



HAL
open science

Comparing the Cultures of Cities in Two European Capitals of Culture

Claire Bullen

► **To cite this version:**

Claire Bullen. Comparing the Cultures of Cities in Two European Capitals of Culture. *Etnofoor, Anthropological Journal*, 2016, *The City*, 28 (2), pp.99 - 120. hal-01491789

HAL Id: hal-01491789

<https://hal.science/hal-01491789v1>

Submitted on 28 Mar 2017

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

ETNOFOOR

Comparing the Cultures of Cities in Two European Capitals of Culture

Author(s): Claire Bullen

Source: *Etnofoor*, Vol. 28, No. 2, The City (2016), pp. 99-120

Published by: Stichting Etnofoor

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44013448>

Accessed: 17-03-2017 11:02 UTC

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



Stichting Etnofoor is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Etnofoor*

Comparing the Cultures of Cities in Two European Capitals of Culture

Claire Bullen

Aix Marseille University, CNRS, IDEMEC

Building on over a century of social science exploring the ‘culture of cities’,¹ this paper focuses on the so-called ‘cultural turn’ in contemporary urban transformation (Peck 2005). The phrase generally denotes two (usually interwoven) dynamics associated with the restructuring of the global political economy since the 1970s. One, a growing prevalence among city leaders to invest in festivals, architecture and aesthetic institutions to attract foreign investors and tourists and, two, the rise of (multi)cultural policies aiming to manage and allocate rights and resources to individuals and groups judged as culturally distinct. A considerable body of scholarship has developed around this subject. Much is critical of the correlation between market-led urban policy, ‘culture’, and the displacement and devaluation of marginalised – often racialised – individuals and groups from the material and symbolic fabric of the

city. This article builds on this literature, while contending that too little is known about how *place* matters in such dynamics. Questions remain about how to make sense of variations and similarities in the enactment of culture and cultural diversity in increasingly complex cityscapes, affecting patterns of inclusion and exclusion within and across cities.

The point I wish to underline is relatively simple and not so new. In short, I contend that representation, production and experience of place and culture are shaped by the intersection of multi-scalar relations of power (Gupta and Ferguson 1992; Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2011). Yet, while easy enough to assert, the depiction of such processes is necessarily complex, involving as it does shifting ideological, political and economic systems and diverse – often contradictory – beliefs and behaviours of urban decision-makers,

Etnofoor, The City, volume 28, issue 2, 2016, pp. 99-120

cultural workers and urban dwellers. This complexity merits underlining, as it raises methodological questions about whether it is possible to compare such densely-entangled threads without over-simplification and essentialisation. I propose that a relational, comparative ethnographic approach can help in this regard.

Comparative work is regularly charged with structural pre-determinism, often riddled with taken-for-granted assumptions about the 'fit' between different units of analysis with the same names (da Col 2015). The first half of this paper addresses one common pitfall within urban comparison, namely the reification of 'place'. A relational 'variation-finding' approach is proposed as a means to avoid this ontological trap and provide useful heuristic purchase. The second half of the article adds empirical meat to these theoretical bones, drawing on material concerning two cultural projects that took place in disadvantaged neighbourhoods in 'downscale'² cities situated within different European Union (EU) member states: Liverpool, in the UK, and Marseilles, in France.

Significantly, the two cities in question were undergoing preparations to become European Capitals of Culture (ECOC) while I was in the field. Three decades since it was launched, this EU cultural policy has increasingly been associated with urban development and economic growth on the one hand and increased emphasis on 'culture' (meaning aesthetic interventions) to 'deal with' a perceived lack of 'integration' of particular groups on the other (Patel 2013). As such it might be considered the epitome of neoliberal (multi)culturalism (Holmes 2000). Moving between cities and countries, it provides an ideal opportunity for comparative

insights into the intersection of multi-level dynamics on the ground.

The projects examined in this study took place in areas that were marginalised from mainstream cultural production linked to the ECOC. The Liverpool case commenced in 2005. Two years after Liverpool was selected as the UK's ECOC for 2008, it involved provision of training in the art of face-painting to 'members of the community' in an area known as Kensington. It was funded as part of a broader programme of 'community cohesion'. Participants went on to face paint at 'community' and city-centre events, including those organised by Liverpool's ECOC team. The project studied in Marseilles involved weekly choir sessions for '*les habitants*', the residents of the *quartier* of Saint-Mauront. It was coordinated by an artistic association set up in the early 1990s, publically funded by multiple layers of the French state, including an area-based scheme known as the 'Urban Contract for Social Cohesion' (CUCS). The choir, which ran between 2008 and 2011, performed at a small number of cultural and festive events in Saint-Mauront, but did not participate in ECOC activities.

As will be seen, there were many differences in the way in which culture was understood, represented and experienced in the two cases, yet structural similarities in how the projects operated and in how people and places were objectified make the comparison relevant. I suggest that exploring these within a comparative and relational paradigm offers a means to theorise how 'relative location'³ matters in the shaping of outcomes of cultural turns in urban policy, a considerable part of which – although not all – can be attributed to the logics of neoliberalism.

Comparative conundrums

Despite growing attentiveness to the social production of space (Low 1996; Massey 2005), it is still common for urban research to be based on *a priori* suppositions that territorial units of the same name can be treated commensurably. Geographical spaces such as ‘the city’ or ‘the neighbourhood’ are taken as ‘context’ in which social phenomena occur, ignoring the interconnected hierarchical processes by which urban *space* is produced and transformed into *place* (Brenner 2011).

Theoretical weaknesses also appear where geographical units such as cities or neighbourhoods are positioned within vertical scalar relations with ‘national’, ‘transnational’ or ‘global’ elsewhere. For example, cross-national urban studies are often constructed on the basis that the nation-state is the most significant spatial scale for regulating how social and spatial relations work locally (Wimmer and Glick Schiller 2003). Similar points can be made about research where the European or ‘global’ scale is deemed the determining variable.

This is not to deny the influence of national political repertoires in shaping social dynamics in Liverpool and Marseilles. Part of the interest of comparing cultural production in Liverpool and Marseilles is their situation in nation-states that have taken distinctive approaches to managing culture and social relations (Stolcke 1995). Cultural policy in post-war France emerged against a backdrop of decolonialisation, tightly connected with ideas of national cohesion and French republicanism (Ingram 1998). Aesthetics (understood as elite works of art) are historically defined according to Eurocentric elitist values, separated from everyday

life and policies developed to support the production and dissemination of this vision of the world (Urfalino 2010). Despite a complicated multi-level policy framework, cultural policy remains highly centralised via the Ministry of Culture (Ingram 1998). With regards to ‘cultural diversity’, the French republican or ‘*laïc*’ model disregards regional, ethnic or religious distinctions – in theory at least – to the point where collecting data on the basis of ethnic or religious difference is illegal (Akan 2009).

In contrast, the British government adopted an ‘arms-length approach’ to the management of the arts, administered by a non-departmental governmental agency, or ‘quango’ (Griffiths et al. 2003). The first ministry responsible for culture (alongside media and sport) was established in 1997 under the centre-left New Labour government of Tony Blair, as culture became increasingly instrumentalised to promote social inclusion and economic growth (ibid.). The British model of multiculturalism is considered diametrically opposed to the French system, with state recognition of racial, ethnic and cultural difference, the right of minorities to maintain cultural differences acknowledged, and demands for culturally-sensitive services supported (Stolcke 1995).

The extent to which these national frames affect local cultural practices clearly needs to be taken into account. However, rather than assuming that the national framework is all-meaningful or, conversely, ignoring national repertoires and assuming that cities are all changing in similar ways because of ‘neoliberal globalisation’, a model is needed that does not take any of this for granted.

A multi-scalar relational approach to place

Liverpool and Marseilles are conceptualised here as occupying similar positions within multi-scalar relations of power (Glick Schiller and Çağlar 2011). Historically speaking, as their countries' principal ports of empire, both shared relatively upscale locations within economic spheres in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. However, their symbolic status was undermined by a number of factors including the visible presence of working-class and migrant populations. Both places were regularly stigmatised and marginalised as 'other' within national imaginaries (Belchem 2000; Biass and Fabiani 2011).

As the geometry of the global political economy was reworked in the post-World War Two (ww2) era, the two cities experienced economic decline, intersected with high-profile social disorder, often involving racialised minorities, becoming the epitome of urban crisis. Following patterns worldwide (Mayer 2013), in the 1980s, there was a shift in urban governance, with new actors including quangos, technocratic experts, and private real estate investors increasingly being involved alongside central and local government in repositioning these cities within the restructured global economy. In the early 2000s, such external experts were responsible to develop the cities' bids to be ECOC.

In many ways, the cities' bids could be seen as the embodiment of the cultural turn evoked at the start of this paper. Indicative of the weak economic position of these two conglomerations, the central case for these two cities' selection was the need to use this cultural policy to transform urban locations evoked as lagging

behind in economic terms, put more strongly than any of the competing British and French cities (Griffiths 2006; Giroud and Veschambre 2013). As one Liverpool interviewee put it, it offered the chance of promotion into the '*European premiere league*'.

Indicative of a general lack of confidence in local capacity, in both instances expertise was brought in from outside to deliver the project.⁴ Drawing on criteria and narratives associated with the EU programme and globe-spanning trends advocating the value of cultural diversity for interurban competition and social cohesion, bid writers described Liverpool and Marseilles respectively as more culturally diverse than competing British and French cities, and the cities' reputations as a-cultural or working-class as well as the presence of ethnically-marked bodies were transformed into assets.

With their similar trajectories and strong resonances in their place-marketing narratives, it would be easy to argue that these studies embody a 'global hierarchy of values' (Herzfeld 2004). Yet a closer reading reveals competing logics and value systems. For example, Marseilles bid writers overtly rejected the idea of multiculturalism, reflecting French republicanism and growing concern about the 'failure' of multiculturalism across Europe (Gilroy 2004). The Liverpool bid's description of culture was much wider than Marseilles', including everyday 'working class' practices such as sport and humour in descriptions of culture. These rhetorical resemblances and variations matter: they contribute to the production of 'abstract spaces' that shape how urban places are experienced (Smith 1992). This leads into the next section, where I describe how an anthropological approach to relational variation

finding could help conceptualise the ways in which differences and similarities in cultural practices were enacted in (different parts of) Liverpool and Marseilles.

Variation finding

As Ward (2010) argues, if comparison is to move beyond a basic juxtaposition of two or more phenomena towards theory-building it has to be given a particular conceptual task to achieve. Building on the work of Tilly (1984), the approach that I advocate here can be categorised as an exercise in 'variation-finding'. Rather than looking for uniform responses to contemporary political, economic, social and cultural change or, alternatively, presupposing that each city is uniquely different, the aim is to highlight resonances and dissonances. There is no effort to essentialise place or culture for comparative purposes; these are taken as constituted relationally vis-à-vis this swirling reordering of socio-spatial hierarchical relations, within and between urban spaces (Glick Schiller 2012). In methodological terms this requires historical analysis of institutional change alongside embedded ethnographic observation. It enables comparison to move beyond analysis of the polished language of place-marketing to explore the relational ways in which these policies affected the socio-spatial ordering of people and places. I begin by drawing on observations from Kensington, Liverpool.

Probing place-making in Kensington

From 2004–2008 I worked as a short-term consultant as the Black and Minority Ethnic (BME) Project Developer for Kensington Regeneration, a ten-year nationally-funded urban development project (2000–2010). One of my tasks was to set up the above-mentioned face-painting project. When I started the job, I was shown government statistics and reports and glossy maps produced by the agency's communications team delineating the boundaries of the 'neighbourhood' requiring 'regeneration'. However, as weeks passed, it became clear that this space was not 'natural', neither in terms of lived experiences nor in terms of administrative frameworks, and that 'culture' was a relatively new policy tool in this part of the city.

The social construction of Kensington is directly linked to Liverpool's history as the most economically-impooverished local authority in England for most of the twentieth century. Holding the title as the most disadvantaged city in post-war Britain, Liverpool became a laboratory for urban policy experiments in the UK (Couch 2008). State-led post-war reconstruction efforts in this badly-bombed city were followed by centrally-funded grants for housing, social and recreational services in the 1960s and 1970s, that intersected with volatile local politics. No political party had a clear majority. Political decisions were taken in the city with an eye on the ballot box while services for ordinary people progressively deteriorated (Parkinson 1985).

Of significance when exploring contemporary socio-spatial understandings, the allocation of public services such as housing and employment were structured by historically-embedded racism in this former

colonial port (Brown 2005). 'White' families were placed in new housing estates on the outskirts of the city while 'black' residents were located in the urban district of Toxteth/L8, which was later defined in numerous governmental reviews following riots in Toxteth in 1981 as 'systematically racist' (ibid.). These patterns continue to shape understandings of the city. Toxteth continued to be seen as *the* 'black' or multi-ethnic part of the city in the early 2000s, which contrasted with the 'north' of the city, including Kensington, generally considered 'white working class' and often racist and the 'white' city centre.

The election of Margaret Thatcher's conservative government in 1979 equally shaped present-day organisations of social space. The government's ideological agenda involved massive public-sector cuts and the withdrawal of regional policy provoked severe socio-economic hardships in cities such as Liverpool (Meegan 2003). Rolled out at a time of mounting racism and anti-racist struggle, and resonating with patterns across Europe, a racial or 'ethnic' twist was added to the stigmatisation of the 'inner-cities', while national area-based grants increasingly included an 'ethnic' component, encouraging the organisation of social relations in socio-cultural terms (Vertovec 2010).

The ways in which these policies came to ground varied across the UK. In Liverpool, a socialist-led administration was elected in 1983, joining other left-wing municipalities across the country in defying Thatcher's market-led reforms. A bitter confrontation between local and central government lasted until the Liverpool administration was dismissed for a technical irregularity in 1987. Despite protests by civil rights movements, questions of racial discrimination were

largely ignored by this local administration, which focused instead on allocating resources in classist terms.

When Thatcher's government won its third electoral success at Westminster, there was a growing sense that there was no alternative to market-led development in what continued to be one of the most disadvantaged cities in Western Europe (Wilks-Heeg 2003). There *was* little choice: local government was marginalised from decision-making processes in favour of 'quangos' headed up by centrally-chosen representatives of the private sector. Echoing fashions visible world-wide, the centre-piece of central government intervention focused on property-led development, aiming to transform the city's deindustrialised city-centre docks into a site of cultural and tourist consumption. The development of other parts of the city took place piecemeal as policymakers parcelled up Liverpool into zones or areas to compete for different area-based funds from national and – from the late 1980s – European development funds. Reflecting the growing socio-spatial fragmentation of cities, these were managed by different agencies that were responsible to different layers of the state and that categorised people according to the criteria of different projects. Services for 'minorities' continued to focus on Toxteth, increasingly outsourced to regeneration agencies and private and third-sector organisations (Clay 2008).

It was against this backdrop that Liverpool city leadership simultaneously bid to become 'European Capital of Culture' and for a new pot of area-based development money that targeted the 'most deprived' areas in the country. For the former, professional bid writers drew on globe-spanning narratives associated with the idea of the 'creative city' (Landry and Bianchini 1995)

to paint a picture of Liverpool as an embodiment of cultural diversity and ‘urban renaissance’. Very different stories were developed by local policymakers concerning what would become known as the ‘Kensington Regeneration’ area.

Central government statistics were used to delineate a place facing multiple forms of deprivation (Allen 2008). High levels of social and economic deprivation were in evidence – although not uniformly. However, the narrative of urban decline alone does not explain its selection: other parts of Liverpool were technically worse off. Intersected by two major arterial roads and a mainline railway line, the area had become conceptualised as a ‘gateway’, linked to city-centre repositioning efforts associated with the ECOC programme. The choice of name reflects such aspirations. The designated area cut through different administrative areas, one of which was Kensington. The name Kensington was selected over others as it created connections with the very differently positioned place of Kensington, London (Allen 2008). As discussed below, Kensington’s new position within multi-scalar urban repositioning efforts not only had implications for the reconfiguration of the urban fabric, but also affected the geometries of power influential in the performance of culture in the lead up to Liverpool’s ECOC.

Probing place-making in Saint-Mauront

At first glance the area where the choir took place might seem more ‘natural’ than Kensington: descriptions of where Saint-Mauront began and ended given to me by members of the choir largely matched the

outlines on the maps I saw pinned to the walls of urban managers working for the Urban Contract for Social Cohesion (cucs) in what, since the 1990s, had come to be categorised as a ‘*sensitive quartier*’. The coherence of this spatial identity extends back to accounts of Saint-Mauront’s roots as a village, before it transformed into an urban district of Marseilles during the rapid industrialisation and urbanisation of the nineteenth century. Despite nostalgic and sometimes politicised accounts of the former village, Saint-Mauront’s image and relative position in Marseilles in 2010 was most strongly structured by socio-spatial reordering brought about by post-war urban reconstruction.

As across the rest of France, post-ww2 renovation was highly-centralised in Marseilles. The main thrusts involved the rebuilding of the badly-damaged city-centre and responding to the housing shortage. The latter involved high-rise social housing (the HLMS), predominately built in the north of the city where there was greater availability of cheap land. Similarly to Liverpool, these policies were refracted by local politicking. For instance, an unwritten pact was drawn up between mainstream parties to keep the local communist party from power (Dell’Umbria 2006), which reinforced socio-spatial hierarchies in the city. Control over social accommodation in the south of the city was given to right-wing politicians, with the mainstream socialist party having control in the northern districts so they could bolster political support in potential communist strongholds (ibid.), thereby reinforcing an already-existing imaginary of the bourgeois south contrasted with the ‘*populaire*’ or working-class north.

As the original working-class tenants – mainly of French or Italian origin – moved out in the 1960s and

1970s, they were progressively replaced by impoverished migrants of North African and Sub-Saharan African origin. Mirroring an ongoing spatialisation and racialisation of urban issues across France (Wacquant 2008), what became known as *les quartiers nord* were increasingly seen via an ethnic or racial lens.

Of note for the argument I am making here, the demographic profile of Saint-Mauront changed broadly in line with *les quartiers nord*, yet unlike social housing estates in the north of the city, Saint-Mauront was largely passed over by national and local urban development programmes. I argue that this was both because of its dense industrial landscape and its relative location vis-à-vis broader urban repositioning.

From the late 1970s, national schemes to deal with social and economic issues in cities were increasingly area-based (Tissot 2006) and conceptualised in terms of dealing with problems associated with large social housing estates constructed in the peripheries (or *les banlieues*) of cities. These programmes became known as *Politique de la Ville* (PDLV). Initially, the focus differed from Thatcher's market-led urban agenda; there was some effort to tackle deep-seated structural inequalities associated with the restructuring of the global economy (Dikeç 2006). However, as budgets were hit by the economic crisis of the European Community in the early 1980s, the objectives narrowed and became dominated by major projects of demolition and reconstruction, while the language used shifted from addressing socio-economic inequalities to socio-cultural issues, most specifically the integration of ethnically-marked others into the republic (Tissot 2006).

In the 1990s, programmes were formalised through the establishment of a 'contract' between central and

local government. Importantly when thinking about the social construction of space, this introduced new tools, new schemas and new actors involved in the imagining and managing of people, places and culture – in certain parts of the city. The purpose was to increase coordination between the different levels of government that delivered mainstream services; in reality the PDLV teams increasingly found themselves substituting insufficient public services.

In Marseilles, the attention of the PDLV did not always overlap with the local administration's priorities, which, for many years, had attempted to transform impoverished city-centre areas, characterised by high concentrations of ethnically-marked populations, into new business and commercial districts as part of an effort to render Marseilles an attractive site for the service-sector. These often-aggressive policies were regularly accompanied by racialised narratives of 'conquering the city' (Mazzela 1995).

The outcomes of these urban interventions were mixed; but the point here is to underscore that Saint-Mauront had not been considered 'north' enough and had lacked the requisite social housing to be included in major central government policies developed to respond to the problems of the *banlieues*. It was not 'central' enough to be included within the municipally city centre gentrification efforts. And, unlike the neighbouring quartier of La Belle de Mai, it was side-lined from the other major urban intervention that had been repositioning the city since the mid-1990s: the state-led Euro-Mediterranean Urban Development Agency (Euromed).

There is much to be said about this state-led intervention (Bertoncello and Rodrigues-Malta 2003); one

major difference is worth particular mentioning here. While resembling classic waterfront restructuring seen around the world (the creation of a central business and commercial district on former brownfield sites and impoverished residential quarters), this project was designated as an operation of national interest, reflecting a long-term investment by central government in a part of the city aligned with broader geopolitical ambitions.

Between 1995 and 2007 Euromed was largely disconnected from PDLV programmes operating around Saint-Mauront. However, when I arrived in 2010, this was beginning to change. As Marseilles' bid was submitted to become ECOC, central government extended the parameters of the Euromed project northwards, abutting the periphery of Saint-Mauront. In parallel, the quartier of Saint-Mauront was included in municipal-led plans known as 'Operation Grand Centre Ville', which were in part efforts to reposition Marseilles as symbolic capital of a wider city-region. Public meetings were held to present major interventions that aimed to 'change the face' of Saint-Mauront. As with Kensington, investment in Saint-Mauront was legitimised by evoking statistics of levels of deprivation; unlike Kensington, for reasons to do with Saint-Mauront's proximity to a cluster of aesthetic institutions developed within the Euromed framework located in the neighbouring La Belle de Mai, and combined with a greater belief by urban managers in the 'value' of culture, culture was overtly identified as a potential factor for increasing the area's attractiveness. This leads to the next section, which compares how such multi-scalar, place-making strategies affected top-down cultural policies in these transforming spaces/places.

Considering elite cultural dynamics in Kensington

The cultural project I studied in Liverpool was not 'typical' of cultural policy carried out in Kensington, or indeed in Liverpool in general (this is not a conceptual problem; uncharacteristic cases can offer insight into 'typical' processes, see for example Kapferer 2015). In fact, culture understood in aesthetic, multicultural or place-marketing terms did not feature in early policy documents produced by the Kensington Regeneration agency.

Historically speaking, leaders of this commercial port tended to take little interest in 'soft' matters like the arts, concentrating instead on the 'hard-nosed' business of the accumulation of capital (Cohen 2007). 'Culture' was equally ignored by the militant socialist leadership of the early 1980s (Lorente 1996), bucking national trends. Elsewhere in the country left-wing municipalities had begun exploring democratised cultural policies as a means to defy both Thatcher's monetarist policy and the moribund model of welfare-statism (Peck 2011). Liverpool's urban policies only began to align with the growing international fashion for culture in the late 1980s, when the more centrist Labour administration took office (Landry and Bianchini 1995). These policy choices were influenced by national and EU funding streams that helped pay for external consultants to identify how 'culture' could contribute to the city's economy. The management of art and culture was moved under the municipality's urban development portfolio, reflecting the instrumentalist approach to this policy sphere. However, support for cultural policy at leadership levels remained weak

until the competition to become the UK's 2008 European Capital of Culture was announced in 1999 (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993).

While official city spokespeople displayed a certain rhetorical commitment to supporting culture around the time of the ECOC project, this orthodoxy had not trickled down into the symbolic or material practices within Kensington Regeneration. The majority of senior managers in the agency were seconded from the city council. In line with the profile of many middle-managers working in the municipality, most were typical of 'traditional Labour' voters in the UK: they had working-class backgrounds, with little elite 'cultural capital'. The *modus operandi* within the organisation was that artistic activity predominately took place in the city-centre and had little to do with urban issues such as housing, employment, or tackling crime.

Some elite cultural projects did take place in Kensington, mainly led by white middle-class cultural workers operating in publicly-funded arts institutions in the city-centre. Their practices were influenced by broad trends to promote social inclusion and cultural diversity nationally (Ang 2005), which were structured around hierarchical notions of cultural production as something defined by 'professional' artists. Other projects were structured by the idea held by many planners in the city that Liverpool's working-class image and 'working-class places' – such as Kensington – ran counter to efforts to rebrand the city as a 'premiere European' place and to reposition the city within elite circuits of cultural consumption (Allen 2008). Cultural interventions funded in this vein broadly served to distract attention from a place and culture seen as

hindering plans to transform Liverpool into a successful modern city (Fitzpatrick 2009).

The 'atypical' face-painting project emerged because of a conjunctural shift in political, economic, and socio-cultural conditions, most notably changes in international migration regimes at the turn of the 21st century. As greater numbers of people sought asylum in the UK, central government introduced a scheme to disperse 'asylum seekers' across the country. Significant numbers were placed in (often substandard) accommodations within Kensington. Locally, the gentrification of some of Liverpool's impoverished multi-ethnic neighbourhoods resulted in an internal displacement of visible minorities and greater numbers of international students were attracted to the city, changing the demographic profile of Kensington.

Similar changes occurred elsewhere in the city without a shift in the governance of social relations. However, the Kensington Regeneration managers were responsible to the New Labour government in London, which placed considerable emphasis on the notions of community cohesion and BME inclusion in urban renovation schemes. As the recorded numbers of people of BME backgrounds rose, reaching people identified as ethnic minorities became a criterion for measuring the 'success' of the regeneration agency.

In 2003 Kensington Regeneration appointed a new outreach worker to work with this population. Lack of in-house experience in the field within the city council and historical wariness of working with local black activists opened up recruitment outside the city (Clay 2008). The person chosen was white, of middle-class background, highly-educated, with an international career spanning organisations including the United

Nations High Commission for Refugees. His world-view and aspirations differed considerably from his Liverpool-born colleagues, and he looked beyond the neighbourhood and Liverpool (a city he often described as 'provincial') to find models for carrying out his remit. Narratives celebrating the city's diversity foregrounded in the ECOC bid and the importance of 'community cohesion' promulgated within national and international spheres became central to the work of the BME team. Unlike most Kensington Regeneration workers, he had considerable social and cultural capital, including social and professional ties with city-centre cultural institutions, and his presence within the organisation introduced different understandings and ways of managing culture and seeing social difference.

As well as developing projects that extended beyond the 'neighbourhood', working with elite city-centre institutions to develop cultural projects focusing on issues of migration and cultural diversity, the 'BME budget' was used to provide grants for everyday cultural activities such as cooking and sport with individuals and groups identified as of BME background or not.⁵ Typical of multicultural work around the country, such approaches were rare in Liverpool. This was where – initially – the face-painting project fitted in.

Considering elite cultural dynamics in Saint-Mauront

Differently to Liverpool, an overtly 'cultural' dimension has been evident in city-centre urban repositioning and urban poverty policies in Marseilles since at least the 1950s. Following WW2, Marseilles' socialist-led munic-

ipality invested in city-centre cultural institutions as part of a strategy to compete with Lyons for the title of France's 'second' city (Suzanne 2007). In parallel, central government financed urban cultural work in a city and a country riven with tensions over the presence of former colonial subjects. Interventions included socio-cultural centres to aid the social integration of people deemed 'far from culture', notably migrant workers and their families living in hostels or transit estates. These two threads – more or less intertwined – run through cultural-inflected policies in the city up until the period of the ECOC.

As elsewhere in advanced capitalist states, changes in cultural policy emerged in the wake of the political, economic and socio-cultural shifts at the end of the 1970s (Mayer 2013). As Marseilles' social and economic woes worsened, the city's name was further tarnished because of its association with a particularly virulent form of racism. City leaders began looking to cultural policy experiments trialled in other socialist-led municipalities, at a time when counter-cultural movements were promoting the promotion of cultural diversity as a means to challenge socio-economic and 'cultural' exclusion. This led to a reconfiguration of the spatiality of cultural policy in the city. New cultural institutions were founded in impoverished locations mainly in the north of the city, including Saint-Mauront. Yet aesthetic projects funded by local government remained relatively conservative in aesthetic terms; essentially, elite cultural workers were funded to take their work into the quartiers (Suzanne 2007).

The director of the choir had moved to Marseilles at this time, one of a number of Parisian-trained artists seeking 'alternative' sites of production, while profiting

from the availability of workspace, cheap rent and clement weather.

The increasing presence of Parisian-trained cultural workers in the city is one factor influencing Marseilles' relative location within elite cultural fields. As one cultural worker whom I interviewed put it, at the time Marseilles was seen as an artistic 'black hole'. His comments echo judgements that continue to be made about the city, including by Parisian cultural workers leading the ECOC project. In essence, the Parisian arts scene remained the yardstick by which elite artists' social status (and thus access to cultural resources) was rated.

The inclusion of culture as an urban policy tool was progressively institutionalised in the 1980s and 1990s, both locally and nationally. Under the Mitterrand presidency of the 1980s, new funding streams were introduced to promote cultural interventions in impoverished neighbourhoods, predominately coordinated by workers operating within the PDLV framework. Two senior PDLV workers I interviewed had been working in Marseilles from the start of the programme. Both were of middle-class background and considerable educational and social capital; one had close links with cultural workers. Differently to Liverpool, and sometimes in opposition to municipal leaders, cultural work funded through PDLV was initially influenced by a dominant belief in the value of artistic 'excellence' and the notion that artistic work should be independent from social or market-led criteria that circulated in French cultural fields.

New dynamics emerged under the leadership of the centre-left administration (1986 - 1995), whose leader was an amateur artist with close links to elite cultural

workers in Marseilles (Peraldi and Samson 2005). Under this administration, following models for post-industrial cultural development visible throughout Europe, the site of a former tobacco factory in the impoverished neighbourhood of Belle de Mai (in a quartier juxtaposing Saint-Mauront) was purchased by the municipality. Included within the Euromed parameters, this cultural cluster was named the Friche, Belle de Mai. Rented out to contemporary artistic companies, it became a high-profile part of the Marseilles cultural scene.

In brief, in the 1990s there was a period of opportunity for middle-class, predominately white French cultural workers to participate in urban development in so-called 'sensitive quartiers'. The arts organisation that launched the choir was established at this juncture and the director was overt in linking the establishment of this association with these new funding streams.

In the lead up to the ECOC, the grant economy for culture was changing. Nevertheless, cultural projects were still shaped by policies and relationships established during this period, denoting a stability in the cultural grant economy that was not evident in Kensington. Thus, as a right-wing administration came to power that was more ambivalent about funding culture in impoverished neighbourhoods, that concentrated on marketing the city-centre (Peraldi and Samson 2005) and that, as the ECOC programme was rolled out, favoured high-profile elite cultural production, cultural work continued to be supported in impoverished neighbourhoods under the PDLV scheme.

The latter was increasingly inflected by the racialisation/ethnicisation of culturally-inflected urban interventions in France in the 1990s and the 2000s (Tissot

2006). Following riots in 2005 by many young people of visible migrant background in cities across France, the 2007 - 2013 urban contract between central and local government was renamed the Urban Contract for Social Cohesion (cucs). Funding streams were put in place for artistic interventions to promote 'republican cohesion', intercultural dialogue, and access to culture for those represented as being excluded on socio-economic or territorial grounds.

It is important to add that the ways in which cultural interventions in impoverished areas took place was dependent on local coalitions of actors and the relative location of neighbourhoods. For example, resources for culture projects in Saint-Mauront were largely overshadowed by the concentration on higher profile activities in the neighbouring quartier of La Belle de Mai.

The neighbourhood choir was typical of many cultural projects developed in impoverished neighbourhoods in Marseilles since the 1990s, delivered by elite cultural workers who had been operating in Marseilles for over a decade, who had become accustomed to a certain leeway by funders in the way they developed projects.

After this broad-brush approach to describing the relational production of elite cultural-inflected urban development, the next section delves deeper, drawing on ethnographic fieldwork to tease out how this turn came to ground, shaping social-space opportunities for social inclusion and exclusion in different urban places.

Enacting culture and social difference in Kensington

Under the aegis of the BME outreach worker and myself, a project was developed to promote face-painting, seen as an activity that married universal popularity – thereby offering a tool to transcend cultural boundaries – with a practical dimension, namely providing a useful resource within neighbourhood social events. The tenets undergirding the project echoed some of the narratives of Liverpool's ECOC bid and resonate with models of multicultural neoliberalism promulgated around the UK and the EU at the time. They could be summed up as the belief that: a) people of (white) working-class background were associated with reactionary politics of nationalism rather than with more progressive politics of cosmopolitanism; and b) 'multi-cultural' interventions could bridge 'problematic' difference *and* create opportunities for 'excluded' individuals, groups, and places to participate in the contemporary political economy (see Binnie and Skeggs 2004).

These views influenced the methods used to attract participants, methods that differed from 'mainstream' projects in Kensington Regeneration. The latter tended to work with long-established 'white working-class' resident associations. For the face-painting project, as well as promoting the project to schools and community centres, 'community members' were contacted through what was called a 'diversity database', comprising contact details of religious and ethnic associations, many of which had been encouraged to form by the BME team, in order to access BME grants. Consequently, half of the members of the group were categorised as 'BME' and half as 'white British'.

Equally, the aesthetic work of the project initially reproduced normative understandings about the value of diversity. For instance, I asked the trainer to introduce multicultural designs and to include training on painting on different skin tones and communicating across language barriers. Trainees were encouraged to volunteer at events organised as part of the 'Kensington Cultural Calendar', a series of deliberate multicultural events, and members identified on the basis of ethnic background were asked to organise social events at which they could present and celebrate 'their culture'. The outline for the project seemed very similar to multicultural projects occurring around Britain; yet it developed beyond its initial remit in ways that muddled the simplicity of this multicultural paradigm and that were linked to the particular entanglements of diverse social actors operating and shaping this historically situated social space.

For instance, one challenge to the multicultural model came from the face-painting trainer. Differently to the BME outreach worker and myself, she described herself as of working-class background. She was passionate about face-painting as a means of artistic expression, as a vehicle to enrich social interaction, and also for individuals and groups to generate income; she was sceptical of national top-down rhetoric of multiculturalism. A number of Kensington residents recruited to the project who came from a similar background shared her scepticism and overtly challenged the elite multicultural focus of the project that positioned people of white, working class background as 'non-cultural' and 'non-ethnic'.

In contrast to dominant models of cultural policy delivered by middle-class cultural workers in the city-

centre, the trainer had a non-hierarchical approach to her cultural work and encouraged me to take part in the training as an equal alongside 'members of the community'. As I did so, I became increasingly critical of the ways in which this form of managed multiculturalism could ignore shared commonalities in people's everyday lives. Further, the BME outreach worker, face-painting trainer and myself shared similar disregard for the idea of a 'bounded neighbourhood' that dominated policy making within the regeneration agency. Where possible, we used personal and professional networks to arrange opportunities for face-painters to take part in major city-centre cultural events, including those organised as part of the ECOC. This experience was unusual: most people living in impoverished neighbourhoods felt excluded from city-centre cultural activities, if they knew about them at all (Impacts08 2008).

Another dimension of the project, influenced by (neo-liberal) ideas of sustainability, economic inclusion, and empowerment circulating within the voluntary and community sectors in the UK, was that all participants were invited to take part in 'non-aesthetic' activities as members of a voluntary face-painting association. Opportunities were provided to partake in committee meetings and training provided in the administration of voluntary associations and developing as a professional face-painter. Some made use of these opportunities to participate in other associations and local politics, a few set up small businesses, others painted within private or personal webs of relations that extended beyond the neighbourhood.

This local cultural project, produced at the intersection of various scales and domains of knowledge, briefly

created new opportunities for participating in cultural, social and economic networks. However, the effects should not be exaggerated. In this cash-strapped city, the drive to attract capital and rebrand Liverpool as a city capable of hosting 'world-class', 'professional' cultural events around the time of the ECOC dislodged the cultural output of 'amateurs', volunteers, and those living in marginalised neighbourhoods from the vision of the cultural and economic future of Liverpool. When I returned to the field in 2012, the face-painting association had dissolved due to the lack of resources in the city in the wake of the 2008 financial crisis, and due to the conclusion of the nationally-funded regeneration programme.

In the former Kensington Regeneration area, streets of 'working-class' housing had been bulldozed as part of the 'regeneration', while reconstruction efforts stalled as Kensington became displaced from urban repositioning strategies. In the desperate competition for any source of income in what remains one of the poorest local administrations in the country, public investment in festivals and aesthetic institutions was increasingly aligned with a major private sector investor wishing to develop the north of the city. As public services faced huge cuts, the BME workers left the city. With little institutional support in this part of the city, discourses of difference had disappeared and 'culture' had become a luxury in what is still one of the most economically-deprived parts of the city. Third-sector organisations struggling to deal with the growing hardships produced by austerity policies told me that they *'didn't do culture any more'*.

Enacting culture and social difference in Saint-Mauront

The aesthetic philosophy behind the choir was linked to counter-culture ideas that emerged in the 1970s. Reflecting increasing rhetorical value accorded to 'working-class' and culturally diverse aesthetic forms, the organisation's promotional material described the cultural work of the organisation as *'raising marginal forms of creative expression to the ranks of works of art'*. Directors contrasted their own cultural production with that of elite city-centre institutions, summed up as *'making art differently'* because of their proximity *'with residents'*.

Like many others who accessed cultural funding via PDLV since the 1990s, and notwithstanding the social objectives of PDLV, the artistic work of this arts organisation was couched in terms of 'artistic excellence' and the directors defended the social status of 'the artist', reflecting a broader hierarchy of cultural values. Cultural workers overtly rejected associating their work with political or social objectives, reflecting a markedly different rhetorical schema than the instrumentalist approach that I had been trained to develop when working as a BME worker in Liverpool.

Nonetheless, the parameters of the project were strongly influenced by socio-spatial categorisations defined by different layers of the state, reflecting trends visible elsewhere in creative city policies (Mayer 2013), as counter-cultural actors learn the language and skills demanded by public funders and become intermediaries between 'the state' and 'the population'. Most notably, and I observed this in other cultural projects as well, the geographical scope of the choir was tightly

delimited by the state-defined category of '*sensitive quartiers*' and people living in sensitive quartiers were often described as being far from culture, living segregated and bounded lives.

It is of note that despite the increasing ethnicisation of urban social problems in France, the cultural workers involved in the choir and in other elite-led cultural organisations I observed expressed a visceral aversion to the type of ethnic profiling I had practiced in Kensington. Influenced by a belief in the value of *laïcité*, participants were recruited on grounds of their identity as '*habitant*' and the arts organisation relied on existing institutional networks to recruit participants, in ways that tended to reinforce existing socio-spatial relations.

In the case of the choir, the partner institution was a welfare-rights organisation run by long-term residents of Saint-Mauront and La Belle de Mai. Responsible for recruitment, members of the welfare-rights organisation had come to see the choir as 'their' social space and tended to invite 'people like them'. Notions of 'people like them' were shaped strongly by ties of neighbourhood proximity, inflected with exclusionary narratives of ethno-cultural difference that circulated across the city and the country. Consequently, despite taking place in a part of the city where nearly twenty per cent of the population was foreign-born, and an even greater number of visible migrant backgrounds, choir members were almost exclusively white French of European background.

The dominant understandings of the choir were inflected with hierarchical understandings of aesthetic knowledge whereby social elites were able to objectify 'ordinary culture' and judge what constitutes art (Bennett 2013). In the choir, this initially involved

cultural workers working with choir members – a small group of people (predominantly women) – to share stories and songs, which were then turned into performances enacted in diverse locations within Saint-Mauront. Yet alternative – sometimes subordinate – value systems challenged this framework, eventually leading to the project's demise.

For example, influenced by the dominant French understanding whereby 'culture' is understood as an elite realm, most choir members denied that they did anything 'cultural'. The choir was seen as 'a pastime' and 'relaxation' and many came looking for respite from domestic chores, care work, and difficult personal social relations. After three years, this perceived lack of engagement by the participants in the 'aesthetic' dimension of the project led to the artistic association's decision to discontinue the choir. However, the organisation behind the choir had less artistic freedom in 2012 than they did in 1992.

I observed increasing disillusionment from PDLV managers in the ability of 'art, for art's sake' to achieve social inclusion. This disenchantment had been heightened by the ways in which the ECOC project had been implemented in Marseilles. At a time when funding for public services was decreasing more generally, the focus on the city-centre (80 per cent of the new infrastructure was in the Euromed redevelopment zone) at the expense of people living in impoverished neighbourhoods was regularly critiqued. Thus, when key members of the choir lobbied among local decision-makers for the singing project to continue, and defended their case in social rather than cultural terms, the arts organisation found that their subsequent PDLV funding in this part of the city was dependent on the choir's continuation.

The choir ran for another two years, albeit it with reduced engagement by the artistic directors. When I joined the choir in 2010, certain aesthetic directions occasionally filtered down to the group. For instance, we were told on one occasion that the theme of the choir for that semester was to be '*voyage*' (travel). We were never informed why; I assumed this was influenced by objectives of funders to promote social cohesion and positive attitudes to diversity.

In 2013, Marseilles' year as ECOC, in line with other 'ordinary' social and cultural activities taking place in marginalised parts of the city, funding for the choir was discontinued. Marseilles' ECOC has not featured thus far for a particular reason. More so than Liverpool, the highly-centralised project seemed very distant from the lives of the 'ordinary people' with whom I was carrying out my fieldwork, with few opportunities for 'ordinary people' to participate as cultural producers (Euréval 2014). Further, across the city neighbourhood festivals and social and cultural institutions saw budget cuts, as the ECOC project sucked in local government resources at a time of state-funding reduced as part of broader restructuring and downsizing of public services.

In this context, the fact that cultural interventions continued to be included in elite visions and policies for the area known as Saint-Mauront needs to be tied into the neighbourhood's proximity to the state-led gentrification associated with Euromed II and quarter's increasing association with the slowly-gentrifying neighbour area of the Belle de Mai. Each time I return to Saint-Mauront, another building has been knocked down as part of the national urban renewal scheme seeking to increase 'social diversity' in the area. Some of the former choir members regularly talked about how

as well as changing the 'face' of Saint-Mauront, '*they*' want to change the population. Though, in parallel, and against the backdrop of a growing backlash against diversity in France, there remains a deep-seated commitment to the importance of 'cultural diversity' among certain urban managers, and certain urban dwellers, elite cultural workers, and urban operators operating in the area remain committed to addressing socio-economic and cultural exclusion and continue to support multi-cultural, multi-ethnic initiatives among the 'ordinary urban dwellers', resonating the work undertaken by the BME team in Kensington Regeneration.

Comparative advantages

I started this paper by arguing that representation, production and experience of place and culture are shaped by the intersection of multi-scalar relations of power. The purpose was to put forward a framework to theorise similarities and differences in the ways in which 'culture' is enacted in cities, and to offer examples of how an ethnographic and comparative approach can help make sense of the complexity of contemporary urban transformations. Rather than essentialising place and culture (that is, assuming that culture means the same thing across the EU and that the ECOC programme operates similarly throughout), the purpose here was to comparatively investigate the mechanisms through which understandings and experiences of place, culture, and cultural diversity were produced.

Throughout this article, the importance of thinking comparatively and relationally *within* and *across* space-

time has been stressed, something of particular significance given the increasing socio-spatial fragmentation that characterises contemporary forms of urban transformation. I argued that making sense of the similarities and differences within cultural policies and practices in Kensington and Saint-Mauront is problematic if they are not placed in relation to the shifting geometries of urban place-making.

In Saint-Mauront and Kensington, top-down cultural-inflected policies emerged on the scene at different times, but in both instances they were reinforced as the pathways of these historically marginalised and economically impoverished neighbourhoods intersected with the growing neoliberal orthodoxy of urban planning, embodied by the respective ECOC programmes in Liverpool and Marseilles. In the two cases, top-down cultural policies created spaces for middle-class cultural workers to access funding to carry out interventions within impoverished areas in both cities. Broadly speaking, elite cultural work served to legitimise top-down urban change that resulted in the displacement of large swathes of the population and that constituted certain urban dwellers as lacking culture. As such, this study corroborates literature that describes patterns of neoliberal cultural development that prioritises middle-class cultural consumption in city-centres at the expense of marginalised people and subordinate cultural forms.

Yet the strength of ethnographic fieldwork is that it describes the sometimes-unexpected outcomes of these processes. In both areas, neoliberal (multi)cultural policies were contested, negotiated, or appropriated – with more or less success. These processes were inflected by local social histories and national political reper-

toires. For instance, in Saint-Mauront the ethnicisation of aesthetic and social relations was opposed by middle-class cultural workers, who were influenced by French republicanism and hierarchical notions of artistic excellence. This led to colour-blind recruitment practices that resulted in *de facto* exclusion of ethnically-marked others, while reinforcing socio-spatial domination of '*les habitants*'. In Kensington, middle-class urban development workers drew on a national rhetoric of community cohesion and cultural diversity. The latter generated certain opportunities for 'minorities' to be included in city and culture-making, challenging briefly historic patterns of racialised exclusion in the city (though in unequal relations of power). Such policies were contested by urban residents (including some urban decision-makers) who rejected a version of multiculturalism that marked certain people and forms of cultural expression in Liverpool as a-cultural.

Finally, this comparative framework draws attention to the uneven pattern of contemporary patterns of urban development. As national austerity policies reshaped the political landscape of cities in the UK, Kensington was no longer included in plans to reposition Liverpool. In this city with little historical commitment to culture, experiments with (multi)cultural policy in Kensington proved to have weak foundations. Conversely, in Saint-Mauront the cultural turn continues, despite the city's – and the neighbourhood's – on-going economic precarity, underpinned by urban repositioning and gentrification strategies financed by central government.

The distinctive trajectories of the urban cultural turn in Kensington and Saint-Mauront underscore the need for considering multi-scalar relations of power

when exploring the construction of urban places. Comparing these case-studies within a multi-scalar framework adds to the corpus of critical studies on the increasing instrumentalisation of 'culture' to sell cities and manage urban populations across Europe, while teasing out local variations in the ways in which (multi) cultural policies materialise in relationally-situated places. Urban anthropology is far from being the only discipline capable of untangling such trends. However, given the enormous complexity of contemporary urban change, anthropological insights and ethnographic sensitivity have real value for highlighting general trends in ways that do not ignore the specificities and messiness of situated city-making.

E-mail: clairebullen@gmail.com

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge the support of the Cultural Policy Research Award 2010, an initiative of the European Cultural Foundation (ECF) and the Riksbankens Jubileumsfond, managed by the European Network of Cultural Management Administration Training Centres (ENCATC). I am also very grateful to Heather Bullen, the editorial team at *Etnofoor* and two reviewers for their help in tightening up my arguments.

Notes

- 1 There is not enough space to list all the literature here. Mumford (1940 [1938]) and Zukin (1995) offer perspectives from each end of this century of research.
- 2 For a discussion of the utility of conceptualising cities within multi-scalar relations of power see Glick Schiller and Çağlar (2011).
- 3 I borrow the notion of 'relative location' from Green (2014).
- 4 The expert chosen in Liverpool was a British businessman based in London with international experience of organising 'mega-events'. In Marseilles, it was an elite civil servant based in Paris, who formerly worked for the French cultural ministry. As I develop elsewhere, this reflects well the different national repertoires underpinning both bids.
- 5 I was recruited in 2004 to help with this work.

References

- Akan, Murat
2009 Laïcité and Multiculturalism: The Stasi Report in Context. *The British Journal of Sociology* 60(2): 237-256.
- Allen, Chris
2008 *Housing Market Renewal and Social Class*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Ang, Ien
2005 The Predicament of Diversity: Multiculturalism in Practice at the Art Museum. *Ethnicities* 5(3): 305-320.
- Belchem, John
2000 *Merseypride: Essays in Liverpool Exceptionalism*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.
- Bennett, Tony
2013 *Making Culture, Changing Society*. Abingdon: Routledge.

- Bertoncello, Brigitte and Rachel Rodrigues-Malta
 2003 Marseille versus Euroméditerranée. *Annales de Géographie* 632(112) : 424-436.
- Bianchini, Franco and Michael Parkinson
 1993 *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Biass, Sophie and Jean-Louis Fabiani
 2011 Marseille, a City beyond Distinction. *Nottingham French Studies* 50(1): 83-94.
- Binnie, Jon and Beverley Skeggs
 2004 Cosmopolitan Knowledge and the Production and Consumption of Sexualized Space: Manchester's Gay Village. *The Sociological Review* 52(1): 39-61.
- Brenner, Neil
 2011 The Urban Question and the Scale Question: Some Conceptual Clarifications. In: N. Glick Schiller and A. Çağlar (eds.), *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. Pp. 23-41.
- Brown, Jacqueline N.
 2005 *Dropping Anchor, Setting Sail: Geographies of Race in Black Liverpool*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Clay, David
 2008 The Changing Face of Community Participation: The Liverpool Black Experience. *Participatory Learning and Action* 58: 88-90.
- Cohen, Sara
 2007 *Decline, Renewal and the City in Popular Music Culture: Beyond the Beatles*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Couch, Chris
 2008 Housing Renewal and the Community in a Shrinking City: Two Recent Books on Liverpool – A Review Article. *Town Planning Review* 79(6): 695-704.
- da Col, Giovanni
 2015 Incomplete Regularities: Comparison, Values, Personhood. *Hau: Journal of Ethnographic Theory* 5(1): 1-7.
- Dell'Umbria, Alèssi
 2006 *Histoire Universelle de Marseille. De l'An Mil à l'An Deux Mille*. Marseille: Agone.
- Dikeç, Mustafa
 2006 Two Decades of French Urban Policy: From Social Development of Neighbourhoods to the Republican Penal State. *Antipode* 38(1): 59-81.
- Euréal
 2014 Impact Assessment for Marseille-Provence 2013, European Capital of Culture. MP2013 Association, Euréal, CCI Marseille Provence, Bouche-du-Rhône's Tourism.
- Fitzpatrick, Susan
 2009 Between Rhetoric and Reality. *Variant* 36: 20-24.
- Gilroy, Paul
 2004 *After Empire: Melancholia or Convivial Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Giroud, Matthieu and Vincent Veschambre
 2013 Capitale Européenne de la Culture 2013: Analyse Comparative des Candidatures Françaises. In: G. Saez and J.P. Saez (eds.), *Les Nouveaux Enjeux du Politiques Culturelles. Dynamiques Européennes*. Paris: La Découverte. Pp. 239-254.
- Glick Schiller, Nina
 2012 A Comparative Relative Perspective on the Relationship between Migrants and Cities. *Urban Geography* 33(6): 879-903.
- Glick Schiller, Nina and Ayse Çağlar (eds.)
 2011 *Locating Migration: Rescaling Cities and Migrants*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

- Green, Sarah F.
2014 Money Frontiers: The Relative Location of Euros, Turkish Lira and Gold Sovereigns in the Aegean. In: P. Harvey, E. Casella, G. Evans, H. Knox, E. McLean, C. Silva, N. Thornburn and K. Woodward (eds.), *Objects and Materials: A Routledge Companion*. London: Routledge. Pp. 286-308.
- Griffiths, Ron
2006 City/Culture Discourses: Evidence from the Competition to Select the European Capital of Culture 2008. *European Planning Studies* 14(4): 415-430.
- Griffiths, Ron, Keith Bassett and Ian Smith
2003 Capitalising on Culture: Cities and the Changing Landscape of Cultural Policy. *Policy and Politics* 31(2): 153-69.
- Gupta, Ankil and James Ferguson
1992 Beyond "Culture": Space, Identity, and the Politics of Difference. *Cultural Anthropology* 7(1): 6-23.
- Herzfeld, Michael
2004 *The Body Impolitic: Artisans and Artifice in the Global Hierarchy of Value*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Holmes, Douglas R.
2000 *Integral Europe: Fast-capitalism, Multiculturalism, Neofascism*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Impacts08
2008 Neighbourhood Impacts. A Longitudinal Research Study into the Impact of The Liverpool European Capital of Culture on Local Residents Liverpool: Impacts 08.
- Ingram, Mark
1998 A Nationalist Turn in French Cultural Policy. *The French Review* 71(5): 797-808.
- Kapferer, Bruce
2015 Introduction. In the Event: Toward an Anthropology of Generic Moments. In: L. Meinert and B. Kapferer (eds.), *In the Event: Toward an Anthropology of Generic Moments*. New York: Berghahn Books. Pp. 1-18.
- Landry, Charles and Franco Bianchini
1995 *The Creative City: DEMOS*.
Lorente, Pedro (ed.)
1996 *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*. Leicester: University of Leicester.
- Low, Setha
1996 Spatializing Culture: The Social Production and Social Construction of Public Space in Costa Rica. *American Ethnologist* 23(4): 861-879.
- Massey, Doreen
2005 *For Space*. London: Sage.
- Mayer, Margit
2013 First World Urban Activism. *City* 17(1): 5-19.
- Mazzela, Sylvie
1995 Le Quartier Belsunce: Marseille, les Immigrés dans les Traces de la Ville Bourgeoise. *Les Annales de la Recherche Urbaine, Plan Urbanisme - Construction - Architecture. Patrimoine et Modernité* 72(1): 119-125.
- Meegan, Richard
2003 Urban Regeneration, Politics and Social Cohesion: The Liverpool Case. In: R. Munck (ed.), *Reinventing the City? Liverpool in a Comparative Perspective*. Chimmenham: Liverpool University Press. Pp. 53-79.
- Mumford, Lewis
1940 [1938] *The Culture of Cities*. London: Secker and Warburg Publishers.
- Parkinson, Michael
1985 *Liverpool on the Brink*. Cambridge: Policy Journals.
- Patel, Kiren K. (ed.)
2013 *The Cultural Politics of Europe: European Capitals of Culture and European Union since the 1980s*. New York: Routledge.

- Peck, Jamie
 2011 Creative Moments: Working Culture, through Municipal Socialism and Neoliberal Urbanism. In: E. McCann and K. Ward (eds.), *Mobile Urbanism: Cities and Policymaking in the Global Age*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. Pp. 41-70.
- 2005 Struggling with the Creative Class. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 29(4): 740-770.
- Peraldi, Michel and Michel Samson.
 2005 *Gouverner Marseille. Enquête sur les Mondes Politiques Marseillais*. Paris: La Découverte.
- Smith, Neil
 1992 Geography, Difference and the Politics of Scale. In: J. Doherty, E. Graham and M. Malek (eds.), *Postmodernism and the Social Sciences*. Basingstoke and London: Macmillan. Pp. 57-79.
- Stolcke, Verena
 1995 Talking Culture: New Boundaries, New Rhetorics of Exclusion in Europe. *Current Anthropology* 36(1): 1-24.
- Suzanne, Giles
 2007 La Controverse du Cosmopolitisme Marseillais (Enquête). *Terrains et Travaux* 2(13): 149-168.
- Tilly, Charles
 1984 *Big Structures, Large Processes, Huge Comparisons*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Tissot, Sophie
 2006 Y a-t-il un «Problème des Quartiers Sensibles»? Retour sur une Catégorie d'Action Publique. *French Politics, Culture and Society* 24(3): 42-57.
- Urfalino, Philippe
 2010 *L'Invention de la Politique Culturelle*. Paris : Hachette.
- Vertovec, Steve (ed.)
 2010 *Anthropology of Migration and Multiculturalism: New Directions*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Wacquant, Loic
 2008 *Urban Outcasts: A Comparative Sociology of Advanced Marginality*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Ward, Kevin
 2010 Towards a Relational Comparative Approach to the Study of Cities. *Progress in Human Geography* 34(4): 471-487.
- Wilks-Heeg, Stuart
 2003 From World City to Pariah City? Liverpool and the Global Economy, 1850 -2000. In: R. Munch (ed.), *Reinventing the City? Liverpool in Comparative Perspective*. Chippenham: Liverpool University Press. Pp. 36-52.
- Wimmer, Andreas and Nina Glick Schiller
 2003 Methodological Nationalism, The Social Sciences, and the Study of Migration: An Essay in Historical Epistemology. *International Migration Review* 37(3): 576-610.
- Zukin, Sharon
 1995 *The Cultures of Cities*. Oxford: Blackwell.