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I. From Global Cities to Creative Cities

The global society of the 21st century is undergoing a major paradigm shift, “from the nation state to the city”. The “century of the city” is starting.

The cities attracting attention in this process are not only the major urban centers known as “global cities” that monopolize global functions in economics, politics and culture, and are standing on top of the global urban hierarchy system. People are also taking an interest in “creative cities” that cultivate creative art & culture and foster an innovative economic base. The terrorist attack of 11th September provided an opportunity to reconsider the trend of globalization based on market fundamentalism. As a result, many people have taken a more critical view of global cities like New York and expressed a preference for the alternative globalization based on mutual recognition of cultural and social diversity. Many cities are now attempting to stimulate and encourage their citizens by promoting creativity in art & culture and encouraging innovation in various areas to revive their economies.

Since the bursting of the economic bubble, Japanese cities have had difficulties emerging from a long period of economic stagnation, and this is one reason for the growing interests in “creative cities” and “urban regeneration through art & culture.” Japanese cities that have moved in this direction are Kanazawa, where indigenous business leaders and citizens have created the Kanazawa Creative City Council and begun promoting the movement for the creative city from the grass-roots, and Yokohama, where new mayor adopted “the artistic creative city strategy” and established the bureau for promoting “Creative City Yokohama”. Also in Osaka which has been suffering from a long-term recession, the Graduate School for Creative Cities has been established in Osaka City University in order to develop its’ problem-solving urban policy and to foster human capital to revive the city. Then in October 2007, the first World Creative City Forum was held in Osaka and the agenda “Developing Creative Cities through Networking” was adopted. (appendix 1)
As the trend of globalization is progressing, advanced capitalist countries lose manufacturing base and entered into the stage of the new knowledge and informational economies. The key driver of the new knowledge economy is creativity, especially artistic and technological creativity. Therefore creativity moved to the center of urban policy.

If we go back far enough in the lineage of the creative city theory, we arrive at the so-called founding fathers of “cultural economics”, namely John Ruskin and William Morris. Ruskin, who was active during England’s Victorian period, resisted the utilitarian economics of the times, and proposed “art economics”, which placed emphasis on creative human activities and receptiveness. According to him, not only artistic works, but all valuable goods have both a functional and artistic aspect, and help to support the lives of consumers and increase their sense of humanity. That which brings out this intrinsic value is “work” – free creative human activity – not “labour” forced upon one by another. He argued that this original, intrinsic value first became an effective value when it was met by a receptive consumer who could evaluate it. Morris, the successor to Ruskin’s school of thought, criticized the mass production and consumption system by large mechanized industries as leading to an estrangement of labour and the de-humanization of life. He went on to coordinate the Arts and Crafts Movement, which aimed at “humanization of labour” and “artification of everyday life” by reintroducing craft-like production based upon the creative activities of artisans proposed by Ruskin. P. Geddes and L. Mumford were the ones who began to apply Ruskin and Morris’ thoughts to urban studies. Mumford, especially, in his *Culture of Cities*, lambasted the monetary economics that dominated the megalopolis, and proposed “cultural economics” which places emphasis on human life and environment over anything else, emphasizing “reconstitution of cities to fulfill human consumption and creative activities.” (Mumford, 1938)

Furthermore, looking at contemporary creative city research, we find ourselves arriving at the American urban researcher J. Jacobs, the person who called those cities that were especially good at industrial innovation and improvisation “creative cities.” (Jacobs, 1984) The contemporary researchers of creative cities, like C. Landry and F. Bianchini were influenced by her, and has defined creativity as something more than fantasy and imagination, and placed it somewhere between intelligence and innovation, that is, the concept that acts as a mediator between art & culture and industry & technology. At present, they are continuing with their comparative research on cities, keeping in mind the question of what kind of role a creative culture has in reconstructing the urban economic base. They believe that cities that make much of the creativity of artistic activities and try to have massive “citizens’ creative activities” and “creative cultural infrastructure,” tend to embrace industries who specialize in innovation, and are able to develop an administrative capacity to deal with difficult problems. What is important for creative cities is
creative problem solving in the areas of economics, culture, organization and finance, as well as the fluidity to change the existing system whenever chain reactions in such occur. (Landry & Bianchini, 1995)

And Landry mentioned the relations of creativity and heritage, like below,

“Cultural heritage is the sum of our past creativities and results of creativity is what keeps society going and moving forward.” “Culture is the panoply of resources that show that a place is unique and distinctive. The resources of the past can help to inspire and give confidence for the future.”

“Even cultural heritage is reinvented daily whether this be a refurbished building or an adaptation of an old skill for modern times: today’s classic was yesterday’s innovation. Creativity is not only about a continuous invention of the new, but also how to deal appropriately with the old.” (Landry, 2000)

III. Possibility of Creative industry and Creative people

With the emerging knowledge society, creative and cultural industries become remarkable as the economic engine of urban and regional development.

According to the definition of D. Throsby, cultural goods and services involve creativity in their production, embody some degree of intellectual property and convey symbolic meaning. He formulates a concentric circle model of cultural industries, with the creative arts lying at the core, and other cultural industries (publishing, advertising, tourism, etc.) forming layers or circles around the core, extending further outwards as the use of creative idea is into a wider production context. Also Throsby stressed that “culture may have a more pervasive role in urban regeneration through the fostering of community identity, creativity, cohesion and vitality via the cultural characteristics and practices which define the city and its inhabitants”.

And Throsby analyzed cultural heritage as cultural capital, like below;

“Consideration of heritage as cultural capital can provide a means of integrating the interests of conservationist, who are concerned with the protection of cultural value, and economist, who look at heritage project as problems of allocation of scarce resources between competing ends.”

“Treatment of heritage as cultural capital parallels what has now became an accepted treatment of environmental resources and ecosystems as natural capital, and …..”

Again the fact that cultural capital embodies and gives rise to cultural and economic value gives it a distinctive claim to attention and conditions the way analytical method should be used in evaluating it.” (Throsby, 2001)

R. Florida who was also influenced by Jacobs, advocates “the rise of the creative class” and insists new urban economy is driven by the location choices of creative people who prefer places
that are rich in cultural diversity, nice amenity, tolerance to avant-garde and gay people. He emphasizes the “social structure of creativity”, comprising new systems for technological creativity and entrepreneurship, new and more effective models for producing goods and services, and a broad social, cultural and geographic milieu conducive to creativity of all sorts. (Florida, 2002)

The British government and the Mayor of London have announced a policy promoting “creative industries”, that is, “those industries which have their origin in individual creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property.” They include thirteen sectors such as advertising, architecture, crafts, design, designer fashion, film, fine arts & antique, game-software, music, performing arts, publishing, software and television & radio. These industries produced €120 billion and hired 1,320,000 employees in 2000, and ranked the second in GDP and the third in employment in London. (DCMS, 1998, 2001)

We estimated the size of Japanese creative industries and compared it to British ones. According to Table 1, even though Japanese is superior to British absolutely, considering that total size of Japanese economy is about double to British one, Japanese creative industries, relatively to total national economy, reached only half in employment and one-third in total revenue of British ones. As a result, there are positive possibilities for the growth of Japanese creative industries.

(In Japan, there are no equivalent government statistics for the “cultural industries”, but data compiled by the author and provided in Table 1 show that the scale of the market for the thirteen industries listed above amounts to 38.834 trillion yen and the industries employ 1,408,780 people. Comparing Japan and the UK based on this data, Japan is higher in absolute terms in both employment and market scale, but when differences in the scale of GDP and total employment between the two countries are taken into account, employment in the UK cultural industries is roughly twice that of Japan and the scale of the market is roughly three times greater. This could be said to indicate the future potential of the creative industries in Japan. The only industries in which Japan has a superior market scale are the game software and craft industries. There is a large gap in the design and performing arts industries, and in the music and film and video industries there is an enormous difference in the scale of employment.)

**IV. The Definition and Six Essential Elements of Creative Cities**

Through interchange with Landry & Florida, the author defined creative cities as follows; *Cities that cultivate new trends of arts & culture and promote innovative & creative industries through the energetic creative activities of artists, creators and ordinary citizens, contain many diverse “creative milieus” and “innovative milieus”, and have a regional, grass-roots capability to find solutions to global environmental problems such as global warming*
Also the author summarized following elements of the Creative City by above analysis.

Firstly, not only artists, scientists, workers and craftsmen should involve themselves with creative work, but also all citizens should evolve (or expand) their free creative activity. As a result, they are able to feel satisfaction with their lives. In order to make this condition, it is necessary to encourage production of useful and culturally valuable goods and services, and to improve environment of factories and offices.

Secondly, ordinary life of citizens should be artistic. To do so, it is necessary to ensure enough income and free time to be well off. In addition, reasonable price of high quality consumption goods should be supplied and arts & culture like the performing arts should be appreciated with low price.

Thirdly, universities, technical schools, research institutes, theater, library, and cultural institutions which support creative activity of science and art in a city have to function as the creative support infrastructure.

Fourthly, the environmental policy is crucial. It preserves historical heritage and a city’s environment and improves amenity. Consequently, citizens enhance their creativity and sensitivity.

Fifthly, a city has to have the well-balanced economic basis which supports sustainable and creative region.

Finally, in terms of public administration, the Creative City is composed of the creative integrated urban policy, unified cultural policy with industrial policy and environmental policy under the democratic management of the public finance.

The author has given advice on developing specific urban policies to the cities of Kanazawa and Yokohama, so on.

V. Challenges for Creative Cities in Japan

An increasing number of cities in Japan are attempting to develop “creative milieu” and revitalize the city and region by utilizing cultural resources and fostering new creative industries.

Kanazawa

Kanazawa has been known for a long time as “the little Kyoto” with a richness of traditional arts and crafts, a human-scale beautiful city on the Coast of Japan Sea is attractive to tourist. The textile industry, which previously contributed to local economic growth in Kanazawa, has declined. Old warehouse and textile factory that are no longer used were utilized to create the Kanazawa Citizen's Art Center in September 1996. In response to public opinion, these facilities are designed to be used freely “24 hours a day, 365 days a year”. Four warehouses were converted into studio, the “Drama Factory”, “Music Factory”, “Art Factory” and “Eco-life Factory”. The buildings were
remodeled to serve as space for performance as well as practice, and directors of these facilities were chosen from ordinary citizens. This example of a cultural center run and used by citizens is attracting attention throughout Japan.

A sleek new building resembling a flying saucer, the 21st Century Museum of Contemporary Art, Kanazawa, has suddenly appeared in an empty space left in the center of the city left when the prefectoral government office moved to the suburbs. This museum was built with the purpose of fusing contemporary art with local traditional crafts and performing arts. The museum collection and exhibitions focus on international contemporary art, and famous artists are invited to produce artworks in open demonstrations accessible to the public. According to former museum director, Yutaka Mino, “Art is an investment in the future, developing human resources for a future filled with creativity,” and this ideal is being carried out through the “Museum Cruise” program, which brings all of the elementary and junior high school students in the city to the museum. With the help of such programs, the museum has received 1.5 million visitors, three times the population of the city, during the first year. The economic effect (without considering the construction investment) has surpassed 10 billion yen. The city of Kanazawa is starting new programs to promote regional industries tied to contemporary art, beginning by establishing a Fashion Industry Creation Organization to support the creation of new fashion and digital contents industries in connection with the museum.

Kyoto

Stimulated by the success of the Kanazawa Citizen’s Art Center, the historical city of Kyoto has produced its own “creative milieu”, the Kyoto Art center, which opened in April 2000. It is housed in an old elementary school in the center of the city. Originally built in 1869, it features stained-glass in the entryway, a tea ceremony room, and a large Japanese style hall. Because it is located in a kimono wholesaler’s district and has also been used for both commercial and local cultural purposes. To take advantage of its value as a cultural property, the building was remodeled to create a gallery and studio spaces and is attracting attention as a facility that supports the creative work of young artists who need a place to rehearse or produce their work.

In addition to these examples, there are also spontaneous grass-roots movements led by citizens and young artists.

The traditional crafts and industries that have been the pride and identity of Kyoto throughout its history have become a part of the live of its citizens both economically and culturally. They have also had the function of preserving the unique urban cultural landscape. Now that these industries are declining, however, older wooden raw houses are being torn down and replaced by new apartments and parking lots, so original urban landscape, “primal scene” of Kyoto, is in danger of changing completely. In a counter-movement, artists are moving into vacant old residences and
warehouses in the so-called Nisijin area, old textile district, and an attempt is being made to restore the vitality of the city. The old wooden raw houses (called Machiya) in Nishijin are unique because they combine space for the artisan work involved in the production of Yusen dying and Nisijin textiles with living space. These houses are creative spaces that provide stimulation to artists not found in ordinary residences, and almost 100 artists are now living and working in this area.

**Osaka**

Osaka was once the foremost industrial city in Japan as well as a national center of finance and commerce. Today, however, it has the highest unemployment rate in the country. The number of homeless people is increasing rapidly, factories are moving overseas, and headquarters of large corporations are moving to Tokyo. Osaka’s economy is rapidly deteriorating, and the city is in a historical period of decline.

Creative industries above mentioned, becomes noteworthy for urban resurgence in Europe recently. How can such creative industries be promoted in Osaka? Creative industries rely greatly on the diversity and creativity of a city’s culture, so cultural creativity is now an important issue for Osaka. There are many artists and creators in Osaka, but there is a shortage of talented producers and facilities for the incubation of creative industries (creative cultural infrastructure). A number of private theaters have closed after the bursting of the economic bubble, and the most capable television producers working in Osaka have been taken to Tokyo.

In spite of these trends, I am keeping an eye on two ventures that have value as creative infrastructure and “creative milieu”. One is Outenin temple, a Buddhist temple that support a non-profit little theater for young actors using the main temple building as a theater, and Mebic Ogimachi, a creative business incubator opened 2003 in an old water bureau building in downtown Osaka. It is necessary to develop emergency programs to foster creative people and to make “social structure of creativity” in Osaka.

**Yokohama**

Unlike the old traditional capital of Kyoto and Kanazawa, Yokohama is a modern city with a short history that began with the opening of the port 150 years ago. Yokohama carried out a large-scale waterfront development plan, “Minato Mirai (future plan of Yokohama port),” during the economic bubble period in an attempt to change its former identity as a center of heavy industry. This effort was frustrated by the bursting of the bubble and a surge of new office building construction in central Tokyo, but a new vision for reactivation of the city was proposed in January 2004, “Toward the Formation of the Creative City of Yokohama.”

After making this proposal, Mayor Nakada established the Artistic and Cultural City Creation
Division in April of the same year, initiating an effort to build the “creative city of Yokohama” involving the entire city office. A noteworthy result was “Creative Core – Working Toward Formation of a Creative Zone and Image Culture City,” a project that included “BankART 1929.” The old Fuji Bank and First Bank buildings of Yokohama were constructed in 1929, during the world economic crisis, and they are a valuable cultural heritage. In this project, the bank buildings as well as a number of warehouses and empty office buildings near the waterfront have been transformed into “creative milieu” for artistic creators and ordinary citizens. Two NPOs selected in an open competition are carrying out a variety of exhibitions, chiefly of contemporary art, and other events including performances, workshops, and symposiums in these buildings over a period of two years.

What strikes me as most significant about the case of Yokohama is the reorganization of previously separate administrative units in charge of cultural, industrial, and urban policy to create two new core organizations, the Artistic and Cultural City Creation Division and the Creative City Promotion Section to promote the use of artistic and cultural creativity in urban revitalization. If this idea is effectively applied, Yokohama will take the lead in the movement to develop creative cities in Japan. Naturally, some conflict is to be expected between previous vertically organized administrative units, but the best way to restore creativity to the city is to make the organization more creative, which in turn will bring out more creativity in individuals. Creative reform of the “culture of bureaucratic organization” will bring Yokohama closer to its goal of becoming a creative city.

In Kanazawa, the business sector and individual citizens took the lead in starting the Kanazawa Creative City Council, making proposals that stimulated the city government to take steps toward making Kanazawa into a creative city, while in Yokohama, setbacks in the Yokohama waterfront urban development project, “Minato Mirai,” led the current mayor to criticize the failure of the project and propose a new strategy for the city. It seems that efforts to develop a creative city will vary with the historical background of the city.

VI. Conclusion: Developing Creative Cities through Networking

Following these well known examples, other cities, including Sapporo, Sendai, Nagoya, Kobe and Fukuoka, are also pushing to become creative cities. Below is a list of what I consider the necessary steps to achieve this goal.

Firstly, it is necessary to conduct an intensive analysis of the embedded culture of the city, increase the shared awareness of fusing contemporary arts with traditional culture, clarify the need to become a “creative city,” and elaborate a creative city concept for the future, with understanding of historical context of the city.
Secondly, in developing concepts, “artistic and cultural creativity” must be recognized as factors that have an impact on many other areas, including industry, employment, the social system, education, medical care, and the environment. In order to link cultural policy to industrial policy, urban planning, and environmental policy, the vertical administrative structure must be made horizontal, ordinary bureaucratic thinking must be eliminated, and organizational culture must be changed.

Thirdly, art and culture must be recognized as central social infrastructures in the knowledge and informational society, and systematic planning must be carried out to bring out the creativity of the city’s people. Specifically, diverse “creative milieu”, “space for industrial and cultural creation” must be established in the city and creative producers must be fostered to take charge of this task.

Fourthly, promotion of creative policy cannot be continued effectively if it is limited to the city government. It is essential to obtain the cooperation of a broad selection of citizens, including business leaders, and NPOs, perhaps in the form of a Creative City Promotion Council. The most important thing for the promotion of creative cities is the establishment of research and educational programs for developing the necessary human resources.

In order to realize and to develop creative cities, not only do we need the global level inter-city partnerships promoted by UNESCO, but we also need to learn from partnerships seen at the Asian level or the national level as well. Collaboration among the public, private and civic sectors within the cities is also essential: We appeal for a multilayered and multifaceted partnership formation and encourage each city to provide diversified platforms towards this end.
Figure 1. Concentric circle model of creative industries
Table 1. Market Size and Employment of Creative Industries (UK vs. Japan, 2000)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Market Size</th>
<th>Employment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>UK £ billion</td>
<td>UK ¥ billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publishing</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3,422.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV &amp; Radio</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>2,238.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>666.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>851.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>2,960.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game-software</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>185.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>6,734.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>4,939.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer Fashion</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>111.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>647.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crafts</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing Arts</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Architecture</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>314.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>23,236.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 1

Agenda “Developing Creative Cities through Networking”

We have participated in the World Creative City Forum 2007 in OSAKA, “Forum for Networking Creative Cities” (October 24th) and “International Symposium: The Age of City – Developing Creative Cities through Networking” (October 25th and 26th).

Based on the presentations and discussion in those three days we declare that we shall act with the common objectives as regards the following points:

“Creative Cities” are becoming extremely important for urban citizens and urban policy administrators as well as academics as a model of a city in the society of twenty first century characterized by globalization and the progress of knowledge – based economy and also as a goal of urban polices.

In order to realize and to develop creative cities, not only do we need the global level inter-city partnerships promoted by UNESCO, but we also need to learn from partnerships seen at the Asian level or the national level as well. Collaboration among the public, private and civic sectors within the cities is also essential: We appeal for a multilayered and multifaceted partnership formation and encourage each city to provide diversified platforms towards this end.

To develop creative cities further, we would, continue to research of success factor and the evaluation and to discuss the following area thus contribute to theoretical evolution of urban policies.

1) The development of creative cities based on their embedded culture and cultural diversity.
2) The role of creativity helping cities to become more successful in the emerging economy.
3) How organizations in the public, private & NPO sectors need to rethink their role & purpose and how they are organized and how they manage in order to help cities imaginatively take opportunities and solve their problems.
4) The significance of cultural, social and economic roles that artists play in creative cities.
5) The development of creative cultural industry as an economic engine of creative cities.

We participants of world creative city forum 2007 in Osaka agreed above and committed ourselves to work on in our respective areas.

October 26, 2007

Issued by the participants of World Creative City Forum 2007 in OSAKA