



Renewal through Culture? The Role of Museums in the Renewal of Industrial Regions in Europe

Martin Heidenreich & Beatriz Plaza

To cite this article: Martin Heidenreich & Beatriz Plaza (2015) Renewal through Culture? The Role of Museums in the Renewal of Industrial Regions in Europe, *European Planning Studies*, 23:8, 1441-1455, DOI: [10.1080/09654313.2013.817544](https://doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2013.817544)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09654313.2013.817544>



Published online: 08 Aug 2013.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 782



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 3 View citing articles [↗](#)

INTRODUCTION

Renewal through Culture? The Role of Museums in the Renewal of Industrial Regions in Europe

MARTIN HEIDENREICH* & BEATRIZ PLAZA**

*Department of Social Sciences, School of Education and Social Sciences, Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg, Oldenburg 26111, Germany, **Faculty of Economics, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Bilbao 48015, Spain

ABSTRACT *Bilbao has become a role model for the regeneration of declining urban and industrial regions. The debate on the so-called Bilbao effect showed that rundown industrial cities and regions might profit from culture-based development strategies, even if successful urban regeneration cannot be induced by only one flagship project without an appropriate local and regional context. Based on the comparative analysis of six, in general recently founded, museums in five countries (Guggenheim Museum Bilbao; Louvre in Lens; Centre Pompidou in Metz; Istanbul Modern Art Museum; Museum Folkwang in Essen; Museum of Natural History in Florence), the authors of this special issue discuss the role of these museums in building the image and the attractiveness of their local and regional environment, the cross-fertilization of ideas and the integration of a region in global circuits and networks. Museums can play an important role in building up “social capital”, creating networks between different professionals, groups, sectors and segments of society, bridging diverse social backgrounds, lowering coordinating costs for individuals and businesses, and increasing the capacity of firms to reconnect.*

Since the opening of the Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao in 1997, Bilbao has become a role model for the regeneration of declining urban and industrial regions (Plaza, 2006, 2008). The so-called “Bilbao effect” refers to the use of a flagship building (e.g. a museum, an opera, a concert hall, a theatre) characterized by an iconic architecture and designed by a leading “star architect”¹ as a means for the culture-driven revitalization of a rundown city or region into an attractive, nationally and internationally visible location for tourism, business or cultural and creative industries (CCIs). Other examples

Correspondence Address: Martin Heidenreich, Department of Social Sciences, School of Education and Social Sciences, Carl von Ossietzky University of Oldenburg, Oldenburg 26111, Germany. Email: martin.heidenreich@uni-oldenburg.de

of this effect include the Groninger Museum (1994) by Alessandro Mendini, the Imperial War Museum North in Manchester (2002) by David LaBau and the Museum of Contemporary Art Kiasma in Helsinki (1998) by Steven Holl, and most recently the Louvre Lens, which the *New York Times* classified as one of the 46 places worldwide to go in 2013:

Lens, an industrial town in the Pas-de-Calais region of northern France, is aiming to become the next Bilbao. The first step in such a transformation happened on December 2012, when a branch of the Louvre opened on what had been a former hilltop mine yard. The 50-acre site, which was abandoned in the 1960s, now has gardens and hangar-like exhibition spaces designed by the Japanese architectural firm Sanaa. (*New York Times*, 2013)

The phrase “Bilbao effect” first of all neglects the fact that the revitalization of Bilbao was inspired not only by national policies (Council of Europe, 1991; Urfalino, 1996), but also by the example of other cities, such as the regeneration of Glasgow after its year as the European City of Culture in 1990 or the urban regeneration of Barcelona before the 1992 Olympic Games. The transformation of Salerno, Groningen, Tallinn, Dublin or Liverpool to cities of culture and tourism could also be mentioned (Sklaier, 2005; Cooke, 2008). Secondly, the focus on the Guggenheim museum designed by Frank Gehry as a paradigmatic case for a “catalytic project” ignores the fact that the renewal of Bilbao is not limited to this museum. The new metro system designed by Norman Foster, a new airport terminal designed by Santiago Calatrava or the Euskalduna Jauregia Bilbao Conference and Music Centre by Federico Soriano and Dolores Palacios have also contributed to the architecture-driven redesign of the city. A single museum will thus hardly form the basis for a local cultural cluster: “A creative city cannot be founded like a cathedral in the desert: it needs to be linked to and be part of an existing cultural environment.” (Pratt, 2008, p. 35). Thirdly, even more unlikely is a regional regeneration process driven by a single flagship project. In the case of Bilbao, the transformation of industrial spaces into spaces for leisure and accommodation, the completion of the sewage system or the restoration of the river Nervion and, last but not least, the armistice with the ETA might have been at least as important for urban renewal as the construction of a spectacular building. These manifold sources of the renewal of Bilbao weaken any unidimensional explanations of a uniquely culture-driven phenomenon. Fourthly, in other locations, revitalization strategies based on flagship cultural investments have failed, did not bring about the desired economic, symbolic, social or cognitive effects (Evans, 2005, 2009) or also led to unwanted effects such as gentrification and urban segregation. Often cultural flagships are “isolated and exclusive spaces that are designed to serve visitors over residents and that are divorced from any public planning process.” (Grodach, 2010, p. 354).

In conclusion, in the debate on the so-called “Bilbao effect”, it has become clear that culturally driven urban renewal is not a particularity of Bilbao, the development of a creative city will not be the result of a single “catalytic project”, successful urban regeneration cannot be induced only by one flagship building without an appropriate local and regional context, and finally that even successful strategies of cultural regeneration may have unintended and unwanted effects for the local population.

These results of the debate on the so-called “Bilbao effect” show that the relationship between “catalytic” cultural flagship projects and urban regeneration has to be discussed

in a more complex perspective. The question of how major cultural investments affect a regional economy cannot be answered by assuming automatic trickling down or spillover effects. Even if the debate on the “Bilbao effect” has convincingly demonstrated that rundown industrial cities and regions might profit from culture-based development strategies, the concrete mechanisms of this effect are not clear. The question still remains open as to how flagship cultural projects translate into new urban images, identities, networks and even value-creation potential in CCI, which are an important source of employment in Europe (KEA European Affairs, 2006).² Empirically, capital cities and other large urban areas such as London, Paris, Milan or Amsterdam are focal points of the creative and cultural industries in Europe (Power & Nielsen, 2010). However, this does not exclude the possibility that formerly industrial towns can develop cultural quarters and creative industries.

A useful basis, which is paradoxical only at first glance, for reflecting on the economic impact of cultural institutions is the assumption that just like museums, theatres and operas, and works of art are characterized by cultural, non-economic and non-political logics. The aim of museums is not to maximize benefits, voters or even the number of visitors. In general, cultural artefacts are generated, used and transmitted relatively autonomously from their potential economic or political functions. Alberto Giacometti, Pina Bausch, Joseph Beuys and other artists have created their oeuvres without the primary concern of making money or contributing to economic growth and prosperity. Artists and also museums that store artistic oeuvres are only successful to the extent that they are able to function according to an own artistic logic. This is also true when culture is used for the reproduction of social inequalities. Culture can legitimate class differences only when it is not the direct expression of economic capital (Bourdieu, 1984). However, it is the—more and more wished-for—contribution of cultural facilities and events to creating “creative” environments (Florida, 2005) and their effects on image, identity and social attributions of a space (Kunzmann, 2004) that give them an economic connotation that translates into city attractiveness and indirect value in an increasing global competition for talent, investments and knowledge.

The starting point for our analysis of museums was inspired by innovation research. Similar to the autonomy of the artistic or cultural sphere, inventions—or more generally scientific and technological advancements—are also characterized by a different logic from innovations, which take place in the economic sphere. For Schumpeter, the difference between inventions and innovations was the origin of innovation theory.³ While innovations are characterized by their economic success,⁴ inventions belong to the realm of science and technology. Empirically, however, it was always clear that individual inventions and organized, systematic research and development activities (R&D) had a major impact on the innovativeness of companies, branches, regions or nations. Innovation research therefore did not respect the warning of Schumpeter and carefully analysed how inventions are transformed into innovations (for example in industrial R&D departments, by linear or recursive or triple-helix innovation processes or in institutionally embedded regional, sectoral or national innovation systems and the corresponding technological trajectories; cf. Fagerberg *et al.*, 2005). In this way, innovation research was able to analyse the societal forms which facilitated the interactions of science, technology and innovation. Organizational, regional or national worlds characterized by different forms of proximity facilitated processes of reciprocal learning between scientific, technological and economic logics.

In a similar vein, the starting point for analysing the economic role of culture (and especially museums) is the distinctiveness of cultural and economic logics. Such an analytical separation allows the question to be raised as to how these apparently completely different logics may interact with each other, since empirically such a relationship can be expected. On the one hand museums of modern art generally require huge amounts of money for their construction and operation, while on the other hand spectacular buildings and flagship projects may contribute to the economic revitalization of depressed regions and quarters, for example as shown by the Guggenheim museum in Bilbao. Therefore, we analyse the role of culture and more specifically museums, in the economic regeneration of a city or a region according to the following three dimensions. Museums can:

- (1) improve the image and the attractiveness of a region for local elites, the local population and for external visitors.
- (2) contribute to the cross-fertilization of ideas and can thus fulfil a catalytic function for the development of new CCIs and jobs (not only but also through cross-sector spillovers as well)
- (3) help to improve the attractiveness and business environment of a city/region through enhancing its international embeddedness.

The *first contribution* of a museum to the revitalization of a region is the result of its social and symbolic role, which refers to the role of culture as part of collective consumption. In the second case, culture is an important feature of the local and regional production process (Scott, 2006, p. 10). Both in the consumptive and in the productive dimensions, networks are essential at the local, regional, national and global levels, especially between the cultural, the political and the economic spheres. These two dimensions will be analysed in the following.

First of all, the societal function of museums is not limited to their economic or political functions. They are part of the cultural memory of humanity because they store and conserve ordered and classified objects. The International Council of Museums defines a museum as

a non-profit, permanent institution in the service of society and its development, open to the public, which acquires, conserves, researches, communicates and exhibits the tangible and intangible heritage of humanity and its environment for the purposes of education, study and enjoyment.⁵

A classical aspect of this “service of society” is the role of culture as means of distinction especially for local elites:

Taste classifies, and it classifies the classifier. Social subjects, classified by their classifications, distinguish themselves by the distinctions they make, between the beautiful and the ugly, the distinguished and the vulgar, in which their position in the objective classifications is expressed or betrayed. (Bourdieu, 1984, p. 6)

Museums are an important place for these practices of social distinction, since via sponsoring events they may become a meeting place for the local elite.

However, museums are not only a place for local elites, as shown by the high number of visitors, especially for exhibitions, annual museum nights and other events or the sales of museum shops. The consumption of cultural goods is a distinctive feature of new social classes especially in the service sector (Featherstone, 1991; Horkheimer & Adorno, 2002). A vibrant cultural atmosphere plays an important role in the attractiveness of a city, especially for high-skilled employees, which Florida (2002) refers to as the creative class:

(C)ultural amenities (in the guise of museums, art galleries, concert halls, multifaceted entertainment districts, and so on) are almost always present in some abundance; and the visible form of the city is generally dominated by up-scale streetscapes, expensive shopping facilities, and well-appointed residential enclaves. (Scott, 2006, p. 4)

Le Galès (1999) observes that “(m)ost cities are involved in the mobilization of culture as a strategic resource to create local identities and images (for instance, through urban projects and festivals)”.

The role of culture is not only important for the urban population, but also for tourists, business travellers and other visitors. Cultural attractions, such as nationally or internationally visible exhibitions, concerts or plays, also increase the appeal of a town for external visitors and may thus support its development as a tourist target.

It can be observed that cultural institutions such as museums contribute to the image and the attractiveness of a city both for local elites and inhabitants and for external visitors if they offer stimulating cultural events—in the case of museums permanent collections of well-known and new, often provocative artists and high-rank exhibitions. In this dimension, culture is an important collective good consumed especially by local elites, skilled employees and external visitors.

Even if cultural consumption is basically an individual activity, social networks may also play an important role in this dimension. This is especially true for the role of museums in the reproduction of social elites. Given the limitations of public expenditures for culture, particular activities such as acquisitions of new objects, spectacular exhibitions, the restoration of a museum or even the construction of new buildings often require additional funding from external, in general private, sources. Such sponsoring activities are an important foundation for regional social networks. In addition, cultural institutions are also an important labour market for qualified employees and firms. Therefore, a high density of cultural institutions contributes to professional networks and to networks with educational institutions. Last but not least, the construction and maintenance of major cultural institutions are often so demanding and expensive that networks between politics and culture at the local, regional, national and sometimes even global levels are essential for financing the construction and operational costs of museums.

The *second previously mentioned dimension* refers to the productive dimension of culture. Cultural investments such as museums may support the development of creative cities, which are characterized by CCIs (Scott, 2006). A starting point for such an unusual role of museums is the observation that objects in a museum may serve as boundary objects in research and communication. Taking the example of a natural history research museum, Star and Griesemer (1989, p. 393) observe that these objects:

are both plastic enough to adapt to local needs and the constraints of the several parties employing them, yet robust enough to maintain a common identity across sites (...) The creation and management of boundary objects is a key process in developing and maintaining coherence across intersecting social worlds.

In this way, museums may thus serve as “bridging institutions” which facilitate cooperation in spite of the heterogeneity of different points of reference and logics, for example through close collaboration with regional universities and research institutions. In addition, museums are important clients for innovative technologies.⁶ Therefore, close collaboration with companies that develop the technologies for new forms of communication (audio-guides, applications for smartphones), security, illumination, acclimatization, presentation, ticketing, visitor management and conservation may open up new innovation and business opportunities.

Florida (2002, 2005) chooses a somewhat different argument to explain why cultural institutions enhance the innovativeness of urban milieus. Besides talent and technology, openness and diversity (tolerance) are essential conditions for creativity and innovativeness. Following a “Jacobian” line of reasoning, Florida (2005, p. 27) conceives cities as “cauldrons of diversity and difference, creativity and innovation”. Cultural experiences in a pleasant, stimulating environment may contribute to the innovativeness of regions by facilitating cognitive openness. Creative and diversified urban milieus may thus facilitate the exchange of tacit knowledge, contributing to the innovativeness of territorially concentrated CCIs. The economic role of culture thus mainly consists in its contribution to diversity and the avoidance of lock-in effects which are so important in older industrial regions: “The presence of a significant bohemian concentration signals a regional environment or milieu that reflects an underlying openness to innovation and creativity. This milieu is both open to and attractive to other talented and creative individuals” (Florida, 2002, p. 56). Lazzeretti (2011) describes this as cross-fertilization:

Culture may promote a cross-fertilization among apparently far-off and dissimilar sectors (...) Culture creates a sort of strategic openness which fuels dialogue and conversation, sets up creative environments inside firms and other contexts, and thus provides the conditions for change (...) culture plays an important ‘bridging’ function as it connects concepts, places and paradigms from different backgrounds. (p. 352)

Cross-sector spillovers are present not only among creative industries, but more importantly between creative and non-creative industries. The so-called related variety synergies support the idea that these inter-sector knowledge spillovers are more powerful when firms (sectors) are related along the value chain (Asheim *et al.*, 2007). These synergies are even a main element in the new “smart specialization strategies”, promoted by DG REGIO as the backbone of the future European Cohesion Policy (McCann & Ortega Argilés, 2013). Museums therefore play an important role in the economy because they offer employment opportunities for qualified personnel, because they are challenging customers for innovative technologies and because they contribute to an innovative regional atmosphere.

If cultural institutions play a productive role in the local economy, then local, regional, national and global networks are also crucial. These networks can facilitate the exchange of competences, mutual learning and the collaboration of producers. A typical example of

these types of networks in the field of cultural production is project networks (cf. Sydow & Staber, 2002), which often rely on “innovative milieus” (Crevoisier, 2004, p. 377). These networks are highly concentrated in urban regions (Scott, 2006). Organizational, institutional and cognitive proximity of regionally agglomerated cultural producers and actors facilitates interactive learning (Boschma, 2005). In spite of, or even due to, the globalization of economic activities, spatial and social proximity remain a crucial dimension of innovativeness and creativity. At the same time, cultural production cannot rely only on local networks, but requires the global production and diffusion of meanings. Local producers of culture have to become part of global networks of cultural production and diffusion. This requires important channels for the transfer of cultural products and schemes across national borders in “international networks of creative partnerships with one another” (Scott, 2006, p. 13). These networks in the CCIs involve partners with complementary competences and profiles, suppliers and service providers, public agencies, schools and universities, business associations and customers.

However, it cannot be assumed that museums, operas, theatres and concert halls will automatically contribute to the emergence of creative industries. Former factory or port buildings and other cheap locations have often been more important for the emergence of start-ups in the CCI industries than museums. This also refers to the different logics and modes of operation of institutionalized and socially accepted forms of culture and individual, often disruptive forms of creativity and innovation. Cooke and Lazzeretti (2008, pp. 1–2) therefore distinguish clearly between CCIs, as

the two have totally distinctive modes of production, institutional bases and aesthetic content (...) Lengthily trained artists, singers, curators and musicians characterize the former, entrepreneurship bordering upon racketeering characterizes much of the latter. Their institutional bases in the academy or conservatory followed by employment as a publicly subsidized specialist contrasts almost entirely with that in the creative industries, which may have its origins for some in higher education but for many knowledge means knowing what is “going down on the street”.

As a classical cultural institution par excellence, it is therefore an empirical question if and what museums really contribute to a creative city. An important indicator would be the involvement of museums in some kind of regional production network in the domain of CCIs.

The *third previously mentioned dimension* refers to the capacity of museums to facilitate connections to global specialized circuits and networks. Cultural entities, like museums, can connect highly particular, specialized global/national/local circuits that criss-cross the world and connect specific groups of cities (Sassen, 2010). These circuits vary enormously. Some are specialized and some are not; some are local; some are regional and some are global. In other words, cultural industries bridge not only networks in the generic sense of the word, but more importantly they can bridge highly specialized circuits. Museums and “high-level culture” institutions connect physical/material circuits and their prestige can open access to Signature Architects (Pritzker prized circuit). They are customers for knowledge-intensive business services (e.g. signature architects) and advanced technologies (Plaza, 2008; Plaza *et al.*, in press). Museums connect with high gastronomy circuits like Michelin star chefs. Branded museums connect with (attract) the big international tourism flows, airlines, hotel chains and/or premium fashion

brands. In addition, “high-level cultural” institutions, like fashion shows, are important yet informal arenas for social networking, especially among the educated population and for strategies of social distinction (Bourdieu, 1984). They may also contribute to the attractiveness of a region for members of transnational classes (Sklair, 2005).

In the same line, CCIs can also connect apparently dissimilar regions and cities, for example, bringing together old industrialized cities like Bilbao with global nodes (New York) through the Guggenheim brand. A cultural and creative brand’s value lies in its ability to make a city visible and to generate economic activity. Brand image plays an important role in facilitating development and innovation processes. In our post-modern globalized world, economic regeneration is as much about image as investment and production. This is also because investment and production depend on place image (Plaza *et al.*, 2013). Images facilitate the process of simplifying and organizing information, thus enabling people to choose the locations of their various urban experiences (economic activities). Another important factor in this context is the easier attraction of creative talent and highly qualified professionals by cultural nodes, as suggested by Florida (2002, 2005).

Moreover, cultural industries produce images, and the New Media has the potential to simultaneously fuel both image reproduction and image demand. Online media (online press, blogging, Facebook, Twitter or Flickr) aid in the long-run branding power of cultural infrastructures and events. The critical accumulation of these positive images supposes a break with an industrial past and the start of a new economic trajectory; they may improve the reputation of a region. Like a brand, art is representational (Schroeder, 2005) and can add value to businesses and regional economies. Brands and culture are both “representational texts”. While the reading of these texts partly depends on how their producers create them, meaning also depends on how consumers receive and interact with them. Meaning is constantly reworked through social and cognitive processes. This diversity, or “multivocacy”, of meaning allows a brand to resonate with a broader audience, which heightens brand visibility and makes a place more valuable. Culture-led brands’ semiotic constructs can signal a wide spectrum of meanings. Cultural iconic assets generate more brand associations and symbolic dimensions than non-cultural brands. Cultural brands are not just managerially constructed; they are also socially constructed (Potts *et al.*, 2008), and brand meaning is subjective to collective cognitive processes of consumers. Part of realizing the brand value of a cultural asset depends on understanding what drives these cognitive connections in their marketplace, perhaps contributing to breaking up path dependencies and lock-in effects, something which is especially important in old-industrial regions. In other words, culture might be an ideal remedy against the risks of regional lock-in effects (Grabher, 1993).

In conclusion, cultural institutions and events can play an essential role in the regeneration of regions in at least three dimensions: they are an important crystallization point for social (tangible and intangible) networks and regional identities; they may facilitate the recombination of knowledge and thus contribute to an innovative milieu (Camagni, 2001; Crevoisier, 2004); and they can break up reputation-related path dependencies, reinforcing positive change. Cultural institutions may play a consumptive, a productive and an internationalization role for the local economy (Table 1). In the first case, museums are a focal point for social networks of local elites, an attractive place for the local population and especially for qualified employees, a point of reference for the symbolic representation of a town and an attractive target for tourists. In these ways, prestigious museums and

Table 1. Consumptive and productive contributions of museums to urban regeneration processes

	Contributions of museums to urban attractiveness	Productive role of culture	Insertion in global specialized circuits and city networks
Social	Social role for local elites	Museums as part of networks of cultural production and diffusion	Short-cut in connecting with people and institutions
Symbolic/ cognitive	Attractive place to live for the local population	Cross-fertilization of ideas Cross-sector spillovers	Museums as gatekeepers for accessing specialized circuits
Economic	Attraction of external visitors Contribution to value increase of former brownfield areas	Museums as demanding and innovative customers and as employer for cultural professions	Museums add brand value and reputation

prestigious exhibitions may contribute to changing the image of a formerly old industrial town to a modern, open “cultural city” that is attractive for its inhabitants and external visitors. In the second case, museums and other cultural institutions may enhance the openness and tolerance of a city and contribute to the cross-fertilization of ideas by functioning as boundary objects between different disciplines, professions and societal subsystems. In addition, they may be part of local, regional and national networks in which museums—as employers of qualified personnel and demanding customers—stimulate innovations and become an important point of reference for local artists, designers and other artistic and cultural professions, but also for service providers and technology-based companies, professional schools, political agencies and customers. Finally, in a third dimension, museums might help to insert cities or regions into new or enhanced global networks of specialized circuits, giving them direct access to valuable people or institutions that otherwise would never have been possible. In this sense, museums act as gatekeepers to specialized circuits of knowledge, finance or advanced services. Furthermore, museums can add to brand value and reputation to reinforce the attractiveness of their home region.

The following articles were initially inspired by the question of whether the previously described “Bilbao effect” can also be observed in other regions. However, as discussed earlier, this question is misleading because such an effect cannot be observed even in Bilbao. The following articles therefore discuss how and to what extent museums contribute to urban and regional regeneration within the consumptive and productive dimensions previously explained. They are based on the systematic comparison of the creation or renewal of museums of modern art in Spain, France, Italy, Germany and Turkey (Table 2). On the basis of interviews and publicly available statistics and reports, the authors have analysed the networks in which the decisions on the creation or renewal of these museums have been taken. In addition, the local, national and international networks in which the museums are embedded after opening for the public have been analysed. With the exception of Istanbul, we have chosen museums in former industrial regions outside

Table 2. Main characteristics of the analysed museums and their local and regional context

	Louvre Lens	Pompidou Metz	Folkwang Essen	Istanbul Museum of Modern Art	Guggenheim Bilbao	Museum of Natural History of University of Florence
Starting year of the project	2003. Opening: 2012	1999 (officially 2003). Opening: 2010	2006. Opening 2009	1987; Opening: 2004	1992. Opening: 1997	1775 foundation 1984 opening with the recent structure
Goal of the project	Decentralization of national institutions; service to the public	Decentralization of national institutions; service to the public	New “cultural” image for an old industrial region	Symbolic support for the EU accession; meeting place for social elites	International branding	Urban renewal and social enhancement
Costs of the project (a) construction; (b) yearly operating costs)	(a) €150 m; (b) €15 m	(a) €69 m; (b) €12.5 m	(a) €55 m (new building); (b) €8 m	(a) €6.5 m (transformation of the warehouse into museum)	€154 m (1997) of which €85 m for the building	
Promoters		Former mayor of Metz; president of CP	Heads of the local cultural and buildings departments; director of the museum	Eczacibasi holding	Guggenheim Foundation New York, Basque region	
Internal management structure	(not clear)	Relative autonomy towards Paris	Total autonomy (stand-alone museum)	Total autonomy	Strongly dependent on HQ	
Level of decision making	National	National (depending on cooperation with local/regional actors)	Local (organizational)	Local and national	Global and regional	Local

Architect(s)	Sanaa agency (Kazuyo Sejima and Ryue Nishizawa)	Jean de Gastines— Shigeru Ban	D. Chipperfield	Melkan Tabanlıoğlu	Frank Gehry	
Exhibition space	App. 11,000 m ² (28,000 m ² usable space)	5000 m ²	16,000 m ²	8000 m ²	11,000 m ²	25,000 m ² in six sites
Visitors	550,000 (expected)	850,000 (2010)	800,000 (2010); 215,857 (2011)	650,000 in 2011; 4.5 million since 2005	800,000	130,000 yearly
Employees in the museum	150	50 (app. 5 curators)	51	70 (plus security and cleaning)	100 (plus security, cleaning . . .)	52
Complementary events	European Capital of Culture 2004	Mission 2000; closure of CP	European Capital of Culture 2010	European Capital of Culture 2010; Istanbul Biennials (since 1987)	Urban regeneration of Bilbao	
Relationship to Bilbao effect		Not a copy of Bilbao	Conscious demarcation (cultural district instead of detached building)	Not a copy of Bilbao	The original	Not a copy of Bilbao
Industrial and employment structure in the region)	Nord-Pas de Calais (transforming old industrial region)	Industrial profile of the region (steel, textile). Metz (administrative and military capital)	Ruhr area (transforming old industrial region, formerly coal and steel, now energy and commerce)	No relation. Logistic support from the Istanbul Metropolitan authorities	Basque country (transforming old industrial region)	Tuscany. Historical city centre of Florence
Interviews and other methods	Interviews with 23 stakeholders	Semi-directive interviews with 23 individuals (2011/ 2012)	Eight interviews (2011)	Seventeen semi- directive interviews (2011–2012)	Review of official documents and previous research	Interviews (3): analyses of events; social network analysis on large temporary exhibitions

the classical sites of high culture. These museums have been established or redesigned in order to improve the image of the region and to increase its attractiveness for the population, for local elites, for external visitors and for companies. The authors analyse the contribution of these museums to the local economy (for example tourism, but also the local CCIs). The Basque Country, the Ruhr area, the Lorraine and Northern France fit into this description because these four regions have been dominated for decades and sometimes even centuries by the coal, steel and metal working industries. Florence and Istanbul do not fit entirely into this picture, but even in these different environments the museums conveyed a message of renewal. In the case of Istanbul—the capital of three huge empires (the Roman, the Byzantine and the Ottoman Empires) situated between Asia and Europe, representing the culture, commercial, corporate and financial centre of Turkey—the creation of modern art museums is aimed at the expression and symbolization of the modern, western and European identity of Turkey—also in contrast to more traditional or Islamic conceptions of the urban identity. In Florence, the centre of “Rinascimento”, the Museum of Natural History, is quite distinct from the classical museums in the Tuscan city and seeks to provide stimulus for creativity and education. Therefore, these latter cases are interesting studies of the partially diverging role of museums in global cities in contrast to formerly industrial regions, which have a much lower rank in global networks of communication, prestige, tourism and attractiveness.

Taking the example of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao (GMB), *Beatriz Plaza and Silke N. Haarich* analyse the interdependence between the local and global embeddedness of this museum. On the one hand, the GMB is clearly linked to the local traditions, values and culture of Bilbao and its institutions and policies. On the other hand, the GMB was part of the global network of the Guggenheim Foundation from the beginning and strived to become a globally visible destination for visitors. The authors demonstrate the branding effect of the GMB on the attraction for tourists. This case study convincingly demonstrates the mutual reinforcement of regional embeddedness and global networks, placing it at the centre of the success of the urban and economic renewal around the GMB.

Guy Baudelle analyses the construction of the New Louvre in a small, old-industrialized town in northern France, whose main advantage is that it can be reached by a direct and quick train journey in one hour from Paris. This case study shows that at least in the first instance, the overwhelming cultural reputation of the Louvre is a success factor, even if it decides to construct a museum in the Arabian Desert or a deserted rustbelt region with no cultural tradition at all. Prestigious architects will accept the order; a touristic infrastructure (hotels, organized travels, restaurants ...) will emerge, national and international tourists will arrive in incredibly high numbers, a previously entirely unknown place will become a cultural hot spot recommended by the *New York Times*. However, even this “cultural superpower” or “cathedral in the desert” strategy, which resembles the mission-oriented innovation strategy of French firms in other domains (trains, computers, nuclear power plants, supersonic planes ...), may fail in the medium term if the regional and national actors do not succeed in creating links with its local and regional environment. For example, by creating links to Lille, the European Capital of Culture in 2004, or by exploiting and emphasizing the cultural heritage of the region which was shaped by the First World War and the coal and mining industry. Also in this case, a top-down strategy should therefore be complemented by a network strategy in order to create a “regional cultural system” in the sense of Cooke (2004). Currently, such attempts at

creating links to its regional environment and embedding the new museum seem to be completely absent.

Gerhard Krauss analyses the process of creation and the regional impact of a second Centre Pompidou in Metz (CPM). Starting from the hypothesis that the future success of the project depends on its social embeddedness, his analysis focuses on the way in which the realization of the project results from a coincidence of cultural, pedagogic, political and economic motives through the multiple interaction of different types of actors across different spatial levels, giving rise to the formation of a new strategic action field. The article studies the coalition building and development of supporting networks around the CPM, the impact of the so-called French cultural exception and the corresponding public model of cultural activities, and the difficult relationship between the Centre Pompidou in Paris and in Metz. It finally discusses the possible role of the CPM in the local innovation system and as an institution which gathers the economic elite and stimulates the formation of new actor coalitions and innovation networks.

Jean-Francois Polo analyses the creation of the Istanbul Modern Art Museum (IM) in the context of the transformation of Istanbul into both a European and global city. A specificity of contemporary cultural policy of Turkey is the overarching importance of private investments. The IM is also the result of a private initiative of a large industrial group and a wealthy family—however supported by the party in power. The principal reason for this and similar public–private collaborations are the symbolic benefits that contemporary art provides for the Turkish economic elites and for the country, which strives to be perceived as modern, developed and European. From Istanbul Modern Museum to Istanbul European Capital of Culture 2010, cultural investments are a means of strengthening an international image in the context of the membership negotiations of Turkey to the European Union. A contribution to urban regeneration is almost absent in Istanbul’s museums.

Martin Heidenreich discusses the contribution of the refurbished Museum Folkwang to the regeneration of the Ruhr Area and identifies four different contributions of such a cultural investment: (1) the direct economic effects of such an investment; (2) the social functions of a cultural institution which often serves as a point of contact for local and regional elites; (3) the symbolic functions as an expression of a new regional identity; (4) the cognitive functions. Taking the example of the renovation of Museum Folkwang, it can be demonstrated that a “Bilbao effect” was not intended and did not take place. The museum, however, is contributing to the emergence of an integrated cultural district and a different image of the town, serving as a meeting place and point of identification for local elites and companies.

Luciana Lazzeretti and Francesco Capone analyse the role of the Museum of Natural History in Florence as a focal point for mostly local networks. Based on an analysis of the networks around temporary exhibitions and other events between 2000 and 2012, the authors show that the museum has contributed to the diffusion of scientific knowledge and education as well as to a close relationship with the citizenship and the territory.

Museums can play an important role in building up “social capital”, creating networks between different professionals, groups, sectors and segments of society, bridging diverse social backgrounds, lowering coordinating costs for individuals and businesses, and increasing the capacity of firms to reconnect (Lorenzen, 2007). In this sense, museums can play a critical role as innovation facilitators, as can be observed in the articles presented in this volume.

Notes

1. Sklair (2005) links the role of iconic architecture, which he defines “as buildings and spaces that are (1) famous for professional architects and/or the public at large and (2) have special symbolic/aesthetic significance attached to them”, to the interests of an increasingly global consumption of architectural culture in globalizing cities and the interests of consumerist fractions of the transnational capitalist class. Current examples of so-called “star architects” are Daniel Libeskind, Norman Foster, Zaha Hadid, Herzog and de Meuron, Steven Holl, Frank Gehry, Rem Koolhaas or other winners of the Pritzker Architecture Prize.
2. In Europe, it has been estimated that already 6.6 million people or 2.7% of the European labour force are employed in these industries (Power & Nielsen, 2010), which are based on “individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property” (DCMS, 2001, p. 4).
3. “It is entirely immaterial whether an innovation implies scientific novelty or not. Although most innovations can be traced to some conquest in the realm of either theoretical or practical knowledge, there are many which cannot. Innovation is possible without anything we should identify as invention and invention does not necessarily induce innovation, but produces of itself no economically relevant effect at all. The economic phenomena which we observe in the special case in which innovation and invention coincide do not differ from those we observe in cases in which preexisting knowledge is made use of.” (Schumpeter, 1939, p. 84).
4. Edquist (2001, p. 219) defines them as “new creations of economic significance of a material or intangible kind. They may be brand new but are more often new combinations of existing elements”.
5. (<http://icom.museum>; accessed 5 October 2012).
6. The “International Trade Fair for Museum and Exhibition Technology” focus in its biennial conferences on “Museum Architecture, Building, Security, Environmental and Climate Technology, Fittings and Scenography, Visitor Service, Guidance Services, Ticketing, Audio, Lighting, Multimedia, Interactive Systems, Museum Education, Storage and Archiving, Data Management as well as Research and Knowledge Transfer in a Digital World.” (www.mutec.de/en; accessed on 18 January 2013).

References

- Asheim, B. T., Boschma, R. A. & Cooke, P. (2007) *Constructing Regional Advantage: Platform Policy Based on Related Variety and Differentiated Knowledge Bases* (Utrecht: Utrecht University).
- Boschma, R. A. (2005) Proximity and innovation: A critical assessment, *Regional Studies*, 39(1), pp. 61–74.
- Bourdieu, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP).
- Camagni, R. (2001) The economic role and spatial contradictions of global city-regions: The functional, cognitive and evolutionary context, in: A. J. Scott (Ed.) *Global City-Regions: Trends, Theory, Policy*, pp. 96–118 (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Cooke, P. (2004) Introduction: Regional innovation systems. An evolutionary approach, in: P. Cooke, M. Heidenreich & H.-J. Braczyk (Eds) *Regional Innovation Systems*, 2nd ed., pp. 1–18 (London: Routledge).
- Cooke, P. (2008) Culture, clusters, districts and quarters: Some reflections on the scale question, in: P. Cooke & L. Lazzeretti (Eds) *Creative Cities, Cultural Clusters and Local Economic Development*, pp. 25–47 (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).
- Cooke, P. & Lazzeretti, L. (Eds) (2008) *Creative Cities, Cultural Clusters and Local Economic Development* (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).
- Council of Europe (1991) *Cultural Policy in France* (Strasbourg: Council of Europe).
- Crevoisier, O. (2004) The innovative milieus approach: Toward a territorialized understanding of the economy? *Economic Geography*, 80(4), pp. 367–379.
- Department of Culture, Media & Sport (DCMS) (2001) *Creative Industries Mapping Document* (London: Department of Culture, Media and Sport).
- Edquist, C. (2001) Innovation policy. A systemic approach, in: D. Archibugi & B.-Å. Lundvall (Eds) *The Globalizing Learning Economy*, pp. 219–237 (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Evans, G. (2005) Measure for measure: Evaluating the evidence of culture’s contribution to regeneration, *Urban Studies*, 42(5–6), pp. 959–983.
- Evans, G. (2009) Creative cities, creative spaces and urban policy, *Urban Studies*, 46(5–6), pp. 1003–1040.
- Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D. & Nelson, R. (Eds) (2005) *Handbook of Innovation* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

- Featherstone, M. (1991) *Consumer Culture and Post Modernism* (London: Sage).
- Florida, R. L. (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class, and how it's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life* (New York: Basic Books).
- Florida, R. L. (2005) *Cities and the Creative Class* (New York: Routledge).
- Grabher, G. (1993) The weakness of strong ties. The lock-in of regional development in the Ruhr area, in: G. Grabher (Ed.) *The Embedded Firm*, pp. 255–277 (London: Routledge).
- Grodach, C. (2010) Beyond Bilbao: Rethinking flagship cultural development and planning in three California cities, *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 29(3), pp. 353–366.
- Horkheimer, M. & Adorno, T. (2002) *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- KEA European Affairs (2006) *The Economy of Culture in Europe* (Brussels: European Commission: Director-General for Education & Culture).
- Kunzmann, K. R. (2004) Culture, creativity and spatial planning, *Town Planning Review*, 75(4), pp. 383–404.
- Lazzeretti, L. (2011) Culture as a source for growth and change, in: P. Cooke (Ed.) with B. Asheim, R. Boschma, R. Martin, D. Schwartz & F. Tödtling, *Handbook of Regional Innovation and Growth*, pp. 350–362 (Cheltenham: Edward Elgar).
- Le Galès, P. (1999) Is political economy still relevant to study the culturalization of cities? *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 6(4), pp. 293–302.
- Lorenzen, M. (2007) Social capital and localised learning: Proximity and place in technological and institutional dynamics, *Urban Studies*, 44(4), pp. 799–817.
- McCann, P., & Ortega-Argilés, R. (2013) Smart specialization, regional growth and applications to European Union cohesion policy, *Regional Studies*. doi: 10.1080/00343404.2013.799769
- New York Times* (2013) The 46 places to go in 2013, *New York Times*, January 11.
- Plaza, B. (2006) The return on investment of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 30(2), pp. 452–467.
- Plaza, B. (2008) On some challenges and conditions for the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao to be an effective economic re-activator, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 32(2), pp. 506–517.
- Plaza, B., Haarich, S. N. & Waldron, C. M. (2013) Picasso's Guernica: The strength of an art brand in destination e-branding, *International Journal of Arts Management*, 15(3), pp. 53–64.
- Plaza, B., Galvez-Galvez, C. & Gonzalez-Flores, A. (in press) Urban regeneration and knowledge intensive services, in: *Proceedings of the Institution of Civil Engineers—Municipal Engineer*.
- Potts, J., Cunningham, S., Hartley, J. & Ormerod, P. (2008) Social network markets: A new definition of the creative industries, *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 32(3), pp. 167–185.
- Power, D. & Nielsen, T. (2010) *Priority Sector Report: Creative and Cultural Industries*, Europe Innova, European Cluster Observatory.
- Pratt, A. (2008) Creative cities? *Urban Design*, 106, p. 35.
- Sassen, S. (2010) Global inter-city networks and commodity chains: Any intersections? *Global Networks*, 10(1), pp. 150–163.
- Schroeder, J. E. (2005) The artist and the brand, *European Journal of Marketing*, 39(11), pp. 1291–1305.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (1939) *Business Cycles. A Theoretical, Historical, and Statistical Analysis of the Capitalist Process* (New York: McGraw Hill).
- Scott, A. J. (2006) Creative cities: Conceptual issues and policy questions, *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 28(1), pp. 1–17.
- Sklair, L. (2005) The transnational capitalist class and contemporary architecture in globalizing cities, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(3), pp. 485–500.
- Star, S. L. & Griesemer, J. R. (1989) Institutional ecology, translations' and boundary objects: Amateurs and professionals in Berkeley's Museum of Vertebrate Zoology, 1907–39, *Social Studies of Science*, 19(3), pp. 387–420.
- Sydow, J. & Staber, U. (2002) The institutional embeddedness of project networks: The case of content production in German television, *Regional Studies*, 36(3), pp. 215–227.
- Urfalino, P. (1996) *L'invention de la politique culturelle* (Paris: La Documentation Française).