# Cultural creation and social innovation as the basis for building a cohesive city[1]

Juan-Luis Klein and Diane-Gabrielle Tremblay

**Abstract**

This paper presents a survey of the main theoretical elements, debates, and strategic perspectives on the link between cultural creation and the building of social cohesion in the city. The question addressed is: How can a cultural creation-oriented approach contribute to making the city more cohesive while contributing to the city's overall economic and social development? This paper is divided into three sections: The first defines the main concepts and presents the main stakes. The second section provides a summary of the main debates on creation and creativity in the city and offers some innovative proposals. The third section sets the groundwork for a city development approach that would allow building a more cohesive city on the basis of cultural creation. The paper shows that creation can be a collective way of enhancing the quality of life for all citizens and this calls for innovative forms of governance.

**Keywords**: creation; creativity; social innovation; creative city; social cohesion; governance.

Juan-Luis Klein, Klein.juan-luis@uqam.ca, CRISES and Department of Geography, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montreal.
Diane–Gabrielle Tremblay, tremblay.diane-gabrielle@teluq.uqam.ca, CRISES and Télé Université, Université du Québec à Montréal, Montreal.

## Introduction

The objective of this paper is to present an overall and critical vision of the main theoretical elements, debates, and strategic perspectives that make it possible to establish a link between creation and innovation on the one hand, and the building of social cohesion in the city on the other. This objective faces three challenges. The first is that creation and innovation are generally treated independently, with the act of creation often seen as the result of an individual action, and the act of innovating associated rather with a social process, i.e., with the broader spread of the results of creation (Sternberg, 1999). The second challenge is that the authors who discuss creation and innovation do so without paying attention to the social cohesion issue, and it is this dimension that will be the focal point of our paper. This is important because there is a risk of increasing inequalities as the consequence of the destructive effects of creation (Scott, 2006a). This results mainly in concentration of power in some areas, which become the "winning areas" (Benko & Lipietz, 1992), at the expense of others, which become the "losing areas" (Côté et al. 1995)—a worrying perspective for social cohesion. The third challenge is that creation and innovation can take place in all sectors of activity and not only in the artistic or cultural sectors or high tech sectors (Scott, 2006a). In this article, we limit the

topic by posing the question as follows: How can creation and innovation be combined to make the city more cohesive and at the same time contribute to the economic and social development of the whole city and not only to the development of creative or cultural services and activities for a certain part of the population (the "creatives")?

In order to respond to that question, we divide this paper into three sections. The first defines the main concepts and presents the main stakes raised by the literature concerning creation and social cohesion. The second section provides a summary of the main debates on creation and creativity in the city and offers some propositions resulting from our literature review that could generate a creative approach to social cohesion in an urban setting. The third section sets the groundwork for an approach that would allow implementing action on the basis of those propositions.

The issue of creation and creatives and their impact on the city and on the economic development has been already addressed by several authors (Hall, 2000; Florida, 2002; Markusen & King, 2003; Scott, 2006b; Gertler, 2004, Musterd & Murie, 2010, and many others). These authors have insisted on creation-based activities and their links with creativity, the creative economy, and competitiveness. While considering these contributions, this article distinguishes itself from preceding works in that it focuses on socially-oriented

collective actions of creation taking place in civil societies and that aim to enhance the quality of life at the neighbourhood level. It proposes that this specific type of creative actions should be encouraged and supported in order to build a more cohesive city "from below" (Stöhr, 2003) and points out that this calls for a participative and inclusive strategy.

## 1. The main concepts and the main challenges: What creation for what social cohesion?

This section will show the urgency to rethink social cohesion in a way that is compatible with a society that is very different from the one referred to by Durkheim at the dawn of Fordism and of the mass consumer society of the golden sixties (Pahl, 1991; Jenson, 1998; Forrest & Kearns, 2001).[2] At the beginning of the 21st century, as a result of globalization, society has become less uniform, more diversified (Scott, 2006a). Actors and citizens are increasingly in search of new identities that reflect their cultural distinctions and simultaneously want to find solutions to the major social problems provoked by structural injustices (Young, 2000). This increasing social and cultural diversity challenges homogeneous public policies and programs and poses new problems of integration (Sandercock, 2004). In this section, we will

first discuss the factors that reduce social cohesion as a consequence of some economic trends engendered by globalization, such as mobility of financial capital, work flexibility and state disempowerment, as shown dramatically by the recent financial and economic crisis, and resulting job losses and unemployment in particular.[3] We will then present different points of view on ways to rebuild social cohesion, taking into account the specific challenges posed by the new social and economic context. The different viewpoints expressed in the literature on creation, social cohesion and innovation will thus be considered, leading up to our notion of "social creation."

## 1.1 Globalization and social cohesion in the city: the archipelago effect

Globalization has dramatically disrupted almost all domains of human life. The regulatory bases of Western growth economies — be it Fordism, the welfare state, or national institutions for social integration—have been shaken by the new economic model combining competition, flexibility, mobility, and individualism. The adaptation, sometimes difficult and at times impossible, of various neighbourhoods and regions to this new economic environment provokes major structural problems within the territories of the different societies; however, it also opens up new opportunities for social actors and citizens (Benko & Lipietz, 1992; Hiernaux, 1999; Benko & Lipietz, 2000).

Globalization and the changes in economic conditions that came with it ushered in a *new model of knowledge-based capitalism* that places great emphasis on creative activities, namely, creative services (Miles & Green, 2010; Musterd & Murie, 2010). The basis of this new model resides in *multiple networks* (Ascher, 1995; Castells, 2004, De Mattos et al. 2005), which span across national territories (Badie, 1995; Amin & Thrift, 2002) and which render the territorial borders more permeable (Castells, 1997, 1998). These networks host flows that produce territorial reconfigurations at the global (Veltz, 1996; Brenner, 1999) and the local scales (Cox, 1997; Fontan et al. 2005).

These reconfigurations strengthen those territories where power structures, productive systems, and human capital are concentrated, which puts cities and mega-cities at the forefront of globalization (Scott, 2001; Lévy, 2006). However, this does not mean that all the cities' inhabitants benefit—far from it. The globalized economy, while generating new economic prospects for some, also creates great inequality for others. This is exacerbated by public sector initiatives, which, in efforts to open up the national and regional economies to globalization, slash social programs and dismantle social development policies. The result is that one segment of the population manages to integrate and do very well in performing networks in the economic sphere (Scott, 2006b; Sassen, 1996; Soja & Scott, 1986), while a significant other

segment of the population is excluded from such networks and thereby prevented from benefiting fully from their basic rights as citizens (Castel, 2008; Laville, 2008).

We are thus witnessing a two-fold trend affecting cities (Table 1). The first one, a spatial trend, concerns the concentration of power in certain spaces of the city (neighbourhoods, zones, corridors). These spaces become the winning areas, at the expense of others (former industrial and manufacturing zones, working class neighbourhoods), which suffer the effects of the crisis of Fordism, lose their main resources, and must restructure their economies in order to be revitalized (Fontan et al. 2003; Drewe et al. 2008). The second trend is social: one social segment enjoys the privileges usually extended to citizens, namely, economic safety and social security (although these are increasingly reduced in many national contexts), while another segment is condemned to vulnerability, poverty, or exclusion from the job market, services, and a quality living environment (Mandanipour et al. 1998). The latter class includes the "newly poor," i.e., those who are in the labour market yet whose jobs are poorly paid and precarious (Laville, 2008).

This double trend engenders new socio-territorial divides that affect social cohesion and that provoke social fragmentation and atomization (Lees, 2003; Cameron, 2003; Dutton, 2003; Dupuy, 2007) and generates what is called

"unfair cities"[4]. Winning areas concentrate connections to global networks, economic and political power centres, and a high-income population. However, they also 'host' the vulnerability and the precariousness of some segments of people (immigrants, homeless, single-parent families). Losing areas, for their part, are affected by tensions between gentrification and slumification. In this way, cities become segregated and fragmented spaces (Graham & Marvin, 2001). This has raised the issue of "flexicurity," or, how to ensure both security and flexibility (Tremblay, 2008), a particularly pressing issue in the present context of competition.

[Insert table 1 here]

**1.2    The creative building of social cohesion in a context of diversity**

How can the reduction of social cohesion generated by the territorial reconfigurations be countered? The first impulse would be to reestablish the homogeneity and social solidarity based on Fordism and state regulation that characterized Western societies in the post-war years (i.e., the Glorious Thirty Years from 1945-1975). However, that goal is neither possible nor desirable in the current context. Many authors insist that the homogeneity and social rigidity that characterized social cohesion under Fordism and the welfare state, although appropriate if development is identified with mass consumption, no longer

correspond to the needs and options of contemporary society. Indeed, our societies are characterized by social heterogeneity. Yet, rather than viewing this as negative, some authors see the potential for creation and innovation which this holds for the development of communities in the context of globalization (Boltanski & Chiapello, 1999; Scott, 2006a; Scott, 2006b). These authors also insist on the importance of finding solutions to the "personal branding" and project-based boundaryless careers that are costly to individual security and cohesion (Tremblay, 2008). Cultural and social differences could thus turn out to be assets for being creative as long as interactions between different groups in the two 'segments' of the population are developed and social equity is respected (Jenson, 2002) or put forward as an essential objective, which is quite a challenge, but not impossible.

The capacity of creation refers to the capacity to create something new, i.e., to invent (Scott, 2006b; Sternberg et al. 2002). Creation precedes innovation; and, innovation depends on the social acceptance of creation and the spread of its effects or results. At the social level, creation and innovation then merge and come to full fruition (Alter, 2000). Individual creation can turn into social creation, thereby laying the foundation for a whole set of new strategies, experiments, and ideas, which are the basis for the implementation of social innovations (Chambon et al. 1982; Klein & Harrisson, 2007; Moulaert &

Nussbaumer, 2008). At the scale of the city and its neighbourhoods, social creation can take on multidimensional forms and occur within many fields, among others, the arts, architecture, public spaces, recreational and socio-cultural activities, entrepreneurship, neighbourhood services, political participation, and the environment (Landry, 2000).

## 2. An important marker of the debate: the "creative city"

While most authors accept the importance of creation for revitalizing urban communities and neighbourhoods, in recent years, the debate on creation and innovation in urban settings has been focused on the strategy of the "creative class", proposed by Florida (2002), which has been highly criticized and provoked strong opposition from excluded and deprived to strategies of city development based on cultural creation (Tremblay and Tremblay, 2010). In this section, we will first present the strategy of the creative class. Secondly, we will present a summary of the critiques raised against that strategy, essentially critiques addressing its negative effects on social cohesion. Building on those critiques, we will present some fields in which creative experiments take place in more cohesive ways. This shall demonstrate that it is not the creative

dimension as such that is contested as a basis of city development but its elitist aspect in many writings.

## 2.1. The creative class

The relation between creation and the city is well established. H. Lefebvre (1970) saw the city as the centre of all creation, while J. Jacobs was the first to talk of the "creative city," in her *Cities and Wealth of Nations* (1984). But it was R. Florida (2002) who popularized the notion of the creative city, associating it with the presence of a new "creative class":

> The super-creative core of this new class includes scientists and engineers, university professors, poets and novelists, artists […] and other opinion-makers. […] Beyond this core group, the creative class also includes "creative professionals" who work in a wide range of knowledge-intensive industries. […] Doing so typically requires a high degree of formal education and thus a high level of human capital. (Florida, 2002, p.68-69)

Florida argues that a creative city relies on talent, technology, and tolerance—a position supported by many. Florida's argument is contested,

however, on the grounds that his notion of talent is seen to reside rather exclusively with an elite, i.e., people with high levels of education. Many consider that this concept does not add anything to the traditional concept of human capital (Shearmur, 2006, amongst others). With the elite thus regarded as the gateway to diversity and creation, Florida calls for massive investments in artistic and cultural amenities and infrastructures to make the city attractive for that so-called creative class, who should in turn stimulate innovation and economic growth.[5]

## 2.2. Cohesive visions: social creativity from the bottom up

Florida has inspired many urban governments to invest in prestigious cultural assets. However, his views have also received much criticism from researchers as well as from local actors at the neighbourhood level (Markusen, 2006; Shearmur, 2006; Stern & Seifert, 2007; Gunder & Hillier, 2009). Even though authors and stakeholders credit Florida with having drawn attention to the importance of culture in urban development (Tremblay & Darchen, 2010), many criticize his elitist vision (Shearmur, 2006) and propose a more inclusive vision of urban creation (Perez et al. 2000), while others claim that public support for creative sectors in fact tends to support the "industry" (producers and the like) more than the creative workers (Klein & Tremblay, 2010). In that

context, the working conditions of creatives illustrate how their work is conceived in "incohesive societies," since these people are often highly educated but work for low wages and under precarious conditions (Menger, 2002). More importantly, cities should not only cater to the "creative class" and to cultural clusters or sectors, but take into account the global development of the city and its various boroughs and social groups.

Many authors bank on cultural resources and creation to reestablish the image of a neighbourhood or to revitalize a city. The goal, they argue, should be to improve the quality of life and the social development of all groups of society (Gertler, 2004). "Social emancipation" should be favoured over "physical beautification" (Moulaert et al. 2004), and all social classes, not only the educated, should be seen as capable of creation (Markusen, 2006). Such a perspective calls for a multi-faceted strategy as opposed to one oriented only towards a so-called creative class (Tremblay & Darchen, 2010). In the following sections we present some proposals of a strategy oriented towards social creativity drawn from a survey of works that address cultural creation. These proposals pertain to four fields (arts, public space, identity, and social economy) and can be seen as ways to achieve a more cohesive development of cities and neighbourhoods (Table 2).

[Insert table 2 here]


**2.2.1. Cultural creation as a means for the development of neighbourhoods**

Decision-makers at the city level are increasingly becoming aware of the importance of arts and the potential of cultural creation as a factor of inclusion in economic development (Landry, 2000; Hall, 2000). Many experiences show the particular potential of creation within the artistic field in promoting social cohesion and the orientation of a urban communities towards a more cohesive perspective (Scott, 2000; Walshok et al. 2002). The presence of cultural creation in diverse neighbourhoods encourages residents to cross their own internal boundaries within the city, thereby breaking with ghettoization, as shown by the case of Minneapolis-St Paul (Markusen, 2006). This, in turn, promotes heterogeneity and collective learning and creates links among local communities as well as between cultural workers and others groups of the local community (Albrechts, 2005). Groups of artists can also become attractions for tourism and even commercial pillars in small cities, as is the case in Montemor-o-Novo, Portugal (André & Abreu, 2009), and many others. At the same time, they can be levers for community development and social integration, as is the case for the École nationale du cirque (Tohu) in the

Saint-Michel neighbourhood or the artist-run centres in the Mile-End district, both in Montreal (Tremblay & Pilati, 2008).

Art creation can thus promote communication between different social groups, as shown by the *Return of the Swallows* project, a film project realized in a disadvantaged immigrant neighbourhood of Brussels (Dietvorst, 2004) with the aim to raise the self-esteem of the residents and to promote their social integration. The project directors took the specific views of the residents into consideration, worked around their objectives and realities, and gave them an artistic voice in the film. With an emphasis on communication and interaction, the project thus promoted the individual and collective creation of the inhabitants and improved their social integration and self-image. Another inspiring example is the Simon Bolivar Symphonic Orchestra, the product of a national support program for musical training and practice in poor neighbourhoods in Venezuela. This national program which contributes to getting thousands of children and youth out of poverty and exclusion has gained international recognition (Sanchez, 2007).

### 2.2.2. Public spaces as integrative places

Stressing cultural creation as a way to foster social cohesion-oriented actions in cities involves the valuing of public spaces as a way to build

collective interaction and social capital (Segovia, 2007). In principle, public spaces should be open and accessible, allowing for interaction, meetings, social exchange, and a great variety of activities by groups with different cultures and social interests (Chelkoff & Thibaud, 1992, 1993). However, this accessibility and openness have often been compromised, while precarious jobs and mobility tend to disrupt social links. Individualism, indifference to neighbourhood bonds, fear of stigmatization, violence, keep many away from public spaces, accentuating the negative effect of spatial segregation on social links and urban mix (Carrion, 2007). With the insecurity this situation provokes (Cozzani, 2008), the population tends to take refuge in its domestic space. Reinvesting public spaces thus becomes a priority if the goal is to generate social cohesion and thereby resocialization.

Many initiatives show that cultural creation allows for the resocialization of such public spaces (Segovia, 2007, Perez et al. 2000). It reduces acts of vandalism and increases the sense of safety. Cultural creation strengthens the image of the neighbourhood, improves its environment and makes it attractive for the inhabitants and visitors; the economy of the neighbourhood generally improves, with local actors launching projects that call for participation. In this way, residents change their perception of the place

they inhabit and develop confidence and interest in their environment (Evans & Shaw, 2004).

Therefore, public spaces can become a place of both diversity and integration (Borja, 2003). Socially reinvested, they generate a shared feeling of belonging (Garcia-Ramon et al. 2004). Moreover, through various means, public space allows for the expression of the citizens concerning their needs and claims (López de Lucio, 2000), which brings social problems to the fore. Interaction also allows to articulate differences and tensions, which can then be negotiated and give way to social compromises—a crucial component for generating social cohesion (Borja, 2001).

### 2.2.3. The perception and building of a positive identity

Social divides refer to more than mere objective inequalities, such as income inequality or quality of the housing. They also rest on perceptions, both by deprived people themselves and by others, and which in general are associated with stereotypes and culturally based norms (Young, 1990) and which stigmatize disadvantaged communities (e.g., ethnic minorities, unemployed, welfare recipients, disabled). This tends to generate feelings of vulnerability, shame, and reclusive behaviour, which transforms the social divide into social exclusion. While some state programs provide financial

support and guarantee a certain level of well-being to some excluded groups (youth, immigrants, people with low levels of education, or others having difficulty integrating the labour market), they cannot alleviate the suffering caused by stigmatization. On the contrary, research by Preteceille (2003) on social housing shows that such programs can even intensify stigmatization. In the new economic model geared towards improving individual performance and opportunities, such stigmatization can even be stronger, exacerbated by a loss of confidence in the institutions that once ensured integration.

Therefore, the rebuilding of social cohesion calls for a strengthening of self-esteem (individual and collective) and requires collective actions that allow to build a positive perception of one's environment, or, as Bassand and Guindani (1983) argue, to transform stigma into a matter of pride. This latter point is, specifically, where cultural creation can reveal its full potential. In many cities, artistic expression (music, theatre, or visual arts) has brought social groups to affirm their identity and obtain the recognition necessary to support their social integration (Bassand, 1990; Gargurevich, 2002). These modes of expression have sometimes permitted to reverse social prejudices against the most deprived groups, and thus to obtain social recognition of those cultural forms by the elites. Music and dance also play a fundamental cohesive role, as documented by Dos Santos,[6] who cites the case of the samba schools in Brazil

and the massive support these receive from the residents of the *favelas*—even if those same residents are deserting the traditional social and political organizations (left wing political parties, trade unions) created to demand better living conditions from the state. Even if some authors are not convinced of its actual potential as an efficient means of integration of the excluded into society or work (Hage, 2000), and it is surely not always the case, many examples show that artistic expression conveys a claim for social and political recognition and can sometimes lead to success on these grounds. This situation, of course, varies from one country to another, and while Richard Florida has created a "diversity index" to rank cities, these issues remain the object of debate. Nevertheless, it does seem that in some cities, such as Montreal and some Brazilian cities as well (e.g., Rio de Janeiro and Salvador de Bahia), community-based cultural expression such as dance and theatre can lead to inclusion of some communities and to greater social cohesion. This is of course is not ensured in all cases.

### 2.2.4. Incubation of creation by the social economy

Some authors who promote a cultural creation as means for the building of more inclusive and cohesive cities have proposed that organizations involved in the social and solidarity-based economy (called "Economía popular" in Latin

America) may be seen as incubators of social creation experiments. Even if this type of initiative may differ from one country to the next (La Serna, 2004; Cattani 2004; Nyssens, 2004; Moulaert & Ailenei, 2005), they have two common characteristics: on the one hand, they aim to improve conditions for citizens on the economic as well as social level, and, on the other hand, they are anchored in the local community. In this way, they have the capacity to implement a collective dynamic of social innovation in deprived neighbourhoods (Demoustier, 2004; Kirk & Shutte; 2004). This capacity also translates into a search for recognition as an actor in the cultural domain (Colin & Gauthier, 2008).

In that respect, the example of the community economic development corporations (CEDCs) in Montreal is revealing. CEDCs play an important role in the building of a new economy based on the hybridization of the social economy, the public economy, and the market. At the same time, they use creation and culture as a means to reconvert devitalized neighbourhoods. An interesting example of this is *Labcréatif*, a cluster of young emerging designers and creators in Montreal's fashion sector which emerged in a devitalized neighbourhood thanks to the support of the local CEDC (Klein et al., 2010). This case is a good example to understand the role which a social economy

organization can play in mobilizing creative capabilities for the regeneration of a traditional economic sector and a devitalized neighbourhood.

By participating in the cluster of young designers, the CEDC supported the production and promotion functions of the designers, by bringing them together to share experiences and knowledge on these issues. The cluster also gave the designers the means to represent themselves before public bodies as well as the tools for responding to their specific problems. The designers were thus able to operate in a broader organization/network promoting creativity. In addition to resource-sharing, the CEDC provided the designers with legitimacy and access to information, something which the designers could not have obtained otherwise—in particular because they, as young creators, lacked the social capital that procures financial credibility as well as an evolved, matured information network. Moreover, the social capital of the CEDC allowed the designers to receive the support of many social, economic, and political organizations. Access to this organization's resources is possible thanks to the community character of the CEDC; as for this one specific case, there are 19 other CEDCs in Montreal that support local businesses, and more and more in the creative sectors. The rebuilding of the Corona Theatre or the Baubien Cinema for instance have been emblematic local collective actions incubated and supported by two others CDECs of Montreal.

With their implication in diverse types of networks, allowing creators to mobilize a diverse set of actors (diverse origins, local and outside, private and public) for the benefit of the local community, the social economy based organisation can contribute to support various initiatives, such as the *Labcreatif.* This examples shows that the social economy can be the basis for the hybridization of many types of actions (economic, social, political, environmental) and promote the integration of development actions in a neighbourhood (Moulaert & Nussbaumer, 2008).

## 3. Supporting creation for a cohesive city

From the works and cases previously summarized, it is possible to see that the implementation of a culture and creation-oriented urban development strategy should be embedded within a large vision of development, mobilizing various initiatives at the neighbourhood level and at the broader city scale.

Cultural creation can in fact serve as a basis for a cohesive urban development strategy, provided that such a strategy is part of a larger strategic planning process designed to foster the creative capacities of individuals and their organizations in their diversity, to support local identity and culture (Landry, 2000), and to ensure that cultural creators and the local population are

not removed from their own space by a process of gentrification but can instead benefit from the financial advantages accruing to the city from this strategy.

However, the cohesive effect of creation as a source of development cannot be taken for granted, even when disadvantaged groups are at the front stage (Villeneuve et al. 2007). As shown by many, creation-geared initiatives in neighbourhoods can easily become a factor of gentrification rather than of social cohesion (Gertler, 2004). To achieve a cohesive effect, creation and creative activities must be an integral part of the overall vision behind the city's governance and, more importantly, ensure the active individual and collective participation of all groups of society and cover the social, economic, and political dimensions (Stoker, 2002; Borja, 2003; Colin & Gauthier, 2008).

Cultural creation activities can be strong vehicles for the integration of marginalized groups, we argue in this article. Some experiments have shown that these activities are a good way to promote social cohesion, since they can bring together different groups from various social or national origins and facilitate exchanges between these groups. However, we argue that a crucial condition for social cohesion to occur is that the artistic and cultural activities involve the actual participation of the local community, as is the case in some

of the cited design, dance or collective painting and sculpture initiatives, rather than being based on passive consumption (Klein and Tremblay, 2010).

Cultural creation thus turns out to be a powerful means for social integration (Raven, 1989; Lacy, 1995), provided that the cultural community is open to the local environment, and that it does not induce a gentrification that would ultimately exclude the young or less successful creators from the community due to rent increases. The creation process can thus build social links within the community, increase self-esteem on an individual and collective level (McCarthy, 2006), and increase safety and respect in the different neighbourhoods (Perez et al. 2000; Sharp, 2007). This is all the more important in neighbourhoods where different economic or ethnic groups cohabit without any interaction between them, a situation that usually gives rise to stigmatization and exclusion.

## Conclusion

Therefore, it is not the idea of the creative city per se that is contested, and much less the importance of creation, but rather the elitist and limited notion of creativity, as well as the very specific role ascribed to it in many of today's urban development strategies. Thus, the challenge for decision-makers and planners is to ensure that creation in its diverse forms becomes a collective

action, even a trigger to improve the quality of life for all citizens, by promoting inclusive projects as well as accessibility to creative processes in all domains and for all citizens (Gertler, 2004; Markusen, 2005; Markusen & King, 2003; Markusen et al. 2004; Jensen, 2007).

The issue of "consumption of" versus the "participation in" cultural creation must also be emphasized (Perez et al. 2000; Borja, 2003). The implementation of cultural activities that truly engage the population is much more important than passive financial support for cultural activities that are often seen as exclusive or oriented towards the best educated and wealthiest. Cultural creation can only serve as a basis for a cohesive urban development strategy if the various populations are enabled to participate and engage actively in the cultural and creative activities themselves rather than being passive observers, or worse, totally excluded from the activities.

The development of cultural creation-based activities and initiatives can then contribute to new forms of governance that favour the expression of opinions and ideas of the various populations, the confrontation of different ideas and forms of expression, and the development of exchanges between a diversity of populations. However, in order to really participate in the definition of strategies and not only be consulted on ideas from above, civil society must

be brought very early to the table or the organization where the strategies are discussed.

Creative, artistic, and cultural activities can be used as a way to promote the expression of ideas from the most diverse groups and thereby begin to open up the deliberative processes traditionally dominated by political and economic elites, or even creative elites, such as those supported by the creative class theory. This would ensure a more creative city, since it has been recognized that more diversity leads to social creativity and innovation all the while being more inclusive.

**References:**

Albrechts, L. (2005) Creativity in and for Planning, *DISP,* 162(3), pp. 14-25.

Alter, N. (2000) *L'Innovation ordinaire*. Paris : PUF.

Amin, A. and Thrift, N. (2002) *Cities: Reimaging the Urban*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

André, I. and Abreu, A. (2009) Social creativity and post-rural places: the case of Montemor-o-Novo, Portugal, *Canadian Journal of Regional Science,* XXXII(1), pp. 101-114.

Ascher, F. (1995) *Metapolis ou l'avenir des villes*. Paris: Odile Jacob.

Badie, B. (1995) *La Fin des territoire*. Paris: Fayard.

Bassand, M. (1990) *Culture et régions d'Europe*. Lausanne: Presses polytechniques et universitaires romandes.

Bassand, B. and Guindani, S. (1983) Maldéveloppement régional et luttes identitaires, *Espaces et sociétés*, 42, pp.13-26.

Benko, G. and Lipietz, A. (Eds), (1992) *Les régions qui gagnent.* Paris: PUF.

Benko, G. and Lipietz, A. (Eds), (2000) *La richesse des régions.* Paris: PUF.

Bernard, P. (1999) La cohésion sociale : critique dialectique d'un quasi-concept, *Liens social et politique*, 41, pp. 47-61.

Boltanski, L. and Chiapello, E. (1999) *Le nouvel esprit du capitalisme*. Paris: Gallimard.

Borja, J. (2001) *El Desafio Urbano y el espacio publico*. Gijón. Fundación Municipal de Cultura, Educación y Universidad Popular.

Borja, J. (2003) *La ciudad conquistada.* Madrid: Alianza Editorial, S.A.

Brenner, N. (1999) Beyond state-centrism? Space, territoriality and geographical scale in globalization studies, *Theory and Society*, 28, pp. 39-78

Cameron, S. (2003) Gentrification, Housing Redifferentiation and Urban Regeneration, *Urban Studies,* 40, pp. 2367–2383.

Carrion, F. (2007) Espacio público : punto de partida para la alteridad, in: Segovia, O. (Ed.) *Espacios públicos y construcción social.* pp.79-95. Santiago de Chile : Ediciones SUR.

Castel, R. (2008) La citoyenneté sociale menacée, *Cités*, 35, pp. 133-141.

Castells, M. (1997) *The Power of Identity.* Oxford: Blackwell.

Castells, M. (1998) *End of Millennium*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Castells, M. (2004) *The network society*. London: Eddward Elgar.

Chambon, J.-L., David, A. and Deverey, J.-M. (1982) *Les innovations sociales*. Paris : PUF (Que sais-je ? 2014).

Chelkoff, G. and Thibaud, J.-P. (1992, 1993) L'espace public, modes sensibles. Le regard sur la ville, *Annales de la recherche urbaine*, 57-58, pp. 6-17.

Colin, B. and Gauthier, A. (2008) *Pour une autre économie de l'art et la culture*. Paris: Éres.

Côté, S., Klein, J.-L. and Proulx, M.-U. (Eds) (1995) *Et les régions qui perdent ?* Rimouski: GRIDEQ.

Cox, K.R. (Ed.) (1997) *Spaces of globalization. Reasserting the power of the local*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Cozzani, M. R. (Ed.) (2008) *Inseguridad. Estrategias para fortalecer la convivencia social*. Mendoza: Editorial de la Universidad Nacional de Cuyo.

De Mattos, O., Figueroa, O., Giménez, R., Orellana, A. and Yanez, G. (Eds) (2005) *Gobernanza, competitividad y redes. La gestión de las ciudades en el siglo XXI*. Santiago: EURE-Libros.

Demoustier, D. (2004) *Économie sociale et développement*. Paris: Édition De Boeck.

Dietvorst, E. (2004) The Return of the Swallows, *City*, 8 (2), pp. 279-288.

Drewe, P., Klein, J.-L. and Hulsbergen, E. (Eds) (2008) *The Challenge of Social Innovation in UrbanRevitalization*. Amsterdam: Techne Press.

Dupuy, G. (2007) *La fracture numérique*. Paris: Ellipses.

Dutton, P. (2003) Leeds Calling: The Influence of London on the Gentrification of Regional Cities, *Urban Studies,* 40, pp. 2557–2572.

Evans, G. and Shaw, P. (2004) *The contribution of culture to regeneration in the UK: a review of evidence.* London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport.

Florida, R. (2002) *The rise of the creative class and how it's transforming work, leisure, community and everyday life*. New York: Basic Books.

Fontan, J.-M., Klein, J.-L. and Lévesque, B. (2003) (Eds) *Reconversion économique et développement territorial*. Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Fontan, J.-M., Klein, J.-L. and Tremblay, D.-G. (2005) *Innovation socioterritoriale et reconversion économique : le cas de Montréal*. Paris: L'Harmattan.

Forrest, R. and Kearns, A. (2001) Social Cohesion, Social Capital and the Neighbourhood, *Urban Studies*, 38(12), pp. 2125-2143.

Gargurevich, J. (2002) *La Chicha, cultura urbana que resiste*. Montreal, Coloquio Panamericano Industrias culturales y dialogo de las civilizaciones en las Américas. Web Site: http://www.er.uqam.ca/nobel/gricis/actes/panam/Gargurev.pdf

Garcia- Ramon, M. D., Ortiz, A. and Prats, M. (2004) Urban planning, gender and the use of public space in a peripheral neighbourhood of Barcelona, *Cities*, 3, pp. 215-223.

Gertler, M. S. (2004) *Creative Cities: What Are They For, How Do They Work, and How Do We Build Them?* Ottawa, CPRN, Paper F.48 Web Site: http://www.cprn.org

Graham, S. and Marvin, S. (2001) *Splintering Urbanism*. London: Routledge.

Gunder, M. and Hillier, J. (2009) *Planning in ten words or less*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Hage, G. (2000) *White Nations. Fantasies of White supremacy in a multicultural society*. New York/ Annadale, Routledge/ Pluto Press.

Hall, P. (2000) Creative cities and economic development, *Urban Studies*, 37 (4), pp. 639-649.

Healey, P. (2004) Creativity and urban governance, *Policy Studies*, 25 (2), pp. 87-102.

Hiernaux, D. (1999) *Los senderos del cambio*. Mexico: Plaza y Valdés Editores.

Jacobs, J. (1984) *Cities and Wealth of Nations*. New York: Random House.

Jensen, O. B. (2007) Culture Stories: Understanding Cultural Urban Branding, *Planning Theory*, 6 (3), pp. 211-236.

Jenson, J. (1998) Mapping Social Cohesion: The State of Canadian Research, *Canadian Policy Research Networks*.

Jenson, J. (2002) Identifying the links: Social cohesion and Culture, *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 27, pp.141-151.

Kirk, P. and Shutte, A. M. (2004) Community leadership development, *Community Development Journal*, 39 (3), pp. 234–251.

Klein, J.-L. and Harrison, D. (Eds) (2007) *L'innovation sociale. Émergence et effets sur la transformation des sociétés*. Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Klein, J.-L. and Tremblay D.-G. (2010) Créativité et cohésion sociale en milieu urbain : pour une ville créative pour tous. In : R. Tremblay and D.-G

Tremblay (Eds.) *La classe créative selon Richard Florida*, pp. 201-221 Québec/ Rennes, Presses de l'Université du Québec/ Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Klein, J.-L., Tremblay, D.-G. and Bussières, D.-R. (2010) Social economy-based local initiatives and social innovation: à Montreal case study. *International Journal of Technology Management,* 51, (1), pp:121-138

Lacy, S. (Ed) (1995) *Mapping the terrain: new genre public art*. Seattle: Bay Press.

Landry, C. (2000) *The Creative City, a toolkit for urban innovation*. London: Earthscan.

La Serna, C. (2004) *La economía solidaria en Argentina.* Cordoba, Argentina: IIFAP.

Laville, J.-L. (2008) *Le travail. Une nouvelle question politique.* Paris: Desclée de Brouwer.

Lefebvre, H. (1970) *La révolution urbaine.* Paris: Gallimard.

Lees, L. (2003) Super Gentrification: The Case of Brooklyn Heights, New York City, *Urban Studies*, 40 (12), pp. 2487-2509.

Lévy, J. (2006) Le monde, entre réseaux et territoire, in: B. Jouve and Y. Roche, (Eds) *Des flux et des territoires: vers un monde sans états ?* pp. 363-369. Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

López de Lucio, R. (2000) La vitalidad del espacio público urbano en riesgo. Implicaciones urbanísticas de la creciente concentración en enclaves de la actividad comercial, *Distribución y Consumo,* 25.

Mccarthy, J. (2006) Regeneration of cultural quarters: Public art for place image or place identity, *Journal of Urban Design*, 11 (2), pp. 243–262.

Madanipour, A., Cars, G., and Allen, J. (1998) (Eds) *Social Exclusion in European Cities*. London: Jessica Kingsley.

Markusen, A. (2005) *Urban Development and the Politics of a Creative Class: Evidence from the Study of Artists*. Minneapolis: Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs.

Markusen, A. (2006) Urban development and the politics of a creative class: evidence from a study of artists, *Environment and Planning A,* 38: pp. 1921-1940.

Markusen, A. and King, D. (2003) *The Artistic Dividend: The Art's Hidden Contributions to Regional Development*. Minneapolis: Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs.

Markusen, A., Schrock, G. and Cameron, M. (2004) *The Artistic Dividend Revisited.* Minneapolis: Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs

Menger, P. (2002) *Portrait de l'artiste en travailleur. Métamorphose du capitalisme*. Paris : Seuil.

Miles, I. and Green, L. (2010) Innovation and creative services. In : F. Gallouj and F. Djellal  (Eds) *The Handbook of Innovation and Services*, pp. 178-196. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

Moulaert, F. and Ailenei, O. (2005) Social Economy, Third Sector and Solidarity Relations: A Conceptual Synthesis from History to Present, *Urban Studies,* 42 (11): pp. 2037-2053.

Moulaert, F., Demuynck, H. and Nussbaumer, J. (2004) Urban renaissance: from physical beautification to social empowerment, *CITY*, 8 (2), pp. 229-235.

Moulaert, F. and Nussbaumer, J. (2008) *Logique sociale du développement territorial.* Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Musterd, S.  and Murie, A. (2010) *Making Competitive Cities*. London: Willey-Blackwell.

Nyssens, M. (2004) Quels enjeux pour les dynamiques d'économie sociale, une perspective Nord-Sud, in : S. Charlier, M. Nyssens, J-P Peemans and I. Yépez Del Castillo, *Une solidarité en actes, gouvernance locale, économie sociale, pratiques populaires face à la globalisation*, pp.129-148. Louvain: Presses Universitaires de Louvain.

Pahl, R. (1991) The search for social cohesion: from Durkheim to the European Commission, *European Journal of Sociology,* 32, pp. 345–360.

Perez, V., Dascal, G and Abogadir, X. (2000) *Manos Unidas: Experiencias Participativas De Espacios Públicos*, Santiago de Chile: Casa de la Paz.

Preteceille, E. (2003) Lieu de résidence et ségrégation sociale, *Cahiers français,* 314, pp. 64-70.

Raven, A. (Ed.) (1989) *Art in the public interest*. UMI Research Press.

Sanchez, F. (2007) El Sistema Nacional para las Orquestas Juveniles e Infantiles. La nueva educación musical de Venezuela. *Revista da ABEM*, Porto Alegre, 18, pp. 63-69.

Sandercock, L. (2004) Towards a Planning Imagination for the 21st Century, *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 70 (2), pp.131-141.

Sassen, S. (1996) *Losing Control? Sovereignty in an Age of Globalization.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Scott, A. J. (2000) French cinema: economy, policy and place in the making of a cultural products industry, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 17, pp.1-38.

Scott, A. J. (Ed.) (2001) *Global City-regions: Trends, Theory, Policies.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Scott, A. J. (2006a) Entrepreneurship, Innovation and Industrial Development: Geography and the Creative Field Revisited, *Small Business Economics*, 26, pp. 1–24.

Scott, A. J. (2006b) Creative cities: Conceptual issues and policy questions, *Journal of urban affairs*, 28 (1), pp. 1–17.

Sharp, J. (2007) The life and death of five spaces: public art and community regeneration in Glasgow, *Cultural Geography,* 14, pp. 274-292.

Segovia, O. (Ed.) (2007) *Espacios públicos y construcción social. Hacia un ejercicio de la ciudadanía*. Santiago de Chile : Ediciones SUR.

Shearmur, R. (2006) L'aristocratie du savoir et son tapis rouge. Quelques réflexions sur les thèses de Richard Floridai, in: D.-G. Tremblay and R. Tremblay (Eds) *La compétitivité urbaine à l'ère de la nouvelle économie: enjeux et défis,* pp. 285-303. Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Soja, E. W. and Scott, A. J. (1986) Los Angeles: Capital of the late twentieth century, *Environment and Planning D: Society, and Space,* 4, pp.249–254.

Stern, M. J. and Seifert, S. C. (2007). *Culture and urban revitalization: A harvest document.* Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, School of Social Policy & Practice,

Stöhr, W. (2003) Development from below: vingt ans plus tard, in: Fontan, J.-M., J.-L. Klein, and B. Lévesque (Eds) *Reconversion économique et développement Territoriale*, pp. 119-143. Québec: Presses de l'Université du Québec.

Stoker, G. (1998) Cinq propositions pour une théorie de la gouvernance, *Revue internationale des sciencessociales*, 155 (mars), pp. 19-30.

Sternberg, R. (Ed.) (1999) *Handbook of Creativity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tremblay, D.-G. (Ed.) (2008) *Flexibilité, sécurité d'emploi et flexicurité : les enjeux et défis*. Québec : Presses de l'université du Québec.

Tremblay, D.-G. and Darchen, S. (2010) La thèse de la classe créative : revue des écrits et perspectives de recherche, in: R. Tremblay and D.-G. Tremblay (Eds) *La classe créative selon Richard Florida* : *un paradigme urbain plausible?* pp. 13-35. Québec: Presses de l'université du Québec et Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Tremblay, D.-G. and Pilati, T. (2008) The Tohu and Artist-run Centers: Contributions to the Creative City? *Canadian Journal of Regional Science*, 30 (2), pp: 337-356

Tremblay, R. and Tremblay, D.-G. (2010). *La classe créative selon Richard Florida* : *un paradigme urbain plausible ?* Québec/ Rennes: Presses de l'Université du Québec and Presses universitaires de Rennes.

Veltz, P. (1996) *Mondialisation, villes et territoires: l'économie d'archipel*. Paris : Presses Universitaires de France.

Villeneuve, P. Trudelle, C. and M. Pelletier (2007) Conflits urbains et humanisation des villes. In Da Cunha, A. and L. Mattey, (Eds.) *La ville et l'urbain : des savoirs émergents*. pp. 235-248. Lausanne : Presses polytechniques et universitaires romandes,

Walshok, M. L., Furtek, E., Lee, C. W. and Windham, P. H. (2002) Building Regional Innovation Capacity: The San Diego Experience, *Industry and Higher Education*, pp. 27-42.

Young, I. M. (1990) *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Young, I. M. (2000) *Inclusion and Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Table 1: Socio-territorial divides affecting social cohesion in the city in the

context of the New Economy

| Population Segments | Types of Spaces | |
|---|---|---|
| | **Winning areas** | **Losing areas** |
| **Rich and protected segments** | • Nodes of global networks<br>• Headquarters and major firms<br>• Concentration of wealth and national and international power<br>• Well-paid labour | • Gentrification<br>• Segregation<br>• Loss of resources |
| **Vulnerable segments** | • Immigrants<br>• Single-parent, deprived families<br>• Elderly people<br>• Homeless people | • Poorly paid labour<br>• Ethnic minorities<br>• Slumification<br>• Stigmatization |

Table 2: Cultural creation and the building of social cohesion in cities

| Themes | Fields of action | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Art creation** | **Public space and integration** | **Collective and individual identity** | **Social economy** |
| **Targets** | - Recognition of social diversity | - Reconstruction of social links | - Affirmation of the collective self-esteem | - Intermediation of development action |
| **Innovative proposals** | - Cluster of artists at the neighbourhood level<br>- Interrelation between production, work, and cultural life<br>- Balance between homogeneity and diversity | - Re-socialization of the public space<br>- Promote collective participation in creation and discussion<br>- Expression of cultural diversity and culture of tolerance | - Transformation of social stigma<br>- Affirmation of identity by means of culture<br>- Building a collective identity by means of the public space | - Incubation of solidarity-oriented creation projects<br>- Participation in the decision-making process<br>- Revitalization of devitalized neighbourhoods |