here we see described a cultural scene 'punching above its weight' – whose aspirations for accomplishing significant change are fuelled by an energy of collective optimism and ambition.

This narrative is echoed in my interviews with the large cultural organizations. Kathy Humphreys (Kamloops Symphony), for instance shows how, amidst a wave of ambition and growth within the arts community in 2003, the Kamloops Symphony Orchestra made the decision to professionalize:

The truth of the matter was that in order for us to provide the kind of orchestra that we felt our community was capable of supporting, and was

interested in hearing, we had to make changes so that we were not, sort-of left behind while some of the development that was happening all around us in the community – ...there were all kinds of progressive things happening, and were kind-of wallowing in the same place we had been for quite a long time, and you know, if you're part of a national organization and you're trying to attract funding from the Canada Council, and you have a BC Arts Council grant and a large-part of the assessments of those bodies is your level of professionalism, your performance quality, your artistic growth, and so they were looking for those kinds of things from us if we wanted to progress, and it was – well which way do we go – do we stay the way we are and, you know, let the community outgrow us essentially, or do we try to keep pace with what the community is becoming/ and so... we made the decision [to professionalize]. (personal communication, May 4, 2016).

The Kamloops Art Gallery also, in 1998, moved into a civic building in downtown Kamloops –becoming a Class A Gallery - enabled via its facility and staffing features to host national/international touring shows (Kamloops Art Gallery, 2017). And Western Canada Theatre was to grow during this time into what would be called the “envy of many across the country” (Klassen citing James Macdonald, 2017).

The type of development that occurred during this time-period involved not only the professionalization of arts groups and the pursuit of high standards of artistic quality, but also the integration of social engagement initiatives within the cultural activities being conducted.

Gay Pooler, General Manager – Kamloops Central Business Improvement Association, speaks to a social consciousness developed within the cultural community during this time that persists: “So we're very supportive as a community of social causes... I get the feeling that a lot of our cultural organizations are very socially conscious. And that's the way they operate” (personal communication, May 5, 2016). Supporting this assertion, Margaret Chrumka from Kamloops Art Gallery, notes how engagement with First Nations and marginalized groups is a key component of the organization's mandate:

we have a large First Nations Aboriginal population – our largest population is First Nations Aboriginal, and then there's the Tk'emlups Indian Band just across the river... as a mandate for the gallery, diversity is something that we're always talking about and considering, and how do we represent the diversity in our population and in our nation?... we do a lot of programs where we reach out to options and opportunities, we reach out to the boys and girls club, and we really work to tie that back to our exhibitions (personal communication, May 4, 2016).

And Kathy (Kamloops Symphony) shows how the Symphony was engaging audiences conversationally, and conducting educational/outreach programming, at a time when many orchestras in large urban centres did not:

I know that at one time like our community outreach activities and educational things that we did was far beyond what was going on in in the bigger centres because there the institutions were just that. And they were not, you know, they started talking about Orchestra Canada conferences about speaking to the audience. Like does your Music Director speak to the audience? Yeah – every single concert – our Music Director has never walked onto the stage, conducted the concert and then walked off stage without talking to the audience. So the big orchestras were learning to do that. They were learning to connect with the community and invite them in, and do things like pre-concert chats and things to get them to engage – where we were already doing those kind of things – by instinct – no one told us we had to do – that just was what seemed to be the right thing to do...it makes me laugh sometimes when I think on the emphasis on community engagement. You know – this is not a new thing (personal communication, May 4, 2016).

Within these excerpts, we see a commitment to community dialogue and social engagement that and positions the cultural community as part of a broader community and ecology.

8.4. Cultural Planning

For a city whose cultural scene is widely seen to be ‘flourishing’, it is interesting to note the absence of a strong cultural agenda in both the City’s ICSP and OCP. These plans – created in 2011 and 2004, respectively, both allocate responsibility for cultural direction to the City’s Cultural Strategic Plan – created in 2003.

8.4.1. Integrated Community Sustainability Plan (ICSP) and Official Community Plan (OCP)

The City of Kamloops’ Integrated Community Sustainability Plan – Sustainable Kamloops - (2011) allocates responsibility for cultural development to the Cultural Strategic Plan. Key culture-based objectives outlined in this document reflect almost exactly some of the key recommendations made in the Plan. These include:

- Continuing to implement the Cultural Strategic Plan;

- Continuing to operate the Kamloops Museum, the Sagebrush Theatre, the Kamloops Courthouse, and other vital arts and culture spaces in Kamloops;
- Continuing to dedicate funding to arts and culture groups and activities;
- Working with Tk'emlups Indian Band to promote First Nations culture in Kamloops; and
- Maintaining the historical buildings registry (p.46).

The ICSP, then, essentially advocates for a continued actualization of the Cultural Strategic Plan. It does not present any new ideas surrounding culture as a key development agenda, nor does it present culture as one of the three pillars of sustainability. Instead, culture is positioned as a sub-pillar of sustainability – an act that arguably diminishes its role and potential within a sustainable ecology agenda.

As with the ICSP, The Official Community Plan (2004) says very little about culture – recognizing that the Cultural Strategic Plan houses the City's agenda for this sector's development (City of Kamloops, 2004, Section IV, p.2 & 62).

8.4.2. Cultural Strategic Plan

Kamloops' Cultural Strategic Plan was produced by the City in 2003 – amidst an atmosphere of new-found collaboration in the arts community. One and a half years prior to this, the community had become engaged in an extensive SSHRC-funded project (Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council) through the CURA (Community-Universities Research Alliance) led by the Kamloops Art Gallery in partnership with Thompson Rivers University - designed to develop new understandings surrounding cultural development within small cities. Through this project, Kamloops' cultural institutions were brought together – engaging in “community collaboration, documentation, and dialogue” (W. Garrett-Petts, personal communication, May 3, 2016). This process, it seems, served to elevate the focus of these organizations from an institutional to an ecological level – whereby cultural leaders were encouraged to think about their institutions not as competitors with others in the sector, but as part of a necessary whole. Will Garrett-Petts, one of the principle researchers leading this process, describes this ‘coming together’ as follows:

At the initial meeting of potential research partners in 2000, Jann Bailey, the director of the Kamloops Art Gallery, pointed out that, as a cultural community, “we are all doing it well but not together.” Given this

observation, the participants immediately recognized that they were beginning with a knowledge and appreciation of Kamloops' diverse cultural resources, as opposed to its deficiencies and drawbacks, thus possessing the fundamentals for what John Kretzmann and John McKnight have termed "asset-building community development." However, the participants were also being asked to consider the possible advantages of working more deliberately together and of sharing resources. This led to a consideration of the very purpose of collaboration for the partners and the community of Kamloops (personal communication, May 3, 2016).

This process of collaboration was to unite the cultural community in the development of shared understandings and visions surrounding the cultural future of Kamloops. When the Cultural Strategic Plan was developed by the City, then, in 2003, the collaborative energy and mentality within the cultural community was to be harnessed – and this document to become another expression of the community's collectively-determined visions and aspirations.

Cultural Strategic Plan - Vision and Goals

The Cultural Strategic Plan's definition of culture focuses largely on that produced by arts and heritage institutions. While acknowledging the value of Kamloops' diverse cultural fabric, and while taking strides to connect and integrate the arts and heritage community with First Nations groups and multicultural communities, these initiatives do not comprise a main focal-point. Indeed, the plan recognizes a gap in this area - "There is no doubt that cultural diversity is an important part of the fabric of Kamloops and that future work in this area would be beneficial" (Janzen & Associates, 2003, p.26). Here we see a preferencing of an Arnoldian definition of culture over anthropological. The plan is also focused on arts/cultural agendas as distinct from social agendas.

The vision put forward in the plan is as follows:

LEADERSHIP: We will be a recognized leader in arts and heritage development in Canada and will be a model for arts and heritage for small cities. We will have a city structure and financial resources which supports this leadership role.

INFRASTRUCTURE: We will create a strong arts and heritage infrastructure to support arts and heritage accessibility and development for every Kamloops resident from children to seniors, artists to organizations and companies and from amateur to professional.

COMMUNICATION AND PARTNERSHIPS: We will build an arts and heritage community which collaborates, communicates, networks and we

will be known for our innovative partnerships. In particular we will forge new and powerful relationships with the education sector as a natural partnership and a commitment to a 'learning community'.

COMMUNITY SUPPORT AND PARTICIPATION: We will build a community where arts and heritage are integrated, are relevant and are part of every day life and are viewed as an essential part of the community both socially and economically. We will encourage and recognize community participation in the arts and heritage as volunteers, practitioners, audience members and supporters.

DIVERSITY AND STRENGTH: Our vision is to see a vibrant arts and heritage sector along the full continuum. By valuing the contribution of both the artist and the organization, the small and the large and the amateur and the professional in all disciplines, we will build a thriving, growing and vital arts and heritage community (Janzen & Associates, 2003, p.56-57).

Key strategies and associated recommendations/actions put forward by the plan are as follows (for the purpose of brevity these have been summarized):

Strategy A: Heritage: Celebration, Commemoration and Preservation

Includes recommendations to develop a Heritage and Management Master Plan and an online Inventory of heritage resources; developing/promoting heritage walks and events; developing policy surrounding heritage conservation, management and interpretation; developing heritage signage; and bringing heritage onto the streets.

Strategy B: Cultural Presentation and Development

Includes recommendations for the creation of new festivals/events (ie: Bard on the Beach, culture on the river, etc.); developing connections with business associations and retailers for arts exhibition; promoting youth arts; supporting large professional organizations as well as small and mid-level organizations; promoting neighbourhood arts, developing a public art program, working with First Nations communities; supporting cultural diversity initiatives; enhancing communication between sectors and groups; the hosting of an Arts and Heritage conference; and the consolidation of funding into a set of 5 formal programs entitled (1) Cultural Presentation (2) Marketing and Cultural Tourism) (3) Service Agreements (4) Professional and Organizational Development and (5) Individual Artists Support Program

Strategy C: Marketing, Cultural Tourism and Economic Development

Includes recommendations surrounding the development of an Arts and Heritage district, the development of media platforms and signage for the arts sector; undertaking physical improvements to the city that integrate public art; establishing an arts market; and creating a Mayor's Awards for business and the Arts.

Strategy D: Cultural Infrastructure

Includes recommendations to construct an Arts and Heritage Centre (later called a Performing Arts Centre); provide facilities solutions for particular arts and heritage organizations needing facilities; address issues of access for small and mid-sized organizations to Sagebrush theatre; and promote home studios through various initiatives.

Strategy E: Culture and Education: Building a Learning Community

Includes recommendations to encourage... arts and heritage in the schools, promote greater partnerships with UCC, promote research and publication into Kamloops arts and heritage issues and create greater linkages between the educational and arts and heritage sectors (Janzen & Associates, 2003, pps. 58-84).

In addition to these strategies, the Plan puts forward a number of recommendations related to Governance, and Financial Action, as follows:

Governance:

Includes recommendations to: identify the key city role as one of policy development, facilitation, administration of funds and service agreements, intergovernmental cooperation and tourism development; delegate responsibility for arts and heritage development to the Parks and Recreation Department with a recommendation to rename it Parks, Recreation and Cultural affairs; create two (2) positions in the city – an Arts and Heritage Manager position with significant decision making authority and a heritage position ... to advance the significant heritage initiatives recommended; review the mandate of the Heritage Commission to strengthen it and develop a Heritage master Plan for Kamloops; create a Kamloops Arts and Heritage Centre Committee to facilitate the development of the new arts and heritage centre; work with community to create a mechanism to promote cohesion and information sharing in the arts and heritage communities; develop policies to guide program development and guide service agreement development to provide clear objectives; move existing programs outside city to service agreement models. In ideal scenario the current services could be delivered from the new centre from an organization like the arts council.

Financial Plan

Includes recommendations to: increase cultural Funding for Individual Artists, Organizations and Service Agreements from \$1,450,000 to \$2,200,000 annually. Current level is \$1,300,000; provide \$50,000 annually for special projects; provide \$150,000 to \$200,000 for internal cultural staff and delivery; resource the construction of an arts and heritage facility in a cost-shared arrangement with the private sector (fundraising) and other levels of government. (Janzen & Associates, 2003, pps. 58-84).

Financial Context and Priorities

A review of the City of Kamloops' internal/unpublished Cultural Budget in 2018 shows a total cultural expenditure of \$3,073,332 (B. Berger, personal communication, March 19, 2018). This amount, compared to the \$1,300,000 identified as the 2003 cultural budget in the Cultural Strategic Plan, shows a considerable increase in cultural investment to have occurred over the past 15 years (the budget more than doubled). Given that the population of Kamloops rose by 6.4% between the 2006 and 2011 census (Statistics Canada 2011c), and by 5.5% between the 2011 and 2016 (Statistics Canada, 2016), we can reasonably deduce that cultural investment has outpaced population growth – a shift that shows a greater prioritization of culture to have occurred throughout this time-period.

Barbara Berger (Kamloops' Recreation, Social Development and Culture Manager) attributes this increase, in part, to a concurrent rise in the tournament capital brand and concept:

at the time that [the Cultural Strategic] Plan was developed, this Tournament Capital, this hosting program, was developing as an economic engine for the City...[as] a clean new economic opportunity. There is always a cultural component... we wanted to see the festival side developed as well... so it enabled me to look at...you know, the start of, Project X, our summer theatre Festival in the Park, [etc.]... and sort-of breat[he] life into new initiatives (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

The 2018 budget, when analyzed for its constituent line-items, appears to place significant emphasis, as in other cities, on the funding of core Arnoldian-rooted institutions – 56% of the total (\$1,739,484) went to fund service agreements for the Kamloops Art Gallery, Western Canada Theatre, Kamloops Symphony, Sagebrush Theatre and Kamloops Heritage Railway, as well as operating funding for the Kamloops Museum and Archives. The remaining funds were allocated to community-based cultural organizations, as well as the Arts, culture and heritage program generally⁸. Examples of community-based cultural initiatives/institutions funded include the Multicultural Society, Pipe Bands, the Old Courthouse Cultural Centre, the Kamloops Arts Council, etc.

The City's public dissemination of grant evaluation criteria lends further insight into its cultural funding priorities. Although only a few grant guidelines were made publically

⁸ Note: as the 2003 budget outlined in the Cultural Strategic Plan was not broken down by line-item, a line-item comparison with 2018 numbers is not possible.

available by the City, these provide insight into its approach to the funding allocation process. Included in the assessment criteria for the Community Arts Grant, for instance, is an outline of City funding priorities as follows: “the artistic merit of the project; the expressed benefit of the project to the promotion of arts and arts awareness within the community; the ability of the applicant to see the project through to completion; the collaboration between artists and organizations not usually involved in artistic production; samples of previous work produced by the artists... [and] the abilities of the applicant(s) to carry out the project within budget” (City of Kamloops, 2018). This set of criteria speaks to an approach to funding that takes into consideration a broad range of factors – including, but also superseding, attendance and participation.

Observations

In looking at this extensive list of strategies and recommendations, as well as the financial picture, some key observations emerge. First – the City of Kamloops appears (relative to the other cities examined) as ahead of its time in its pursuit of a rigorous cultural development agenda (Prince George -or rather the Regional District that includes Prince George- produced its cultural plan in 2006, and Kelowna in 2011).

Second – it is notable that while the plan includes, as a major pillar, an economic development strategy, it also includes (in addition to recommendations surrounding the development of arts-based organizations and initiatives), a mandate to develop a ‘learning community’. Through these distinct agendas – one harkening to an economic growth model, and the other to a collective knowledge- and insight- development process, we see a key tension stated.

A third observation notes that the plan, written before the ICSP process had been widely implemented, was in many ways ahead of its time in its recommendations surrounding the *integration* of culture into a wider community development network, framework and agenda. The plan notes: “we will build a community where arts and heritage are integrated, are relevant and are part of every day life and are viewed as an essential part of the community” (p. 56). This intent shows a valuation of culture as key to community wellbeing and a sustainable ecology.

As we will see in the interviews, this Cultural Plan continues to be referenced by many in Kamloops’ cultural community for its role in solidifying a framework for cultural

development that places emphasis on collaboration over competition. Its currency, however, is now, given its age, limited.

Where does the cultural strategic plan sit now (the failure of the Performing Arts Centre initiative)?

The majority of the recommendations made in the Cultural Strategic Plan have been completed. This said, one of the plan's key recommendations – the creation of an Arts and Heritage Centre (later called a Performing Arts Centre) was left unaccomplished. In 2016, the City of Kamloops, which had “purchased the former Kamloops Daily News building shortly after the newspaper closed down”, put forward a “\$90million proposal for a performing arts centre and parking complex for that property” (Kergin, 2016, para. 6). This agenda-item was put to a referendum – with a significant number of cultural organizations (though not all), as well as Tourism Kamloops and the Kamloops Central Business Improvement Association supporting the referendum (para.3), and with the City itself spending \$35,000 on advertising for the vote (Kergin, 2016b). Some of the ‘no’ votes, according to Barbara Berger (Kamloops Recreation, Social Development and Culture Manager), came from geographic divides: “there were... geographic pockets... on that side of the river – [who would say] “why am I going to vote for something that benefits this side of the river”(personal communication, May 5, 2016). The vote occurred in November 2015, and the initiative was denied by 53.7% (CBC News, 2015, November 9). This action would present a blow to the cultural community. Kathy Humphreys (Kamloops Symphony) speaks to the impact of this move:

Well I think everyone needed time to lick their wounds really, because it was so intense for those of us who were promoting it, and it was so close in the referendum... It was quite close. And it was devastating really. So no one even wanted to talk about it I would say for at least a few months... I'm kind of waiting for the city to take some kind of a lead, or give some kind of indication of what they would like to see happen next, because the mayor and the city staff like the whole city machine was as a promoter of... they were very much for the project and wanted to see it happen and worked really hard on it, so I think that hasn't changed... that they're in support of it... I don't know where we go from here exactly (personal communication, May 4, 2016).

Not only was the Performing Arts Centre referendum-failure seen as a challenge to the cultural community's morale, but the act of developing the concept for this Centre was responsible, it seems, for presenting challenges to the community's heretofore sense of unity and ecological connectedness. As Barbara Berger, observes:

[the Performing Arts Centre] wasn't perceived to be a positive project by all cultural partners... Western Canada Theatre ... didn't believe... they felt 1200 seats would kill the type of programming they're committed to performing, and that it would put them into a financial model that would be really you know detrimental to them and the company... (personal communication, May 5, 2016).⁹

Here then, we see the referendum and process of developing a plan for a Performing Arts Centre as having negative impact on the cohesiveness that had been generated within the cultural community. The Cultural Strategic Plan, Barbara notes, "is very ... cohesive and brought a lot of stability...so we have a project that began that was somewhat divisive" (personal communication, May 5, 2016). Following this event, then, the need to 'regroup' – to bring cultural leaders and the cultural community at-large together to re-build unity and a shared vision is, according to Barbara, essential: "There were some really incredible lessons learned, but it's also [the failure of the referendum and associated development process] why I think that the next evolution of cultural mapping and planning is so important that it happen and a process be identified sooner than later" (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

This call for renewal of the Cultural Strategic Plan (now 15 years old) is echoed by many interviewees. The sector, bound together for so long by a commitment to a larger ecological vision, has seen an erosion of this cohesiveness.

This erosion is accompanied, it should be said, by a tangible sense of angst as related to the impending change in leadership faced by the sector:

I think that some of the key people are leaving, are passing away, or they're retiring, and I don't think there's good succession planning in-place, so it's difficult to know exactly what will happen and what

The Sagebrush Theatre – a 685 seat proscenium theatre jointly owned by the City of Kamloops and the Kamloops/Thompson School District, has for many years served as the home for Western Canada Theatre and the Kamloops Symphony Orchestra. Kathy Sinclair explains that the theatre is currently "booked over 280 days a year" (Edwards, 2018). Western Canada Theatre, according to Barbara Berger (personal communication, May 5, 2016), retains booking priority within the Sagebrush Theatre. Additionally, the Sagebrush Theatre is seen as less than adequate for music and dance performances as it was constructed for theatre, and does not have appropriate acoustics or floors to best support these art forms. The proposed Performing Arts Centre was to have a main hall that would seat up to 1200, a black box flexible theatre space that would seat up to 350, and a performance hall that would seat up to 120. Western Canada Theatre, according to Berger, did not see its programming as fitting into the the main hall: "1200 seats would kill the type of programming they're committed to performing... [and would] put them into a financial model that would be detrimental" (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

mechanisms need to be in-place to make those things happen (W. Garrett-Petts, May 3, 2016).

Here, then, we see that while the 2003 Cultural Strategic Plan fostered on many levels a sense of togetherness, and an ecological mindedness within the cultural sector, one of its key recommendations, the development of a Performing Arts Centre, when put into action, served to create divisiveness – posing a challenge to the sector’s sense of unity. This divisiveness, coupled with questions now coming forward pertaining to the future leadership’s resilience (or lack thereof), present real challenges to the spirit of collaboration that had for many years infused the sector.

Cultural Development within the City’s Larger Development System

While the Cultural Strategic Plan has served, alongside other factors, to (largely) support and nourish cohesiveness, the City’s staffing support infrastructure embodies a conflicted stance towards cultural development – one that both enables and diminishes the potential of the sector to move forward within an ecological sustainability context.

To begin (echoing the absence of cultural development agendas in the ICSP and OCP) there appears to be (and have been) little recognition by the various Mayors and Councils of culture’s role in developing a sustainable ecology. Barbara Berger (Kamloops Recreation, Social Development and Culture Manager), observes the following:

Our sustainability plan until very near its completion really was an environmental plan... to this day it’s something I still see our Council, our elected officials, if you were to ask them what sustainability means in our community, they would immediately say that their top 5 sustainability priorities would be environmental (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

This lack of understanding surrounding cultural sustainability potentials carries over into the city’s administration, where culture is, it seems, downplayed in its ability to contribute to a wider ecology:

culture was very very isolated... when I advocated for the first time for the Museum to be involved in our official community planning process, certainly to be shaping our future, there were people and experts in our organization that understand our past more than anyone else so wouldn’t that be key in terms of how we plan for the future, and that was... they [city administration] hadn’t thought about this. And the same thing with the Sustainability Plan (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

Additional barriers to the City's understanding of culture as a force for sustainability come from the mechanisms in-place at City Hall that systemically relegate culture to the sidelines. Jen Casorso is the Social and Community Development Supervisor for the City of Kamloops. Her position, while focused on the social dimension of sustainability is also responsible to bring cultural concerns forward within the City's planning and decision-making processes. She reveals her frustration at this systemic exclusion of culture. The following excerpt from her interview reveals the systemic mechanisms by which such relegation, within the City infrastructure, occurs:

So I am one individual within the organization, I try to be the gatekeeper for the social/community development work. But sometimes I feel like I've been, I'm like the isolated, lone individual doing this, right? And council sometimes positions me like that. And I try hard... and I use the sustainability plan to really help drive this, right... that I'm but one individual of the team, like everyone has an ownership over all of the policies that we are to implement, right? ... So it seems like it is an ongoing struggle all the time, and you'll see this in our council reports. So we have a template that we use for council reports, -this is something that I sometimes smash my head against the desk about because I feel it falls on deaf ears, it doesn't always... people hear me, it just doesn't change. Council reports have a variety of sections that include financial implications, personnel implications, social, sustainability, environmental implications... so the author of the report should be commenting on as many of those sections as is relevant to what they are proposing to council. But what we find is that there may be a knowledge gap for an individual, but they're not seeking us out to fill that knowledge gap, they're rather just not including anything. So it will go through an internal process to be edited, where another department, they're called document services... will clean it up, clean up the template, remove the stuff that's not completed and just keep the content that the author has submitted, and then it goes back for review to the author, and once the author is good with it, they will have it reviewed by their direct report, and it goes up the chain. No one up the chain is saying – no, timeout, where are your social implications? Where are your sustainability implications? And so reports will go forward without any of that, and that needs to change...like there's... on transit related things there's a social impact, I have never once fed info into a transit report. Which I should be because on a poverty side of things I come up against transit issues every day, right? So... there's work that needs to happen to create those understandings... (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

[S.K.] So there's a systemic underplaying of social issues as related to planning and development?

Yeah, I think people think that it can be contained, ... but haven't realized that no, as an organization, we have to embed this within everything that we do, right? Because it's so important to all of our work... if you really want to effect quality of life and change...

[S.K.] So is one of those boxes related to culture and cultural implications?

No.

[S.K.] So the social actually falls on the table but culture does not?

That's right

Yeah and I guess it depends on how you look at it, because if you just went on how they've structured the sustainability plan, you could write culture under social implications, or even under sustainability implications, although what I gather from the sustainability implications is it's really about our environmental reductions, like our energy emissions and stuff like that, and not so much focused on other things (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

Jennifer goes on to show that some changes are happening in the social/cultural services ability to infiltrate, and collaborate with, other City departments:

One of the successes that's happened in the last few years, it didn't happen right away, and it took a long time felt like, at least 3 years for this to happen, is as an organization we have this team called the Project Evaluation Team – P.E.T. for short. They meet every Friday morning and they talk about development applications. And they bash things around. Here's all the issues from a drainage perspective, here's all the sewage issues. It gets highly technical. Because it's all the people in the organization that may be affected by a project moving forward. And so, what's helpful is that that is my opportunity to try to get those social implications into the document. And so I try to do my best at doing that (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

These changes, though, appear to be slow in coming. It is apparent – from Jennifer and Barbara's frustration, that the systemic exclusion of culture (and social) concerns in city planning, and also the lack of recognition of culture's potential role within a sustainability framework, constitutes a key barrier to their work.

On the other hand, it should be noted that the cultural, social and recreational sectors of the City, at least, appear to harbour a collaborative and constructive relationship. Key to this relationship, it seems, is Barbara's role which, while instigated in 2004 as the Cultural and Heritage Manager (one of the key recommendations of the Cultural Strategic Plan), was soon to grow to take on responsibility for not only the cultural but also social and recreational services. Currently her job title is: Recreation, Social Development and Culture Manager. According to Jennifer Casorso, (who works under

Barbara as the Social and Community Development Supervisor), Barbara's position of oversight for all three of services allows for a climate of collaboration between them:

So she's [Barbara's] responsible for her title – recreation and culture and social development –so it's kind of all encompassing. But her primary focus for the last, well, since I've been with the city, has been largely on the culture piece, right? She has a team of supervisors that then helps manage in the other areas – social community development, recreation we have aquatics supervisor, and a recreation health/wellness supervisor... we all connect to each other because of, just sheer quality of life, just wanting to improve everyone's quality of life, and how can you do that? And we see ways we can do that together. I work with vulnerable populations, I work with all the service providers, non-profit organizations in the community, and often there's opportunity to pair culture, art-based organizations with those social agencies and vice-versa, right? So one example would be... the Arts Council has started working with - for the last couple of years - Crossing Bridges Art and Outreach Program. So they work with many non-profit organizations in the community to help bring art to vulnerable people to help them get past trauma or whatever, um, the city has funded that through social planning grants or through arts grants. So we see it as priorities that are being met in both areas, so that's another crossover... (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

Clearly, then, Barbara's role, and her oversight of multiple services, provides a connect point whereby culture can be woven into, and considered within, a larger ecosystem of city practice – at least within recreation and social domains.

In addition to playing a bridging role, Barbara's position is seen to advocate for the cultural community within City Hall. Speaking to the creation of her position in 2004, Will Garrett-Petts (Thompson Rivers University) says the following:

the idea was to place a champion in City Hall. When I was up in Prince George in 2009, they were looking, I don't know if they've done anything since then, but they were looking at our model as an important difference... to have an empowered spokesperson to champion culture within City Hall...and from my perspective that's been a very important sounding board... Even Barbara's choice to keep her office in City Hall rather than in the Tournament Capital Centre up on campus is an important strategic one... She's keeping the advocacy for culture and I think as much as she is a manager for that area she is also very much an advocate for it as well... and wants coherent policy, and wants to see the whole cultural agenda well-integrated into our discussions. And I don't think that could be done from an outside position. It would seem more lobbying rather than a naturalizing of the role of culture. So I see that as a really positive step forward (personal communication, May 3, 2016).

Many of the interviews with funded organizations in the cultural community echo this view. Kathy Humphreys (Symphony) says: “So it doesn’t feel like she’s [Barbara’s] part of the bureaucracy as much as she’s inside city hall as an advocate for us. Here, then, we see a dual role played by Barbara Berger as both cross-services connector, and advocate for the cultural community.

While there appears, then, to be a high-level connection achieved between culture and both social and recreation services at the City, its integration into the City’s wider framework of decision-making appears as problematic – with systemic hurdles working to significantly limit culture’s cross-disciplinary potential. Such hurdles pose real challenges to a vision of culture that is rooted in ecological development and integrative sustainability practice.

Moving Forward - Strategic Plan and Vision

Recognizing the difficulties faced by the City’s cultural staff in transcending these systemic barriers, it is worth taking a moment to highlight one of the key insights that came forward from my interview with Barbara Berger (City of Kamloops) – an insight that shows her vision for a future manifestation of the Cultural Strategic Plan, and that also highlights a commitment to culture as an ecological force.

To begin – Barbara acknowledges the role played by the 2003 Strategic Plan in both changing the approach taken by political leaders to culture, and in engendering a collaborative, rather than competitive relationship between the cultural organizations:

[The Cultural Strategic Plan] elevated culture in the minds of our politicians and people who seek leadership in this community. And they used that plan more than anything to say yes – this is what I would go forward with in creating a sustainable model of funding for these groups vs. having to come cap-in-hand and do this – request funding - every year... and shouldn’t part of that relationship be [about] saying: ‘you are an important partner in delivering all the things that as a City... in developing a high quality of life?... And thank you cultural community for the huge role you play in helping to accomplish this... So you don’t have to worry, you don’t have to compete with one another’ (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

One of the effects of this collaborative mindset is, in Barbara’s view, the positioning of the cultural community as a catalyst in generating the kinds of discussions now needed by the City as it wades through questions surrounding its identity and direction.

I think what we've come to now is a little bit of an identity crisis that has been fleshed out by this mining question [Ajax mine], in and around the future of our city... and people don't see themselves... we don't see ourselves, as a mill town anymore (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

Barbara puts forward the cultural community as the ideal instigator of dialogue surrounding this crisis. Specifically, she points to the generation of a new Cultural Strategic Plan as an opportunity for the cultural community to play this dialogue-facilitation role. She sees this plan as including a 'cultural map' that houses insights related to the cultural histories and identities of place. Pointing to a recent project accomplished by the Museum and Archives, she shows how cultural organizations can bring new insight as related to place and identity that are of relevance to the current identity crisis occurring within the city at-large:

The very project that the Museum and Heritage Commission are doing as related to, say, the outcome of the vote for the referendum, the mapping of the culture of these geographic pockets and the history of the cultures there... I think that an exercise on mapping would allow us to better-understand our community...(personal communication, May 5, 2016).

[S.K.] So...you're looking at cultural mapping and cultural planning as a much larger process than involving just the cultural sector. This process is infused with the core issues around culture and identity of this place.

Absolutely.

[S.K.] And what I'm seeing is that because the plan would be housed in the cultural community, there is a leadership role being played by that community in generating a wider conversation around identity.

It has to play that [role] I believe because this isn't the Official Community Plan, it is cultural mapping, so they do need to play that leadership role. But it needs to be so much broader and more inclusive of the community to really reflect how we advance culture and move forward.

[S.K.] ...you see a role for artists in extracting and compiling or presenting those aspects of identity?

Absolutely... that's part of a cultural leadership... artist-based.... I don't personally... again, this would be new to me to participate in this... but I really do believe we are ready as a community for a process like that...And I think the community is ready too after the whole PAC [Performing Arts Centre] ... and plus with the mine...I think what artists are able to do, because of the different ways they would be able to uncover and introduce... I don't think people would silo in the process. It would be new, bringing everybody together – a new way of seeing and

experiencing, and unearthing.... So I think that that's again just a huge benefit over say a traditional sort of consulting - I think we're beyond that. In fact, I think people are somewhat jaded to that (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

Here, Barbara puts forward a mechanism in which creative and artistic practice can evolve community consultation processes, bringing the wider community together collaboratively and creatively.

This process, she claims, also has the potential to produce new insights and understandings as related to place, community and history:

I think the other thing that artists tend to do is to turn to our natural environment and our natural history in a way that... because that's where they will draw some inspiration, ... by using that they give everybody a very different lens. And after what we've just been through, I think [it is important] that people [are] owning and feeling that sense that 'this is our planning'... (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

Here, then, we see a cultural planning direction suggested in which creative practice drives a wider community discussion and uncovers new ecologically-derived understandings surrounding place and history.

8.4.3. Summary

To summarize, then: neither the City of Kamloops' ICSP nor its OCP appears to have had significant impact on the City's cultural sector. The ICSP, contrary to many such plans across the country, does not posit culture as a 4th pillar of sustainability – but relegates culture to a sub-goal. Furthermore, its recommendations essentially replicate those made in the Cultural Strategic Plan. The City's Cultural Strategic Plan is out-dated, and, while it originally played an essential role in unifying the cultural community, has more recently instigated dissension through the actuation of one of its key recommendations (the Performing Arts Centre development).

Within the City structure itself, there exists some sizeable hurdles as related to the manifestation of a cultural sustainability agenda – notably the systemic exclusion of cultural agendas within planning-based decision-making processes. In spite of these hurdles, the cultural staff at the city have managed to create a level of interconnectivity between culture, social and recreation services. Barbara Berger (City of Kamloops) has also put forward a vision for a new strategic plan that re-positions the Cultural

Community as an essential and integrated force in the creation of new understandings and realities within the City at-large – thereby, perhaps, shining light on the City’s potential as a laboratory for a kind of cultural sustainability rooted in an ecological approach.

8.5. Insights from Interviews

Switching gears for a moment - it is worth noting some of the findings that came forward surrounding the ways in which the City addresses its cultural management and development role, and the opportunities, and pitfalls facing the City as it charts a new path and strategy for cultural development.

While many interviewees expressed satisfaction with the City’s cultural management approach, a few key tensions are worthy of consideration, particularly as the Cultural Services department heads into the development of a new Strategic Plan. Furthermore, various interviewees flagged emerging trends and shifts within the cultural community that are changing the ways in which cultural organizations and governments approach their work. These comments can be seen to pose items for consideration as the City moves towards actuation of a sustainable cultural ecology.

8.5.1. Critiques

1. Need to balance agendas related to attendance, programming and risk-taking

Several interviewees spoke to the balance to be had between the City’s focus on attendance as a key measurement tool, versus its focus on artistic risk-taking. While recognizing the importance of attendance numbers, Kathy Humphreys (Symphony) also sees an over-weighting of this criteria as limiting the organization’s capacity for exploration and experimentation:

I think maybe in their (the City’s) minds sometimes, drops in attendance means that we’re doing something wrong, whereas there are lots and lots and lots of factors contributing to attendance, and not the least of which is the fact that our community is so active...

So we don’t always have the answer [to why a particular performance was not well attended], but sometimes it could point to programming, and the level of sophistication of our audience. So we’d like to introduce them

to new things or things they might not be exposed to otherwise or would never have before... we also want to provide them with things that they're more familiar with and that they really enjoy (personal communication, May 4, 2016).

Here we see a tension between the need to 'fill seats' by keeping an audience within a particular comfort zone and the need to also program innovative and/or cutting-edge work.

Margaret Chrumka (Kamloops Art Gallery) also references the City's focus on attendance as a performance measurement tool. In her view, this focus does not diminish the Gallery's risk-taking capabilities – partly because the organization has found ways to engage the wider community in risky work through adjunct programming: “because our exhibitions can be quite controversial, we don't do programming that's going to push them even further. We do programming that's going to gently encourage them to be okay with the content of the exhibitions... I know attendance is a very core measure, but our attendance is great, our memberships are stable and growing, our donations are stable and growing, so we're kind of meeting all the obvious targets in terms of committing to our funders” (personal communication, May 4, 2016).

This said, Margaret conveys a willingness to shift programming, if needed, so as to comply with the City's attendance/accessibility expectations:

If we get comments from City Council like – why aren't you guys having more exhibitions like the Arts Council – which my predecessor took to mean – more accessible exhibitions, we would listen to that because, as one of our funders, we know we have a responsibility to deliver some of their expectations - but they're only one of, you know, we consider them one of 6 pieces of our planning puzzle. And I would say Canada Council and BC Arts Council and their pursuit of excellence and nurturing of new emerging artists can be in conflict with what the City expects of us, but I think we have enough of a historical reputation that it's okay. Some exhibitions do not appeal to the broader community in Kamloops (personal communication, May 4, 2016).

Here then, we see a tension between the City's focus on attendance/accessibility as a key performance measurement, and the ability of the Gallery and Symphony to take risks that may limit accessibility and attendance.

2. Allocation of funding – large vs. small, professional vs. ‘un’professional

Another area of tension/critique involves the prioritization of professional groups within funding allocations. Kathy Sinclair, Executive Director of the Kamloops Arts Council, notes an imbalance between the funding received by the Arts Council and the larger professional arts organizations: “funding from the arts section of the City, you know, it does go towards more like producing theatre, or producing gallery, that kind of thing” (personal communication, May 2, 2016).

[S.K.] So you’re more of a community development organization rather than a presenting organization?

Exactly.. there does tend to be sort-of the perception of the big three and then we’re a fraction of those budgets...(personal communication, May 2, 2016).

[S.K.] So why do you think that is? Why do you think funding priority is given to professional arts groups?

it goes way back and for whatever reason the political will is to put money in this pot and not that pot as much. Or... yeah. I think it’s also just to do with perception and professionalism... so I guess that – we hope to keep increasing that level of professionalism, and - you can be a professional organization but be working with artists who maybe haven’t had training and, you know, we see that as totally co-existing together... (personal communication, May 2, 2016).

Kathy hints in her interview at a shift in strategy that would allow more value to be placed on development of the cultural community. She speaks to her organization’s role in enabling this development to occur:

So our core mission is to support artists and to give them opportunities to show, sell, or get their work out there, and we do provide grants as well on a fairly limited basis.

There’s numerous smaller arts groups – like tones – I think there’s 5 small theatre companies in Kamloops, and they seem to be springing up all the time, and the photo arts club, there’s a prints and crafts club, so there’s a lot going on, and we the Kamloops Arts Council, we’re trying to position ourselves as the umbrella organization at least for the smaller arts organizations... right now we’re mostly visual arts focused but we’re really trying to branch out into theatre, music, dance, film... all artists we’re representing, and so, in order for us to respond to the needs of artists and smaller arts groups, then, you know, that’s one of the things we’re trying to do is have that ongoing conversation – what does our arts community need?... one of the big needs that we keep hearing is – more space. So rehearsal space for musicians, for theatre groups, space that is reasonable that can be

rented out on a reasonable basis... (personal communication, May 2, 2016)

Here, then, we encounter a suggestion that the City look at factors other than 'professionalism' (ie: artistic professionalism) when determining funding allocations. In particular, an organization's catalytic role in developing an arts community might be considered an evaluative standard.

3. Consideration of role of art within larger social fabric

A number of emerging trends were identified by interviewees that, within the context of a new Strategic Plan and pursuit of an ecological stance, may be worthy of consideration. These pertain largely to the role of arts in enacting, and engaging with, wider community agendas:

Margaret Chrumka (Kamloops Art Gallery) speaks to an awakening now happening as related to the role of art in enacting healing agendas;

...in the same way that... if you read something and have to explain it to a friend and teach it to a class... certain parts of your brain light up which builds up dendrites to stave off Alzheimers – music has the same capacity to a unique part of our brain that no other activity nourishes. And you know, I don't investigate it fully – it's a surface investigation, but it just seems, that somebody is going to say – we've been doing it long enough – it's obviously nourishing, there's got to be a health benefit (personal communication, May 4, 2016)

Margaret points, then, to an increasing recognition of the role of the arts in healing and wellness agendas – also to its role in developing new cognitive thought-processes.

Julia Cyr, Supervisor of the Kamloops Museum and Archives, points to a shift underway in the museums community, in which museums are broadening their reach to: a) engage in current issues in addition to those deemed as 'historical', and b) broaden their engagement platform so as to increase relevance amongst youth, underserved populations, etc.

Kamloops is in this questioning period of who we are and where we're going... I feel that on a micro level the museum is in that position too, because we reflect Kamloops. We're asking those questions of ourselves... what histories are we addressing, what are we talking about when we're looking at different levels of exhibits? So right now something that's very new for us is that we're introducing an exhibit of the recent history of skateboarding over the last 30 years.. and it's definitely raising

a couple of eyebrows because people are expecting from a heritage museum stuff from 1912... We are a heritage museum but we also want to reflect contemporary culture as well... heritage is happening right now. So I see this museum growing as well as a place that is more than just a museum, we're a cultural hub as well... and we offer different types of programming like yoga... different groups can come in and have meetings of the mind... and I think we're reflecting that shift too (personal communication, May 5, 2016).

An additional cultural development possibility brought forward by Will Garrett-Petts (Thompson Rivers University), focuses on the role of artists (and students) in enacting social change within communities. Speaking about the work accomplished by Thompson Rivers University in recent decades to match students with community organizations on targeted projects, Will notes the following:

The students become a wonderful bridge. And as long as we make sure that it's a great experience for the students, a really valuable and an enrichment experience, and that they're doing good work while they're out there so that they're well supervised, I think that will continue.

My own perspective is that artists also play a similar kind of bridging role, and they make visible, and they make available, often complex notions ... they become agents of social change, and that's something that we definitely championed when we had the funding to do it...they both play a really important bridging role between the world of ideas, the research that's there that can inform decision-making and the actualizing of that.. the activating and animating of that within smaller communities (personal communication, May 3, 2016).

Here then, we see a recognition of artist (and student) as change-maker.

These observations show an emerging understanding of artistic practice as profoundly relevant to, and imbricated within, a wider set of social structures. Here, it seems, we are being challenged to think about the value of the arts beyond standard valuations accorded to it by historical precedence and the mechanisms working within the art community – and to imagine ecological potentials surrounding creative practice when it is 'unleashed' into a wider domain of practice.

An additional set of insights surrounding an ecological role for art worth noting was brought forward by Will Garrett-Petts. Will posits that in the face of a shifting logic that turns focus away from 'creativity' to innovation, it is more important than ever that cultural systems pursue connectivity with wider community development goals as a key principle and motivating agenda.

[S.K.] So in terms of creation of a new [Cultural] Plan, how would you recommend the conversation begin? What are the key elements that you think need to be part of the dialogue around the creation of a plan?

Well here's an interesting phenomenon that's going on... nationally, provincially and even locally...that the emphasis is not on a creative community. So it's not the rise of the Creative Class, it's an innovative community. That innovation, which is not creativity, not creation; innovation, the innovation agenda, is something that is very much alive, and it's very appealing, I think, to the political class and decision makers. And nobody wants to leave the term innovation off, everybody wants to say – oh yes we're part of that – and a lot of that was driven by the Harper government nationally, and of course by the liberal government here. So when Andrew Wilkinson [B.C. MLA] comes to visit our campus he wants to find out about the new graduate programs that we're offering, they want to make sure that it's tied to the jobs agenda and the innovation agenda. So that's driving an awful lot. More people outside Kamloops who are in decision-making capacities would know about Kamloops Innovation Centre then they would about the Museum and Archives or the Kamloops Art Gallery and what it's doing for the community. And the Kamloops Innovation Centre is doing really interesting work, but it's very small-scale, and it's mainly for high-tech entrepreneurs who want to create start-ups, want to create their own small businesses. And in the last 4 years, they've been successful in supporting 17 small businesses. 17's not a big number. But it fits the prevailing narrative of innovation and so becomes a source for good stories of how small places can grow and how they can develop, and for linking everybody together, maker groups, maker societies and so forth, and it sounds really very good.

[S.K.] It's interesting because when I hear innovation I hear newness, and a sense of forward motion, but the term is rooted in a logic that...

It's rooted in neoliberalism, and the neoliberal agenda is no great friend of smaller places. And I think the more people uncritically buy into innovation, I'm not anti-innovation, and I'm not anti-making links, etc., but to put all of the eggs in that basket, and to uncritically adopt an innovation agenda, you can hear that I'm more than a little suspicious. And I don't ... you can take a look at what's happening in Australia, it's kind of a canary in the mineshaft, and that's it's not particularly helpful there, it hasn't saved the small towns, I'm not sure that the creative agenda can either, unless it's fully integrated with a successful social agenda (personal communication, May 3, 2016).

Will continues on to point to the value of cultural ecological collaboration as a kind of antidote to neoliberalist logics:

It's interesting that most of our conversation hasn't been about creative outputs, ie works of one kind or another, but rather working together, and finding ways of working together. And I think that's really gonna be the

salvation of smaller places is figuring out how their cultural organizations whether they're formal or informal, you know – galleries, or arts councils or whatever they might be – embracing a progressive social agenda, and working with other institutions and other groups to create a quality of life – a shared quality of life in smaller places that is truly possible. But saying - if we can only attract another industry, if we can only open up another mine, if we can only do this, that somehow that will be ... that's a boom and bust prescription for smaller places. A kind of steady, organic growth is really what would be the ideal. Pretty utopian, eh? (personal communication, May 3, 2016).

Here, then, Will substantiates the need for an ecological approach to cultural development in which cultural organizations look up and beyond their own institutional realities to create alliances, and make change, in concert with a wider network of community goals, organizations and individuals.

Such an approach, utopian as it may be, is put forward as a key ingredient in the sustainability of both cultural sectors within small cities, and of small cities generally. The ability of cultural sectors to collaborate, to network with a wider array of community development forces, and to collectively move forward in enacting change is seen to pose an antidote to a logic of neoliberalism that would channel communities into a kind of economic essentialist manifestation of 'growth' in which core community values are sacrificed to often-superficial, short-term, manifestations of 'progress'.

8.6. Conclusion

The cultural future of Kamloops faces many challenges. These include: a lack of buy-in by elected officials to the concept of cultural sustainability; the absence of culture within sustainability planning frameworks; the systemic exclusion (or relegation to the sidelines) of culture within the staffing infrastructure of City Hall; a sense of divisiveness within the community brought about by the Performing Arts Centre referendum; a dawning recognition of the need for (and absence of) succession planning; etc.

This said, the City houses some remarkable assets that may provide a level of resilience, and possibility, to the cultural scene in the face of these challenges. The community's long-standing propensity for collaboration, its aspirational nature, its ability to co-exist with and benefit from other sectors (ie: sporting), its propensity for critical thinking and reflection (evident throughout the interview process), its propensity for social engagement and for an ecological orientation to the work being accomplished; its

possession of a cultural manager in City Hall who is not only an advocate for the sector, but who works to make connections between culture and a wider city ecology; and its strong connection (and working relationship with) Thompson Rivers University as a key driver of community development and social change – all of these elements together present a fertile ground in which new possibilities and approaches to these problems can, potentially emerge.

Given the larger shift identified by Will Garrett-Petts (Thompson Rivers University) towards an increasingly neoliberal governance logic and framework, it seems essential that these assets be mobilized to their full extent. Such mobilization would, it seem, set Kamloops apart as a model – a kind of ‘beacon’ of alternative thinking surrounding culture’s role – that could prove valuable to other cities and cultural scenes facing similar challenges in the face of a seemingly-impenetrable logic of economic essentialism brought about by neoliberalization.

Chapter 9. Reflection

What, then, can small city cultural governance contexts tell us about the challenge of using cultural policy to develop a fuller and richer sustainable culture? In this chapter, I reflect back on the case studies – applying the lenses outlined in the methodology section of this report to develop a multi-level, critical analysis. I look also at a set of heretofore unexamined findings that reveal particular conditions within small cities that make them potentially fertile sites for the development of such pathways. Finally, looking back at the research data as a whole – I note the change-factors seen to move cities from a creative city to a cultural sustainability model of governance.

9.1. Predominance of Neoliberal Governance Modalities

To begin - all three cities' cultural offices, plans and policies show evidence of neoliberal governance, and of creative cities principles at work - with theories surrounding the creative class and creative tourism referenced as a driving force underlying numerous of their cultural development initiatives. In Kelowna we witness this paradigm's prevalence, for instance, in Corie Griffiths' acknowledgement of the Central Okanagan Economic Development Commission's efforts to attract, through culture, creative class workers (personal communication, April 27, 2016). This same paradigm is evident in Prince George – in the RDFFG's positioning of culture as a means to draw tourists and economic development; and in Kamloops, through the City's intertwining of cultural development with sports development under the 'tournament capital' moniker - a vehicle for economic and tourism investment. In all three cities, the link between culture and tourism/creative class attraction provides a key rationale for municipal cultural support, and positions culture as a commodity within a new-world governance framework – a vehicle for the marketization of place.

9.2. Predominance of Arnoldian/Professional Culture

Coupled with this preoccupation with culture's propensity for economic development is its position within these cities' governance bureaucracies as a predominantly Arnoldian force - the lion's share of funding managed by the City of Kamloops, Kelowna and RDFFG (less so the City of Prince George) ascribed to 'professional' institutes such as

public art galleries, museums and theatres – with lesser amounts allocated to anthropologically-based community arts organizations, multicultural groups, Indigenous groups, etc. Professional arts/heritage organizations and initiatives, in other words, are positioned centre-stage within these municipalities’ cultural policy and funding platforms. This hierarchy again draws attention to culture’s commodity status – and to its symbolic value in showcasing competitiveness and ‘Arnoldian excellence’ as related to place. Culture is here positioned as a resource – it is subjected to the demands of the global marketplace, and implicated in the marketization of arenas that would, within a cultural sustainability paradigm, be dedicated to democratic processes and citizen cultivation (McGuigan 2005; Miller and Yudice, 2002; Zelizer, 2011, p.249).

Such a view is complicated, it should be said, by the drive expressed by many of the professional/Arnoldian groups interviewed to showcase and support anthropological forms of culture and identity. The Exploration Place’s (Prince George) partnership with local First Nation Lheidli T’enneh, in which it holds a collection of cultural artefacts and knowledge (2017); the Kamloops Museum and Archives’ *Ground Control* exhibition showcasing the City’s recent history of skateboarding (2016); the work accomplished by the professional organizations in all three cities to connect with Indigenous culture and identity – these programs and initiatives speak to a permeable relationship between Arnoldian and anthropological expressions of culture. Recognizing this permeability, Rob Budde’s (Prince George UNBC Professor) observations surrounding the colonialist-tinged power structures that infuse and drive many of the professional institutions’ leaderships nonetheless resonate. Here we see, in spite of these instances of diverse anthropologically-oriented programming, a power structure in which is preferred ‘professionalized’, often European-informed and market-benefitting modes of production (personal communication, April 20, 2016).

9.3. Culture’s Marginalized Place within Municipal Power Structures

Recognizing the centre-stage position enjoyed by Arnoldian-based/professional cultural institutions within these cities’ cultural departments, it is important to also recognize these departments themselves as positioned, to varying extents, on the margins of dominant municipal decision-making power. Proponents of cultural development agendas struggle perpetually in all three cities to articulate culture’s validity and

usefulness within their larger municipal infrastructures. This struggle is seen in Kamloops – Jen Casorso’s (Social and Community Development Supervisor – City of Kamloops) comments highlighting the City’s systemic preferencing of land-use/planning logics over people-centred and cultural logics speak to a marked divide within the City’s administrative infrastructure. A similar struggle is seen in Kelowna - in the detachment (identified by the City’s Long-Range Planning Manager James Moore) between the city’s lower-level Cultural Plan and its Official Community Plan. In both Kamloops and Kelowna, we see evidence of a systemic marginalization of cultural agendas -often in conjunction with social and recreation agendas. Culture is systemically positioned as a peripheral, rather than central, force.

9.4. Non-Progressive Policy and Indicators Frameworks

Contributing to culture’s position on the periphery is the seeming inability of these cities’ governments (some more than others) to set progressive goals and objectives for cultural development through policy, and to follow-up on these through progressive indicators frameworks and managerial practices. While the City of Kelowna and the RDFFG stand out from the others in their creation of current cultural plans, none of the municipal governments examined (Kelowna included) appears to endorse and/or enact a comprehensive, value-based indicators system. Most rely on standardized measurement data for analysis – including attendance - positioned by many interviewees as a blunt evaluative mechanism that fails to account for the core work, purpose and stories of the organizations being assessed. The lack of engagement we see demonstrated by these governments with policy opportunities rooted in sustainable development principles, and with values-based indicators systems (except perhaps in Kamloops – in which we see the beginnings of such engagement expressed in the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department’s ecologically-based vision), reflects, perhaps, what Tracy Calogheros (Chief Executive Officer – Exploration Place, Prince George) calls a ‘white bread’ style of governance – one that propagates existing power hierarchies and reinforces the status quo (personal communication, April 22, 2016).

9.5. Mismatched Rhetoric

Such an approach stands at odds, in many cases, to the rhetoric unleashed by these cities through their cultural plans and policies. The fact that two of the three cities -

Kelowna and Prince George - rhetorically pay tribute within their OCP's, ICSP's and/or Cultural Plans to the power of culture in enacting sustainable development brings into the spotlight what some might call a 'third-way' approach to governance – one that uses the progressive language and ideology surrounding cultural sustainable development as a form of window dressing that in-turn serves to humanize the hard edge of market-based development logic. We see this approach in Kelowna's Cultural Plan in particular which, while touting the benefits of sustainable cultural development, at the same time promotes culture's role as a catalyst for economic growth, and positions sustainability almost exclusively as 'sustainability of the cultural sector'. While on one hand the City professes a rhetorical commitment to cultural sustainability, culture's potential as a sustainable development force is, within this context, limited.

9.6. Creative Cities / Resilient Cities

A second limiting force against which sustainable cultural development agendas are positioned, it seems, is a disaster preparedness ethic and logic. James Moore (Long-Range Planning Manager, City of Kelowna) outlines a trend occurring globally in which the 'creative cities' discourse has in recent years taken a back seat to one rooted in 'resilient cities'. This move undercuts, he observes, the logic (propagated by Florida, Landry, etc.) of creativity as a driving force for change and innovation. Prioritized instead is an ethic of disaster preparedness – including a turn towards hard infrastructure rather than people-centred forms of development. In this turn, we see concretized a protectionism against which creative cities theory, with its emphasis on symbolic capital and globalized marketization, is underplayed (personal communication, April 25, 2016).

While on one hand, then, the principles of creative city development remain strong within these cities; and while this script appears in many cases to continue to propagate a market-driven approach to culture that in-turn diminishes possibilities for bottom-up, public sphere-based forms of cultural development; a potentially greater threat to sustainable creative development looms on the horizon - one that foregoes the rhetoric of the creative cities movement altogether, replacing it with an emergency preparedness, protectionist stance. Such a move holds the potential to greatly diminish (but also, paradoxically, to make room for), culture's role as activator of citizen identities – and generator of dynamic public spheres.

9.7. Glimmer of Hope

Recognizing this threat, and acknowledging culture's marginalized (and at the same time marketized) position within these cities, we nonetheless find within their cultural scenes instances in which the potential for a progressive sustainable cultural development paradigm is unveiled. Within these instances, potentials for radical bottom-up democratic agency, and for the waging of power struggles along lines of class, race, ethnicity, gender, etc. are revealed (see chapter 5.1 - the Birmingham School's 'cultural turn'). In what follows, I look at key elements within each city that speak to possibility of such a paradigmatic shift – acknowledging as well the ways in which this possibility is constrained and/or diminished.

9.7.1. Prince George

The City of Prince George's approach to cultural development offers a glimmer of hope for the development of a cultural sustainability mandate. Cultural investment is rationalized by the City as a morale-booster, identity-shaper and salve – a means to shift the tide of social degeneration, and to improve the City's social outlook. Indeed, the City's decision, following from its ICSP's release, to combine cultural and social funding agendas reinforces culture's value as a socially regenerative force. This hinging can be seen to have incited cultural groups funded by the City to re-imagine, and re-position, their activities within a social regeneration context. Theatre Northwest in its communications with the City emphasizes its work with underserved youth (J. Grinhaus, personal communication, April 22, 2016); Studio 2880 / Prince George and District Community Arts Council develops projects that pair art with social activism (W. Young, personal communication, April 21, 2016). The value of the cultural sector is determined by the City in-part, then, by its ability to foster social regeneration. Such an approach appears, on some level, to have transformed culture from an economic resource into a community- and sustainable development enabler. As culture becomes equated with a larger social good defined by, and generated through, community betterment and expression, we see, perhaps, the beginnings of a Hawkesian turn towards 'the anthropological'.

This hope for the development of a cultural sustainability paradigm is diminished, however, by the City's apparent inability to provide substantially increased funding for a

social development role for culture. The City's non-commitment to fuel this direction, coupled with its lack of formalized planning and visioning surrounding culture place a limit on this potential. Furthermore, the relative impoverishment of the City-funded cultural groups in relation to the RDFFG-funded cultural groups presents a marked divide within the cultural community that serves, it seems, as a hindrance to the growth of an 'ecological mindset'. This hindrance can be seen to diminish sustainable cultural development potentials.

Furthermore, the City's alignment of cultural/social agendas can be seen, paradoxically, to feed into a neoliberal paradigm in its activation of biopolitical governance possibilities, and in its positioning of culture as governance resource. In combining cultural and social funding portfolios, cultural governance becomes necessarily entwined with the social lives of citizens. This socialization of culture may help the City achieve particular governance objectives considered inimical to a sustainability paradigm - the City might, for instance, be seen to off-load its responsibility for social development onto the cultural domain, and/or through this connectivity to enact entrepreneurial governance strategies that compromise the integrity of cultural/community engagement. The activation of social and cultural agendas together presents, then, both an opportunity and threat for the creation of a progressive cultural sustainability paradigm.

9.7.2. Kelowna

The City of Kelowna's explicit references within its Cultural Plan to Jon Hawkes and to a cultural sustainability paradigm seem, upon first glance, to position the City as a leader in sustainable creative city-building. This rhetoric presents a powerful statement about the role of culture in transforming communities, and in engendering new manifestations of community identity, participation and belonging. Yet positioned as they are -within a framework that also essentializes culture's role as a catalyst for economic development - such references lose their salience. Indeed, this contradictory pairing of economic growth and social democratic principles in Kelowna's Cultural Plan can be seen to 'culturewash' the hard-edge economic essentialist growth agendas espoused by the city - making these appear as humanistic and progressive. They can also be seen to undercut the value of sustainable development as a necessarily radical, and disruptive, force. Here we are reminded of the new-world governance modality outlined in chapter

4, in which the hard edge of economic essentialism is softened – and made palatable with humanistic principles in-line with the tradition of third-way politics.

From another angle, however, this uneasy pairing of cultural sustainability and economic development paradigms can be seen as an attempt by municipal leaders to begin shifting the conversation around culture's value and purpose –as they deal, all the while, with the very real forces of economic essentialism cemented into the community's memory and habit. In this scenario, the emancipatory power of Hawkes' work, and of cultural sustainability in general, is recognized and valued by municipal leaders; but the extent to which it can be viably unleashed within the context of the existing neoliberal-infused governance framework espoused by the City is seen as minimal. Such a view shows this rhetoric as a starting-point, perhaps, for the gradual infusion of social democratic principles into the City's cultural development agenda.

And yet - if Kelowna's Cultural Services leadership is genuinely concerned with pursuing a cultural sustainability agenda, a good place to start would be, it seems, with the Cultural Services Branch itself – in its relationship with funded cultural groups. A key critique arising from the interview process shows this office as entrenched in a measurability paradigm – in which indicator frameworks are predicated upon 'measurement for measurement's sake'. These frameworks are seen to reinforce a top-down relationship between the city and funded organizations. Several groups expressed frustration at an inability to within this context speak to the value of cultural expressions that are of relevance to sustainable development agendas. The department's focus on measurability is seen to detract from a conversation about value, and to thereby undercut, or diminish, the potential of culture to nourish a sustainable development agenda.

Perhaps the City's emerging partnership with the En'owkin Centre and UBC Okanagan's Institute for Community Engaged Research (S. Kochan, personal communication, October 16, 2017) provides hope that a quest for meaningful connection with land, and with Indigenous peoples might occur as a counter-balance to the forces of economic essentialism, and of cultural scientism. This connection, though in its early stages, could be developed in such a way as to imbue place-based awareness into the funding strategies activated by the City's Cultural Services Branch – an awareness that in-turn would help to foster connectivity between the city's cultural community and its land and communities.

9.7.3. Kamloops

Within the City of Kamloops, a glimmer of hope for the growth of a sustainable cultural development trajectory is found, it seems, in the history of collaborative and critical visioning held within the cultural sector at-large. Thompson Rivers University through its multi-year CURA Research initiative (W. Garrett-Petts, personal communication, May 3, 2016) appears to have played a significant role in enabling the cultural community to think collectively, interdependently and ecologically. This move, it seems, along with other factors, including the City's 1993 hosting of the Canada Summer Games – an event (ironically given its tourism focus) seen to have drawn the cultural community together in collaboration; and the long-standing tenure of many of the key leaders within the City's cultural sector (personal communication, May 3, 2016), are seen to have contributed to an aspirational, dialogically-oriented modality, and to a belief in the possibility of Kamloops and its cultural scene as a whole greater than the sum of its parts.

Coupled with this history is the City's systemic construction of ties that bind culture to social and recreational development agendas - thereby integrating culture into a larger governance framework. While these ties do not, according to interview texts, extend culture's domain and influence into other areas within the City's administrative governance machinery such as land-use planning, they show the possibility for culture to work alongside, within and through, social and recreational agendas in enacting broad-level change.

Adding to these observations – it is worth noting Barbara Berger's (Recreation, Social Development and Culture Manager) vision for culture as a necessarily integrated force. Barbara speaks to the collective visioning power embedded within cultural practice, and envisions applying this power to key identity-forming processes within the city – inviting a wide array of citizens to participate in culture-led dialogue leading to new collectively-driven understandings and visions for change. Such a vision appears as somewhat radical, and as a catalyst for further cultural sustainable development. From a critical perspective, however, such a project and vision can again be seen to engender new manifestations of biopower - with culture working in such a way as to bring the populace into compliance with an entrepreneurial manifestation of governance. On the other hand, this vision can be seen to enact 'biopower from below' – in that it uses culture as a

dialogic force to enable the emergence of citizen-based identities, as well as new collectively-derived understandings of place and community. The fact that numerous Kamloops cultural management interviewees recognize the power of collaborative, bottom-up activism in creating city-wide, democratic forms of transformation supports such a view.

Yet while Kamloops' Parks, Recreation and Culture Department appears advanced in its commitment to a democratized and integrated conception of culture, its power is nonetheless underplayed by the City in its official planning documents – culture being relegated within the ICSP, for instance, to a sub-heading under a 3-pillar (excluding culture) sustainability model. Perhaps in-part because of this position, City staff advocating for cultural agendas appear to encounter significant challenges when working within the larger city machinery. Adding to these hurdles is the absence of a current Cultural Strategic Plan – and a 15-year policy gap in which little has been done to refresh and/or re-examine the City's cultural funding and mandate. Furthermore – the City does not appear to have in-place a strong indicators framework – tending instead to evaluate their work on the basis of standardized measurements such as attendance. Fundamental values central to the mandates of the cultural groups funded by the City, including the propensity of these groups to enact community development and/or sustainable development paradigms, remain, it seems, under recognized.

Kamloops has a ways to go in enacting a radical cultural sustainability agenda. The city faces many challenges – including questions surrounding its identity and future direction (embodied in debates about the mine, for instance); the current and emerging turn-over of its key cultural leaders; and the need to enact new collaborative strategies in the wake of the Performing Arts Centre failure. Still, however, the building blocks underlying an ecological-mindedness persist, it seems, amidst this churning landscape - positioning the City as a potential instigator of a progressive and dynamic transformation.

9.8. Hidden Potentials

Adding weight to the glimmers of hope we've seen in each of these cities are a slew of perspectives expressed by interviewees that draw attention to 'latent' sustainable development potentials evident within small cities generally – and within these cities in particular. Interviewees in all three locales speak to the ways in which small city cultural

scenes possess an 'orientation towards action', a 'rooted and ecologically-based network', and a 'propensity towards adaptivity'. These qualities serve, it seems, as potential fuel for the development and expression of a cultural sustainability agenda. In what follows, I reveal and unpack these comments – bringing them into the wider reflection on cultural sustainability potentials activated within this chapter.

Small cities are widely seen by interviewees to engender an 'orientation towards action' – in which cultural projects and activities are rapidly mobilized. This mobilization stems, it seems, from the degree of connectivity existing among cultural leaders within such locales. Jen Casorso (Social and Community Development Supervisor – City of Kamloops) states:

the small city context drives us to have more of a collective impact approach to our community development than say maybe a big centre would... [In a large city]... you have so many hands available to support issues... whereas in a small community you have more limited resources, so you have to work together in order to make some effective change” (Casorso, personal communication, May 5, 2016)

Illustrating this orientation is Carolyn Holmes (Executive Director of Two Rivers Gallery - Prince George), who speaks to the rapidity with which key projects of the Gallery's were birthed: “If we want something to happen we just do it. It was a staff of mine that said – I want to go into the hospital, and that's how it happened and now it's a big thing – we get \$17,000 from northern health a year (personal communication, April 20, 2016). This focus on trust, collaboration and partnerships is highlighted again by Linda Digby (Executive Director of Kelowna Museums), who states: “...definitely in a small town there's no such thing as 'they'.... There's only 'us'. And it creates a very different dynamic – it becomes very relationship-based, you know... getting anything done is very relationship-based....” (personal communication, April 27, 2016) . Here, then, we see the 'relationships of proximity' within small cities as spurring a kind of 'group-think', and an 'economy of trust' – through which is enabled rapid mobilization of key cultural initiatives.

Another small city sustainable cultural development advantage stems, claim numerous interviewees, from the strong relationships held between cultural organizations and their constituent bases. Says Jack Grinhaus (Artistic Director, Theatre Northwest): “I get phone calls, people stop me in the supermarket, and they'll tell me what they like and don't like – and whether it's an informed opinion or not it's an opinion that I try to take”

(personal communication, April 22, 2016). Kathy Humpherys (Executive Director, Kamloops Symphony Orchestra) reinforces this point:

...we definitely did feel that we were ahead of the huge professional organizations because we had fewer people involved, we weren't a big bureaucracy with tons of staff who weren't necessarily communicating well with each other, and because we were really well connected to the people in the community. So they could come up to us and talk to us...they see you on the street. They say – “oh – that concert last weekend...” – that kind of thing that we have here that you would not probably have in Vancouver (personal communication, May 4, 2016)

And Jeremy Stewart (former General Manager, Prince George Symphony Orchestra) states:

people feel comfortable, they feel a sense of ownership ... I don't think you have that in the bigger cities.... They love that it's there, they support it, they attend it, ... And maybe because a lot of people recognize that they are fortunate to be able to have access in a place this small, you know... they're that much more supportive and more interested in... more invested in what we're doing (personal communication, April 20, 2016).

Building on these observations, numerous interviewees show small city contexts as platforms for certain manifestations of adaptive programming, and of programming demonstrative of artistic risk. Says Nataley Nagy (Executive Director, Kelowna Art Gallery): “... smaller regional centres have the opportunity to be more nimble. ... we can change our programs around with little or not so much fuss, which you can't do in a large centre - in a large centre you have to be committed, you've got your team on, there's no changing it” (personal communication, April 26, 2016). And Jeremy Stewart (General Manager, Prince George Symphony Orchestra) states:

So the top freelancers in Vancouver who are very very good, and who are internationally... they're competitors from a purely artistic point of view, we can attract those people, and they play with us... these people are like the absolute crême of the crop of the Vancouver music scene, and they were here playing with us for rates much lower than they would command at home, because they felt that it was not only socially interesting but also artistically interesting (personal communication, April 20, 2016).

These observations show small cities as offering flexibility to cultural producers and artists alike – a ‘freedom’ afforded through lack of pressure and expectation. Within such cities, organizations can adjust programming to meet emerging community needs; and artists can create work considered risky within a larger urban context.

While a significant portion of interviewees speak positively about the potential of the small city as a cultural/sustainable development catalyst – highlighting their propensity for ‘collective action’, ‘constituent connectedness’ and ‘artistic/programming flexibility and experimentation’, many (and often the same ones identifying these advantages) recognize and identify key limitations within small city environs– leading to the diminishment of cultural/sustainable development potential. These comments illuminate the ways in which small city contexts systemically discourage particular types of artistic risk-taking, foster regressive political orientations that dampen the emergence of novel approaches to cultural development; and pursue cosmopolitanism at the expense of local cultural development – leading to a kind of mimicry seen as antithetical to a cultural sustainability project. So while on one hand small cities are applauded by interviewees for the degree of proximity they engender, and for the resulting benefits to the cultural community that ensue, they are also, paradoxically, seen as held back in their cultural sustainability pursuits by these same qualities. As Will Garrett Petts (TRU) notes: “There’s got to be more factors at play [than proximity and size in a community’s aptitude to work collaboratively together towards progressive change]... those same kinds of factors can also create silos, create competition, create hurt feelings, and the very worst of what small places can bring (personal communication, May 3, 2016).”

9.9. Applying the Birmingham School’s ‘Cultural Turn’

Looking across these three cities, and referring back to the Birmingham School’s cultural turn – a movement that embodied, at its root, a quest to discover possibility within cultural expression as brought about by diverse voices and articulated through power relationships predicated upon multitudinous factors including class, gender, sex, race, ethnicity, etc.... I now ask – what can the ‘cultural turn’ tell us about the cultural policy environments examined within these three small cities?

On one hand, it is discouraging to witness dominant class and power relationships being reproduced within these cities’ cultural policy domains. This reproduction appears often as shrouded in superficial tributes to humanistic notions of sustainability – such as in Kelowna’s Cultural Plan, which speaks a language of sustainability while also touting economic development ideals. In examining the strength and pervasiveness of these forces, it is easy to feel overwhelmed by their ‘structural’ force, and their capacity to

resist, through the establishment and propagation of creative class and neoliberal' ideologies, radical and democratic forms of change.

At the same time, a call for change is emerging – from proponents such as Robert Budde (UNBC Professor, Prince George) who recognizes the need for Indigenous forms of leadership and knowledge to be supported within cultural sector; from Wendy Young (Former Director, Studio 2880, Prince George) who sees a role for cultural establishments in supporting anthropologically-driven forms of social change; from Sandra Kochan (Cultural Services Manager, Kelowna) – who has pursued relationships with Indigenous leaders in recognition of the need faced by governments for reconciliation; and from Barbara Berger (Recreation, Social Development and Culture Manager, Kamloops) – who imagines the cultural community as taking on a leadership role in envisioning fundamental, community- and sustainability- based change. In the midst of a sea of neoliberalist-infused governance agendas, these instances ring out as counterpoints, and incite us to see possibility against the backdrop of systemic market-based domination.

9.10. Response to Research Questions

Anchoring this dissertation is the core research question, which asks: ***what can the governance practices of small cities tell us about the challenge of using cultural policy to develop a fuller and richer sustainable culture?*** In posing this question, I pose as well a series of sub-questions – which now serve as a focal-point for reflection.

How do small city governments, through public policy and indicators frameworks, define, catalyze and contest cultural sustainability agendas?

Understandings surrounding the term 'cultural sustainability' appear to vary between municipal governance entities. Kelowna's focus on sustainability as a process of sustaining the existing art/culture community places focus on preservation, but underplays, it seems, the term's radical change potential. Prince George and Kamloops both exhibit approaches to cultural sustainability in which culture is catalyzed towards wider municipal change agendas. In the case of Prince George, the envisioned change attaches to culture an arguably instrumentalist' function– a move reflected both in the City's attention to culture as a 'social' resource, and in the RFFFG's valuation of culture

for its tourism draw. In Kamloops, culture is (among other things) touted for its potential to incite a kind of collective imagination – a move that takes culture into a visioning role.

This distinction between culture's problem-solving and visioning potential is interesting, in that it highlights a question emerging from these studies, which asks: does a move towards cultural sustainability necessarily entail a move towards cultural expediency? In response to this question, I reference the COST Action Research team's (2015) differentiation between culture 'in, for and as' sustainable development – in which culture is positioned either as a segregated element within a sustainable development landscape; an agent of servitude towards larger sustainable development goals, or an integrated and visionary expression of place and community (p.28). In looking at all three city cultural scenes, it appears that Kelowna, in its focus on maintaining and developing the cultural sector separately from the other sectors, embodies a 'culture in sustainability' paradigm. Prince George, on the other hand, pursues, it seems, a 'culture for sustainability' paradigm – in its use of cultural assets to solve urban problems. Kamloops can be seen to embody a 'culture as sustainability' paradigm – made manifest in the cultural sector's long-standing focus on integrated dialogue within a wider field of community-based visioning and ecologically-based practice. The fact that this sector has been repeatedly called into a visioning role within the City and wider community lends to it a history 'civic responsibility'. Of these paradigms, Kamloops' appears from this researcher's view as the most radical – it moves beyond a manifestation of solipsism that has the potential to isolate culture within its own pillar; and beyond a functional manifestation in which culture becomes a 'resource' for solving problems of urban blight. 'Culture as sustainability', rather, positions culture at the centre of the place in which new values, new ways of life and (perhaps) utopian visions of a sustainable society" are formed" (COST Action, 2015, p.31). Here, then, we see emerge a potential for sustainable cultural development premised upon something other than culture's role as market resource.

Recognizing the distinct ways in which each city grapples with, and defines, issues of cultural sustainability, it is worth noting that the term does not, within any of these cities, appear to be well-conceptualized. I wondered, at times, if the power and history of this term defined by UNESCO in *Our Creative Diversity* (1996) and/or the *Hangzhou Declaration: 'Placing Culture at the Heart of Sustainable Development Policies'* (2013), in the Local Agenda 21 Movement (Selman, 201), and/or in Jon Hawkes' work (2001)

had really taken root. James Moore, Long Range Policy Planning Manager with the City of Kelowna (personal communication, April 25, 2016) makes the point that the 4-pillar model of sustainability has become, in recent years, a municipal development ‘trend’ – one that replaced but did not eradicate the creative cities model and logic, and that was eventually transcended but not replaced by the ‘resilient cities’ model. In this light, cultural sustainability appears as a ‘lingo’ temporarily used by municipal planners to be morphed, at some point, into a new lingo and governance concept.

Fuelling this viewpoint is a snapshot of the internal city infrastructures within these locales, which shows, by and large, an ambivalent stance taken by government administrations, through policy and practice, towards cultural departments in their relationship with wider city agendas. Jen Casorso’s (Social and Community Development Supervisor for the City of Kamloops) comments bring to light the City of Kamloops’ failure to fully and authentically integrate social and cultural agendas into a wider planning framework (May 5, 2016). The same element of disconnect is evident in Kelowna, in the lack of integration evident between the OCP and the Cultural Plan. The RDFFG in Prince George shows, in its perpetual re-constitution of the tourism-based ‘status quo’, a lack of capacity to engage with the kinds of ecological possibilities demanded by cultural sustainability paradigm.

In short, then, all three cities share a purported interest in the link between culture and sustainability. Notwithstanding this interest, they all appear to lack the organizational commitment and conceptual understandings needed to make good on this concept as a transformative paradigm.

How are the cultural sustainability agendas fostered by small city governments interpreted and received by funded organizations?

Interest in a cultural sustainability paradigm was expressed by representatives of funded organizations across the board – the majority of whom requested new and better ways of measuring success and ‘value’ within and towards a cultural sustainability ecology. Calls were repeatedly made by funded groups for governments to engage with ‘more than’ the dominant measurements of attendance and financial success. Jack Grinhaus (Artistic Director, Theatre Northwest, Prince George) advocates for a funding evaluation structure to be implemented that recognizes the role of creative practice in altering the heart and mind of a community (personal communication, April 22, 2016). Wendy Young

(former Director, Studio 2880) requests that government engage with issues of ‘value’ – asking questions surrounding the value articulated by funded groups in relation to a wider network of practice (personal communication, April 21, 2016). Likewise, Patrick LeBlanc (Executive Director of the Rotary Arts Centre, Kelowna) advocates for an assessment to be put in-place that positions the ‘story’ of his organization within a larger municipal development context (personal communication, April 28, 2016). And Kathy Sinclair (Executive Director of the Kamloops Arts Council, Kamloops) incites her local government to think through the potential of cultural institutions as catalysts for a wider sectoral development (personal communication, May 2, 2016).

While each of these individuals presents differing recommendations surrounding assessment and indicators frameworks, they have in common the recognition of a need for significant change in the ways in which culture is, by their municipality, valued and defined– leading to a more meaningful positioning of their organizations’ contribution within a larger whole.

How are anthropological versus Arnoldian understandings of culture implicated within small city cultural sustainability agendas?

This quest for the greater integration of cultural organizations into a wider whole is echoed again in the debate over anthropological. vs. Arnoldian forms of cultural development. This binary, while in many ways posing as an overly-blunt analytical tool, remains of relevance to numerous sustainability theorists and practitioners- as it allows them to problematize Eurocentric, elitist, cultural practice rooted in concepts of artistic ‘excellence’, and enables a recognition of the value of ‘lived’ cultural experience. Here we find an ethic that values cultural expression in a myriad of lived forms, and that challenges small city governments’ conventional reliance on colonialist-rooted arts institutes to define a cultural scene. This shift allows us to see culture as ‘part of’, rather than ‘segregated within’, a larger municipal ecology.

What values and qualities underlie sustainable creative city-building on the small city level?

Section 9.11.1, Seeds of Creative Sustainable City Building, identifies a number of values and qualities seen to define and inform sustainable creative city-building. These include a focus on ecological forms of cultural development, the integration of culture

into a wider framework of municipal action and a focus on future-building. An 'ethos of connectedness' is also seen as integral to this platform.

What happens next for the sustainable creative cities movement?

The three cities examined, while attempting to enact (to varying degrees) a cultural sustainability paradigm, are doing so within frameworks and power structures that are deeply implicated in a market-based, neoliberal ideology. This ideology is seen clearly in the continued relevance, within these cities, of the creative class narrative. The emergence of the sustainability paradigm has not, it seems, radically altered this narrative. Indeed, in some ways, the creative cities principles as described by Florida in his earlier work are made stronger by the language of sustainable cultural development –the aims and attributes of which can be seen to 'soften', or make more palatable or humanitarian, the concern at the centre of the creative cities movement with market growth (see Stevenson's 2004 discussion on 'third way' politics – covered in Chapter 2.3). While the creative cities script is now largely de-legitimized within academic contexts, including by Florida himself, its legacy lives on. Such a reality poses significant challenges for the development of a progressive cultural sustainability paradigm.

Here, then, we return to our central driving research question: ***what can the governance practices of small cities tell us about the challenge of using cultural policy to develop a fuller and richer sustainable culture?***

On one hand, I am reluctant, in-part due to the findings from this research and in-part due to my own experience a cultural manager working within a system not so different from those examined in this study, to champion a hope for a radical change - in which culture is made to contribute significantly to a fuller and richer sustainable municipal culture. The challenges referenced by interviewees highlight key barriers that diminish such hope. Neoliberal ideology is seen to pervade all areas of these cities' infrastructures, and to influence the ways in which culture is positioned. Such an ideology is seen as developed within these places over time, and as exerting impact on their development trajectories. The economic growth prerogative embedded within Kelowna's municipal landscape; the tourism agendas that root and rationalize development in all three cities; the use of culture as a tool to solve municipal problems – these situations are produced through and within a larger logic framed by a market globalization agenda.

Recognizing the strength and pervasiveness of this agenda, I am, on the other hand, encouraged by such possibilities for sustainable cultural change as are signalled in the 'glimmers of hope' identified within this study. In the interviewees' recognition of the strength of relationships at play within their small city communities there lies a hope, perhaps, for the emergence of new paradigmatic ways of thinking and being. Within these cities we've see instances in which culture serves as an agent of social cohesion and sustainable development - bringing communities together in recognition of their essential interconnectivity and interdialogic power. Such a role for culture is supported by Will Garrett Petts, who again observes: "the salvation of smaller places [is to be found in the capacity of their cultural organizations to] embrac[e] a progressive social agenda, and work... with other institutions and groups to create a shared quality of life" (personal communication, May 3, 2016). In this view, cultural sustainability, in its orientation towards togetherness/cohesion, dialogic interchange, collective action and community mobilization is far from an abstract, ethereal concept. It occupies tangible dimensionality, and is played out in these cities' cultural life-worlds. Such 'glimmers' bring to light the potential expressed through the Birmingham School's 'cultural turn' in which culture becomes a site of struggle, and of emancipatory action. Here, agency, and transformation seem possible in a landscape characterized by powerful manifestations of capitalism.

9.11. Change Factors

What, then, are key change factors to be considered by municipal leaders in making a shift away from a creative cities (or resilient cities) paradigm and towards a cultural sustainability paradigm? In this section, I zoom out to look at the insights emerging from both the interview and literature review processes. Here I ask – 'what values underlie sustainable creative city-building?' - and 'what qualities of this phenomenon can be identified through this research?'. I ask how these values and qualities can be activated as the foundation of a transformative shift.

9.11.1. Seeds of creative sustainable creative city building

Sustainable creative cities are, it seems, **deeply connected to place and community**. They exhibit a deep-rooted concern for the local environment – including its land and creature inhabitants. Such cities are attuned, as well, to inequalities within a community,

and actively strive to address and reconcile these. In this way, sustainable creative cities are justice-oriented – exhibiting a deep care and concern for the development of a ‘right’ relationship between land, animals and community inhabitants.

Sustainable creative cities **thrive on the active and dialogic participation of a wide swath of citizens**. They engender and cultivate rich dialogue and debate – including through officially-sanctioned forums such as political rallies, but also through forms that exist outside of these domains – such as informal gathering, cultural venues, community events and exchanges, etc. Such cities invite and cultivate a plethora of voices and expressions in the activation of public spheres – recognizing diversity as a key value and goal. Within such cities, governments become implicated in the activation of multitudinous citizen identities.

Sustainable creative cities are **ecologically-minded**. Individuals and organizations (including cultural organizations) working within this context have positioned themselves within and in responsibility to, a wider ecology. Cultural actors find themselves regularly contributing to a wider community dialogue, and are entwined with key issues that define and challenge their community.

Sustainable creative cities are **concerned with the well-being of future generations**. Such a view problematizes short-sighted orientation towards economic growth at the expense of community/environmental health. It advocates for a deep consideration of the ‘future value’ of economically-oriented decisions – and actively strives to cultivate resources (cultural, social, economic and ecological) that propagate a community’s long-standing viability.

Coupled with this observation - sustainable creative cities **view economic health** (not growth) **as part of a larger holistic framework of wellbeing**. Economic growth, particularly that which diminishes opportunities for future generations and manifestations of place, is seen as antithetical to a holistic evolutionary agenda and framework.

Furthermore, and tied in with this orientation towards future viability - sustainable creative cities are **concerned less with the propensity of culture to ‘boost the marketability of place’**; and **more with its capacity to enact ‘anthropologically/ community- based dialogue and exchange’**. In practice, this proclivity towards the anthropological can be witnessed in the level of support provided by governments to

community-based cultural organizations. It can also (alternatively) be seen in the ways in which city governments recognize and value the expression of anthropological agendas within Arnoldian cultural institutions. Here a role is recognized for both Arnoldian and anthropological organizations in facilitating a larger sustainable development conversation, and in activating citizens around issues that matter to this agenda.

Finally - Sustainable creative cities position culture as a necessarily **integrated, and centralized (rather than marginalized) force within a wider governance framework.**

Cultural agendas are not, within such cities, separated out from a city's overall vision; they are considered integral to it.

9.11.2. Moving Forward

These values/qualities of creative sustainable cities can be seen as a starting-point for municipal managers wanting to move forward in building a conceptual foundation for this term. Also central to a government's propensity to enact sustainable cultural change is, it seems, its propensity for self-reflexivity. Government entities engendering democratic participation in cultural goal-setting and evaluation – through dialogically-informed policies and indicators development processes, increase their capacity to tackle this transformative agenda.

Work is yet to be done, it seems, to more fully encapsulate the meaning and potential underlying the sustainable creative cities concept, and to explore the methodologies by which change and transition can occur. In particular, work is needed to examine the ways in which creative cities platforms can be systemically altered to allow for the seeds of sustainable creative development to grow.

9.12. Conclusion

By examining the interview data coming from Prince George, Kelowna and Kamloops, the historical/sociological context and background surrounding the emergence of the sustainable creative cities movement – we see emerge a hope for the creative cities phenomenon... through the notion that it might, in certain instances, be salvaged and transformed within a new sustainability paradigm. The small cities I've examined show us glimpses of this possibility. A necessary component of this transformation, however, is a government that radically re-conceives the role and position of culture within a wider

municipal ecology, and that re-shapes its governance practices so as to allow sustainability potentials to flourish.

Those engaging in a struggle towards real and sustained transformation leading to a fuller and richer sustainable culture have their work cut out for them. Civic leaders and cultural leaders alike must problematize, it seems, the roots of their positions and understandings surrounding culture's role within a larger municipal ecology, and must work collaboratively, and ecologically, towards new positions and understandings. By unpacking these struggles, we are empowered to see beyond dominant municipal governance paradigms and their limitations; to glimpse what it might be like to live in a world where governments, through cultural sustainability policy, work alongside their citizen constituencies to produce meaningful and necessary transformation. Such a vision, utopian as it may seem, presents grounds for the possibility of a significant paradigmatic shift.

References

- Adams, D., & Goldbard, A. (2002). Community, Culture and Globalization. In *Community, Culture and Globalization*. New York: Rockefeller Foundation. Retrieved from http://arlenegoldbard.com/wp-content/uploads/2007/11/ccg_chapter_01.pdf
- Adorno, T., & Horkheimer, M. (1944). The Culture Industry: Enlightenment as Mass Deception. In *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/adorno/1944/culture-industry.htm>
- Adorno, T., & Horkheimer, M. (2002). *Dialectic of Enlightenment: Philosophical Fragments*. (E. Jephcott, Trans.). Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Allan, S. (2003). Series Editor's Forward. In N. Stevenson, Stuart Allan (Ed.), *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Questions*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- Althusser, L., & Balibar, E. (1968). *Reading Capital*. (B. Brewster, Trans.). London: Verso.
- Amin, A., & Graham, S. (1997). The Ordinary City. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 22, 411–429. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0020-2754.1997.00411>
- ASEF/ASEM. (2010). Culture360.org: Connecting Civil Societies of Asia and Europe – Sustainable Creative Cities Workshop. Retrieved from <https://culture360.asef.org/news-events/connecting-civil-societies-asia-and-europe-sustainable-creative-cities-workshop>
- Askerud, P., & Engelhardt, R. (2007). Statistics on Cultural Industries: Framework for the Elaboration of National Data Capacity Building Projects. UNESCO Asia and Pacific Regional Bureau for Education. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0015/001549/154956e.pdf>
- Badham, M. (2015). Democratizing Cultural Indicators: Developing a Shared Sense of Progress. In M. Badham, E. Blomkamp, & K. Dunphy (Eds.), *Making Culture Count: The Politics of Cultural Measurement*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Baldwin, A., Cameron, L., & Kobayashi, A. (2011). *Rethinking the Great White North: Race, Nature and the Historical Geographies of Whiteness in Canada*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Bartie, A. (2013). *The Edinburgh Festivals: Culture and Society in Postwar Britain*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Baycan, T. (2011). Creative cities: context and perspectives. In T. Baycan, L. Fusco Girard, & P. Nijkamp (Eds.), *Sustainable City and Creativity*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Limited.

- Baycan, T., Fusco Girard, L., & Nijkamp, P. (2011). Creative and Sustainable Cities: A New Perspective. In *Sustainable City and Creativity, Promoting Creative Urban Initiatives*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Beale, A. (2013). *Flat-lined but Still Alive: Analyses of the Provincial Territorial 2012-13 Budgets from the Perspective of Arts, Culture and Heritage* (British Columbia Analysis). Ottawa: Canadian Conference of the Arts/ Centre on Governance, University of Ottawa. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/292134436_Flat-Lined_but_Still_Alive_-_Analyses_of_the_2012-2013_Provincial_and_Territorial_Budgets_from_the_Perspectives_of_Arts_Culture_and_Heritage
- Beale, A., & Van Den Bosch, A. (1998). *Ghosts in the Machine: Women and Cultural Policy in Canada and Australia*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Belfiore, E. (2012). "Defensive instrumentalism" and the legacy of New Labour's cultural policies. *Cultural Trends*, 21(2), 103–111.
- Belfiore, E., & Bennett, O. (2007). Rethinking the social impact of the arts. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(2), 135–151.
- Belfiore, E., & Bennett, O. (2010). *The Social Impact of the Arts: An Intellectual History*. Palgrave MacMillan. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Bell, D., & Jayne, M. (2010). The Creative Countryside: Policy and practice in the UK rural cultural economy. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 209–218.
- Benhabib, S. (1992). Models of Public Space. In C. Calhoun (Ed.), *Habermas and the Public Sphere*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Benjamin, W. (1936). Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction. (H. Zohn, Trans.). Retrieved from <http://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/benjamin.htm>
- Bennett, N. (2017, September 19). Ajax Mine: Too Close for Comfort in Kamloops? *Business Vancouver*. Retrieved from . <https://www.biv.com/article/2017/9/ajax-mine-too-close-comfort-kamloops/>
- Bennett, T. (2001a). *Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity: Mapping the Policy Domain*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, Cultural Policies Research and Development Unit.
- Bennett, T. (2001b). *Differing Diversities: Transversal Study on the Theme of Cultural Policy and Cultural Diversity*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
- Bennett, T. (2003). The Political Rationality of the Museum. In *Critical Cultural Policy Studies: A Reader*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

- Bhabba, H. (1994). *The Location of Culture*. New York: Routledge.
- Bhattacharya, K. (2017). *Fundamentals of Qualitative Research: A Practical Guide*. New York: Routledge.
- Bishop, C. (2012). *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso Books.
- Blencowe, C. (2012). *Biopolitical Experience: Foucault, Power and Positive Critique*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Blomkamp, E. (2015). A Critical History of Cultural Indicators. In L. MacDowell, M. Badham, & E. Blomkamp (Eds.), *Making Culture Count: The Politics of Cultural Measurement*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Bonifacio, G. T., & Drolet, J. L. (2017). *Canadian Perspectives on Immigration in Small Cities*. Switzerland E-Book: Springer International Publishing. Retrieved from <https://books.google.ca/books?id=ZkFrDQAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&dq=Canadian+Perspectives+on+Immigration+in+Small+Cities.&hl=en&sa=X&ved=0ahUKEwjuqKrK4bvbAhXXFzQIHecZALsQ6AEIKTAA#v=onepage&q=Canadian%20Perspectives%20on%20Immigration%20in%20Small%20Cities.&f=false>
- Brabazon, T. (2013). *City Imaging: Regeneration, Renewal and Decay*. Bathurst: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Braden, S. (1978). *Artists and People*. London: Routledge.
- British Columbia. (n.d.). Multicultural B.C. Retrieved from <https://www.welcomebc.ca/Choose-B-C/Explore-British-Columbia/Multicultural-B-C>
- British Council. (2014b). About Creative Cities. Retrieved from <http://creativecities.britishcouncil.org/about-creative-cities>
- British Council. (2014). Creative Cities. Retrieved from <http://creativecities.britishcouncil.org/>
- Broom, A., Cheshire, L., & Emmison, M. (2009). Qualitative researchers' understandings of their practice and the implications for data archiving and sharing. *Sociology*, 43(6), 1163–1180.
- Bryant, C. R. (1994). Interest groups, policy makers and the challenge of futures. In F. T. Job, P. A. Schoute, F. R. Veeneklaas, & H. Wolfert (Eds.), *Scenario Studies for the Rural Environment: Selected and edited proceedings of the Symposium Scenario Studies for the Rural Environment*,. Wageneingen, The Netherlands: Springer Science & Business Media.
- Bullen, P., & Onyx, J. (1998). *Measuring Social Capital in Five Communities in NSW: A practitioners' guide* (No. J). Coogee NSW: Management Alternatives Pty Ltd.

- Burford, G., Hoover, E., Velasco, I., Janouskova, S., Jimenez, A., Piggot, G., ... Harder, M. K. (2013). Bringing the 'Missing Pillar' into Sustainable Development Goals: Towards Intersubjective Values-Based Indicators. *Sustainability*, (5).
- Burman, J. (2005). Culture as Resource in an Era of Globalization. *Topia*, 14, 130–131.
- Cairns, J., & Sears, A. (2012). *The Democratic Imagination: Envisioning Popular Power in the Twenty-first Century*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Canada. (2015). *Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada: Calls to Action*. Retrieved from http://www.trc.ca/websites/trcinstitution/File/2015/Findings/Calls_to_Action_English2.pdf
- Carnie, J. (2002). Talking to the Centre: Different Voices in the Intellectual History of The Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies (CCCS). *Gateway Online: Academic History Journal on the Web*, (December 8). Retrieved from <http://homepage.usask.ca/~jgz816/archive21.html>
- Carrier Sekani Family Services. (2017). Highway of Tears: Preventing Violence against Women. Retrieved from <http://highwayoftears.org/>
- CBC News. (2015a, March 6). Prince George, B.C., history you probably didn't know: The city that invented the beer can once had the most millionaires per capita in the country. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/prince-george-b-c-history-you-probably-didn-t-know-1.2983933>
- CBC News. (2015b, November 9). Kamloops Votes 'no' to Performing Arts Centre Complex. Retrieved from <http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/british-columbia/kamloops-performing-centre-1.3311017>
- Central Okanagan Economic Development Commission. (2018). *Kelowna and the Okanagan: Thriving on a national level*. Central Okanagan Economic Development Commission. Retrieved from <https://www.investkelowna.com/about-the-okanagan/okanagan-overview/how-does-okanagan-compare/>
- Chen, S. A. (2012). Questioning the Cult of the Creative Class. Next City. *Next City*. Retrieved from <http://nextcity.org/daily/entry/questioning-the-cult-of-the-creative-class>
- Choe, S. C. (2006). Creating cultural identity for sustainability: A case study of Cheongju, Korea. In M. Nadarajah & A. T. Yamamoto (Eds.), *Urban Crisis: Culture and the Sustainability of Cities*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- City of Kamloops. (2004). Official Community Plan. Retrieved from <https://www.kamloops.ca/homes-business/community-planning-zoning/official-community-plan-kamplan>

- City of Kamloops. (2018). City of Kamloops: Grants and Funding: Community Art Grant. City of Kamloops. Retrieved from <https://www.kamloops.ca/our-community/grants-funding>
- City of Kamloops. (2011). Sustainable Kamloops Plan – Foundations for Sustainability. Retrieved from <https://www.kamloops.ca/sites/default/files/docs/sustainablekamloopsplan.pdf>
- City of Kelowna. (2011). Official Community Plan. Retrieved from <https://www.kelowna.ca/city-hall/city-government/bylaws-policies/kelowna-2030-official-community-plan>
- City of Kelowna. (2012). Thriving, Engaging, Inspiring: 2012-2017 Cultural Plan. Retrieved from <https://www.kelowna.ca/sites/files/1/docs/community/culturalplan-web.pdf>
- City of Kelowna. (2018a). 2018 Cultural Grants - General Operating Program GUIDELINES. City of Kelowna. Retrieved from https://www.kelowna.ca/sites/files/1/docs/community/culture/2018_general_operating_guidelines.pdf
- City of Kelowna. (2018b). 2018 Cultural Grants - Project Program. City of Kelowna. Retrieved from https://www.kelowna.ca/sites/files/1/docs/community/culture/2018_project_guidelines.pdf
- City of Prince George. (2010). myPG an Integrated Community Sustainability Plan for Prince George. Retrieved from https://princegeorge.ca/City%20Services/Documents/myPG_Part_1.pdf
- City of Prince George. (2012). Prince George Official Community Plan. Retrieved from <https://princegeorge.ca/Business%20and%20Development/Pages/Planning%20and%20Development/OfficialCommunityPlan.aspx>
- City of Prince George. (2016). *Staff Report to Council - Community Services*. Retrieved from https://princegeorge.ca/cityhall/mayorcouncil/councilagendasminutes/Agendas/2016/2016-03-21/documents/myPG_Grant_Council_Report_2016_02_16.pdf
- City of Prince George. (2017). Grants and Financial Assistance. Retrieved from <https://princegeorge.ca/City%20Services/Pages/GrantsandFinancialAssistance.aspx>
- City of Prince George. (2017b). *City of Prince George: 2017 Community Profile*. City of Prince George. Retrieved from <https://www.princegeorge.ca/Business%20and%20Development/Economic%20Development%20Documents/2017-Prince-George-Community-Profile-Web.pdf>

- landinin, D. J., & Huber, J. (2010). Narrative Inquiry. In *International Encyclopedia of Education* (Third Edition). Science Direct. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/B9780080448947013877>
- COST Action IS1007. (2015). Culture in, for and as sustainable development. (J. Dessein, K. Soini, G. Fairclough, & L. Horlings, Eds.). University of Jyväskylä. Retrieved from <https://www.culturalsustainability.eu/conclusions.pdf>
- Craik, J. (2007). *Re-Visioning Arts and Cultural Policy: Current Impasses and Future Directions*. Canberra: Australian National University E-Press. Retrieved from <http://press.anu.edu.au?p=61151>
- Creative City Network of Canada. (2014). History. Retrieved from <http://www.creativecity.ca/about-the-network/history.php>
- Crehan, K. (2016). Gramsci's Common Sense: Inequality and its Narratives. Duke University Press.
- Crossick, G. (2006, May). *Knowledge transfer without widgets: the challenge of the creative economy. A lecture to the Royal Society of Arts in Leeds*. Retrieved from <http://www.goldsmiths.ac.uk/warden/creative-economy.pdf>
- Cunningham, S. (2002). From Caltura to Creative Industries: Theory, Industry, and Policy Implications. *Media International Australia*, 102(1), 54–65. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1329878X0210200107>
- Curry, J., & Llewellyn, J. (1999). The Revitalization of Downtown Prince George'. *BC Studies*, (Winter 1999/2000), 223–232.
- Cuthill, M. (2010). Strengthening the 'Social' in Sustainable Development: Developing a Conceptual Framework for Social Sustainability in a Rapid urban Growth Region in Australia. *Sustainable Development*, 18(6). <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.397>
- Dahlgren, P. (1995). *Television and the Public Sphere*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Denzin, N., & Lincoln, Y. (1995). Transforming Qualitative Research Methods - Is It a Revolution? *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 349–358.
- DCMS (Department for Culture, Media and Sport). (2001). Creative industries mapping document. Gov.UK. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/creative-industries-mapping-documents-2001>
- Debord, G. (1967). *Society of the Spectacle*. (Black and Red, Trans.). Retrieved from <https://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/debord/society.htm>
- Dixon-Woods, M., Shaw, R., Agarwal, S., & Smith, J. (2004). The problem of appraising qualitative research. *Quality and Safety in Health Care*, 13(3), 223–225.

- Donegan, M., & Lowe, N. (2008). Inequality in the Creative City: Is There Still a Place for 'Old-Fashioned Institutions?' *Economic Development Quarterly*, 22(1).
- Dowler, K. (1996). The cultural industries policy apparatus. In M. Dorland (Ed.), *The Cultural Industries in Canada: Problems, Policies and Prospects*. Toronto: James Lorimer & Company.
- Drexhage, J., & Murphy, D. (2010). Sustainable Development: From Brundtland to Rio 2012. Background Paper – Prepared for consideration by the High Level Panel on Global Sustainability at its first meeting, 19 September, 2010. United Nations. Retrieved from http://www.surdurulebilirkalkinma.gov.tr/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/Background_on_Sustainable_Development.pdf
- Druick, Z. (2006). International Cultural Relations as a Factor in Postwar Canadian Cultural Policy: the Relevance of UNESCO for the Massey Commission. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 31(1). Retrieved from <http://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1742/1853>
- Dubinsky, L., & Garrett-Petts, W. F. (2002). Working Well, Together': Arts-Based Research and the Cultural Future of Small Cities. *AI & Society*, 16(4), 332–349.
- Duncan, J. (2017, February 8). Census 2016 data released, Kelowna amongst top growing cities in Canada. *Kelowna Now*. Retrieved from https://www.kelownanow.com/watercooler/news/news/Kelowna/17/02/08/Census_2016_data_released_Kelowna_amongst_top_growing_cities_in_Canada/
- Durham, G., & Kellner, D. (2006). *Media and Cultural Studies: Keywords*. (Gigi Durham & D. M. Kellner, Eds.). Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.
- Duxbury, N. (2002). Introduction –circle – CCRN round table. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 27. Retrieved from <https://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1287/1305>
- Duxbury, N., & Campbell, H. (2011a). Developing and Revitalizing Rural Communities through Arts and Culture. *Small Cities Imprint*, 3(1), 111–122.
- Duxbury, N., & Campbell, H. (2011b). Developing and Revitalizing Rural Communities through Arts and Culture. *Small Cities Imprint*, 3(1), 111–122.
- Duxbury, N., Cullen, C., & Pascual, J. (2012). Cities, Culture and Sustainable Development. In H. Anheier & Y. R. Isar (Eds.), *Cultures and Globalization: Cities, Cultural Policy and Governance*. London: Sage.
- Duxbury, N., Gillette, E., & Pepper, K. (2007). Exploring the Cultural Dimensions of Sustainability. *Creative City News*. Retrieved from http://www.creativecity.ca/database/files/library/Creative_City_News_E.pdf

- Duxbury, N., & Jeannotte, S. (2015). Making it Real: Measures of Culture in Local Sustainability Planning and Implementation. In L. MacDowall, M. Badham, E. Blomkamp, & K. Dunphy (Eds.), *Making Culture Count: The Politics of Cultural Measurement*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Duxbury, N., Mascarenhas, J., Jeannotte, S., & Andrew, C. (2012, June 19). Integrating Culture in Sustainable Communities: Comparing Canadian and European Approaches. *Sociedade Crise e Reconfiguracoes*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/4210332/Integrating_Culture_in_Sustainable_Communities_Comparing_Canadian_and_European_Approaches_Integrando_Cultura_em_Comunidades_Sustent%C3%A1veis_Uma_an%C3%A1lise_comparativa_entre_Canad%C3%A1_e_Europa
- Eagleton, T. (1987, February). Awakening from modernity. *Times Literary Supplement*.
- Edwards, K. (2018). Kamloops city councillor says possibility of performing arts centre isn't dead yet. *Penticton Info News.Ca*. Retrieved from <https://infotel.ca/newsitem/kamloops-city-councillor-says-possibility-of-performing-arts-centre-isnt-dead-yet/it55326>
- Eggertson, L. (2011, July 1). Creative returns on investment: Funding the arts grows the bottom line. *The Star*. Retrieved from https://www.thestar.com/business/2011/07/01/creative_returns_on_investment_funding_the_arts_grows_the_bottom_line.html.
- European Commission. (n.d.). Health Indicators – Policy. Retrieved from https://ec.europa.eu/health/indicators/policy_en
- European Task Force on Culture and Development. (1996). *In From the Margins: A contribution to the debate on culture and development in Europe*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
- European Union. (2014). Creative Cities. Retrieved from <http://www.creativecitiesproject.eu/en/index.shtml>
- Evans, B., & Theobald, K. (n.d.). Policy and Practice LASALA: Evaluating Local Agenda 21 in Europe. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 46(5).
- Evans, G. (2006). Branding the City of Culture – the Death of City Planning. In *Culture, Urbanism and Planning*. Abingdon: Ashgate Publishing Ltd.
- Evans, G. (2009). Creative Cities, Creative Spaces and Urban Policy. *Urban Studies*, 46(1003).
- Federman, C. (2012). Review: Claire Blencowe – Biopolitical Experience: Foucault, Power and Positive Critique. *Marx & Philosophy*. Retrieved from <http://marxandphilosophy.org.uk/reviewofbooks/reviews/2012/580>

- Ferreira, I., & Duxbury, N. (2017). *Cultural Projects, Public Participation, and Small City Sustainability* (Culture in Sustainability: Towards a Transdisciplinary Approach). Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, Department of Social Sciences and Philosophy. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Nancy_Duxbury/publication/321858966_Cultural_Projects_Public_Participation_and_Small_City_Sustainability_eds_Jyvaskyla_SoPhi_pp_46-61/links/5a35665d0f7e9b10d845190a/Cultural-Projects-Public-Participation-and-Small-City-Sustainability-eds-Jyvaskyla-SoPhi-pp-46-61.pdf
- Finlay, L., & Gough, B. (Eds.). (2008). *Reflexivity: A Practical Guide for Researchers in Health and Social Sciences*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Fisher, A. (2009). British Council: 75 Years of Cultural Relations. British Council. Retrieved from <http://www.britishcouncil.org/britishcouncilbyalifisher.pdf>
- Flick, U. (2018). *Doing Triangulation and Mixed Methods*. Sage Publications.
- Florida, R. (1995). *Cities and the Creative Class*. New York: Routledge.
- Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class: And How it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Perseus Book Group.
- Florida, R. (2004). Revenge of the Squelchers. *Next American City*, 5(ii).
- Florida, R. (2012, July 16). The Geography of Tolerance: Where are the most tolerant metro areas? The Atlantic City Lab. Retrieved from <http://www.citylab.com/housing/2012/07/geography-tolerance/2241/>
- Florida, R. (2013, January 30). More Losers than Winners in America's New Economic Geography. The Atlantic City Lab. Retrieved from <http://www.citylab.com/work/2013/01/more-losers-winners-americas-new-economic-geography/4465/>
- Florida, R., Mellander, C., & Adler, P. (2011). The Creative Class Paradigm. In D. E. Andersson, A. E. Andersson, & C. Mellander (Eds.), *Handbook of Creative Cities*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Florida, R. (2014). *Rise of the Creative Class - Revisited*. Basic Books.
- Florida, R. (2017). *The New Urban Crisis: How Our Cities Are Increasing Inequality, Deepening Segregation, and Failing the Middle Class and What We Can Do About it*. Basic Books.
- Fortems, C. (2017). Kamloops' Population crests 90,000. *Kamloops This Week*. Retrieved from <http://www.kamloopsthisweek.com/kamloops-population-crests-90000/>

- Fossett, W. (2018). Kelowna is now at the forefront of Canadian tech innovation. *Daily Hive*. Retrieved from <http://dailyhive.com/vancouver/kelowna-forefront-canadian-tech-innovation-2018>
- Fraser, N. (1990). Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy. *Social Text*, 25(26). Retrieved from http://carbonfarm.us/amap/fraser_public.pdf
- Fusco Girard, L. (2011a). Creativity and the Human Sustainable City: Principles and Approaches for Nurturing City Resilience. In L. Fusco Girard & T. Baycan (Eds.), *Sustainable City and Creativity, Promoting Creative Urban Initiatives*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Fusco Girard, L. (2011b). Creativity and the Human Sustainable City: Principles and Approaches for Nuturing City Resilience. In T. Baycan, L. Fusco Girard, & P. Nijkamp (Eds.), *Sustainable City and Creativity, Promoting Creative Urban Initiatives*. Burlington: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Garcia, B. (2005). Deconstructing the City of Culture: The Long-term Cultural Legacies of Glasgow 1990. *Urban Studies*, 42(5–6), 841–868. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980500107532>
- Garrett-Petts, W. F., & Dubinsky, L. (2005). 'Working Well, Together': An Introduction to the Cultural Future of Small Cities. In W. F. Garrett-Petts & L. Dubinsky (Eds.), *The Small Cities Book: On the Cultural Future of Small Cities*. Vancouver: New Star Books.
- Geertz, C. (1983). *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Sanford: Sanford University Press.
- Gerring, J. (2006). *Case Study Research - Principles and Practices*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Giroux, H. (2013). The Public Intellectuals Project. Retrieved from <http://publicintellectualsproject.mcmaster.ca/democracy/henry-giroux-on-zombie-politics/>.
- Glaser, B. (2001). *The Grounded Theory Perspective: Conceptualisation contrasted with Description*. Mill Valley: Sociology Press.
- Glasgow City Council. (1990). Glasgow 1990 European City of Culture. Retrieved from <https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/view/27830855/glasgow-1990-european-city-of-culture-ecoc-doc-athens/2>
- Goldbard, A. (2006). *New Creative Community: The Art of Cultural Development*. Oakland, CA: New Village Press.

- Goldbard, A. (2015). The Metrics Syndrome: Cultural Scientism and Its Discontents. In L. MacDowell, M. Badham, E. Blomkamp, & K. Dunphy (Eds.), *Making Culture Count: The Politics of Cultural Measurement*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Goldbard, A. (n.d.). Public Service Employment for Artists. Retrieved from <http://arlenegoldbard.com/books/newcc/public-service-employment-for-artists/>
- Government of Canada. (1951). *Report: Royal Commission on National Development in the Arts, Letters and Sciences*. Ottawa: Edmond Cloutier. Retrieved from <https://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/massey/h5-400-e.html>
- Gramsci, A., & Forgacs, D. (2000). *The Antonio Gramsci Reader: Selected Writings 1916-1935*. New York: New York University Press
- Gray, J. (1995). *Liberalism* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Griffin, C. (1996). The essentialist roots of the public sphere: a feminist critique. *Western Journal of Communication*, 60(1).
- Habermas, J. (1991). *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. (T. Berger, Trans.). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Haddock, S. V. (2010). *Brand-building the Creative City: A Critical look at Current Concepts and Practices*. (S. V. Haddock, Ed.). Florence: Florence University Press.
- Hall, S. (1973). Encoding and Decoding in the Television Discourse. Retrieved from http://epapers.bham.ac.uk/2962/1/Hall_1973_Encoding_and_Decoding_in_the_Television_Discourse.pdf
- Hall, S. (1993). What is this 'black' in black popular culture? (Rethinking Race). *Social Justice*, 20(1-2). Retrieved from www.aasp.umd.edu/chateauvert/whatis.doc
- Halseth, G. (2016). *Transformation of Resource Towns and Peripheries: Political Economy Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2000). *Empire*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Hardt, M., & Negri, A. (2005). *Multitude: War and Democracy in the Age of Empire*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Harrison, A. (2010). *The Cultural Production of Matthew Arnold*. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press.
- Harvey, D. (1988). *The Urban Experience*. Basil Blackwell: Oxford.
- Harvey, D. (1989). From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: the Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism. *Geografiska Annaler*, 71(1), 3-17.

- Harvey, D. (2007). *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hawkes, J. (2001). *The Fourth Pillar of Sustainability: Culture's essential role in public planning*. Victoria: Cultural Development Network. Retrieved from [http://www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/community/Downloads/HawkesJon\(2001\)TheFourthPillarOfSustainability.pdf](http://www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/community/Downloads/HawkesJon(2001)TheFourthPillarOfSustainability.pdf)
- Hawkes, J. (2002). Creative Engagement. *Artwork Magazine*, (54). Retrieved from http://www.ccd.net/imm/art54_creative_engagement.pdf
- Hawkes, J. (2004). Let Them Eat Culture or Here Comes Another Bandwagon: Presentation to the '4th Pillar Conference' for the Cultural Development Network at the Melbourne Town Hall. Retrieved from <http://www.culturaldevelopment.net.au/community/EatCulture.html>
- Herbert-Cheshire, L. (2000). Contemporary Strategies for Rural Community Development in Australia: a Governmentality Perspective. *Journal of Rural Studies*, 16, 203–215.
- Herzstein, R. E. (1978). *The War that Hitler Won: The Most Infamous Propaganda Campaign in History*. New York: Putnam Pub Group.
- Hesmondhalgh, D. (2007). *The Cultural Industries* (2nd Edition). London: Sage.
- Hill Strategies Research Inc. (2009). *Artists in Canada's Provinces and Territories*. Retrieved from <http://www.hillstrategies.com/content/artists-canada%E2%80%99s-provinces-and-territories>
- Hodge, G., & Robinson, I. M. (2013). *Planning Canadian Regions*. UBC Press.
- Hoffman, J. (2006). Political Theatre in a Small City: The Staging of the Laurier Memorial in Kamloops. In G. Ratsoy (Ed.), *Theatre in British Columbia*. Toronto: Playwrights Canada Press.
- Holcombe, R. (2011). Cultivating Creativity: Market Creation of Agglomeration Economies. In D. E. Andersson, A. E. Andersson, & C. Mellander (Eds.), *Handbook of Creative Cities*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Howley, K. (2010). *Understanding Community Media*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hristova, S. (2015). We, European cities and towns: The role of culture for the evolving European model of urban sustainability. In S. Hristova, M. Dragičević Šešić, & N. Duxbury (Eds.), *Culture and sustainability in European cities: Imagining Europolis* (pp. 42–54). London: Routledge.
- Hunter, A. (2017, October 3). Why I quit the Art Gallery of Ontario: former Canadian-art curator Andrew Hunter explains. *The Toronto Star*. Retrieved from <https://www.thestar.com/entertainment/visualarts/2017/10/03/andrew-hunter-why-i-quit-the-art-gallery-of-ontario.html>

- Innes, J. (1990). *Knowledge and Public Policy: The Search for Meaningful Indicators* (2nd Edition). New Brunswick: Transaction.
- InterVISTAS. (2017). *Final Report: Economic Impact of Tourism in Kelowna and the Greater Kelowna Area, B.C.* Tourism Kelowna. Retrieved from https://res.cloudinary.com/simpleview/image/upload/v1/clients/kelowna/Economic_Impact_of_Tourism_in_Kelowna_2016_033f81a1-fd41-4429-b99f-22d942d92660.pdf
- Jackson, J., & Morpeth, N. (2002). Local Agenda 21: Reclaiming community ownership in tourism or stalled process? In D. Hall & G. Richards (Eds.), *Tourism and Sustainable Community Development*. London: Routledge.
- Jacobs, J. (1961). *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Jameson, F. (1991). *Postmodernism or, the Logic of Late Capitalism*. London: Verso.
- Janssens, M., Bechtoldt, M., de Ruijter, A., Pinelli, D., Prarolo, G., & Stenius, V. (Eds.). (2010). *The Sustainability of Cultural Diversity: Nations, Cities and Organizations*. Cheltenham, UK and Northampton, MA, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Janzen & Associates. (2003). Cultural Strategic Plan - Kamloops. City of Kamloops. Retrieved from <https://www.kamloops.ca/sites/default/files/docs/city-hall/culturalstrategicplan.pdf>
- Jeannotte, S. (2003). Singing Alone? The Contribution of Cultural Capital to Social Cohesion and Sustainable Communities. *The International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 9, 35–49.
- John, A., & Storr, V. H. (2011). The sociability and morality of market settlements. In D. E. Andersson, E. Andersson, & C. Mellander (Eds.), *Handbook of Creative Cities*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Judd, D. R. (1988). *The Politics of American Cities: Private Power and Public Policy*. Glenview, IL: Scott Foresman.
- Kagan, S., & Hahn, J. (2011). Creative Cities and (Un)sustainability: From Creative Class to Sustainable Creative Cities. *Culture and Local Governance*, 3(1–2).
- Kagan, S., & Verstraete, K. (2011). *Sustainable Creative Cities: the role of the arts in globalized urban contexts: An extended report from workshop 3 at the ASEF CCS4. Conference*. Asia-Europe Foundation & Universität Lüneburg. Retrieved from http://www.asef.org/images/docs/CCS4_SustainableCreativeCities_report.pdf
- Kamloops Art Gallery. (2017). History. Retrieved from <https://kag.bc.ca/about-us>

- Kamloops Museum and Archives. (2016). KMA Presents: Ground Control. Retrieved from <https://www.kamloops.ca/our-community/news-events/news-releases/kma-presents-ground-control>
- Kellner, D. (2001). Cultural Studies and Social Theory: Critical Intervention. In G. Ritzer & B. Smart (Eds.), *Handbook of Social Theory*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Kellner, D. (2002). The Frankfurt School and British Cultural Studies: The Missed Articulation. In J. Nealon & C. Irr (Eds.), *Rethinking the Frankfurt School*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Kellner, D. (2014). Cultural Marxism and Cultural Studies. Retrieved from <http://pages.gseis.ucla.edu/faculty/kellner/essays/culturalmarxism.pdf>
- Kergin, B. (2016). "Yes" group outspent all others in Kamloops performing arts centre campaign. *Penticton Info News.Ca*. Retrieved from <https://infotel.ca/newsitem/yes-group-outspent-all-others-in-kamloops-performing-arts-centre-campaign/it27618>
- Kergin, B. (2016b). City spent \$35K getting Kamloops to vote in performing arts centre referendum. *Penticton Info News.Ca*. Retrieved from <https://infotel.ca/newsitem/city-spent-35k-getting-kamloops-to-vote-in-performing-arts-centre-referendum/it27787>
- Kirchberg, V. (2008). Angst and unsustainability in postmodern times. In *Sustainability: A new frontier for the arts and cultures* (pp. 95–105). Frankfurt: VAS (Verlag für Akademische Schriften).
- Kiriakos, C. (2011). Why Being There Matters: Finnish Professionals in Silicon Valley. In David Emanuel Andersson, A. E. Andersson, & C. Mellander (Eds.), *Handbook of Creative Cities*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Klassen, C. (2016, August 5). WCT opens curtain on new Artistic Director. *CFJC Today*. Retrieved from <https://cfjctoday.com/article/537627/wct-opens-curtain-new-artistic-director>
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (2001). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics* (Second Edition). London, New York: Verso.
- Landry, C. (2006). *The Art of City-Making*. London: Earthscan.
- Landry, C. (2008). *The Creative City: A Toolkit for Urban Innovators*. London & Sterling, VA: Earthscan.
- Landry, C. (2011). A Roadmap for the Creative City. In D. E. Andersson, A. E. Andersson, & C. Mellander (Eds.), *Handbook of Creative Cities*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.

- Landry, C. (2014). Publications. Retrieved from <http://hamarvelene.no/comedia.pdf>
- Laves, W., & Thompson, C. (1957). *UNESCO: Purpose, progress, prospects*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- LeBlanc, P. (2010). What do Socialists say about democracy. *International Socialist Review*, 74(Nov-Dec).
- Lewis, Nathaniel M., & Donald, B. (2010). A New Rubric for 'Creative City' Potential in Canada's Smaller Cities. *Urban Studies*, 47(1), 29–54. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098009346867>
- Lewis, N.M., & Donald, B. (2009). A New Rubric for 'Creative City' Potential in Canada's Smaller Cities. *Urban Studies*, 47(1), 29–54.
- Lewis, T. (2002). Empire Strikes Out. *International Socialist Review*, (24). Retrieved from http://www.isreview.org/issues/24/empire_strikes_out.shtml
- Lheidli T'enneh. (2017). We welcome you to our traditional territory! Retrieved from <http://www.lheidli.ca/>
- Lincoln, Y., Lynham, S., & Guba, E. (2011). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions and emerging confluences revisited. The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research (Vol 4). Sage Publications.
- Litt, P. (2005). The Force of Culture: Vincent Massey and Canadian Sovereignty. *The Canadian Historical Review*, 86(1).
- Lorentzen, A., & Lansen, K. J. (2012). *The City in the Experience Economy: Role and Transformation*. New York: Routledge.
- Low, D. (2012). Content Analysis and Press Coverage: Vancouver's Cultural Olympiad. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 37(3), 505–512.
- Luciani, P. (2006). Creative Cities: The Latest Urban Economic Fad. Atlantic Institute for Market Studies. Retrieved from <http://www.aims.ca/site/media/aims/CreativeCities.pdf>
- Luckman, S., Gibson, C., & Lea, T. (2009). Mosquitoes in the mix: How transferable is creative city thinking? *Singapore Journal of Tropical Geography*, 30(1), 70–85. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9493.2008.00348.x>
- Mabry, L. (2008). Case Study in Social Research. In P. Alasuutari, L. Bickman, & J. Brannen (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Social Research Methods*. Sage Publications.

- MacEwan, A. (2005). Neoliberalism and Democracy: Market Power versus Democratic Power. In A. Saad-Fihlo & D. Johnston (Eds.), *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader*. London: Pluto Press.
- MacLeod, G. (2002). Urban Entrepreneurialism to a 'Revanchist City'? On the Spatial Injustices of Glasgow's Renaissance'. Department of Geography, University of Durham. Retrieved from <http://overgaardtonnesen.dk/TEKSTERNE/12-MacLeod-Urban-Entrepreneurialism-Spatial-Injustices-of-Glasgow.pdf>
- MacQueen, K., & Treble, P. (2011). Canada's most dangerous city: Prince George. *Macleans*. Retrieved from <http://www.macleans.ca/news/canada/crime-most-dangerous-cities/>
- Madeleine Co. (2015). *What Can Art Do for You?: A Companion Piece to the 2015 Creative Catalyst Symposium – Ryerson University*. Madeleine Co & Ryerson University. Retrieved from <http://madeleineco.com/art/what-can-art-do-for-you/>
- Marontate, J., & Murray, C. (2010). Neoliberalism in Provincial Cultural Policy Narratives: Perspectives from Two Coasts. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 35(2).
- Maxwell, J. (2005). *Qualitative Research Design: An Interactive Approach*. Sage.
- McGuigan, J. (2004). *Rethinking Cultural Policy*. Maidenhead: Open University Press.
- McGuigan, J. (2005). The cultural public sphere. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 8(4). Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1367549405057827>
- McKee, Y. (2008). *Tactical Media, Sustainability, and the 'New Green Revolution.'* London: Routledge.
- Meppem, T. (2000). The discursive community: evolving institutional structures for planning sustainability. *Ecological Economics*, 34(234), 47–61.
- Milicevic, M. (2014). UNESCO Scope: Creative Industries – A Catalyst for Youth Employment. UNESCO Scope. UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://www.munplanet.com/articles/mun-branding/unesco-scope-creative-industries-a-catalyst-for-youth-employment>
- Miller, F., & Katz, J. (2002). *The Inclusion Breakthrough: Unleashing the Real Power of Diversity*. San Francisco: Barrett-Koehler Publishers.
- Miller, T., & Yudice, G. (2002). *Cultural Policy*. London, UK: Sage Publishers.
- Millier Dickinson Blais. (2015). *Taking it to the Next Level: Regional District of Fraser-Fort George Cultural Plan 2016-2020*. Prince George: Regional District of Fraser-Fort George. Retrieved from <http://www.rdffg.bc.ca/uploads/reports/Culture/RDFFG-Cultural-Plan-2016-2020.pdf>

- Mills, A., Durepos, G., & Wiebe, E. (Eds.). (2010). *Encyclopedia of Case Study Research*. Sage Publications.
- Mitchell, R., & Duxbury, N. (2000). Making connections: culture and social cohesion in the new millenium - CCRN round table 2000. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 26(4). Retrieved from <https://www.cjc-online.ca/index.php/journal/article/view/1255/1253>
- Mithlo, N. M. (2012). No Word for Art in Our Language: Old Questions, New Paradigms. *Wicazo Sa Review: Project Muse*, 27(1), 111–126.
- Moore, J. (2005). Seven recommendations for creating sustainability education at the university level: a guide for change agents. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 6(4), 326–339.
- Morrison, P. (2011). The creative city and its distributional consequences: the case of Wellington. In D. E. Andersson, A. E. Andersson, & C. Mellander (Eds.), *Handbook of Creative Cities*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Mouritzen, P. E. (1989). City size and citizens' satisfaction: two competing theories revisited. *European Journal of Political Research*, (17), 661–688.
- Nadarajah, M., & Yamamoto, A. T. (2006). *Urban Crisis: Culture and the Sustinability of Cities*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Nair, P. (2004). *Configuring Community: Theories, Narratives, and Practices of Community Identities in Contemporary Spain*. London: MHRA.
- Negri, A. (2003). *Time for Revolution*. London, New York: Bloomsbury.
- Nicolson, P. (2008). Reflexivity, “bias” and the in-depth interview: developing shared meanings. In L. Finlay & B. Gough (Eds.), *Reflexivity: A Practical Guide for Researchers in Health and Social Sciences*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Ong, A. (2006). *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Paddison, R. (1993). City Marketing, Image Reconstruction and Urban Regeneration. *Urban Studies*, 30(39).
- Paolini, A. (1999). *Navigating Modernity: Postcolonialism, Identity & International Relations*. (A. Elliott & A. Moran, Eds.). Boulder & London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Parkins, J., & Reed, M. (2012). Toward a Transformative Understanding of Rural Social Change. In J. Parkins & G. Reed (Eds.), *Transformations in Rural Canada: Community, Cultures & Collective Action*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

- Pawliw, B. (2017, February 8). Prince George's City Population Exceeds 74,000 According to 2016 Census. *MyPrinceGeorgeNow*. Retrieved from <https://www.myprincegeorgenow.com/42369/prince-georges-city-population-exceeds-74000-according-2016-census/>
- Peck, J. (2005). Struggling with the creative class'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(4), 740–770.
- Peck, J. (2010). *Constructions of Neoliberal Reason*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Penner, D. (2017, October 5). Census: B.C. Aboriginal Population grew 38 per cent over the last decade. *Vancouver Sun*. Retrieved from <http://vancouver.sun.com/news/local-news/census-b-c-aboriginal-population-grew-38-per-cent-over-last-decade>
- Peters, G., & Pierre, J. (2006). *Handbook of Public Policy*. London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Peters, M. (2001). Education, Enterprise Culture and the Entrepreneurial Self: A Foucauldian Perspective. *Journal of Educational Inquiry*, 2(2).
- Pierce, J. T., & Dale, A. (2011). *Communities, Development, and Sustainability across Canada*. UBC Press.
- Polèse, M., & Stren, R. (2000). *The Social Sustainability of Cities: Diversity and the Management of Change*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Ponzini, D., & Rossi, U. (2010). Becoming a creative city: the entrepreneurial mayor, network politics and the promise of an urban renaissance. *Urban Studies*, 47(5). Retrieved from <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0042098009353073/>
- Ponzini, D., & Rouppila, S. (2011). What's the "city" in the design and implementation of the European Capital of Culture? *Tafer Journal*, 42(December). Retrieved from <http://www.taferjournal.it/2011/12/05/what%E2%80%99s-the-%E2%80%9Ccity%E2%80%9D-in-the-design-and-implementation-of-the-european-capital-of-culture-an-open-issue/>
- Pratt, A. (2010). Creative Cities: Tensions within and between social, cultural and economic development – a critical reading of the UK experience. *City, Culture and Society*, 1(1), 13–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccs.2010.04.001>
- Prince George Conference and Civic Centre. (2017). About Us. Prince George Conference and Civic Centre. Retrieved from <http://princegeorgeciviccentre.ca/venue/Pages/AboutUs.aspx>
- Procter, J. (2004). *Stuart Hall*. London: Routledge.
- Purcell, M. (2008). *Recapturing Democracy: Neoliberalization and the Struggle for Alternative Urban Futures*. New York: Routledge.

- Purderer, H. (2009). *Urban Perspectives and Management* (Geography Working Paper Series). Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Raco, M. (2012). Neoliberal Urban Policy, Aspirational Citizenship and the Uses of Cultural Distinction. In T. Taşan-Kok & G. Baeten (Eds.), *Contradictions of Neoliberal Planning: Cities, Policies and Politics*. Dordrecht, Heidelberg, London, New York: Springer Science + Business Meida.
- Radice, H. (2004). Neoliberal Globalization: Imperialism Without Empires? In A. Saad-Fihlo & D. Johnston (Eds.), *Neoliberalism: A Critical Reader*. London: Pluto Press.
- Ratiu, D. (2013). Creative cities and/or sustainable cities: Discourses and practices. *City, Culture and Society*, 4, 125–135.
- Ratsoy, G. (2005). Away from Home, or Finding Yourself Back In Kamloops: Literary Representations of the Small City. In W. F. Garrett-Petts & L. Dubinsky (Eds.), *The Small Cities Book: On the Cultural Future of Small Cities*. Vancouver: New Star Books.
- RDFFG Regional District of Fraser-Fort George. (2017). *2016 Annual Cultural Report*. Prince George: Regional District of Fraser-Fort George. Retrieved from www.rdffg.bc.ca/uploads/1614/RDFFG_ACR_2016-pdf
- Rectenwald, M. (2014). What's Wrong With Identity Politics (and Intersectionality Theory)? Retrieved from <http://www.douban.com/note/340740351/>
- Redden, G. (2015). Culture, Value and Commensuration: the knowledge politics of indicators. In L. MacDowell, M. Badham, & E. Blomkamp (Eds.), *Making Culture Count: The Politics of Cultural Measurement*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Research Methodology. (n.d.). Interpretivism (interpretivist) Research Philosophy. research-methodology.net. Retrieved from <https://research-methodology.net/research-philosophy/interpretivism/>
- Rittel, H., & Webber, M. (1973). Dilemmas in a General Theory of Planning. *Elsevier Scientific Publishing Company*, 155–169.
- Robertson, C. (2006). *Policy Matters: Administrations of Art and Culture*. Toronto: YYZ Books.
- Rothbard, M. (2004). *Man, Economy, and State: A treatise on Economic Principles. Power and Market: Government and the Economy*. Auburn, Alabama: The Ludwig Von Mises Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.mises.org/rothbard/mespm.PDF>
- Rural and Remote Health. (2017). Taking Action Together. Rural and Remote Health. Retrieved from http://crhrs-scrsr.usask.ca/princegeorge2006/info/RemoteHealth_Conf.pdf

- Sasaki, M. (2006). Towards an urban cultural mode of production: A case study of Kanazawa, Japan. In M. Nadarajah & A. T. Yamamoto (Eds.), *Urban Crisis: Culture and the Sustainability of Cities*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Sassatelli, M. (2002). European Cultural Space in the European Cities of Culture. *European Societies*, 10(2). Retrieved from s.eu/attachments/1127_European_Cultural_Space_in_the_European_cities.pdf
- Sassen, S. (2013). *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Scott, A. J. (2014). Beyond the Creative City: Cognitive-Cultural Capitalism and the New Urbanism. *Regional Studies*, 48(4). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2014.891010>
- Seiler, R. (n.d.). Human Communication in the British Cultural Studies Tradition. Retrieved from <http://people.ucalgary.ca/~rseiler/british.htm>
- Selman, P. (1996). *Local Sustainability: Planning and Managing Ecologically Sound Places*. London: Paul Chapman.
- Selman, P. (2010). Local Agenda 21: Substance or Spin? *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management*, 41(5), 533–553.
- Serrat, O. (2017). *Knowledge Solutions: Tools, Methods, and Approaches to Drive Organizational Performance*. Springer Open.
- Shields, R. (1991). *Places on the Margin: Alternative Geographies of Modernity*. London: Routledge.
- Silver, D., Nichols Clark, T., & Graziul, C. (2011). Scenes, Innovation and Urban Development. In D. E. Andersson, A. E. Andersson, & C. Mellander (Eds.), *Handbook of Creative Cities*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Silverman, D. (2009). *Doing Qualitative Research* (3rd Edition). Newbury Park, London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Springer, S. (2009). Social Justice and neoliberalism: Global Perspectives. *Journal of Economic Geography*, 10, 481–483.
- Springer, S. (2011). Public Space as Emancipation: Meditations on Anarchism, Radical Democracy, Neoliberalism and Violence. Department of Geography, University of Otago. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/354048/Public_Space_as_emancipation_meditations_on_anarchism_radical_democracy_neoliberalism_and_violence
- Stake, R. (2008). Qualitative Case Studies. In N. Denzin & Y. Lincoln (Eds.), *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. (3rd Edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Statistics Canada. (2011a). *NHS Aboriginal Population Profile, Prince George, CY, British Columbia, 2011*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/dp-pd/aprof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CSD&Code1=5953023&Data=Count&SearchText=prince%20george&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=59&A1=All&Custom=&TABID=1>
- Statistics Canada. (2011b). *Aboriginal Peoples in Canada: First Nations People, Métis and Inuit*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-011-x/99-011-x2011001-eng.cfm>
- Statistics Canada. (2011c). *Focus on Geography Series, 2011 Census: Census Agglomeration of Kamloops, British Columbia*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2011/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-cma-eng.cfm?LANG=Eng&GK=CMA&GC=925>
- Statistics Canada. (2016a). *Aboriginal Peoples: Fact Sheet of British Columbia*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/89-656-x/89-656-x2016011-eng.htm>
- Statistics Canada. (2016b). *Focus on Geography Series, 2016 Census*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/as-sa/fogs-spg/Facts-cma-eng.cfm?LANG=Eng&GK=CMA&GC=915>
- Statistics Canada. (2016c). *Census Profile, 2016 Census. Kelowna*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/Page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=POPC&Code1=0403&Geo2=PR&Code2=59&Data=Count&SearchText=British%20Columbia&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&GeoLevel=PR&GeoCode=59>
- Statistics Canada. (2016d). *Census Profile, 2016 Census: Prince George [Population centre], British Columbia*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=POPC&Code1=0679&Geo2=PR&Code2=59&Data=Count&SearchText=Prince%20George&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&GeoLevel=PR&GeoCode=0679&TABID=1>
- Statistics Canada. (2016e). *Census Profile, 2016 Census: Kelowna*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CMACA&Code1=915&Geo2=PR&Code2=47&Data=Count&SearchText=Kelowna&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All>
- Statistics Canada. (2016f). *Census Profile, 2016 Census: Kamloops [Census agglomeration], British Columbia*. Statistics Canada. Retrieved from <https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/census-recensement/2016/dp-pd/prof/details/page.cfm?Lang=E&Geo1=CMACA&Code1=925&Geo2=POPC&Code2=0397&Data=Count&SearchText=Kamloops&SearchType=Begins&SearchPR=01&B1=All&TABID=1>

- Stenbacka, C. (2001). Qualitative research requires quality concepts of its own. *Management Decision*, 39(7), 551–555.
- Stevenson, D. (2003). *Cities and Urban Cultures*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Stevenson, D. (2004). “Civic gold rush”: cultural planning and the politics of the “third way”. *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(1), 119–131.
- Stevenson, D. (2013). *Cities of Culture: A Global Perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Stevenson, N. (2003). *Cultural Citizenship: Cosmopolitan Questions*. Berkshire, UK: Open University Press.
- Strayer, R. (2001). Decolonization, Democratization, and Communist Reform: The Soviet Collapse in Comparative Perspective. *Journal of World History*, 12(2), 375–406.
- Stuckey, M. E. (2008). *Jimmy Carter, Human Rights and the National Agenda*. College Station: Texas A&M University Press.
- SUNY Levin Institute. (2014). Globalization 101: Post World War II Migration. SUNY Levin Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.globalization101.org/post-world-war-ii-migration/>
- Taylor, C. (2011). Biopower. In D. Taylor (Ed.), *Michael Foucault: Key Concepts*. London & New York: Routledge.
- The Canadian Press. (2015, February 4). A list of the victims along B.C.’s Highway of Tears. *Global News*. Retrieved from <https://globalnews.ca/news/1811819/a-list-of-the-victims-along-b-c-s-highway-of-tears/>
- The Exploration Place. (2017). About Us. The Exploration Place. Retrieved from <http://www.theexplorationplace.com/about-us>
- Theatre Northwest. (2017). History. Theatre Northwest. Retrieved from <http://theatrenorthwest.com/history/>
- Thompson Rivers University. (2017). History: Chronology of Key Dates. Thompson Rivers University. Retrieved from <https://www.tru.ca/about/tru-mission-statement/history.html>
- Thorson, D. E., & Lie, A. (2010). What is Neoliberalism. Department of Political Science, University of Oslo. Retrieved from <http://folk.uio.no/daget/What%20is%20Neo-Liberalism%20FINAL.pdf>
- Throsby, D. (2010). *The Economics of Cultural Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Tiwari, S. R. (2006). Transforming cultural heritage into sustainable future: a case study of Patan, Nepal. In M. Nadarajah & A. T. Yamamoto (Eds.), *Urban Crisis: Culture and the Sustainability of Cities*. Tokyo: United Nations University Press.
- Todd, D. (2015, December 4).). B.C.'s ethnic diversity divide raises political questions. *Vancouver Sun*. Retrieved from <http://vancouversun.com/opinion/columnists/b-c-s-ethnic-diversity-divide-raises-political-questions>
- Tools4Dev. (2017). Using the 'Most Significant Change Technique to measure the intangible. Retrieved from <http://www.tools4dev.org/resources/the-most-significant-change-msc-technique-tool-review/>
- Tourism Kamloops. (2017). Kamloops Tourism Valued at \$377 Million. Retrieved from <https://www.tourismkamloops.com/articles/post/kamloops-tourism-economy-valued-at-377-million/>
- Trépanier, F. (n.d.). Awakening Memory. Retrieved from <https://curious.royalbcmuseum.bc.ca/awakening-memory/>
- Trépanier, F. (2018, February 20). Open Space Resignation Letter. Retrieved from <https://www.acc-cca.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Open-Space-Resignation-Letter.pdf>
- Tsai, A., Kohrt, B. A., Matthews, L., Betancourt, T., Lee, J., Papachristos, A., ... Dworkin, S. (2016). Promises and pitfalls of data sharing in qualitative research. *Soc Sci Med*, 169(November), 191–198.
- Two Rivers Gallery. (2017). Discover Us – the evolution of Prince George's Art Gallery. Two Rivers Gallery. Retrieved from <http://www.tworiversgallery.ca/discover-us/about-two-rivers-gallery>
- UK Department for Culture, Media and Sport. (1998). Creative Industries Mapping Document. UK Department for Culture, Media and Sport. Retrieved from <http://www.creativitycultureeducation.org/creative-industries-mapping-document-1998>
- UN Committee on the Geographic Foundation for Agenda 21, Division on Earth and Life Studies, Committee on Geography, Mapping Science Committee, & National Research Council. (2002). *Down to Earth: Geographical Information for Sustainable Development in Africa*. Washington: National Academies Press.
- UNESCO. (1978). *Declaration on Fundamental Principles concerning the Contribution of the Mass Media to Strengthening Peace and International Understanding, to the Promotion of Human Rights and to Countering Racism, apartheid and incitement to war*. UNESCO. Retrieved from http://portal.unesco.org/en/ev.php-URL_ID=13176&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html

- UNESCO. (1996). *Our Creative Diversity: Report of the World Commission on Culture and Development*. UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001055/105586e.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2002). *Cultural Diversity and Biodiversity for Sustainable Development*. Nairobi, Kenya: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc28585/>
- UNESCO. (2013). *The Hangzhou Declaration: Placing Culture at the Heart of Sustainable Development Policies*. Nairobi, Kenya: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/fileadmin/MULTIMEDIA/HQ/CLT/images/FinalHangzhouDeclaration20130517.pdf>
- UNESCO. (2014). *United Nations Education, Scientific and Cultural Organization*. Nairobi, Kenya: UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://unesco.ca/home-accueil/unesco>
- UNESCO. (2014b). Creative Cities Network. UNESCO. Retrieved from <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/culture/themes/creativity/creative-cities-network/about-creative-cities/>
- Union of British Columbia Municipalities / Canada. (2005). Agreement on the Transfer of Federal Gas Tax Revenues under the New Deal for Cities and Communities, 2005-2015. Retrieved from <http://www.ubcm.ca/assets/About~Us/MOUs~and~Protocols/Gas%20Tax%20Agreement.pdf>
- United Nations. (2014). *World Urbanization Prospects: The 2005 Revision*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs. Retrieved from <http://www.un.org/esa/population/publications/WUP2005/2005wup.htm>
- United Nations Sustainable Development. (1992). *Agenda 21* (United Nations Conference on Environment & Development). Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: United Nations Sustainable Development. Retrieved from <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/content/documents/Agenda21.pdf>
- United Nations World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987). *Our Common Future (Brundtland Report)* (No. Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-second Session, Supplement No. 25 (A/42/25)). Retrieved from https://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Brundtland_Report
- University of Alberta: Alberta Centre for Sustainable Rural Communities. (2014). Canadian Sustainability Plan Inventory. Retrieved from <https://www.ualberta.ca/augustana/research/centres/acsrc/projects/priority-areas/planning/completed-projects/cspi>

- University of Brighton. (n.d.-a). *ESDINDS Report Summary: Periodic Report Summary - ESDINDS (The Development of Indicators and Assessment Tools for CSO Values-based projects in Education for Sustainable Development (ESD))* (No. Project ID: 212237). European Commission CORDIS Research and Development Information Service. Retrieved from https://cordis.europa.eu/result/rcn/55795_en.html
- University of Brighton. (n.d.-b). *We Value: A Values-Based Approach*. Retrieved from <http://blogs.brighton.ac.uk/wevalue/>
- University of British Columbia. (2013). UBC's Okanagan Campus. University of British Columbia. Retrieved from <https://aspire.ok.ubc.ca/wp-content/uploads/sites/41/2017/07/aucc-report41065.pdf>
- University of Northern British Columbia. (2017). UNBC History. University of Northern British Columbia. Retrieved from <https://www.unbc.ca/about-unbc/history>
- van der Heijden. (2014). *Governance for Urban Sustainability and Resilience: Responding to Climate Change and the Relevance of the Built Environment*. Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar.
- van Dijk, J. (1999). *The network society: Social aspects of new media*. (L. Sporeenber, Trans.). London: Sage.
- van Houdt, F., & Schinkel, W. (2013). A genealogy of neoliberal communitarianism. *Theoretical Criminology*, 17(4), 493–516.
- Vaz, L. F., & Jaques, P. B. (2006). Contemporary urban spectacularisation. In *Culture, Urbanism and Planning* (pp. 241–253). Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Venn, C. (2009). Neoliberal Political Economy, Biopolitics and Colonialism. *Theory, Culture and Society*, 26(6).
- vonHausen, M. (2013). *Dynamic Urban Design: A Handbook for Creating Sustainable Communities Worldwide*. iUniverse.
- Viaud, G. (2008). The challenge of defining a national urban strategy in the context of divergent demographic trends in small and large Canadian cities. In *Electronic conference proceedings of the Western Association of the Canadian Association of Geographers*. Retrieved from <http://content.wvu.edu/cdm/compoundobject/collection/wdcag/id/152>
- Vinodrai, T. (2011). Understanding Canada's Evolving Design Economy. In D. E. Andersson, A. E. Andersson, & C. Mellander (Eds.), *Handbook of Creative Cities*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Voicey, H., Beuermann, C., Syerdrup, A., & O'Riordan, T. (1996). The Political Significance of Local Agenda 21: the early stages of some European experience. *Local Environment: The International Journal of Justice and Sustainability*, 1(1).

- Walks, A. (2010). Bailing out the Wealthy: Responses to the Financial Crisis, Ponzi Neoliberalism, and the City. *Human Geography*, 3(3).
- Ward, S. (2006). Cities are Fun: Inventing and Spreading the Baltimore Model. In J. Monclús & M. Guàrdia (Eds.), *Culture, Urbanism and Planning*. Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Waugh, T., Baker, M. B., & Winton, E. (Eds.). (2010). *Challenge for Change: Activist Documentary at the National Film Board of Canada*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.
- Wheeler, K. (2012). *Fair Trade and the Citizen Consumer: Shopping for Justice?* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Whitson, D. (2001). Nature as Playground: Recreation and Gentrification in the Mountain West. In R. Epp & D. Whitson (Eds.), *Writing Off the Rural West: Globalization, Governments and the Transformation of Rural Communities*. Edmonton: University of Alberta Press and Parkland Institute.
- Willaims, R. (1983). *Culture and Society: 1780-1950*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Williams, R. (1983). *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Wilson, C. (2010). Arts. Environment. Sustainability. How can Culture make a Difference? (C. Wilson, Ed.). Asia-Europe Foundation. Retrieved from <http://www.asef.org/images/docs/Culture%20make%20a%20difference.pdf>.
- Windatt, C., Morin, P., Myre, N., Claus, H., Hampton, J. G., Johnson, N., ... Larivee, C. (2019). Call to Boycott Open Space Arts Society's Call for 'Curator of Exhibitions' / Appel à boycott de l'Open Arts Society – Offre d'emploi « Commissaire des expositions. Aboriginal Curatorial Collective. Retrieved from <https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSenVdkhDBHW0rSEQIrZA35uhH3yWtHJgWD-RvQI2OReozBxduw/viewform>
- Woolcock, G., & Davern, M. (2015). Creative Accounts: Re-imagining Culture and Wellbeing by tapping into the Global Movement to Define Progress. In M. Badham, E. Blomkamp, & K. Dunphy (Eds.), *Making Culture Count: The Politics of Cultural Measurement*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- World Population Review. (2017). Kelowna Population 2017. World Population Review. Retrieved from <http://worldpopulationreview.com/world-cities/kelowna-population/>
- Wyman, M. (2004). *The Defiant Imagination: Why Culture Matters*. Vancouver: Douglas & McIntyre.

- Yin, R. (2009). Case study research: Design and Method. In L. Bickman & D. G. Rog (Eds.), *Applied Social Research Methods Series*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Yudice, G. (2011). *The Expediency of Culture: Uses of Culture in the Global Era*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Yue, A., & Kahn, R. (2015). New Approaches to Cultural Measurement: On Cultural Value, Cultural Participation and Cultural Diversity. In M. Badham, E. Blomkamp, & K. Dunphy (Eds.), *Making Culture Count: The Politics of Cultural Measurement*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Zelizer, V. (2011). *Economic Lives: How Culture Shapes the Economy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Zimmerman, J. (2008). From brew town to cool town: Neoliberalism and the creative development strategy in Milwaukee. *Cities*, 25, 230–242.
<https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.cities.2008.04.006>

Appendix A. Interview Guide

From the Margins:

Creative Cities Theory - An Alternative Approach

Researcher:

Sharon Karsten, School of Communication, Simon Fraser University, BC, Canada

Contact Information: Sharon Karsten. Phone: 250-[-...]. Email: [\[...\]\[@sfu.ca\]\(mailto:\[...\]@sfu.ca\)](mailto:[...]@sfu.ca)

Application Number: 2013s0861

Version 3: November 10, 2015

Supervisor: Dr. Stuart Poyntz, School of Communication, Simon Fraser University, BC, Canada

-How does your municipality/region currently define culture? How has this definition changed over the past 10 years – and in particular through the introduction of the ICSP?

-How does your municipality/region track and measure cultural development? How have these tracking/measurement protocols changed since the introduction of the ICSP?

-What are the key cultural policy shifts that have occurred within your municipality/region stemming from the ICSP? What planning documents, policies and events show evidence of these shifts? What role did creative cities theory play in the instigation of these shifts?

-What results were observed following from the release of the ICSP? How did the results differ from those intended/communicated by proponents at the outset? How did the public and stakeholders react? What were the perceived benefits and drawbacks?

-Looking at the pattern of cultural development initiatives that occurred over the past 30 years in your city, what observations can be made about the ways in which cultural agendas have influenced the development path of this city?