

The Urban Core as Cultural Sticky Place

Ann Markusen

Professor and Fesler-Lampert Chair in Urban and Regional Affairs

Director, Project on Regional and Industrial Economics

Humphrey Institute of Public Affairs

University of Minnesota

Minneapolis, MN 55455 USA

markusen@umn.edu

<http://www.hhh.umn.edu/projects/prie/>

2007

Forthcoming in Dietrich Henckel, Elke Pahl-Weber, & Benjamin Herkommer, eds. *Time Space Places*. Berlin: Peter Lang Verlag.

Introduction

Most analyses of the urban core stress the role of firms and entire industries in abandoning central locations for dispersed ones. Only those with strong ties to government or for whom face-to-face specialized interchanges matter remain tied to the core. This line of reasoning ignores the fact that workers are also urban actors and may make residential location decisions independent of firms. In this paper, I argue that one source of contemporary urban core stability and vitality is the commitments of certain groups of workers to work and live there. I explore this theme by looking at artists as a case study.

Most geographers and economists assume that it is firm location decisions that matter and that workers move to fill the jobs created by firms. I argue that many groups of workers are able to choose their locations independently of firms, who then must take differential labor quality and accessibility into account in making their location decisions. Workers' preferences can be inferred by studying them as members of occupational groups, just as we study firm behavior by grouping them as members of industries. In the first part of the paper, I present this occupational approach and introduce artists as a case study.

Artists exhibit very high levels of self-employment, giving them latitude to locate semi-independently of firms. In the US, artists gravitate strongly to larger metropolitan areas, and within them, to urban cores. Although some of this concentration can be explained by the presence of cultural industries, much of it cannot. Apart from the largest cities, artists congregate in some mid-sized urban cores and not others, drawn by a series of networking opportunities and amenities, including vacant historic and industrial buildings that offer ample artistic workspace in settings with cache. While gentrification processes may be a problematic counterpart of artistic enclaves, often this process is overstated, while the role of artists in stabilizing communities, diminishing crime rates and enlivening political discourse is understated.

I. The Urban Core as Sticky Place

Rapid transnational economic integration has undermined the traditional economic base of many cities. In the past twenty years, especially given devolution and the abandonment of central government regional policy in many countries, cities all over the globe have had to take on greater responsibility for strategizing and implementing economic development activities to provide jobs and incomes for their residents. Fashioning economic development policy is a difficult new project for cities emerging from centuries of growth, often rapid. Most traditional urban planning activities involve accommodating growth by building infrastructure, regulating land use and providing housing, and the tools cities had at their disposal were relatively powerful.

Economic development, especially in a deregulatory environment, is a much more daunting task. Not only are certain industries imploding and their redundant land, buildings and workers an adjustment problem, but economic developers have much weaker tools at their disposal. They have few regulatory powers and must rely on marketing and often costly incentives as ways of home-growing, attracting and retaining private sector establishments. They must also compete with cities within their nation and abroad that offer similar incentives and perhaps lower business costs or better access to markets. At the same time, the fringes of metropolitan areas are successfully competing for economic functions that previously took place in the core.

Recent strategies for cities experiencing structural change in their economies rely heavily on industrial targeting. Targeting requires that a city or region understand its competitive advantages and use incentives to play to these strengths, chiefly by targeting employers in these industries and related clusters. Targeting is quite controversial (Buss, 1999; Finkle, 1999; Wiewel, 1999), but it is heavily used and is central to the recent spate of cluster strategies. Often, the distinction between what is good for the region and what works for the core is not clearly made—high tech activity, for instance, is remarkably suburban in its spatial orientation and may not contribute much at all to the core of a city promoting it.

In what follows, I explore the potential for core cities to use targeting as a means of reshaping its employment structure. I begin by asking what advantages the urban core still possesses as a center for economic activity—what makes it a sticky place in slippery space (Markusen, 1996)? What activities seem to cleave to the urban core despite the accelerated obliteration of the friction of distance? I argue that especially for the urban core, industrial targeting is inadequate, because it is so expensive and because it focuses on firms as decision-makers, many of which are caught up in the dispersal process. Cities should also engage in occupational targeting, recognizing that many skilled workers have some discretion about where they will live and work and that some show strong preferences for the urban core. I then use a case study of artists in the US to show how this particular occupational group is strongly drawn to the urban core and why, and show how cities can use their influence over space to enhance the prospects for artistic enclaves in their urban core.

II. Core City Economic Potential

In an increasingly integrated world market, each locality must work harder to find and fashion its own niches – the activities in which it has a comparative advantage. It is in these sectors and occupations that civic and public sector leaders can anticipate a substantial economic development dividend if they invest their resources well. To do this in the longer run, such activities have to be “sticky” – they have to be deeply anchored in particular places so that longer run returns are assured (Markusen, 1996). Core cities – the inner areas of larger metropolitan areas that have lost many of their traditional industrial sectors to competition from suburbs, smaller cities or regions elsewhere in the world – face this need in a particularly pressing way. What economic activities can bring work and prosperity to the urban core?

I focus on seeing regional economies not just as assemblages firms in particular industries (finance, business services, manufacturing and so on), but also as agglomerations of human capital and skill, captured in occupational profiles (Thompson and Thompson, 1985; Markusen, 2004; Markusen and Schrock, 2005). I have used this framework to explore the existing distribution of occupational specializations across metropolitan areas in the US. I find that certain occupations are most apt to root in larger metropolitan areas, and within them, in the urban core, where they comprise a disproportional share of the area workforce. The occupations of computer

expert, mathematician, lawyer, business and financial operations specialist, artist/designer/entertainer, media worker, architect, engineer, and life/physical/social scientist are over-represented in the US in metropolitan areas with labor forces of 1 million or more (Table 1). This table shows that smaller cities excel only in manufacturing operations – in the US, manufacturing work has become highly de-urbanized. In similar industry-based studies, scholars find that government, education, finance, advertising, architecture/design, media, hospitals and cultural industries are highly urban core-centric.

How can urban core advocates and policymakers work from these general insights to a more precise understanding of their comparative advantages and how to nourish them? First, developing a view of within-metropolitan distribution of activity and dynamics is important. Studies in the US have found that some large metro-oriented jobs and industries, especially high technology, are chiefly suburban-oriented. They are largely new sectors and occupations in which employers prefer suburban campuses and employees prefer to live there as well. But others are quite core-centric, among them law, finance, media, marketing and cultural activities.

Second, an efficient and effective strategy can only be built on a substantive understanding of particular sectors and occupations. Why do firms and workers prefer to operate and live in the core versus other places? What costs and amenities and networking possibilities anchor them there? What are the challenges from other locations – either other core cities or other types of locales? What public sector interventions might help make them more sticky and provide something they cannot do for themselves?

In what follows, I use the case of artists, a group with extraordinary location discretion, to probe to what extent they are core-oriented and sticky in their spatial orientation and why.

Table 1. Occupational Specialization by Metro Size Class, United States, 2000

Occupational Group	All MSAs	4m+	1-4m	500k-1m	250-500k	<250k
Computer and Mathematical	1.17	1.05	1.56	1.06	0.84	0.75
Legal	1.15	1.47	1.26	1.06	1.02	0.84
Business and Financial Operations	1.12	1.26	1.23	1.10	0.98	0.85
Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, and Media	1.09	1.87	1.05	0.97	0.95	0.83
Architecture and Engineering	1.09	0.79	1.36	0.96	0.98	0.96
Life, Physical, and Social Science	1.05	0.96	1.26	0.95	0.89	0.92
Office and Administrative Support	1.04	1.14	1.04	1.06	1.01	0.95
Management	1.04	1.09	1.11	0.97	0.97	0.95
Protective Service	1.02	1.30	0.97	1.06	0.93	0.91
Healthcare Practitioners and Technical	1.01	0.98	0.95	0.99	1.11	1.10
Sales and Related	1.00	0.92	1.01	1.03	1.01	1.02
Personal Care and Service	1.00	1.13	0.99	0.98	0.97	1.00
Building and Grounds Cleaning, Maintenance	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.97	1.03	0.98
Community and Social Services	0.98	1.20	0.87	0.94	1.05	1.06
Construction and Extraction	0.97	0.74	1.01	0.98	1.01	1.05
Food Preparation and Serving Related	0.96	0.75	0.94	1.00	1.03	1.11
Installation, Maintenance, and Repair	0.96	0.79	0.95	1.00	1.01	1.04
Education, Training, and Library	0.96	1.01	0.92	0.90	0.96	1.11
Healthcare Support	0.96	1.00	0.86	0.95	1.04	1.12
Transportation and Material Moving	0.95	0.95	0.90	1.01	0.97	0.96
Production	0.91	0.95	0.81	0.94	0.97	1.01
Farming, Fishing, and Forestry	0.68	0.17	0.31	0.32	1.55	2.02

Source: Calculated from Bureau of Labor Statistics, Occupational Employment Statistics
Specializations shown as location quotients. Those in excess of 1.20 in bold.

III. Artists as Case Study

The case of artists offers an exceptional opportunity to look at an occupational group that heavily favors core cities, semi-independently of job offers from core industries. Artists are much more apt to be self-employed than most other occupations in the economy – in the US, 45% of artists are self-employed versus 8% of the workforce as a whole (Table 2). Because they are self-employed, they are freer to choose a location to live and work that is detached from employers' location.

Table 2. Self employment trends, artistic occupations, 2002

Occupational Title	Total Employed	Self-employed	% Self-employed	Primary job	Secondary job
Visual artists	307,254	155,159	50%	129,109	26,050
Artists and related workers	148,682	80,022	54%	70,731	9,291
Arts directors	50,664	27,139	54%	23,988	3,151
Fine artists: painters, sculptors, illustrators	23,192	12,866	55%	11,372	1,494
Multi-media artists & animators	74,826	40,017	53%	35,371	4,646
Photographers	130,442	68,432	52%	54,024	14,408
Camera operators, TV/video/motion picture	28,130	6,705	24%	4,354	2,351
Performing artists	176,463	42,724	24%	38,174	4,550
Actors	63,033	10,992	17%	9,754	1,238
Producers and directors	76,125	24,995	33%	21,683	3,312
Dancers & choreographers	37,305	6,737	18%	6,737	0
Dancers	19,992	3,854	19%	3,854	0
Choreographers	17,313	2,883	17%	2,883	0
Musicians, singers and related	215,425	83,121	39%	56,770	26,351
Music directors & composers	54,271	21,354	39%	14,584	6,770
Musicians & singers	161,154	61,767	38%	42,186	19,581
Writers & authors	138,980	94,377	68%	80,509	13,868
Total, arts occupations	838,122	375,381	45%	304,562	70,819

Source: Bureau of Labor Statistics, National Industry-Occupation Employment Matrix

<http://www.bls.gov/emp/empoils.htm>

Why might artists favor core areas of large metropolitan regions (Markusen and Schrock, 2006)? First, sheer size may matter. Residents who love big core cities may display a higher penchant for arts consumption, and producers may enjoy increasing returns to scale, especially in art forms such as the opera. Second, the demand for artistic activity from residents may be higher in the traditional elite cities like New York, Philadelphia, Boston, Chicago, San Francisco and Los Angeles where people with high, unearned (i.e. capital) income cluster and patronize the arts through philanthropy, attendance and collecting. Third, certain large city centric industries, such as advertising and media, may form a significant source of demand and income for artists. Fourth, artists and art spaces attract tourists, generating urban income flows that feed back into artists' livelihoods (Judd, 1999). Fifth, synergies among different types of artistic activity may create agglomerative tendencies that enhance the draw of large, traditional city centers (Blau, 1989). Such synergies can be informal as well as organizational; artists are highly networked with other artists and with workers in other sectors (Becker, 1982). Sixth, artists may be drawn to the amenities offered by a plethora of cultural institutions in, and the diversity and innovativeness of, the largest cities (Florida, 2002; Clark, 2004.)

Finally, the impact of these factors may be magnified by the behavior of artists themselves, who are more likely to patronize other artistic endeavors than any other group.

Do artists favor larger cities, and within them, core areas? In general, yes. In the US, artists comprise a much larger share of the labor force in the three arts super-cities – Los Angeles, New York, San Francisco – than in the nation as a whole (Table 3). However, the presence of artists is not fully explained by metro size or growth rates – other very large metro areas such as Chicago and Philadelphia have artistic concentration ratios at or near average, while in some of the fastest growth metros – Dallas, Phoenix, Denver – they are below average. Some “second-tier” metros (Washington DC, Seattle, Boston, Minneapolis/St. Paul, San Diego and Miami) have relatively high concentrations, while other older industrial cities and newer sunbelt metros do not. Artists gravitate residentially towards core cities within metro areas. In the Twin Cities metro area, artists are heavily concentrated in the two core cities – Minneapolis and St. Paul, and within each, they are concentrated in inner city precincts (Figure 1).

In extensive interviews with artists about why they chose to move to or stay in the region, we found that amenities (including the parks, alternative health care, a progressive political culture), strong regional foundation support for the arts, networking and marketing possibilities, the presence of artist-employing industries (e.g. publishing) and an unusual number of artists’ centers and decentralized performing arts and artists studio and live-work spaces were most important (Markusen and King, 2003; Markusen and Johnson, 2006). There were several factors that countered this tendency. The higher cost of housing and workspace in cities and preferences for a slower pace of life and greater access to nature drove some artists to prefer smaller towns and rural locations. To some extent, the proliferation of digital technologies as ways of producing and distributing art work favored the latter.

IV. Artist-centric Spaces for Cities

This characterization of artistic work and spatial preferences helps us think about what core city strategies might attract and hold this important occupational group. In our intensive examination of artists in the Twin Cities, involving more than 200 interviews, we have concluded that

enhancing artistic space is a key way that urban core leaders can nurture a vibrant cultural economy (Markusen and Johnson, 2006). Most cultural

Table 3. Artistic Concentrations for the Top 29 U.S. Metro Areas by Employment, 2000

	Total	Performing Artists	Visual Artists	Authors	Musicians
Los Angeles, CA	2.99	5.44	2.34	2.71	1.95
New York, NY-NJ	2.52	3.71	2.01	2.99	1.85
San Francisco-Oakland, CA	1.82	1.85	1.83	2.51	1.12
ALL 29 METROS	1.34	1.60	1.26	1.45	1.12
Washington, DC-MD-VA-WV	1.36	1.51	1.01	2.27	1.08
Seattle, WA	1.33	1.15	1.48	1.48	1.06
Boston, MA-NH	1.27	1.24	1.02	2.00	1.15
Orange County, CA	1.18	1.21	1.36	0.92	0.98
Minneapolis-St. Paul, MN-WI	1.16	1.12	1.10	1.33	1.16
San Diego, CA	1.15	0.90	1.27	1.10	1.25
Miami, FL	1.15	1.48	1.05	0.82	1.28
Portland, OR-WA	1.09	1.12	0.99	1.50	0.87
Atlanta, GA	1.08	1.05	1.11	0.97	1.15
Baltimore, MD	1.08	0.96	1.10	0.92	1.30
Chicago, IL	1.04	0.83	1.14	1.27	0.84
Newark, NJ	1.02	1.07	0.97	1.24	0.83
US AVERAGE	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Dallas, TX	0.99	1.08	1.11	0.73	0.87
Philadelphia, PA-NJ	0.96	0.90	1.04	0.94	0.88
Phoenix, AZ	0.96	0.70	1.13	0.88	0.94
Nassau-Suffolk, NY	0.93	0.83	1.10	0.84	0.76
Kansas City, MO-KS	0.90	0.59	1.16	0.82	0.76
Denver, CO	0.90	1.08	0.82	0.98	0.79
Tampa-St. Petersburg, FL	0.89	0.83	0.89	0.76	1.08
San Jose, CA	0.84	0.75	0.95	0.95	0.61
Cleveland, OH	0.79	0.61	0.79	0.74	1.05
Riverside-San Bernardino, CA	0.77	0.79	0.84	0.61	0.76
Pittsburgh, PA	0.76	0.63	0.74	0.79	0.91
Houston, TX	0.74	0.65	0.75	0.66	0.91
Detroit, MI	0.74	0.61	0.82	0.73	0.74
St. Louis, MO-IL	0.71	0.52	0.79	0.67	0.80

Sources: Census 2000 5% PUMS dataset, Integrated Public Use Microdata Sample, Minnesota Population Center, University of Minnesota.

(Figure 1. Artists in the Twin Cities Metropolitan Region Labor Force here)

policymakers have little experience with urban planning and economic development strategies and tend to think organizationally, not in terms of

space and place. It is difficult from them to see and appreciate the role of dedicated spaces for artists in urban economic revitalization.

Our prescriptions for artistic space enhancement are of two types. First, we advocate a decentralized, smaller scale mosaic of artistic space in contrast to the large, centralized arts district that has been favored by many cities in past eras (e.g. Lincoln Center in New York, the Civic Center in San Francisco). We believe that a multiplicity of galleries, museums, clubhouses, live/work and studio buildings and performing arts space brings healthy competition to the artistic economy in a city. It also embeds artistic space in neighborhoods, where artists and arts space managers interact with the larger community on issues of safety, community life and community development, often bringing artistic talent to revitalization campaigns and community-building efforts. In turn, communities hosting artistic space become advocates for artists and artistic programming. This vision of the cultural mosaic was first set out by Jane Jacobs (1961) in her depiction of New York as a series of ethnically differentiated live-and-work neighborhoods, each with its own distinctive culture – Little Italy, SoHo, Greenwich Village, Chinatown – where citizens felt invited to cross the porous borders between them and enjoy the amenities of the others.

Three types of artistic space are central to our vision of urban core artistic stickiness: artists' clubhouses or centers, artists' live/work and studio buildings, and performing arts centers. In what follows, I describe each of these and give a few examples.

A. Artists' Clubhouses

In some cities, non-profit or even for-profit entrepreneurs have created dedicated spaces that welcome artists at all levels of expertise and for nominal membership fees to participate in multiple types of activities, such as classes, access to equipment (photography labs, printing presses, kilns, rehearsal space), exhibitions and performances, mentoring, specialized libraries, websites and newsletters. Some were started by artists who sought a way of continuing to share their work and get feedback beyond formal training; others by communities who believed that providing artists studios and exhibition space in their neighborhoods would help counter crime and drugs, especially in their impact on youth. The Twin Cities hosts some eighteen of these clubhouses with \$18 million in revenues and 8500 members and which also serve the larger arts-loving community. They are

mapped in Figure 1, spread out among a number of neighborhoods in a pattern reminiscent of the Jacobs vision.

An outstanding example of such a clubhouse is the Loft Literary Center, started in the 1970s by a group of politically active poets that survived six moves, several organizational overhauls and challenges to move to new literary forms, expand diversity and reach far out to the suburbs. Currently, the Loft occupies portions of The Open Book (Figure 2), a series of three rehabbed industrial lofts that also houses the Minnesota Center for Book Arts and a small non-profit press, Milkweed Editions. On the second floor, a large open space with moveable tables and chairs allows people to group themselves. Adjacent is an auditorium for readings and talks given throughout the year by master writers, spoken-word artists, award winners, and mentees. Along the back wall sit classrooms and a library of books by Minnesota authors and small presses, as well as regional and national literary magazines. To the west lies a series of writers' studios, each with a table and chair, an easy chair and an ample window with afternoon light. Writers may rent studios on a scheduled basis and keep their materials in a phalanx of lockers that line the corridor outside. More classrooms, a book-club room and a rooftop space are upstairs.

(Figure 2 The Open Book, Minneapolis [here](#))

Today, the Loft has 2700 members, mostly in the region, and a budget of \$1.8 million. It offers classes on everything from beginning poetry and memoir to advanced novel-writing and business skills for writers. It runs prestigious competitions for fellowships and mentorships, some tailored to emerging writers and some for career writers to begin a new body of work. It raises about 55% of its revenues from contributed funds, and 45% from earned income – chiefly class fees. A survey of Loft participants found widespread agreement, among amateurs as well as accomplished writers, that the Loft's activities had substantially improved their writing skills and helped many to make careers of their writing (Markusen and Johnson, 2006).

The Loft has also begun reaching out to its neighborhood and larger community. Although it originally chose the Open Book site because it was conveniently located near two freeways, it has come to understand that its original vision of itself as a destination site rather than a community-embedded center has hurt some of the other buildings' occupants, specifically the ground floor independent bookstore that was forced to close

for lack of neighborhood traffic. Central to the Loft's strategy, and that of the Minnesota Center for Book Arts, is to serve inner city schools as a place to visit and do hands-on work.

B. Live/Work Buildings

Artist live/work and studio buildings form another urban spatial element and constitute both an investment in the arts economy as well as a revitalization catalyst in neighborhoods. Generally developed out of used and discarded industrial space and involving extensive rehabbing, these buildings create residential communities that encourage artistic spillover among artists while enlivening the surrounding streets and bolstering local businesses. Artists tend to work odd hours, and their presence helps keep streets safer at all hours of the night and day. They patronize local merchants and often become active in community groups. They open up their space for periodic arts crawls, where the public is invited to view (and buy) their work in the very spaces where it was created, often in full view of kitchen sinks and clothes closets.

The Twin Cities hosts a large number of artist live/work buildings and is home to one of the pioneering American live/work space developers, Artspace Inc. Artspace is a non-profit that was formed at the request of the Minneapolis City Council when sports bars (associated with a new entertainment arena) began forcing out galleries and restaurants that had thrived in the warehouse district. After developing a number of successful projects, Artspace found that if it did not continue to manage the buildings, artists were apt to move out or be bought out by higher bidders. Since 1991, they have continued to manage all of their live/work buildings for the long haul, preventing rents from rising to market rates.

Artspace has created large live/work buildings in the urban core. In the early 1990s, it developed two vacant former warehouses in downtown St. Paul – The Northern Warehouse and the Tilsner, both as artist coops (Figure 3). The two buildings house dozens of artists, and the former also provides rental space to cafes and arts-related non-profits on its first two floors. The buildings have brought stability and commercial revitalization to the surrounding neighborhood, inducing the start-up of the old outdoor farmer's market across the street and encouraging private developers to convert other empty buildings into housing.

(Figure 3 Northern Warehouse and Tilsner Artist Coops, St. Paul here)

As part of its complicated negotiations with the city to do these two buildings, Artspace agreed to do a project in a troubled low income neighborhood in the inner city. It took an old printing building, a brownfield site (Figure 4) and converted it into Frogtown Family Lofts. Today, this complex houses dozens of artists with their children, including a number of Hmong artists from the surrounding immigrant community (Figure 5). It has brought activity and stability to its neighborhood, and some of the artists are using their work as a catalyst for community change.

(Figure 4 Frogtown Family Lofts, St. Paul, Before here)

(Figure 5 Frogtown Family Lofts, St. Paul, After here)

C. Performing Arts Facilities

Smaller scale performing arts spaces, such as theaters and dance venues embedded in neighborhoods, stabilize and invigorate commercial areas and often relate to the unique character of the community. The Twin Cities hosts 55 theaters and a number of dedicated dance spaces, plus many music venues that serve similar purposes. While the largest of these are entertainment destinations surrounded by parking ramps and receiving disproportionate shares of public arts and economic development funding, many others have forged close ties to neighborhood residents.

An outstanding example of how artistic space has helped to revitalize and stabilize a low-income neighborhood is the In the Heart of the Beast Puppet and Mask Theater (Figure 6). Begun in the 1970s by counter-culture young people, Heart of the Beast Theatre (HOBT) works with larger-than-life puppets worn by the players, original scripts, and live music, much of it now international ethnic folk material. After working out of a series of churches and lofts, HOBT worked with the City of Minneapolis to lease and then buy a former porn theater (once a family theater) in the poorest neighborhood of town. After some dragging of its feet, the city gave the theater troupe a ten-year, interest-free loan of \$325,000 to do the renovations, and HOBT also won a \$150,000 loan from the Neighborhood Revitalization Program, to be repaid through service to the neighborhood. The neighborhood, increasingly Latino, rallied to help clean up the building – it needed a new roof, standing water pumped out, and every surface washed. Across the street, Latino merchants had redeveloped vacant space into a Mercado and new restaurants with rental housing upstairs, all with private money. Through a carefully

built partnership of mutual respect, HOBOT and the Latino Business Association are now taking over the huge, adjacent Minnesota Antiques building, vacant for more than a decade, to use as an incubator for Latino businesses, a Latino Community Network space, and for the theater, a place to rehearse, build puppets (previously done in the theater aisles), and run the office (previously in the old balcony).

(Figure 6 Heart of the Beast Puppet Theater, Minneapolis here)

Cities have been important investors in each of these forms of artist-centric space. In some cases, they have owned the buildings in question. In others, they have helped to finance the rehabbing of the space. Changes in land use regulations have enabled some projects, as has infrastructure provision. Some cities have designated cultural districts, while in others, opposition to such concentrations has ensured that projects are spread throughout the city.

V. Artists and Gentrification

The mushrooming of artistic activity in some inner city neighborhoods has prompted concerns about gentrification and community displacement. Planners and communities are also concerned that artists' space may reap subsidies – for low income housing, for instance – that may crowd out other poorer and worthy recipients. In some cities, like New York City, tensions between long-time working class and minority residents of a neighborhood and incoming young artists moving into apartments and industrial spaces has been high for decades, as described in Sharon Zukin's pioneering book, *Loft Living* (1982). Real estate developers often use artists as a vanguard for wholesale neighborhood turnover, even subsidizing galleries and performance spaces as a way of making the neighborhood more hip and benefiting from the sweat labor of artists. Yet in some cities, pioneering low-income artists have been displaced by wealthier galleries and more prosperous residents. This process is less problematic in de-industrializing and de-populating neighborhoods in older cities like Cleveland and St. Paul's Lowertown that have benefited from artists moving into vacant industrial space and increasing personal security and economic activity. Also, many artists occupying such space *are* of the neighborhood to begin with, so that the artistic use of such space constitutes a community retention success.

Many artists, along with other lower income residents, are displaced when property taxes and rents begin to rise with the incursion of higher income residents attracted to the buzz that artists create in neighborhoods they have helped to renovate. One way of preventing this dynamic, so powerful because of private land ownership rights, is to build and hold artistic space in common as cooperatives, in non-profit organizations, or in land banks as Artspace has done.

Beyond economic impacts, urban core artists make many contributions to community viability and life. Artists produce commissioned and informal public art that enlivens the community visually, and they often participate in planning parks and cultural facilities. Artists are often actively engaged in community events such as parades, festivals and fairs, and in neighborhood politics. The Heart of the Beast Theatre, for example, unfurls its puppets every year for a themed May Day parade down the south side, ending up in Powderhorn Park and drawing admirers from all over the city.

VI. Conclusions

In general, contemporary discourse on cultural and economic development policy undervalues the significance of space and place. This is particularly true in the arts sector. Arts administrators and funders tend to think organizationally. But many artists and arts fans think instead of a place: a theater space, a gallery, a jazz club, an art crawl, or even an entire arts neighborhood that they love to visit and revisit. Ongoing access to spaces that offer novelty and serendipitous encounters with other artists and art lovers is a great gift for artists. It is not only the events and equipment that matter, but also the networks and friendships formed around them. “More and better” artists, to use the rather crass terminology of economics, emerge in and are attracted to urban cores that offer a portfolio of dedicated spaces for living, working, learning, networking, exhibition, presentation and sharing tools and workspace. Once there, they contribute to the host economy by exporting their work, contracting with businesses to make them more productive and profitable, stimulating innovation on the part of suppliers, and bringing income and energy to their neighborhoods.

Cities and towns can help generate, recruit and retain artists as a sticky occupational core that can in turn attract other firms and individuals. Providing artistic space that embeds artists in their communities is a fruitful way for cities to do so. In addition, cities nurturing their urban cores could

apply the occupational approach illustrated here to identify and pursue other key urban occupations that are attracted to inner cities, amplify the cities' exports and generate multiplier effects via other business sectors and consumer spending.

- Becker, Howard. 1982. *Art Worlds*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Blau, Judith. 1989. *The Shape of Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Buss, Terry. 1999. "The Case Against Targeted Industry Strategies." *Economic Development Quarterly*. Vol. 13: 339-355.
- Clark, Terry Nichols. 2004. *The City as an Entertainment Machine*. *Research in Urban Policy*, Vol. 9. Camberly, UK: Elsevier.
- Finkle, J. A. 1999. "The Case Against Targeting Might have been More ...Targeted." *Economic Development Quarterly*. Vol. 13: 361-64.
- Florida, Richard. 2002. *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York, Basic Books.
- Jacobs, Jane. 1961. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage.
- Judd, Dennis. 1999. "Constructing the Tourist Bubble." In D. Judd and S. Fainstein, eds. *The Tourist City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press: 35-53.
- Markusen, Ann and Amanda Johnson. 2006. *Artists' Centers: Evolution and Impact on Careers, Neighborhoods, and Economies*. Minneapolis, MN: Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, University of Minnesota.
- Markusen, Ann and David King. 2003. *The Artistic Dividend: The Hidden Contributions of the Arts to the Regional Economy*. Minneapolis, MN: Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, University of Minnesota, July.
- Markusen, Ann and Greg Schrock. 2005. "Regional Job Growth through an Occupational Lens." Working Paper #256, Project on Regional and Industrial Economics, the Humphrey Institute, University of Minnesota, July.
- Markusen, Ann and Greg Schrock. 2006. "The Artistic Dividend: Urban Artistic Specialization and Economic Development Implications." *Urban Studies*, Fall forthcoming.
- Markusen, Ann. 1996. "Sticky Places in Slippery Space: a Typology of Industrial Districts." *Economic Geography*, Vol. 72, No. 3: 293-313.

Markusen, Ann. 2004. "Targeting Occupations in Regional and Community Economic Development?" *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 70, No. 3: 253-268.

Thompson, Wilbur and Philip Thompson. 1985. "From Industries to Occupations: Rethinking Local Economic Development." *Economic Development Commentary*, Vol. 9: 12-18.

Wiewel, Wim. 1999. "Policy Research in an Imperfect World: Response to Terry F. Buss, "The Case Against Targeted Industry Strategies." *Economic Development Quarterly*. Vol. 13: 357-60.

Zukin, Sharon. 1982. *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.