

► Session 4:

Culture and the City

17 November Morning

Moderator: **Dr MA Ka Fai**

Assistant Director, The Chinese Civilisation Centre of
City University of Hong Kong

The Art Museum as a Global Institution

Mr Thomas KRENS

Director of Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation

Nurturing the Creative Community

Professor John EGER

Author of *Creative Community*

The Cultural Ecology of Great Cities

Mr John KREIDLER

Author of *Creative Community Index*

Indicators of Creativity: How Do We Know?

Professor Colin MERCER

Principal Researcher of
'Hong Kong Arts and Cultural Indicator'

Imagined Hong Kong

Ms Sisy CHEN

Television and Radio Programme Host, Taiwan

City, Memory, and Creativity

Professor LEE Ou Fan

Professor of Humanities of Department of Cultural and
Religious Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Question and Answer

Mr Thomas KRENS

Director of Solomon
R. Guggenheim Foundation

The Art Museum as a Global Institution



We believe that you can think about the museum in new ways, and that is really the challenge that we are facing today. Imagine a museum in constant motion; imagine that the Guggenheim is not a place; imagine that it is simply a point of view; and how do you fill in the spaces between these various declarations?

The Guggenheim was founded in 1937. We had a special type of design by Frank Lloyd Wright. In 1998, the Guggenheim became a little bit more complex, a little bit harder to figure out, and certainly capable of generating a great deal of controversy and even consternation within the community. Indeed, it is one thing to describe something as being global; it is quite another thing to claim something as being global because it raises all kinds of issues on both sides of the question: is globalization a good idea, can it be resisted? These are things that we are in the process of trying to figure out.

THE ACCOMMODATION OF ART

The Guggenheim have five locations, the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum in New York City, which was designed by Frank Lloyd Wright in the 1940s, a very famous building with the capacity to do all kinds of things uniquely inside that space. In the 1970s, we acquired the Peggy Guggenheim Collection in Venice, a rather small-unfinished palazzo on the Grand Canal. Over the years we have seen it, in the last 12 years, more than double in size, as we have acquired adjacent buildings and expanded our programme and collection in Venice. The Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao opened in 1997 and in many ways was an extraordinary collaboration between an autonomous region, the Basque country in Spain, and a private foundation, the Guggenheim Foundation in New York. Frank Gehry was the architect. The building may be regarded as one of the most important pieces of architecture in the 20th century. Indeed, the revolution that the building itself brought among cultural institutions raised very fundamental questions about how art should be seen, or I might even venture to say, how art might be consumed. The architecture clearly is a major part of the attraction. People come to Bilbao to see the architecture. But on top of that, it is an extraordinary place/space to show art, because it really pushes the boundaries of what a museum can be. I use this as a primary example. There is a single gallery in the Guggenheim in Bilbao, it is about 480 feet long. There are eight sculptures by Richard Serra, each one of them weighing about 170 tonnes. My point here is not that Serra made the art to fill the gallery space but rather, the gallery space was conceived to accept the art, because this art existed before the museum.

I think that raises an important question about the shape of these structures that we call museums. Should they be predefined and have the art assumed to conform to the boundaries of what the museum is, or do the museums have an

obligation to be flexible, to try and engage the art and the culture around it on various terms? It is a fundamental question. The architectural community is very much engaged in this debate as museums are being built all over the world. Two weeks after the Guggenheim in Bilbao opened, we opened a very small space, and you might say the anti-Bilbao, the Deutsche Guggenheim in Berlin. Where the Guggenheim Bilbao was 27,000 square metres, or about 300,000 square feet, the Guggenheim Berlin was just 500 square metres, a little over 5,000 square feet.

Yet, interestingly enough, we had developed a programme in Berlin. The point that I want to make here is that promoting culture is a little bit like retailing. If you have a space halfway between the Brandenburg Gate and the museums island on the most famous street in Berlin, it is not a bad address. Perhaps because of that address, as it turns out, for the last two years our tiny little space of about 5,000 square feet has outdrawn in attendance the Gemelida Gallery in Berlin, which is the major museum for Renaissance paintings. So it raises some interesting questions about, as I said before, how culture is consumed and how it fits into the urban environment.

GUGGENHEIM'S MISSIONARY WORK

What we do in Berlin is very special. Half of our programme, our major commissions are the James Rosenquist Commission where we have made an arrangement with Deutschebank where they allow us to invite two artists a year, with a very liberal budget that goes up to four million per artist, to commission major works for the space. Those works are then jointly owned by the Guggenheim and Deutschebank, which are also another interesting proposition, because they make us collaborators or joint owners of major works of art with a very large corporation. Finally, there is the Guggenheim Museum in Las Vegas. Las Vegas would seem to be a rather unusual place to an art museum, but as I said once in response to the question of 'Why Las Vegas?', I said I can see myself sometimes being in the missionary business, and if you are in the missionary business, you go where the heathens are. There are 39 million heathens that go to Las Vegas every year. It is the second-largest tourist destination in the United States. In case this needs a little bit of imagination, you only have to look 45 minutes away here to Macau and you will see the future as Macau is being developed.

The Guggenheim in Las Vegas is designed by Rem Koolhaas. It is a very small building, only about 8,000 square feet, but it is steel on the outside and the inside, and we actually hang works of art using very powerful magnets, in this rather extraordinary space. I think Las Vegas is actually one of the best exhibition spaces I have ever seen for classical paintings; Rem Koolhaas has done an extraordinary job.

In addition to the five museums, the Guggenheim has two of what we call 'content alliance partners', the State Hermitage Museum in St Petersburg and

Question & Answer

THE WEST KOWLOON: A GRAND EXPERIMENT?

Q. If West Kowloon did not go ahead, is Guggenheim still very interested in Hong Kong? And if so, do you think an end-of-the-pier location is the best location or would you be more interested in a centralised location which complies with location, location, location?

THOMAS KRENS: I think the answer to the first part of your question is yes. Our interest in this is not necessarily a function of West Kowloon. The way that I see it from the outside, and I am certainly not a local person, but I think a transition has taken place, obviously beginning with the handover, but more recently driven by the reality and the recognition of what a powerful economic transformation is taking place in this region. I think that whether Hong Kong acknowledges it specifically or not, a certain monopoly that it used to enjoy in this part of the world is no longer something that can be taken for granted. The explosive growth that is taking place in Shanghai and Beijing is phenomenal, and with it is the creation of brand new institutions. I thought six or seven years ago, one of the most remarkable things that I had seen in Asia was the creation of the Shanghai Museum. The Shanghai Museum has become a very important institution. I think there is no doubt about that. Then, three or four years ago, the

Shanghai Art Museum also began to develop, and you are looking at the kind of investment and infrastructure in Beijing, in anticipation of the Olympics in 2008, that will have the capacity — it already has had the capacity to make these two areas, to become the most modern and sophisticated cities in the world. In that context, Hong Kong has to look at itself, I think, and say: how do we co-exist, how do we compete?

So here is an opportunity. We did not come seeking Hong Kong. When the 'Invitation For Proposals' (IFP) was announced, it said that the developer was responsible for operating world-class cultural institutions for 30 years — putting myself into the seat of a Hong Kong developer I would probably reach for the yellow pages, look under 'Museums' and see who is in business here. Under 'world-class' there are not that many suppliers, so every single one of the developers came to us, within the first couple of months, through my office in New York, every one of them, looking to gather information, looking to build a constituency.

So we are confronted with an opportunity where we are generally interested in the region. I think that is clear. And I cannot just pick cities, if there is not a critical mass of resources ready to go forward. Usually, this is a visionary government leader. It was the case in Bilbao. It has been the case every time we have considered a project that there was a government leader who understood basically what we are talking about here, everything about creativity and its impact on the economy, and the ability to realise projects was a function of the power

the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. In January 2001, the Guggenheim Foundation, the State Hermitage Museum and the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna announced a long-term collaboration where we pledged each other's collections to one another; you might call it a marriage. We exchanged staff. We organised exhibition programmes together. We also agreed that if either of us took on an international expansion project, the others, if they desired, were automatic partners. So if it happens that the Guggenheim finds itself in a situation in this part of the world to forge collaboration with a local entity, we will also do so with our partners, the Hermitage and the Kunsthistorisches Museum.

That raises some very fundamental questions: What is this all about? Does this make sense? Is a global museum a good idea or a bad idea? Before I get into that, I want to pose some of these questions in a little bit more succinct way. Why a global museum? Is it a necessity or is it a conceit? What are the benefits? What are the costs? Should culture not be a strictly local concern? Because it is one of the issues that comes up all the time as we engage in these discussions around the world. I want to step back and look at some of the concepts that motivate the Guggenheim. One of these is very simple: we believe that culture is a biological necessity. Every society produces it, and the richness of our culture and the depth of our understanding depend very much on the intensity of our encounter with art. We also know that things change, and maybe the greatest conceit of all are to expect that our institutions of tomorrow will look like our institutions of yesterday. That simply does not happen. Things change, governments evolve, educational institutions, corporations, every conceivable entity and organization have evolutionary process embedded in it, and it should probably be the same for art museums.

A GLOBAL MUSEUM; A MUSEUM FOR ALL

We think that museums can be both things: they can both be proactive and even risk-taking institutions and they have an obligation to do that; and at the same time they have to be deeply conservative because the stewardship of objects of material culture are entrusted to art museums.

We are also populist institutions. We believe that the audience matters and that art are for the masses, because it should not be and cannot be an elitist activity. So the museum has to be responsive to its audience. We also believe that you can think about the museum in new ways, and that is really the challenge that we are facing today. Imagine a museum in constant motion; imagine that the Guggenheim is not a place; imagine that it is simply a point of view; and how do you fill in the spaces between these various declarations? When they were posed earlier on about the global museum, what could be the possible solutions? I think there are four. First of all, the concept of a global museum is about dialogue, it is about discourse and it is about diversity. Secondly, there are programmes and operating efficiencies. The network of the Guggenheim, the Hermitage and the Kunsthistorisches Museum are about that. We believe that

by pooling our resources, human as well as physical objects, in the collection, and our technologies, that we can arrive at a much more efficient level of operation and reach a wider audience. That is a model that has to still be proved. The third one is economic impact, and this is where it touches most directly on the city. Can culture be used responsibly and intelligently as a vehicle for urban development? I think that is one of the questions, which is being faced, so importantly, here in Hong Kong right now.

GUGGENHEIM AS A POINT OF VIEW

Finally, is the global museum an ongoing social benefit? Let us look at dialogue and discourse diversity. I am simply going to give you ten examples in practice. The 'Aztec Empire'. Four hundred and fifty objects of extraordinary beauty and of a culture that were snuffed out by the Spanish in the space of five years in the early part of the 16th century. One of the most warrior-like, sophisticated and urban-oriented cultures that North America ever produced, this amazing culture virtually disappeared. In 1998, we did 'China: 5,000 years', by making a collaboration with the Central Government in Beijing. There were more than 400 objects that came from 75 museums in China. In many ways, this exhibition still remains the definitive work on a broad view of Chinese culture.

A third example, Dan Flavin, is a contemporary artist who transformed the Guggenheim in 1992. No art, just glowing lights in the great space of Frank Lloyd Wright. The 'Art of the Motorcycle' in 1998, a design exhibition that caused enormous consternation in New York City, that somehow the Guggenheim was selling out to Hell's Angels, and that the motorcycle had no place in an art museum. Frank Gehry interpreted the Guggenheim by cladding it in highly polished stainless steel. The installation also designed by Gehry's team was extraordinary, and the audience responded in kind. It was a controversial exhibition, but a huge success. It set an attendance record for the Guggenheim. The interesting thing is that the next exhibition, the retrospective of 'Nam Jun Paik' actually out-drew the 'Art of the Motorcycle'. It is a little bit like television, when you have a popular show and one slot leads the audience into the next one, and it is something to think about.

'Frank Gehry, Architect' followed in 2001, an exhibition where we hung enormous stainless steel screens from the top of the rotunda and then surveyed all of Gehry work in the rest of the spaces. 'Frank Gehry, Architect' remains the best-attended exhibition ever in the history of the Guggenheim. We had 26,000 visitors a week in a relatively small space. 'Giorgio Armani: A Retrospective', another controversial exhibition. Somehow it seemed appropriate that the Metropolitan Museum could do fashion but the Guggenheim could not. It became a big issue in New York City. I do not think it is an issue any more.

'Brazil Body and Soul' is an exhibition of 500 years of Brazilian culture. The centrepiece of that was a 75-foot high altar piece that we borrowed from a church north of Recife. This altar piece had to be disassembled on site. 'Moving

of that government leader. It is the Leader of the Basque country who made that project happened, and I could say that that project came within two weeks of not happening, because windows of opportunity are really important here.

So I see these things in very broad terms as an opportunity. Do I think that that is the best solution? I read the press now, and we are totally tuned into this, because we have been involved in planning, and we have developed a very significant part of the submission for the first IFP for Dynamic Star which is the Cheung Kong/Sun Hung Kai consortium. Our documentation was part of their presentation or submission to the government. I have never seen anything quite like it, and I see it as a grand experiment. Can you put five museums and three performing arts centres in one location, and will it still preserve the urban magic that you see just by the kind of diversity of things that are going on in Hong Kong?

I think you have some very fundamental questions, however that have to be considered about the future of this city. Absolutely fundamental, as to how you use the harbour, what the distribution of open spaces are, what the distribution of cultural institutions throughout the fabric of the city; those are really big issues. I have been grappling with: is it too late to have that discussion? I think there are some fundamental issues about how cultural institutions work, but it may be too late in the process for that investigation to take place.

SISY CHEN: You are all interested

about the Guggenheim Museum. Will the Guggenheim be here in Hong Kong? I think most of the questions are put in this way. Actually, this is the same question of my home town. I come from Taichung, so in a sense I am now a competitor of Hong Kong.

My home town is now one of the competitors for the Guggenheim Museum. However, we are talking about how we put this kind of gallery and the cultural district together, that can develop Hong Kong itself and really rebuild the spirit of Hong Kong. This is a question that it seems we have different kinds of concept and dialogue, and as I have mentioned, I think we just need more creativity than just museums and traditional arts centre. I am not saying that you do not need a Guggenheim Museum, just because I come from Tai Chung. I need the Guggenheim in Tai Chung, although I know it is the problem of the Central Government and the city council.

However, I have experienced the Edinburgh Festival. Every morning and afternoon, you always have an unexpected performance on the street. Actually there are performing groups at night in the theatre, but they will go to the street, inviting people saying, 'Hey, come here, we have such a great performance.' I think that is something Hong Kong should learn. That is why I said you need some kind of gallery in the window shopping. You need to connect the public culture and the so-called museum and the district. It is a long process of the system of how you create it.

So I have three conclusions for Hong

Pictures' is an exhibition of technology, media art and photography, very contemporary art of the last ten years, and then 'Constantin Brancusi: the Essence of Things'. These are 10 examples of diversity at work. The curators were different in every case; the collections came from all over the world. There was a contrast of cultures. But I think as an example of what a museum could and should ascribe to, a global museum is as good an explanation as I can offer that the content and the programming, the level of quality at which it is done, the discourse that it generates, the level of scholarship that is behind it, these are the things that can make a great museum, and I think that discourse diversity and dialogue have to be factored into any cultural enterprise that we take on.

QUALITIES OF GLOBAL MUSEUM

The second element of this is the programme and operating efficiencies. We do know that networks are efficient. We do know that content can be circulated. Ideas can be exchanged. Practices can be improved. Costs can be saved. Resources can be aggregated and, of course, dialogue can be enhanced in the territory or in the network of a global museum. These are reasons to argue for that.

The collections of the Hermitage, the Guggenheim and the Kunsthistorisches Museum from the earliest civilizations of the 21st century represent the largest single resource of cultural artefacts in the world under one co-operative entity. We have a powerful programming entity and that programming entity then can engage curators and artists, thinkers and even economists, to think about how culture can be used to foster understanding.

The fact that we are just beginning to see how effectively this works inside this network of the three institutions is a very important aspect and a very challenging commentary on how art museums can decide to co-operate. I think that the kind of paradigm that is being suggested for the operation of a museum in West Kowloon, as perhaps a cluster of both local and international institutions, will produce some of the same outcomes and same benefits, and maybe even at a more enhanced level. But by thinking together, by pooling commentary, collections and human resources, there is a very powerful argument that the cultural programming can be raised to new standards and to higher levels, so we are very obviously delighted to be involved with these two other institutions.

THE BILBAO STORY

My third point here is economic impact, responsible and intelligent urban development. Bilbao is a case study in the use of culture as an economic and social driver. Clearly, it is a distinctive piece of architecture. The architecture by Frank Gehry set extraordinary standards. The capacity of this building to absorb art from classical art to multi-media and high technology stuns me every time.

As we experiment with it and bring exhibitions like 'Rubens and His Age' to the Guggenheim in Bilbao, it is absolutely evident that this building is one of the best museums for art ever created. It would also be a mistake, however, to think that the Bilbao effect was only a function of the architecture or the cultural entity itself. In Bilbao, they decided at the same time to build an airport.


Norman Foster designed a subway system. The subway system, the airport, a new congress centre, convention centre, a whole new series of waterfront parks and the art museum were all under construction at the same time. This is an example of what I would call the intelligent urban development using culture as a driver. What was the cost of Bilbao? To put this into perspective, if you were to include the capital cost for the building, the trademark licensing and content fees, the six-year operating subsidy for the museum and the art acquisitions that were all part of the original agreement, the project cost \$277 million over the first six years. During that period of time, it attracted 7.2 million visitors. It generated direct expenditures of US\$1.2 billion. The gross domestic product in the Basque country increased by \$1.17 billion. Tax revenues to the Basque country were \$203 million. It created 4,500 new jobs, and the return on investment was 17 percent. That is almost as good as Cheung Kong in its real estate investments, I think.

Finally, the fourth reason to make the argument for a global museum is social impact. It is clear that we live in a global society, and as individuals become more fully realized they also become more demanding and more discriminating. New models of access and exchange have to evolve to respond to that demand. The institutions by which we live and even the rules by which we now live will be obsolete in such a quick period of time, and to think otherwise and not to try to anticipate that is a huge mistake: culture can play an incredible role. I have to say at the end of the day that the concept of a global cultural network is but one option. It generates controversy, it generates discussion, and this is going to be an ongoing process.

CULTURAL CONVERSATION OF MUSEUMS

Let me just offer two observations on a postscript. First of all, in trying to put together an international cultural network, you find yourself being a local politician in 20 places around the world simultaneously, because to engage the discussion authentically you have to become a local figure. You have to engage the local community, the artists, and the political structures. It is not an easy thing to do. Because of that, there will be failures from time to time. But the reality is that without taking risks and chances, without daring to think about how culture can affect the urban environment, how can culture change the character of the city and make it a better place to be? It seems to me that the use of culture simply as a contemplative object is underselling the enormous potential for cultural dialogue that exists all around us.

Kong. First, the most important thing is the leaders with vision. Leaders with the vision of international art, leaders with the vision of how to connect with the classical and the popular art. Secondly, I think, to keep more freedom in Hong Kong is extremely important for the government. This is the major, exciting element that Hong Kong can compete with Shanghai or Beijing. We heard from Thomas that he is now actually interested in the region, not specifically Hong Kong, but Hong Kong is the first city that has the invitation to the Guggenheim Museum. But for the other artists and for all the museums, one thing is important, that you have an open society. So to have more freedom or to have open air, an open mind in Hong Kong I believe is extremely important for the cultural future. The third: more budget. I read that you have only HK\$2.7 billion annually just for the cultural budget. The cultural district that you imagine today, the reason why you have to go to the developer is because you have such a small amount of budget for culture. I believe these are the three suggestions I have for Hong Kong.

The last point is that this is how the Guggenheim sees the world. We believe that culture is in fact a global concern. We believe that culture equals communication. We believe that culture equals understanding. We believe that culture is a universal good. We think the Guggenheim is a cultural voice via its alliances and networks, and that is what makes it a strong institution. We also think of our institution as a force for change. I think that is the most important way to conceive of it. Finally, we have a very simple piece of arithmetic that drives what the Guggenheim does, which is that one plus one equals three. We think that is the formula for success. 

**Professor
John EGER**

*Author of Creative
Community*



Nurturing the Creative Community

You have to have a vision, you have to be connected, you have to be creative and you have to have clarity to get the vision and the plan, but you need the collaboration. Nothing could be more important than the collaboration.

Today I want to talk a little bit about uncertainty and change because I do think there is a new urgency. Walter Wriston said, 'You know what, information has replaced gold as the new monetary standard. Information is the new wealth, and information technology the tools of wealth creation.' That is the reason why we are seeing today, in this global, knowledge-based economy, an emphasis on re-inventing our cities. Cities are the centres of commerce, and have been since the earliest days of any government. Cities are the crucibles of civilisation, and in this new age it is cities that will be the incubators of creativity and innovation, which are the hallmarks of a successful city. There are other meetings taking place like this all over the world. Cities are struggling to re-define themselves, to re-invent themselves. But I want to talk today about creativity and the creative class. The Numara Research Institute has claimed that the age we are entering is the creative age, and Richard Florida, a colleague of mine at Carnegie Mellon, talks about a whole class. Richard has defined that class as very large; it even includes accountants and lawyers, and being a lawyer myself, I am not sure that they belong in that class.

CITIES' HUNT FOR CREATIVE PEOPLE

Nonetheless, what Richard did was quite phenomenal, because he pointed out that there is a new migration pattern. The creative choose to live where they want to, and we are seeing migration. He has a colleague at Carnegie Mellon, for example, who founded a little software company called Lycos. Does anyone remember Lycos? That was another 'dot com' that got absorbed somewhere. Lycos was spun off from the university and was doing business in Pittsburg, but then he did not see him for a long time, and he saw him maybe six months after the company was spun off, and he said, 'I do not see you in Pittsburg, where are you?' He said, 'I am in Boston, that is why.' 'Why Boston?' 'That is where the talent is.' So companies are now going to the cities where the talent is rather than the other way around.

Another reason why cities not only need to nurture creativity at home but to do what they can with public art and education to attract the creative worker to be successful in the creative age: Richard has his three 'Ts' that he talks about. He says the cities of the future will have the technology, they will have the talent, also a high degree of tolerance for dissent and sexual differences.

In fact, one of the very interesting things about Richard's book is that a colleague of his was doing a study on gay and lesbian migration patterns. And it turns out that wherever you have a really creative city, you have a very high

concentration of gays and lesbians. Sadly, some cities are now recruiting gays and lesbians in the hope that that will be the formula. But it is a barometer of the kind of attitude that has to take place to be a nurturing, caring, creative place. Patrick Ho, at the opening a few days ago, said that is primarily a western idea, and I think he is right. I think there is an advantage in the East because you do not think of it as tolerance as much as you think of it as the collective, providing a forum for co-operation and consensus decision-making. I am going to return to that, frankly, because I think that is the key to become and nurture a creative community.

CREATIVITY, COLLABORATION, AND CONNECTIVITY

I would like to talk about the three 'Cs': 'Connectivity'; broadband wireless communications connecting every man, woman and child, institution, public and private; the technical infrastructure, but also the infrastructure that connects us, because, as somebody said to me, 'even poor people have good ideas', and in a knowledge economy you cannot afford not to tap, into the intellectual prowess of every one of your citizens, no matter how young or old, how rich or poor, how rural or urban.

'Creativity', we really do need to define this. What do we want to do in our schools? What do we want to do in our communities to nurture creative thinking? What do we need to do in the workplace? There is an Institute of Neuroscience headed by a well-known Nobel Laureate, Gerry Edelman, in La Hoya who is doing research showing, 'If you have a beautiful view of the harbour and you have art on the wall and open spaces, the more chances you are going to be more productive as a creative worker than if you were in the basement.' It is kind of obvious, isn't it? But we need to think more about these public spaces, these corporate spaces, our own homes, and importantly what we need to do in education.

'Collaboration', because again, I think it is the key. We stand on the shoulders of every generation before us. The wealth of knowledge, the DNA of the intellectual process, has to be tapped in order for creativity to really flourish. Is everybody going to be Da Vinci? I do not know. Richard Restak, the author of *The New Brain*, says that the brain is plaster and we all can be geniuses. I want to concentrate today on my own experience and share it with you, because this notion of creativity is something that too many of us, for too long, have taken for granted. I chaired a commission on education and technology for the then Governor of California in the mid-1990s. Not too long after I took the job I got an alert, I had to go to visit with the executive director of the Alliance for Motion Picture and Television in Los Angeles. They wanted more H1B visas. H1B visas allow companies to bring foreign workers into the States. So I went to L.A. and met with the woman who was executive director and said, 'What is the problem?' 'Jim Cameron, who is doing *Titanic*, needs more digital artists, so-and-so needs more digital artists, and by the way, Silicon Valley needs more digital artists.' I said, 'Digital artists? What is this, and why?' I still do not

understand exactly what a digital artist is. The problem was that they could hire people who knew computers but did not know a thing about art or music or colour or balance or form; on the other hand, they could hire people who had good backgrounds in music or art but really were not very savvy, very literate, from a computer standpoint. When we looked deeper, we discovered indeed, in our zeal to be number one in math and science, because that was the goal 25 years ago, we cut art and music out of the schools. We cut it out of the schools. And guess what? We slipped from the 9th to the 24th. Little countries like Singapore, Norway and Sweden, are the first, the second and the third, I believe, in the world in math and science, they teach art and music; they infuse it as part of the core curriculum.

Without exception, every one of the hundred best scientists was equally accomplished in the fine arts as well as the hard sciences. At the University Centre for Nervology, they coined something called the 'Mozart Effect' for taking a control group and playing ten minutes of Mozart before an IQ test, and guess what, Mozart gave them a nine-point advantage. I do not know if it works for heavy metal or rap, but it sure works for complex scores. And they are doing more now in showing that a half-hour of classical music before a half hour of math improves math comprehension. Howard Gardiner was saying 20 years ago: there are multiple intelligences. Some of us are more tactile, some more verbal, some more musical, some more visual, and why are we still delivering information mouth to ear?

I want to talk to you about just two or three stories that I have come to know personally, as examples. In the Bronx ten years ago, there was a little school called St August. Their story, called 'Something Within Me', was actually a one-hour PBS special which won two awards from the Sundance Film Festival. It is about these black Hispanic youths, living in single-parent families, crack addiction, pervasive, where the drop-out rate was 80 percent and they scored in the bottom ten percent of the standardised New York tests. It was a Catholic school. The nuns and the priests got together; they wrung their hands and said, 'What can we do? What can we possibly do?' They decided the arts were the only alternative. They took every course - biology, physics, and history - and somehow they taught those courses using the arts. It could have been drama or music, and they worked in collaborative teams, and guess what happened? In less than three years, the drop-out rate was less than ten percent, not 80, and they scored in the top ten percentile of New York's state exams.

THE FUTURE CLASSROOM IS THE MUSEUM

Closer to home, Balboa Park is a wonderful collection of museums. It is about 30 acres; it has an opera, a theatre, an art museum and an interactive science museum. Because it is so huge, there is lots of space, unlike one of the poorest schools in City Heights, a nearby community, where the problems, as with the Bronx, were the same: huge drop-out, most immigrants come to City Heights, and not surprisingly we have 40 languages and a hundred dialects in most of the

schools in City Height. Probably because they ran out of classrooms, they said, 'Send the kids to the museum once a week, then twice a week.'

Seriously, that was how it started. Slowly but surely, this experiment began just four years ago which started to take root. The kids started coming to school, they started showing an interest, they went home and told their parents what they saw, the parents got involved in schools and, before you knew it, the same phenomenon took place: from the bottom ten percent to the top ten percent, proving once again the valuable role of public art, of museums, of all of our cultural institutions. L.A. hopefully can pull this off. They have looked at some of these examples here and elsewhere in the world and said, 'You know what, we are responsible for training two million children.' L.A. is not a very small place, as you know. They have put together an alliance of 50 organisations, artists, art educators, government policy-makers, the business community, and they created 'Arts for All' which will ensure over a ten-year period that there is art and music in every classroom in L.A.; that the opportunity to participate in tourist museums will be real, and because they know it is empowering and a matter of economic necessity.

THE SEATTLE CREATIVE CLUSTER


Let me talk just briefly about what cities are doing too. In places like Seattle they have known this, and we know Seattle is a success because of it. The Seattle Centre is really one of the first creative clusters - we are now using this term today, and I think it will grow in essentiality and in importance. The same way we talked about economic clusters just a decade or two ago. It is a cluster where they have museums, they have the Frank Gehry's Experience Music Project, opera, and kids acting out books and little theatre on Saturdays and they have rides and coffee shops. It is a place where people go to nurture themselves.

Seattleites read; 80 percent of Seattleites have a library card. They were ranked the second most literate city. They said, 'Let us put our money where our mouth is', and they built recently this wonderful schoolhouse designed building which houses over a million books at a cost of over \$178 million. And even though it looks like it is a huge, impressive building, it is very friendly. I have visited it myself. People were having fun. You go from floor to floor in a library and you saw people having fun. You do not have to take elevators, by the way; you can take a winding staircase up ten floors. It is an icon that others could model, and it is within three or four blocks of the Seattle Centre; again, part of the same creative cluster.

Austin is no slouch either. Austin have nurtured and encouraged film-making. So after New York and L.A., Austin now ranks the third. And as a consequence, they have been attracting filmmakers and graphic artists, people who do editing, etc. and they have that cluster for the 21st century. They have also preserved their neighbourhoods. So if you are on location shooting, it is really easy just to

pick up your camera and walk a block to change the scenery. Silicon Valley is really one of the more interesting initiatives taking place in the US right now, because before that, there was nothing there to begin with, not a lot of regulation, not a lot of anything. It just grew. When it grew and as it grew, people woke up one day and said, 'Do you know what, this is not a very liveable community'.

There is no 'there' there. There is no culture, there is no centre to the place, and what do we do? Let me close by just reminding you of the three 'Cs'. You have to have a vision, you have to be connected, you have to be creative and you have to have clarity to get the vision, the plan, but you need the collaboration. Nothing could be more important than the collaboration. I say that particularly today, in the wake, frankly, of '9/11'. This book was written before '9/11', by Benjamin Barber, who is a scholar at Rutgers, called the *Jihad versus McWorld*. What Barber says is wrong today, that we have these two global trends: one, a bloody search for blood lines; and two, a bloodless search for markets, and neither one of them cares about the common wealth, the common dream, the common purpose, that is the heart of a democratic social system.

Walter Litman, a journalist/author in America said before he died that, this is a new uncertain time. It is a struggle that will last for decades. It is a struggle to remake our civilisation. That is the time we are in. It is not a good time for bureaucrats or politicians. It is a time, rather, for dreamers and explorers, and those willing to plant trees for their children to sit under. 

The Cultural Ecology of Great Cities

Mr John KREIDLER

Author of *Creative Community Index*



We believe that in order to have a vibrant, lasting and somewhat stable society, we have to find a way to hold on to those people. But also we believe that investments in creativity have a lot to do with enhancing the creative capacities of the population that already lives in Silicon Valley. So it is a matter of both attracting creative people and also training our own creative people.

For at least 100 years in the United States, we were a place where culture and the arts were very much a part of the marketplace. There were proprietary, commercial organizations that were responsible for carrying out artistic activities. There used to be 300 organizations like this toured in cities, in mining camps, in farm communities. There was no subsidy for their work at all.

In the late 1950s, largely because of some work being done at the Ford Foundation, the US began to move toward the view that the arts simply were not good enough. We felt a kind of inferiority to Europe, to the Soviet Union, to much of the rest of the world, in the quality and the amount of art that was being produced, so we began to intervene in this basically marketplace model by subsidising the supply of art. Actually, there were a lot of other policies that were crafted during that period of time and continue to go on in the US to the present.

WHAT TO LOOK FOR IN SUPPORTING ART?

What I am trying to emphasise here is that it was an attempt to increase the supply of artists and arts institutions, with the assumption that the demand would follow, that people would come to these institutions and would take part in the exhibitions and performances, if the supply and the quality of work was improved. In the early 1980s in the US, we began to see a different reason to support the arts, rather than just trying to improve the quality and in effect to overcome our own inferiority in comparison to the rest of the world, we began to see some more practical reasons to support the arts. I call this a 'Modified "Supply-side" Model'.

Although we continued to support supply primarily, we began to see other benefits that were part and parcel of supporting the arts; namely, tax revenues, jobs and business revenues. The kinds of initiatives that we saw during this period of time were not as though they were jettisons; we began to see regional economic impact studies, art-friendly zoning regulations in American cities, downtown development projects that often included cultural facilities such as museums or performing arts spaces.

The previous speaker, Dr Eger, mentioned that this new evolution really began in the early part of the new century. We might call it a 'creative city model'.

Again, the subsidy is still going to the supply side of this dimension, but we became more ambitious. We began to think of the arts as not only doing what we accomplished with a modified supply approach, but to attract people in creative professions, that they could create jobs, that we could help regions to become more competitive on a global basis.

A lot of this led to initiatives that were designed to attract creative industries, including research, high-tech, arts/entertainment; projects to attract and to train creative workers; downtown development projects that enhanced authenticity. Much of this was based on the writings of Richard Florida, and other authors as well, that began to make this connection of the artist and urban authenticity to highly culturally energised cities. At almost the same time that all of this was going on, my organization came into business, and we certainly agreed with all of the previous policies but we started to make the point in our little area of northern California, that simply supporting the supply of highly qualified artists and excellent arts organisations had its limitations. Certainly in northern California, we have seen many cultural organizations, and just to give you an idea, in our area, if you go back to 1960s, there were about 30 non-commercial arts organisations and over the next 15 years only, between about 1960 and the mid-1970s, the number went from 30 to about 1,000, and today it is not much larger than that. So there was a huge growth in the number, and in the quality and the size of non-profit cultural institutions. But as time has gone on, many of them have not prospered; many of them in fact have failed to attract substantial audiences.

THE FULL-SYSTEM INITIATIVES: DEMAND AND SUPPLY IN ART

The most difficult example of that, where I work in the Silicon Valley area, is we recently lost the San Jose Symphony which had been in business for 123 years. It was actually the oldest symphony orchestra in the western United States. And over a period of 20 years, it in effect lost its audience. There was nothing wrong with the quality of the music, and nothing really wrong with the quality of the management either, but the point was that things have changed in Silicon Valley, things have changed in many parts of the US, and I think this is probably true globally, and these cultural institutions did not maintain the kind of vitality that we have been hearing about Guggenheim, which has had a very different approach to all of this than just beefing up the supply and output of what it is doing.

What I am calling full-system initiatives that we have been using in Silicon Valley has not only dealt with supply issues, but also, there are other organisations in our region that do support arts-producing and arts-distributing organizations. But the point was to also look at this other part of the equation: we are not like Europe; we do not provide our cultural organisations with massive governmental subsidies, they still have to make it in the marketplace. But the point was to look at both supply and demand. On the demand side, we began to look at arts

education as a key, and also the development of advocate or amateur arts groups. We also decided early on that we would measure cultural indicators covering both supply and demand to see if over time we could make a difference. Finally, we decided to try to put forward, to try and promulgate a more balanced notion of what healthy arts ecology would look like.

But unless there is a foundation of arts literacy – 'arts literacy' meaning that people know about creativity, people know about the history of art, criticism, and aesthetic theory, and unless on top of that there is a way in which everyday people can participate in making art and culture, can sing, dance, work at calligraphy, whatever it may be; without those foundations, it is going to be difficult to sustain a professional high-arts sector. But if we can do all of those things at the same time – our belief is that there is a sort of synergy that is good for the economy of the local area and is also very good for the social situation in the local area.

DIVERSITIES OF CREATIVE TALENTS IN SILICON VALLEY

Fourty years ago, Silicon Valley was fruit orchards. Today, it has a population of 2.6 million people. Almost all the orchards have gone. It has been paved over. There is a very large immigrant population. In fact, it is absolutely vital to Silicon Valley that we attract foreign immigrants. Sixty-one percent of our residents are either foreign-born or the children of foreign-born immigrants. Forty-eight percent of the population in my area of Silicon Valley speaks a non-English language at home. It so happens that Silicon Valley is rated by Dr Florida as the number one creative region in the US. But most of the Valley's creative talent is imported; it is not locally grown, it is not something that is coming out of the local educational system. Our primary sources of immigration are from India, China, Viet Nam, Korea and Mexico. So there are a lot of different languages and cultures, and that is just the beginning. We have large populations also from countries like Slovenia and from basically all over the world. The region is a world leader certainly in technology, but it has at the present time, especially since the demise of the San Jose Symphony, very few cultural institutions. So in fact, since its early days, Silicon Valley has relied on San Francisco, which has many cultural institutions and lies in about 75 kilometres north of Silicon Valley.

My organisation was created in 1998. It has four primary initiatives. Again, these initiatives mostly focus on demand and I am trying to develop what I was describing earlier as a balanced ecology of culture within the region. The first and foremost initiative that we carry forward is called our creative education programme. It is a massive arts education programme. The thinking here is that we simply have to develop more creativity and more appreciation of the arts at an early age, and the way to do that most forcefully is through the local public elementary schools. It is also the fact that in the early days of Silicon Valley there were two surveys that were done of our local adult population, and again most of this population is foreign-born or children of foreign-born, so it is a very

diverse population. When doing those surveys, when presented with a list of different cultural policies that might be implemented in Silicon Valley, there was one overwhelming response to the idea of improving the quality of arts education in the public schools; 95 percent of the people who were surveyed in both of those studies said that that was what they regarded as most important. So there is an enormous level of consensus behind what we are doing.

What we do is we provide each of the districts that work with us with a substantial amount of funding. And we have technical consultants. Our schools have been drained for 30 years of teachers who can teach in the arts, and of administrators who understand the arts and how it integrate it into the curriculum or how to teach it as a stand-alone subject. So we have technical consultants who go into the schools, and we also provide teacher training outside of the school day to try to elevate the level of our local teachers. We are currently working with 75 percent of the local school districts, that is 17 districts, a total of 141 schools, about 66,000 students. So that is by far our largest service delivery programme, in the field of arts education. The next thing is to try to stimulate the amateur sector of the arts. This could be in choral music, instrumental music, hip-hop, rock and roll and drama; it could be in any field. But the idea being that everyday people, working by themselves or working with expert artists, should be able to express themselves through a creative medium. This is a new part of US policy. We know of no model currently in the US of trying to intervene in this sector and trying to help it advance. So what we are doing in Silicon Valley is we are conducting research. We have employed two cultural anthropologists. The first report has just been completed. It is on the subject of participatory or amateur artistic activities within the immigrant communities of Silicon Valley. Our next report will deal with everything else in the amateur sector. Once these reports are done, we will be doing some convening of local people to think about how to move this agenda ahead. As I said, we do not really know how to do it yet.

The third area is cultural indicators. We research into both the supply and the demand dimensions of the arts in Silicon Valley. The most interesting part of all of that work is what is called an intercept survey where we actually interview people in parks and shopping malls, other kinds of daily settings, and we have done this in three different languages - English, Spanish and Vietnamese, which are the main spoken languages in Silicon Valley, to ascertain the cultural interests and the needs of this very broad population that we have. We have published the results of this in something called the *Creative Community Index*. We hope to do this about every four years.


THE GREAT SIM CITIES

The final thing is in the realm of what we call 'policy simulation'. Silicon Valley is one of the Internet and software high-tech capitals of the world. It seemed a shame to simply write a paper about culture and why it ought to be advanced, so we decided to create some software in the form of simulation. It is called 'Great Cities'.

As far as we know, it is the only cultural policy simulation that has ever been created. It is very technical in order to make it accessible to people in everyday settings, we have made it into a game. In this game, you become the head of a foundation that has the purpose of trying to improve the cultural quality of Silicon Valley, and you are given 40 years and a variety of these full-system policies, to see if you can make Silicon Valley become something like the great civilizations of the world. Take your choice. It is currently in use in eight US universities and one in Australia. That was not what we intended. It was meant primarily as a vehicle for explaining ourselves, especially to the business and political leaders of Silicon Valley.

We took five months to create this software. There were three of us who were the design team. We worked with a system dynamics expert who was able to convert the logic into computer code. In this simulation, we make the point that creativity is derived from a vibrant culture, and that it has two significant impacts. One is that by making these investments, we attract and hold creative immigrants. That is a huge issue for Silicon Valley, because while we attract people from around the world, they do not necessarily want to stay. Most of them want to move back ultimately to China, India and the various countries from which they came. We believe that in order to have a vibrant, lasting and somewhat stable society, we have to find a way to hold on to those people. But also we believe that investments in creativity have a lot to do with enhancing the creative capacities of the population that already lives in Silicon Valley. So it is a matter of both attracting creative people and also training our own creative people.

The third point about the simulator is that it provides a learning laboratory for considering how five different policies might over time transform Silicon Valley into a great city region – 40 years is the time horizon in the simulation. I will just briefly name the five policies. First and foremost, we have a whole policy about enhancements in arts education. We have a policy that has to do with increased production of artistic goods and services. The more aggressive marketing of artistic goods and services is another thing that deals with the marketing. The fourth strategy has to do with improved management of cultural institutions, and finally a policy that allows you to build new cultural facilities - West Kowloon, perhaps.

I want to point out that our software is purposely not copyrighted. We want it copied by everyone. It would give us great joy if every computer in Malaysia or China or Singapore had a copy of our software on it and people were playing with it and interacting with us over the Internet. We would greatly relish that. I want to tell you too that we are hoping soon to produce an Internet version of the 'Great Cities' software so that anybody can get it from us at any time. Any country, city and region that has an interest in developing a model, a mental map of its cultural policies to build a simulation out of it, can share it with policy leaders, teachers and professors. In our case, it only took us five months to do it. The total amount of money is almost embarrassing to mention to you, I think it cost us something like US\$55,000 to create it all, though we had some advantages, a lot of donations from local companies of software and also a video production facility and a sound studio. So we had all those donated to us, still it was not that difficult to do. 

**Professor
Colin MERCER**Principal Researcher of
'Hong Kong Arts and
Cultural Indicator'**Indicators of Creativity:
How Do We Know**

When we are talking about culture, we are talking about it in the broadest possible sense. It is in culture that young people in the West Midlands of England, for example, are affiliating to al-Qaeda or went to fight in Afghanistan. It is that broad. It is that important. That is why we have to treat it as a special commodity.

Do we have a sufficient knowledge base in order to have indicators of creativity or indicators of cultural development or indicators of anything? I think we are getting there. We are not quite there yet. Richard Florida's work has been enormously important in getting it on to mainstream strategic urban and regional development agendas at international level, but I think there are significant flaws in Florida's work. We are only partly there by using that particular methodology.

I want to suggest that in order to build a knowledge base, you have to understand creativity in terms of, to borrow a concept from the Harvard business guru Michael Porter, the value production chain, or what is now being called the culture cycle. Creativity is not just the moment of inspiration, it is a systemic and organised process. Creativity has a value chain. The first stage is obviously creation. But not just the idea, the practice, the concept of creation; the educational, infrastructural and financial conditions of creativity.

THE VALUE CHAIN OF CREATIVITY

The next stage in the creativity value chain or the cultural value chain, if you like, is production and reproduction. This is concerned with a more or less elaborated transformation of creative content into tangible and consumable forms. I am trying to build up the picture, or the matrix, from which we need to understand culture and creativity. This is the second stage.

The third stage is knowledge dissemination. It involves marketing, but it is getting the knowledge out there, in whatever form, of the tangible and consumable forms of culture. By forms I mean experiences, not just commodities. The fourth stage is distribution or dissemination. The networks, venues and opportunities are for access to culture.

In Australia and the UK, there are some very fine cultural centres and venues but you will often find that the actual physical, intellectual and spiritual access to those cultural centres is denied to a significant portion of the population, for reasons of ethnicity, socio-economic status and so on. I was working on a project in Brisbane where I used to live and was interviewing a Vietnamese resident of an inner city neighbourhood called the West End, which is right next to a cultural centre on the south bank of the river in Brisbane. I said, 'What do you think of the cultural centre?' He said, 'Actually, I don't think it's a cultural

centre at all. It is a European arts centre, because there's not much in there that interests me, in terms of my Vietnamese culture.' That was a long time ago; things have got a lot better since then, but it is an indicator that there are ways of excluding as well as including people on infrastructure-based cultural development projects. It is something we have to be conscious of and something we need to pick up in our processes of cultural mapping, surveying before planning.

Finally, the thing we know least about in culture: consumption and participation. Yes, we know how many people buy things and books and so on, but we do not know how they are actually using those resources to construct an identity, a sense of belonging, a subculture - a sub-national culture, if you like, or a trans-national culture in many circumstances. We do not yet know enough at ground level, and this is where we need the anthropologists to tell us: What are the ritual processes by which culture is taken up? How are people using cultural resources and cultural capital to construct their sense of self, their sense of identity and, ultimately, their sense of citizenship? We do not know enough yet about the diversity and range of citizen consumers and the ways in which those resources get used.

There is a model which has been in operation in Australia since 1992, at the national level especially. It has also now been developed in the context of something called the regional cultural data framework in the UK, which is rolling out at regional and local government level. It is also informing the methodology we are using in the Hong Kong Arts and Cultural Indicators Project for the Arts Development Council. It re-states those moments: creation, production and reproduction, promotion and knowledge, distribution and delivery, and consumption.

The point is that cultural policy has historically been defined more or less in arts policy terms as concerned with the beginning moment of that chain, with the artist, creation, production and reproduction, partially, but not much with the other stages: promotion and knowledge, marketing, distribution and delivery and consumption. There has been a problem. There has been a skew in cultural policy, historically, especially in the English-speaking countries, and many of the European countries as well, with that moment of creation, the first stage of creation, but not the other stages of creation, not the other stages in the creation value chain or culture cycle.

MAKING OF CULTURAL CAPITAL: GLASGOW AND SHEFFIELD

On the other hand, there has been the revival of culture in the urban regeneration context, often leading to some very useful results, but especially on big flagship projects, often leading to a consumption orientation, ignoring the moment of creation at the beginning of the chain. 'Glasgow Stage One', in 1991, when it became, to everybody's surprise, the European City of Culture, is

a classic example of that. A lot of money went into getting people into Glasgow, bringing the tourists in, having set piece venues, the museums, the Tates, and so on, established in Glasgow, but at the expense of fostering, at the same time, a culture of creative production, content generation. The result was that, following the City of Culture, following the first wave of interest in Glasgow, the economic base of the cultural economy of Glasgow was significantly weakened. They were in debt in terms of infrastructure costs and so on, and there was nothing new coming from the local area. They had even sold the intellectual property rights to Glasgow's greatest creator, Rennie Mackintosh, to a firm in Milan. So they could no longer exploit that creative content base either. 'Glasgow Stage Two', which is now happening, is much more concentrated on the Silicon Glen initiative, new media production and creative industry development and small-scale clusters and so on. It is much more production oriented and is now catching up with the consumption orientation of 'Glasgow Stage One'.

The other side of the scale, another UK example, of production orientation is probably Sheffield, the first government initiated or sponsored, and largely paid for creative industries quarter in any UK city. There are some very significant successes there, but it is costing them an awful lot of money, because they have a strong production base in the Sheffield creative industries quarter, but a very weak consumption base. You can walk around it. There are very few places to sit down, have a drink, and go to a coffee bar. You go in there and you come away again.

There is not that balance of production and consumption operating in Sheffield as should be happening in successful, sustainable city cultural quarters, creative clusters or cultural precincts. You need that combination of production and consumption. There is an important of balance. Production skew, as in the case of Sheffield, can be produced as a result of over-investment in creativity and production. That may sound scandalous, but there are many examples around the world, partly because of the emphasis of arts and cultural funding programmes on the moment of creativity, where there is significant over-investment in creativity and production, and not looking at the other end of the scale, the development of markets, audiences, consumers and so on.

A lack of understanding of business processes and marketing is another feature of the production skew. The fact that, as we are discovering in many regional and sub-regional projects in the UK now, artists who are emerging at a significant rate, something like eight percent a year at the moment in some of the English regions, do not have the skill base to do business planning and marketing. They do not have the connections, the business support systems and so on, to enable them to become a sustainable company. There is also a lack of intelligence on local and wider markets and a need for audience development. There is simple market research logic here, which is to do with knowing and building your market. It actually needs to be much more conceptually complex than that. We need to understand much more, as I mentioned just now, about

how people use cultural resources in their everyday lives. We need much more mapping of that detailed, in-depth, almost anthropological type to understand precisely what it is that people are doing. How are young aboriginal kids in Australia, for example, using hip-hop as a particular form of identity affirmation, which is not simply making them slavish to an imported American or British culture. The active negotiation of cultural resources to construct a sense of identity, a sense of place, a sense of belonging, a sense of affiliation, or a sense of resistance.

UNDERSTANDING THE CULTURAL MARKET BRINGS FRUITS

Cultural tourism is a significant reality now. Thirty-five percent of all global travel is now motivated by cultural or knowledge-based tourism. Fifty percent in the European Union area of overseas holiday trips are taken principally for cultural reasons. Cultural tourists spend more and stay longer. Cultural tourism in the UK, even in a county like Essex, is more important than seaside or town tourism. People are spending, on average, about 40 percent more than people who simply visit the towns and the seaside resorts. They are high-yield, free independent travellers. They are an important factor. You need to use that factor not simply to make the argument that we are going to get more money in, but that demand for cultural tourism should also be feeding back along the value chain to stimulate new forms of creativity and production. It is a crucial link. At the bottom of the value chain, there is an important feedback loop that needs to be established between the moment of consumption and the moment of production. If you separate them, you have not got conditions of sustainability. That seems to me to be important, particularly in the case of Hong Kong.

We need to understand much more in terms of sustaining the cultural offer, in a tourism context, about how people are actively engaging and using the cultural resources that are available in a much more dynamic anthropology-oriented understanding of the cultural tourism market and the way in which that market, those consumers, engage with the cultural offer; a dramatic transformatory experience, rather than a simply passive one.

We come to the argument about culture is a commodity like no other. The UNESCO declaration is that culture is a special commodity, a commodity unlike any other, because it has embedded within it all sorts of values of identity, of affiliation, of faith, of belief, of citizenship, which no other marketed product can offer. It seems to me extraordinarily important. When we are talking about culture, we are talking about it in the broadest possible sense. It is in culture that young people in the West Midlands of England, for example, are affiliating to al-Qaeda or went to fight in Afghanistan. It is that broad. It is that important. That is why we have to treat it as a special commodity.

DESIGN FOR THE ARTS AND CULTURAL INDICATORS

In the 'Hong Kong Arts and Cultural Indicators' project, we have identified, in principle, four indicator clusters which are drawn from the 'Towards Cultural Citizenship' project, as follows: Indicators relating to creative vitality and diversity – levels of output, turnover, gross value added in the cultural sector. You are also measuring whether or not you have a balance across the various sub-sectors - media, performing arts, visual arts, publishing and so on, and whether that balance is sustainable and healthy. We are also, in a more qualitative sense, beginning to understand those forms of economic activity.

Access and participation. The range and diversity of opportunities and amenities available, in any given context - whether you are talking about a city, a neighbourhood, a region, a nation - and the social outputs for participation. Here comes the qualitative dimension.

The first dimension you can talk about by simply counting quantitatively how many venues, how many people are going to venues and so on. But the second more important and complex part of this is the social outputs of participation. What is its effect? What is its social impact on the cohesion of a community, on increasing learning levels, on increasing a sense of belonging, a sense of a recognition and tolerance of diversity and so on. All of those things need to be evaluated. The third one is culture, lifestyle and identity. This is again about the uses of culture and creativity, how people are actively appropriating cultural resources to consolidate their identity, to differentiate themselves from others, to affiliate themselves with others.

Culture and governance. I am talking about cultural policy, cultural planning and cultural governance. As Patrick Ho mentioned the other day, the role of government - and I am talking about broader than government here - is to act as a facilitator in this context. But it is a facilitator that has to be guided by appropriate policy settings which link culture to the economy, to regeneration, to quality of life, to social justice, to social inclusion and so on. This is what in the UK is increasingly called joined-up government, or joined-up thinking for joined-up government.

Another way of saying this is that we need strategic, holistic and integrated policy settings, informed by the process of cultural mapping, in order to make the connections with the economists, office of tourism, the inward investment specialists, the marketing agencies and so on. We need that joined-up thinking, which is increasingly happening at local and regional level and, to a certain extent, at a national level in the UK now. One of the key drivers - the UK does not have a cultural policy, but it has a cultural thrust- was the establishment in 1997 by the Prime Minister of the 'Creative Industries Taskforce', an inter-departmental working group, which also brought in significant cultural entrepreneurs, such as Richard Branson and Paul Smith and brought in the

industry as well. That has been an important and key driver in getting culture, creativity, the creative industries, on to mainstream policy agendas at national, regional and, increasingly now, local level. There is something like 28 local government authorities currently engaged in creative industries mapping projects.


DATA ON HONG KONG PRODUCTION AND CONSUMPTION OF ARTS AND CULTURE

My final point is about understanding the ecology of culture and creativity. Let me come to Hong Kong, for example. The data taken from the 'Creative Index Baseline Study' by the Cultural Policy Research Centre at Hong Kong University reads, creative industries in Hong Kong records 3.8 percent of gross domestic product in 2001, which was a decline from 1998, but a 42 percent increase in gross value added of the content production sector. A 54 percent increase in the gross value added of reproduction and distribution sector in 1996 to 2002. That is the people getting the products out into the marketplace. These are significant increases. There was also significant sub-sector gross value added growth from 1996 to 2001, in media, software, entertainment, printing and publishing.

The activity in all of these sectors is in content generation and distribution. The actual manufacturing component is in significant decline, as it is internationally. A 5.3 percent share of total employment in 2002, which is on a par with the UK. But, a significant indicator here, only six percent of your creative industry's workforce is self-employed. That is a very low figure. In the UK, nationally, it is about 30 percent. In some regions, it is up to 60 percent. In some occupations, it is as high as 86 percent. If that is an indicator, and it probably is, it seems to be an indicator of a certain lack of vitality in the creative industry's workforce, but these are only provisional guesses at this stage.

Cultural consumption. Here is an astonishing figure: you are too busy for it. That is the problem. Asking a sample of 829 people why they did not go to arts and cultural events, 72 percent of them were too busy to attend; 22 percent are not interested, which is not unusual; 16 percent are not sufficiently able to appreciate arts and culture; nine percent do not have sufficient information; five percent say it costs too much. So your problem is not an economic one, in terms of access to cultural resources, it is a time resource one. Set that now against cultural attitudes and values. Seventy percent of the sample placed a 'fairly high' and 'high' value on culture; 82.5 percent believe culture encourages a sense of community; 85 percent believe culture 'helps me understand the world and its people'. That is a cultural diversity indicator. Seventy-four percent believe culture helps in personal development. That is a human capital indicator: 72 per cent believe culture is important for Hong Kong identity; 82.5 percent think culture is important for the international profile and image of Hong Kong. You can show this to the government: 90 percent support public funding for

culture. That is an unusually high figure. You would not get that in the UK. Ninety percent of this sample, across all demographics is provisional. We have not done the cross-tabulations yet and it is a first run of the data on the survey.

That sort of data can get translated into indicators which we can then feed into a coherent conceptual framework to make the connections between creativity, culture, economic development, regeneration, tourism initiatives, inward investment strategies, knowledge economy development initiatives and a whole range of other, new, 21st century imperatives, but we need to be able to hold that data together in a coherent framework which makes the connections between culture, regeneration, citizenship, identity and, ultimately, sustainability. It seems to me that that is the sort of way we should be going. 

Ms Sisy CHEN

Television and Radio
Programme Host, Taiwan



Imagined Hong Kong

Hong Kong's prosperity is borrowed from China, and to a certain extent, we can say we are not returning prosperity to China, but as far as the cultural industry is concerned, because of the rise of the manufacturing industries in China, because of the rise of a new China, Hong Kong could be the very new centre for the imagined China.

Hong Kong is very important to me. When I was in Taiwan, when there was martial law, you are not allowed to go out of the country. After martial law was over, as the first step of opening up, the most important thing for young people is that we can go abroad freely, so we can know about the world outside. Hong Kong to me was my first step going out to the world.

My term as a legislator will expire in January next year. I think my constituents would heavily criticise me for leaving them. I ask myself what I should do. I made up my mind that I want to have another cross-cultural experience. I do not choose Beijing, Shanghai or Singapore; I have chosen to come to Hong Kong.

HONG KONG: THE IMAGINED CHINA

Like what I did in 1976, when Taiwan opened up, I immediately came to Hong Kong. When I was young, I chose Hong Kong as my first stop outside the country. To me, there is some imagination involved in the consideration. After 1949, from Shanghai, from the mainland of China, many people moved to Hong Kong. Hong Kong is not just Hong Kong, but an imagined China. It is like China in our imagination. Compared with China, it has certain distance, it is somewhat detached from China geographically and also culturally. At that time, it was a British colony and it had been a colony for quite a long time. Secondly, it has a large number of immigrants. The distance between Hong Kong and the mainland gives people the image of an imagined China and there were quite a number of cultural phenomena that would not be imaginable if Hong Kong were not the imagined China. For example, Kung Fu and martial arts fiction - the righteousness of these people practising martial arts. All these reflect the imagined China.

People go to Hong Kong because Hong Kong to them is the imagined China. They come here to search for the China in their imagination. It is shallow, it is easy to accept, and there are certain western elements in Hong Kong. Immigrants to Hong Kong created an imagined China in Hong Kong. Foreigners in Hong Kong are also here to search for the China in their imaginations. Therefore, we have to give some consideration to the concept of Hong Kong as a cultural space. It is a collection of a number of shopping malls and everything broke down suddenly, after the outbreak of SARS; very few tourists came to Hong Kong. The fate of Hong Kong saddened me and I wrote an article about

the sorrowful state of Hong Kong. I wrote about Hong Kong's prosperity as being borrowed and propelled by China's inability to develop herself. Therefore, we have to ask ourselves one question: What is the position of Hong Kong in this new China that we face now? At that time, I attended a seminar where there were some economists from Hong Kong who said that Hong Kong should become a creative centre, a trading centre and so on. The picture they painted was exactly the same as that painted by economists from Taiwan. You can still be a shipping centre, you can be a trading centre, but for the question I posed, that is, as far as Hong Kong's prosperity is concerned, in fact, before 1949, Hong Kong was still just a backward fishing village in the southern part of China.

Hong Kong rose because of the sufferings of China, in a way. For a person like others and me who have special emotional attachment to Hong Kong, we will ask: is Hong Kong's time up? Perhaps our time is up because of the rise of the new China. Are we returning the prosperity to China because we borrowed it? If you look at it from that angle, the answer is more than clear. The answer is affirmative. Hong Kong's prosperity is borrowed from China, and to a certain extent, we can say we are not returning prosperity to China, but as far as the cultural industry is concerned, because of the rise of the manufacturing industries in China, because of the rise of a new China, Hong Kong could be the very new centre for the imagined China.

HONG KONG BORROWS CULTURAL INDUSTRY FROM CHINA

You can ponder that thought. You are still borrowing something, it is just that this time you are not borrowing prosperity, but rather you are borrowing the cultural industry. I would like to share with you other cities with a similar experience to Hong Kong: the city of Shanghai in the late Qing Dynasty. A lot of the Shanghainese people migrated to Hong Kong after 1949 and brought along with them their Shanghainese culture. Hong Kong actually has a very similar background to Shanghai at that time. Because of the riots and all that, a lot of people moved from other parts of China to Shanghai and those landlords brought prosperity to Shanghai. Before that, Shanghai was just a trading centre. There were prostitutes, gambling and lots of rascals in the city. But because of the Taiping Rebellion, people moved to Shanghai, and then Shanghai became an important city for China. Again, Shanghai then borrowed prosperity from the sufferings of China as a whole. Then there was warlords and everything, and a new class of entrepreneurs emerged in China, and then people fled from China to Hong Kong. Hong Kong had a unique edge because it was opened up to the world, unlike China. But, of course, it also shares a lot of the historical background of China.

There was a special feature in Shanghai in the late Qing Dynasty. There were people who fled from other areas to Shanghai. They felt they were overlooked because, at that time, Shanghai was very westernised and the traditional Chinese scholars felt they were overlooked. So when they moved to Shanghai,

they could not adapt at that time. The scholars were angry and wrote a lot of articles and they would gather together all the time and form their own cultural network. At that time, there was a poet from China who wrote a poem. I am not going to recite the poem, but what he meant was that this city only worshipped money. It is a cultural desert. That is more or less what he said in his poem. Eventually the intellectuals found a new tool that is founding newspapers, they established several newspapers. Again, the intellectuals and scholars regained control in Shanghai, in the sense that they established their own status and they became more influential than businessmen.

I think in Hong Kong, there are a lot of paparazzi and newspaper publishers who have control, but I think their status is not given enough importance. At the time, the intellectual circle had sway over everything. If they wished, they could boost the importance of anybody they liked, including prostitutes or actors and actresses, with their pens. I think Shanghai as a city, and Hong Kong also as a migrant city, have actually the same unique set of cultural background. So in your imagined China, you do not want a real China, you are not seeking a real China, you are not trying to preserve the original living style, because it is not Germany, it is not Heidelberg, it is just a migrant city; and a migrant city, whether it is Shanghai or Hong Kong, is just seeking a certain style of fashion, because among the different migrants, they do not share a common background. Their civic culture is accepted not because of their common history but rather based on popular culture. For example, like in Shanghai, prostitutes, actresses and actors enjoyed high status at that time, so it is very similar.

WINDOW-SHOPPING HONG KONG FASHION

So in Hong Kong, what is popular culture here? When I look at Hong Kong, I would imagine it as a piece of cultural work. I think Hong Kong is all about fashion and style. Yesterday I went to Joyce. You cannot imagine, I had to wait an hour for my credit card to be used, and when I was waiting, I saw 17 women coming into Joyce. Only one was using a Gucci bag. All the 17 others were using carry bags, some carried a red bag, some black, and some bags were made of crocodile skin. So this is the fashion that has so much influence here. You cannot find another more common language than fashion in Hong Kong. For popular culture, we all know that when something is in fashion, everybody just follows blindly.

But then my other intellectual friends may think that is because Hong Kong does not have its own character, so you can unite people with carry bags, or perhaps next time it is a different fashion, it is a hat or something. Then people might all wear a hat to come to the place. But you can see that people here are conquered by fashion. To Andy Warhol, art is part of popular culture. That is why Marilyn Monroe was successfully turned into culture. Chinese people do not think actresses have high status but he successfully turned an actress into a status symbol, into a fashion. They could turn a commodity into culture and then they could turn culture into commodities.

In Hong Kong, I think so far fashion actually is not married enough to culture, to your culture and arts. Imagine you were in the then Shanghai. If you moved China to Hong Kong, there should be some certain chemical reaction. You need a chemical reaction. But so far, in the imagined Hong Kong, we cannot see another characteristic that projects itself strongly here. How can we have all the elements of an imagined China here in Hong Kong taking root? That is something we can consider. Last time when I came to Hong Kong, I went to Lee Garden, a new shopping mall, and this time I come, I find new shopping malls again and a lot of people are doing window-shopping, so I think someone should do an art creation.

Just now Professor Mercer in his presentation said that 72 percent of people said they were too busy for arts and culture. But if your shopping windows are turn into galleries and if you move all your arts items into shopping windows, it will work, and I think it will only work in Hong Kong. So Hong Kong is classical as a shopping city, but I think Hong Kong's culture is very different from other places, in that only business and the commercial sector could promote arts and culture in Hong Kong.

Lung Ying Tai is an author I like most. Her viewpoint is very different from me in that I think Hong Kong should not try to learn the classical things but you should keep your fashionable characteristics. Do not try to embrace classical things in a disciplined manner. But in Hong Kong, I think everything boils down to money.


POTENTIAL SOHO IN WEST KOWLOON

The West Kowloon cultural district project is an organized trend of creativity. Now you want to do the West Kowloon project. That is exactly the problem. We have brought Guggenheim here. We have brought Pompidou here. But who will foot the bill? It is the developers. You can have the best museums there, but the whole idea of a cultural district is not about property development.

I think Hong Kong and China could be both borrowing time. You can borrow time from China in the sense that you can borrow the lack of free creative space in China, so that for all the Chinese artists who are creative, you can bring them to Hong Kong; let them station in the West Kowloon Cultural District. It will be like the SOHO of New York.

In this special region, Chinese people can create their own art, and you do marketing at the same time in the same place. You can put gallery in this West Kowloon Cultural District. It is just like SOHO. So Hong Kong should buy time

and history. It is just like New York. Back in those years, New York recruited artists from Paris, and SOHO at US\$700 per hour. These artists were especially brought into the galleries to do creation. So in the West Kowloon Cultural District you should not just have a few museums being surrounded by so many skyscrapers. That will be a waste.

So in China, in Hong Kong, people aspire for freedom. It is just like myself, when you think of something that can sell for money, you will spend effort on it. So Hong Kong should have fashionable art. Do not think about the classical art. I heard some statistics about the entertainment industry. Every day your mother and your wife are doing window-shopping. That is the thing for Hong Kong. They may say no two cities are the same, so do not think you can duplicate what other cities have done. You have to find out Hong Kong's special characteristics. 

**Professor
LEE Ou Fan**

Professor of Humanities of
Department of Cultural and
Religious Studies,
The Chinese University of
Hong Kong



City, Memory, and Creativity

What we have here is a very interesting, imaginative creation of a city re-inventing itself, based on an assessment of its citizens' own values, namely family, money and no culture. So what is the place of culture there?

I am teaching Walter Benjamin's big book called *The Arcade Project*, 1,008 pages, at the Chinese University. From that book, upon re-reading that book, I became inspired, troubled by the current situation in Hong Kong. That is to say I began to ask the question: whether we could talk about city and memory. The whole book by Benjamin is built on finding some clues, some emblems, in fact some ghosts of the 19th century French capitalism, culture of French capitalism. Now, of course, we are in the 21st century Hong Kong, a city that does not pride itself on its collective memory. I am currently reading another book, about 500 pages, by Christine Boyer. The book is called *The City of Collective Memory*. So maybe my talk is totally irrelevant, since Hong Kong may be a city of fashion, shopping malls, popular music and movies; an imaginary city with no memory whatsoever. If that is the case, what is the role of creative industries and what is the role of West Kowloon? If Ms Sisy Chen would recommend that we bring all the creative artists from China to West Kowloon, who is going to pay the rent? Since most artists are not millionaires. Shall we ask one of the developers to set up an artistic colony with all rents paid for so that we can create some kind of collective memory? So basically it really comes down to a very crucial issue, and this crucial issue has been revealed by Mr Mercer's statistics. Seventy-two percent of Hong Kong people are too busy to go to cultural events. Of course, they have in mind high culture, concerts, classical music, etc. Twenty-two percent of Hong Kong people declared that they are not interested. That would add up to 94 percent of the Hong Kong people. You will have a city of 94 percent of cultural citizens who are not interested in culture. That itself becomes a paradox.

A CITY RE-INVENTING ITSELF


So where is the solution to that? Probably there is a misconception of culture among the Hong Kong people, meaning that all these cultural events are for rich people, yuppies or white-collar class, or people like me who just crave classical music. I am the one who talks about classical all the time in Hong Kong, by the way, a minority of one. Now, maybe there is something else that might provide a way of confronting the issue. I am heartened to see that a very high percentage of Hong Kong people consider family to be very important. So therefore, if you add family and money, then it becomes real estate. You always like to buy a good house for your parents, in addition, another house for yourself, and then a third house just to make more money with. That of course is the internal logic that has led to the white-collar phenomenon.

What we have here is a very interesting, imaginative creation of a city re-

inventing itself, based on an assessment of its citizens' own values, namely family, money and no culture. So what is the place of culture there? You have four Guggenheims there, if you like, and what is the agitated role as mentioned, if you have a Guggenheim in West Kowloon? I wonder if the real estate people have ever thought about that possibility. Do you educate, do you bring all Hong Kong people to the museums and turn the museums into schools? That would be a great idea. Or do you do something else? As Ms Sisy Chen would suggest, let us have a Guggenheim mall, and put the museum within the mall in the midst of all the shops, so you have good clothes and a little bit of art at the same time.

IN SEARCH OF MEMORIES IN A CITY OF SPECTACLE

Actually I think Hong Kong is faced with probably another major turning point. If 1997 were a famous turning point, I would say that probably the next few years would mark another turning point. This is the turning point about the city rebuilding or re-inventing its own image. The current slogan about Hong Kong is that Hong Kong is Asia's cosmopolitan city, or Asia's world city. So in a way that is kind of a self-defined image. So how do you live up to that image? I was reading this very densely theoretical book called *The City of Collective Memory* in which the Princeton scholar says that throughout western history in the past three or four centuries, you have three kinds of cities. The first kind will be called a city as a work of art - Florence, Venice and all that. Then some time around the 19th century or so was the rebuilding of Paris by Baron von Hausmann. You have the city of panorama. That is to say you go to the Eiffel Tower, you go to the highest point, you have a bird's eye view. So the city has a centre, you have centre in a city and then you have a kind of overview. So that is how urban vision is created. But then of course when you go to Los Angeles and some of the other cities in America, you enter into what she calls the city of spectacle. A spectacle is a media creation. You can say that a city spectacle is essentially a product of creative industries.

Now, Hong Kong is on the threshold of becoming a city of spectacle. If you do not believe that, you can always go to East Kowloon and watch the fireworks, on the Hong Kong side, the spectacular fireworks every Wednesday, Tuesday, whatever - I never watch them. In other words, image building becomes the most crucial issue in Hong Kong culture, so that this image building will then attract many investments, thereby enhancing Hong Kong's economy. So what does memory have to do with all of this? I wrote a big paper about this but I decided to throw it away because this is not an academic occasion. But I think deep down, on a kind of subconscious level if you like, if you really talk to average Hong Kong people, if you really eavesdrop on what they talk about over their Sunday family lunches - they are talking about their individual and family memories. How do you deal with that issue, especially when you are trying to rebuild a city as a spectacular city of the future? I will leave that question to you all. 

REMEMBERING HONG KONG

Q. I have a question to Professor Lee. In your point of view, what impressed you the most on your rediscovery of Hong Kong's history? Do you think that is the most valuable thing in Hong Kong's yesterday and which is to be connected to Hong Kong's today and future?

LEE OU-FAN: Of course I have to speak in favour of history, but I think Hong Kong history can be used dynamically. I am not taking the conservative position, saying that we have to withhold our history or defend our history, but rather I think memory and history should figure in the cultural industry. That is basically my conclusion. So if you have no interest in history or memory, that factor is left out. My worry is that in the current debate, most people basically are really not concerned with that issue. Only a few people, a small minority, are more concerned, not merely with the problem of preservation or heritage, which is a big issue, but rather about how to creatively use that history, the elements of history, for the future.

My example is Chicago. Chicago is a city where I lived for about ten years. This is a city that prides itself in re-using its history. Every year it has a humanities panel. Every year it tries to re-invent itself.

I think every small village has its history and memory, and that somehow has to be used.