

**‘The rules of the game’: a comparative study of local cultural
policy decision making for the European Capital of Culture in
Liverpool and NewcastleGateshead, 2000-2006.**

Thesis submitted in accordance with the requirements of the
University of Liverpool for the degree of Doctor in
Philosophy

by

David Thomas O’Brien

August 2009

ASBTRACT

It is commonplace for cities across the world to use aspects of culture as part of their strategies for development and as a response to economic restructuring in light of the increasing interconnectedness of the global economy. This use of cultural policy takes place against the backdrop of the move to an economy based on consumption of commodities, rather than their production. The policies take several forms, including the use of mega-events (Roche 2000), the construction of iconic buildings, and the re-branding of places based on aspects of their culture. The use of cultural policy at local level is therefore a crucially important aspect of the political economy of the modern city.

Several authors (Mooney 2004, Garcia 2004, Wilks-Heeg and Jones 2004, Miles 2005, Paddison 1993, Evans and Shaw 2004, Evans 2005, McGuigan 2004) are concerned with looking at the impacts of cultural policy, or government policy that employs a rhetorical element of culture. However the process of decision making around cultural policy seems to be an uncritically accepted consensus in academic literature. Moreover academic research on cultural policy tends to centre on what forms cultural policy takes (McGuigan 2004, Hewison 1995, Quinn 1998) or on the impacts of cultural policy (Garcia 2004, Evans 2001, Bianchini and Parkinson 1993, Landry 2004). Current research, therefore, often lacks an exploration of how the policy process operates in different places, and at different levels of government. Academic literature often adopts a 'one size fits all' approach that sees cultural policy as continuous across many different places and levels of government (McGuigan 2004, Garcia 2004). This form of academic research into cultural policy also lacks a sustained engagement with what

analysts of policy would understand as the policy process (Rhodes 2003). Where this type of policy analysis does exist (e.g. Quilley 1999, 2000, Cochrane *et al* 1996) it is specific to geographical areas, and thus raises questions concerning the comparisons of cultural policy in different sites.

In order to supplement existing research into cultural policy with an analysis of local decision making the thesis undertakes a comparison between Liverpool and NewcastleGateshead during the years 2001-2005, when the two areas were involved in bids for European Capital of Culture status. The comparison between the two cities shows how local history, politics and culture all shape the governance of cultural policy, creating very different governing arrangements in the two areas. Using insights from political science and urban studies the thesis shows the extent to which cultural policy is enabled or constrained by local circumstances, offering insights that will be of interest to academics, policy-makers and the art and cultural sector.

CONTENTS

Abstract	2
Acknowledgments	5
Chapter 1 <i>Introduction</i>	6
Chapter 2 <i>Narrating British cultural policy and cultural policy studies</i>	19
Chapter 3 <i>Methodology: Synthesising urban theory, political science and cultural policy studies</i>	58
Chapter 4 <i>The 'Liverpool way' of cultural policy</i>	95
Chapter 5 <i>A 'NewcastleGateshead way' of cultural policy?</i>	145
Chapter 6 <i>Liverpool European Capital of Culture 2008</i>	191
Chapter 7 <i>NewcastleGateshead as a 'cultural policy regime'</i>	231
Chapter 8 <i>Conclusion</i>	269
Bibliography	282
Appendix 1 <i>List of acronyms</i>	322
Appendix 2 <i>List of organisations and representatives interviewed</i>	325
Appendix 3 <i>Liverpool timeline</i>	327
Appendix 4 <i>Newcastle and Gateshead timeline</i>	330

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

For my parents, who in giving me so much, have ensured that I need say very little, aside from thank you.

I am indebted to my two supervisors, Dr. Steven Sun-Miles and Dr Stuart Wilks-Heeg whose ceaseless support and willingness to engage with my work have made this thesis possible.

The thesis would also not exist without the numerous participants who kindly gave their time and effort to assist my research.

Finally I would like to extend my gratitude to my friends and colleagues from both within (and without) the School of Sociology and Social Policy, particularly Dr Victoria Durrer

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

“Strange memories on this nervous night in Las Vegas. Five years later? Six? It seems like a lifetime, or at least a Main Era – the kind of peak that never comes again. San Francisco in the middle sixties was a very special time and place to be a part of. Maybe it meant something. Maybe not, in the long run... but no explanation, no mix of words or music or memories can touch that sense of knowing that you were here and alive in that corner of time and the world. Whatever it meant...

History is hard to know, because of all the hired bullshit, but even without being sure of “history” it seems entirely reasonable to think that every now and then the energy of a whole generation comes to a head in a long fine flash, for reasons that nobody really understands at the time – and which never explain, in retrospect, what actually happened. My central memory of that time seems to hang on one or five or maybe forty nights – or very early mornings – when I left the Fillmore half-crazy and, instead of going home, aimed the big 650 Lightning across the Bay Bridge at a hundred miles an hour wearing L. L. Bean shorts and a Butte sheepherder’s jacket... booming through the Treasure Island tunnel at the lights of Oakland and Berkeley and Richmond, not quite sure which turn-off to take when I got to the other end (always stalling at the toll-gate, too twisted to find neutral while I fumbled for change)... but being absolutely certain that no matter which way I went I would come to a place where people were just as high and wild as I was: No doubt at all about that. There was madness in any direction, at any hour. If not across the Bay, then up the Golden Gate or

down 101 to Los Altos or La Honda... You could strike sparks anywhere. There was a fantastic universal sense that whatever we were doing was right, that we were winning. And that, I think, was the handle – that sense of inevitable victory over the forces of Old and Evil. Not in any mean or military sense; we didn't need that. Our energy would simply prevail. There was no point in fighting – on our side or theirs. We had all the momentum; we were riding the crest of a high and beautiful wave.

So now, less than five years later, you can go up on a steep hill in Las Vegas and look West, and with the right kind of eyes you can almost see the high-water mark – that place where the wave finally broke and rolled back.”

Hunter S. Thompson, *Fear and Loathing in Las Vegas*

This thesis is about why place matters. Place matters for a wide variety of reasons, not least of which is the way that the specificity of place, its culture and history, shapes the lived reality of a given locality. Place can underpin production, setting the context for periods of intense creativity within technological, artistic or scientific invention, or it can limit and constrain the possibilities for these endeavours. The importance of place, particularly within the realm of human culture is illustrated by bringing together the quotation that opens this thesis with work considering the role of specific places in shaping Western civilization. In his epic comparative work on the role of the city in human creativity Sir Peter Hall (Hall 1998) outlines the development of significant peaks in human cultural endeavour along with the places, the *milieu*, which represent the context for those enterprises. From Florence's role in cultural production, through the technological innovations of Manchester and Detroit, to contemporary London, Hall surveys the key sites that have shaped Western culture, linking them all with an explicit

grounding in the urban, whatever historical form that has taken. Hall's interest is much like Hunter Thompson's, when he wrote about San Francisco in the middle 1960s. The quotation that opens this Chapter not only indicates Thompson's regret at the end of a 'golden age' (Hall 1998:3) but also San Francisco as the city serving as the looking glass through which the evolution of the 'Hippy' movement, artistic and musical innovation and the wider changes occurring in American society's most 'troubled decade' (Fischer 2006:321) could be observed and understood. These two ways of considering the importance of place and its relationship to cultural production represent the first steps towards the goal of this thesis, which is to demonstrate how local culture, history and politics shape the type of governance found in the emerging sector of local cultural policy.

Thompson, writing as a journalist and sometime author of fiction, and Hall, an academic, in their own separate ways are seeking to pin down a phenomenon that has become a central concern in both academic literature on cultural policy and an essential part of the practice of those governing the modern, Western, city (Scott 2000, Stevenson 2003, Florida 2002). Against the backdrop of globalisation (Griffiths 1995), the hollowing out of the nation state (Rhodes 1994) and the shift from government to governance, the city has re-emerged (Griffiths 1995:254) and culture has taken a leading role within that re-emergence. The phenomenon of cultural concerns rising to the forefront of the city can therefore be understood as the foundation for the growth in debates on what has been described as the 'cultural turn' (Hastings 1999:9) within both urban studies and within the urban regeneration agenda, particularly in the UK (North and Wilks-Heeg 2004:305). Although it is always dangerous to categorise positions within a diverse literature, with an ever present risk of reducing or caricaturing specific and complex opinions,

it is possible to detect three strands within the practice and research on the city's cultural turn, a cleavage between advocates, analysts and critics.

Perhaps the most well known advocates of the use of cultural policy within cities, especially for urban regeneration policies, have been those writing in support of ideas such as 'the creative city' (Landry and Bianchini 1995) and the 'creative class' (Florida 2002). These seductive hypotheses seek to suggest a role for the nebulous notion of 'creativity' in solving 'the myriad problems of the city' (Landry and Bianchini 1995:9). As Landry (2000) identifies, the backdrop of industrial deterioration and urban decline posed difficult questions for policy makers, questions that could be answered through the means of 'culture' (Griffiths 1993). Work such as Landry and Florida has indeed proved persuasive within urban policy, as decision makers in cities (Leslie 2005) and nationally (DCMS 2004) have taken up the possibilities offered by the advocates of a 'cultural turn', particularly in local economic performance (Gibson and Kong 2005:550) and urban regeneration (Urban Task Force 2005, DCMS 1999).

The cultural turn has not been limited to advocacy for the role of creativity, as a range of possibilities for the use of culture in urban settings have emerged over the last twenty years. These possibilities include, but are not limited to: The practice of constructing iconic buildings (Plaza 1999); promoting cultural tourism (Bonet 2003, Law 1992); developing creative quarters (Montgomery 2003) to foster creative industries (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005); hosting major events, often with a significant arts programme, (Roche 2000, Garcia 2004a); and creating a brand for the city (Evans 2003, Jensen 2007). The literature describing these developments moves away from advocacy to garner explanations for these trends, seeking to contextualise them in the post-industrial city (Kong 2000). The

explanations tend to coalesce around what Kong (2000) understands as four main characteristics of cultural policy: as investment in cultural infrastructure; flagship developments; public art and public realm investment; and partnership between public sector organizations and private sector business (2000:387). These characteristics are effectively policies that are engaged in a civic boosterism, a boosterism that takes in both the local economy, via tourism, creative industries and civil society, through the reinvigoration of public culture and the public sphere (Griffiths 1995).

That is not to say that the cultural turn identified as taking place in cities has always been successful. Leading examples of cultural policy, for example Glasgow's use of European City Culture in 1990 to foster a range of impacts on its urban life, have generated strong debate as well as being taken up by policy makers looking to replicate the 'success' of Glasgow's urban regeneration model. Analysts of the 'Glasgow effect' have discussed the extent to which the transformation claimed by elites within the city was felt by all sections of Glasgow society (Miles 2005a) and whether the new 'brand' for the city and the new urban spaces had long term prospects (Garcia 2005, Gibson and Stevenson 2004). Investigating Glasgow has also given rise to a vociferously critical literature, much stemming from an explicitly Marxist (Mooney 2004) and critical political economy (Boyle and Hughes 1994) perspective, narrating the entire City of Culture project as a triumph for one type of capital accumulation at the expense of the local working class (Mooney 2004) and its culture (Jones and Wilks-Heeg 2004).

Whilst some (e.g. Sharp 2007:64) have offered practical and empirical critiques on research by the advocates of the use of creativity within the urban setting, the political economy approach suggested by work critical of Glasgow 1990 is the dominant paradigm for literature seeking to

rail against the new urban hegemony (Boyle 1997). The effects delimited by this political economy literature can be summed up by a quotation from David Harvey, one of the earliest and most perceptive critics writing on the effects of cultural turn in urban policy:

‘The aggregate effects are clear enough. First, the serial reproduction of the same solution generates monotony in the name of diversity. Secondly, the formula does not attack basic ills but, in conformity to Engels' rule as to how the bourgeoisie always approaches problems of this kind, it simply moves them around’ (Harvey 1989b:21)

The ‘formula’, of cultural policy within the city, can therefore be seen to be a form of exclusion, of cultures and of classes, taking place within spaces governed and administered by the powerful (Harvey 2008). The operations of these powerful groups are intimately connected with capitalist social relations and the embedding of ‘neo-liberal’ logic (Hay 2004b) in cities competing against each other using entrepreneurial governance methods (Harvey 1989a, Wood 1998). The entrepreneurial city is one that must strive to create conditions amenable to the accumulation strategies adopted by globalised, transnational, capital (Castells 2000), by creating the appropriate safe urban spaces (McGuigan 1996) or by offering subsidy to attract potential investment (Harvey 1989a), investment that is often made by partnerships between the local state and the private sector, with the specific interests of private capital (as opposed to public citizens) at the forefront of decision making (Smith 2000).

The critical political economy narrative is one that has had extensive influence within academic study of the urban ‘cultural turn’ (Latham 2003). It is a narrative that seeks to relate the above phenomena to modes of city

governance that can be explained by focusing on the influence of neo-liberalism (e.g. Coleman 2004), particularly at a structural level. Neo-liberal discourses are shown to shape the landscape for city governance, whilst being enacted and embodied in the practice of policy makers, particularly in the rhetoric surrounding their actions (Ward 2003, Peck and Tickell 2002, Tickell and Peck 1996). Hand in hand with the move to relate urban policy to critical political economy has been a 'cultural turn' within the political economy literature itself (Sayer 2001, Jessop and Oosterlynck 2008) as the writers from the regulationist school of urban studies have looked to understand the role of culture, often in the form of ideology, in securing contested urban settlements.

These links between those writers critical of the use of cultural policy currently in vogue across Western European, and particularly British, cities and a wider critical political economy approach has created a tendency in the literature to focus on the types of structural explanations described above. This is to the detriment of examinations paying closer attention to the specificity of local culture and history as well as the role of agency in shaping cultural policy outcomes (Latham 2003:1702, 1713). The thesis is situated within the apparent lacuna in contemporary British approaches to urban cultural policy, using a case study of European Capital of Culture, an event which has become a major 'strategic weapon' in the supposed cultural arms race between European cities (Richards 2000). The case study contends that close examination of local decision making reveals an uneven adoption of the 'homogenous' cultural policy emphasized by critical literature and the existence of policy 'failure' not referred to by those advocates of the 'creative' city.

Underpinning this contention is the context of cultural policy studies in Britain. As such Chapter 2 outlines the way that this emerging field has sought to understand the use of cultural policy in the urban setting, against the backdrop of a discussion of the development of cultural policy in the UK, particularly in British cities. The three 'themes' of excellence, inclusion and economic contribution found within contemporary British cultural policy are shown to interact in underpinning the setting for both British cities' use of cultural policy and cultural policy studies' way of understanding that use. This discussion illustrates how the two poles of academic research and policy practice in the UK are mutually reinforcing and interdependent in shaping British cultural policy studies' specific interests, to the exclusion of the types of investigation suggested by research into urban governance from the discipline of political science. Although these types of approaches do exist in European work, the thesis illustrates how these concerns are generally absent from work based in, or focusing on, the UK.

The importance of political science to the thesis is best explained by the methodology described in Chapter 3. In order to move beyond the existing, English speaking, work addressing cultural policy in the UK, which is set out in Chapter 2, the thesis' methodology suggests a blend of theoretical perspectives drawn from political science and urban studies. In the first instance work on governance is used to set the context for a synthesis of theoretical perspectives from research on urban regimes, governing coalitions and contemporary institutionalist theory. These two perspectives allow the main contention of the thesis to develop, as subsequent Chapters use the framework of regime theory to show how coalitions develop in the two case study areas around the bidding for European Capital of Culture 2008 (ECoC 2008), whilst the institutionalist

perspective is used to show how local circumstances, particularly local political cultures, constrain and promote particular forms of decision making around the two site's respective cultural policies.

Although the theoretical framework of urban regimes and governing coalitions is perhaps a dominant paradigm for understanding issues of governance in the field of urban studies (Lauria 1997b), Chapter 3 shows how it has been subject to extensive critiques, particularly surrounding its import into questions of British urban politics from its origins in the United States (Davies 2003). This critical discussion of urban regime theory is shown to not only justify its synthesis with new institutionalism, but also to draw attention to the selection of precise methodological tools for the investigation. These tools are substantiated by a detailed consideration of methods such as interpretivism and elite interviewing. The latter is of course the foundation of much of social, as well as political, science research, whereas the former is a comparatively recent methodological development that stresses the need for understanding individuals' narrations of their understandings of their actions and place in the world. By focusing attention on individual narratives, the insights of the interpretive method compliment the theoretical framework given by regime theory and the explanatory potential in new institutionalism. This methodological mix is shown to be perfectly suited to an investigation that seeks to privilege explanations founded in the local and the specific over the more global and generalised narratives offered by existing British work on cultural policy.

In order to make the case for the role of the local in cultural policy, the thesis uses an exploration of the culture and politics of the two case studies. In Liverpool the specific form of local politics, with its 'boss politics', Militancy and distrust of outsiders, linked into the wider culture of

the city to fashion an unease within the local authority towards cultural policy and the city's large and historic cultural sector. At the same time that political culture shaped a lack of organisational capacity for stable governance and partnership work, leading Liverpool to be both a richly impressive city of cultural artefacts, organisations and production, dating back to the Victorian era, (Longmore 2006) and yet a city almost incapable of sustaining a cultural policy. Chapter 4's description of this tension is in contrast to the North East, where history and politics had shaped a strong tradition of partnerships, and subsequently governance networks, which had allowed the cultural sector to become influential, particularly in the era of capital funding from the National Lottery (Beaumont 2005). Newcastle and Gateshead, as Chapter 5 shows, did not have the same level of cultural provision as in Liverpool, yet administered and governed their cultural sector in a much more stable way. Chapter 5 describes how the regional arts infrastructure reflected the 'way of life' in the North East and a concern with process based art and culture, as opposed to creating grand projects to house cultural artefacts, as occurred in Victorian Liverpool. This stability is reflected in the contrasts highlighted by both Chapters including: cross-river responses to the abolition of the Metropolitan County Councils in 1986, responses that produced cohesion on the Tyne and difficult fragmentation on the Mersey; and specific cultural policy projects, successes such as the Angel of the North in Gateshead (completed in 1998) and failures such as the 1990 John Lennon memorial concert in Liverpool (Grey 1990, Brown 1998). These two Chapters taken together provide the data used in the institutionalist explanations of the respective places' governing coalitions described and analysed in the remainder of the thesis.

The bulk of the data on the 2001-2005 period is presented and analysed in Chapters 6 and 7, which authenticate the contention of the importance of understanding local context developed in Chapters 2 and 3. In the Liverpool case study, Chapter 6 uses the insights of regime theory to describe how a potential governing coalition developed in the city around the ECoC 2008 bid. After the city won the ECoC 2008 status in 2003 the Chapter shows how the coalition collapsed based on the constraining influence of the local culture and history, the ‘Liverpool way’ to which Chapter 4 is devoted. Thus the *descriptive* framework of regime theory is *explained* with recourse to institutionalism. The institutional ‘rules of the game’ (Lowndes 2005:292) of politics and culture, seen in light of the difficult history of cultural policy in the city made the embedding of cultural policy within the city’s governance highly unlikely. The problems associated with governance decisions around the form of the Culture Company, responsible for running the ECoC 2008, show how the city returned to the *status quo ante*, reflecting the peripheral role of cultural policy and the inability of the Local Authority to form lasting trust relationships with the cultural sector, a sector that was to be charged with delivering ‘the most spectacular celebration of culture in the history of Europe’ (BBC 2003).

By contrast the framework of regime theory and the explanatory power of institutionalism allow the thesis to present a very different analysis of cultural policy in Newcastle and Gateshead. In Newcastle and Gateshead local political culture fostered a co-operative ethic amenable to the production of partnerships. Although Chapter 5 touched on the traditionally curt relationship between the two banks of the Tyne, the development of cultural policy *between* Newcastle and Gateshead was accelerated by the ECoC 2008 bid, an acceleration of a process for which the institutional

context of the North East, specifically the coherence of regional governance and the role of the cultural sector in making the 'cultural case' (Miles and Paddison 2005:836), was well prepared. The major shock (BBC 2003) of Liverpool winning the right to host ECoC 2008 was absorbed relatively smoothly by a governing coalition that had created decision making structures to embed cultural policy into the two local authorities, as well as forming the basis for the wider urban regime in the area. Thus Newcastle and Gateshead, as outlined by Chapter 7, form somewhat of a 'cultural policy' regime, whereby cultural policy (much like environmental policy in Jonas and Gibbs' (2003) discussion of Leeds and Manchester and Pincetl's (2003) work on Los Angeles) had taken its place on the governance agenda and the cultural sector formed part of the decision making process.

Chapters 6 and 7, by getting inside the 'black box' (Smith *et al* 1993:571) of decision-making at local level, return the thesis to the initial starting point, of how place specificity shapes the governance of cultural policy. This contention lays at the heart of the concluding Chapter in the thesis; a Chapter which draws together comparisons of the two modes of governance demonstrated by the 'failed' cultural policy coalition in Liverpool and the embedded role of cultural policy in the governance arrangements and transformed relationship between Newcastle and Gateshead. This recapitulation is the first part of the tripartite summation of the thesis given by Chapter 8. The conclusion also shows the potential limitations of the research presented in the main body of the thesis by reconnecting the specific local case studies with the wider literature in cultural policy studies. By going back to Chapter 2 and 3's discussions of those writers and methods that privilege global, structural explanations over the local, agency centred, narratives of cultural policy, the thesis opens up

the prospect for future research that may build on the insights in this thesis to further synthesise understandings of cultural policy that may, more fully, connect structure and agency as well as the local with the global; and, as a final element in the conclusion to the thesis, and complimenting the reflection on the thesis' limits is a consideration of the prospects for cities planning to use accolades such as the ECoC as part of their cultural policy, drawing out the lessons learnt for future policy from the case studies of Liverpool and NewcastleGateshead. This again shows the potential for further, fruitful, research and in doing so allows for the thesis to restate its claim to a place as part of the wider discourse of academic work considering the city and cultural policy.

In the context of the above discussion the thesis represents an investigation of local decision making around a major cultural event, the European Capital of Culture. By beginning from the contention that most existing British work on cultural policy has not fully engaged with decision making, the thesis offers explanations of the practice of individual agents and how that practice is shaped by *local* context, rather than reading off (Bevir and Rhodes 2003a) local cultural policy from *global* trends. The thesis therefore has four key objectives. First to illustrate how a concern with the local can help to understand the impact of the trends currently seen as explanations for contemporary cultural policy; second to inform British literature within studies of cultural policy, urban governance and local administration; third to introduce methods from political science to the investigation of cultural policy practice; and finally the thesis aims to suggest the possibility for further work in cultural policy studies by drawing attention to possibilities offered by interdisciplinary research based on frameworks from outside this developing field.

Chapter 2

NARRATING BRITISH CULTURAL POLICY AND ‘CULTURAL POLICY STUDIES’

The opening Chapter provided the schema for the thesis’ contention that decision making in local cultural policy has been under explored by existing research. This Chapter builds on that assertion by offering a two-fold narrative of cultural policy, exploring the way that cultural policy developed in the UK and linking this development with the emergence of British and English speaking research into cultural policy. The narrative of British cultural policy offered by this Chapter demonstrates how cultural policy has emerged from three uses of culture that can be understood under the rubrics of the promotion of excellence in British cultural life; the use of culture to combat social exclusion; and the economic uses of culture. In considering these three uses the narrative illustrates the way cultural policy emerged as a key area of concern for local government in British cities. In doing so this narrative evokes a contrast between the important role of local government in developing British cultural policy and the rather under-researched position that local administration occupies in studies of that cultural policy. The importance of the specificity of place and space is therefore a notable absence within cultural policy research, an absence that is seen very clearly in a consideration of the nature of current cultural policy practice and the related research.

The fundamental concern underpinning this thesis is that there is relatively little written that involves interrogating the decision-making process surrounding cultural policy, even though there is much seeking to

account for the reasoning behind policy and the purposes for which it is constructed. As this Chapter's review of the literature explains the tendency is for British and English speaking research to focus on outcomes of policy, either in terms of evaluations to directly feed into policy production (e.g. Bennett 1992, Evans And Shaw 2004), or critically analysing and engaging with cultural policy adopted at both local and national levels (e.g. McGuigan 2004, Mooney 2004, Hewison 1995). This lack of attention given to decision-making is also a feature of studies on the European Capital of Culture (ECoC), the cultural policy case study used by this thesis (e.g. Garcia 2005). As a result of explaining the importance of ECoC to European cities' cultural policies it is possible to see how work on ECoC has reflected the debates between policy relevance and critical positions on cultural policy. By mirroring these debates, work on the ECoC has also suffered the same lacunae and it too requires a more detailed look at the decision-making processes that underpin the existing analyses of its role. These deficiencies in the literature ultimately lead to Chapter 3's justification for the need to adopt cross-disciplinary methods to understand local differences in cultural policy. These cross-disciplinary methods are garnered from those few studies that engage with the decision making process in local cultural policy (e.g. Bassett 1993, Boyle 1997), which pick out regime theory from urban studies to provide the framework for the analysis of the role of local decision making in producing the specific governance arrangements surrounding cultural policy in the two case study areas.

Cultural policy and the concept of excellence

The initial starting point for a consideration of British cultural policy is perhaps the most difficult to pin down. British cultural policy had long sought to promote artistic and cultural excellence and such a commitment

existed as far back as the inception of the Arts Council. The concept of excellence was enshrined in the Arts Council's royal charter, reflecting its founder, John Maynard Keynes', conception of culture as the high point of civilisation (Upchurch 2004). Support for artistic and cultural excellence is also reflected in the Arts Council's funding and protection for elite arts such as opera and ballet, understood in terms of their self-explanatory worth as high culture (Hewison 1995: 117), reflecting a liberal humanist conception of the possibility of the best aesthetic experiences (Belfiore 2002). Questions over the promotion of artistic excellence can even be seen as far back within the debates generated by the great reform act of 1867, in particular Matthew Arnold's insistence on the conception of culture as 'the study of perfection' that could 'make all men live in an atmosphere of sweetness and light' (Arnold 1993: 63, 79). Whilst the second part of that quotation gives a clue as to the transformation of cultural policy under New Labour, as both a vehicle for social policy and as an 'economic' activity, Arnold's insistence on the importance of cultural excellence encapsulated the residual aspects of the commitment to the 'elite' aspects of culture present in contemporary policy.

Commentators, both from academia, the media and from within the cultural sector, are divided as to the extent to which British cultural policy maintains the commitment to aesthetic excellence, often citing changes in government policy in the 1980s and the need to 'justify' arts funding as the end of the era of dedication to cultural excellence (Belfiore 2002, Hewison 1995: 269). This disquiet has manifested itself in a profound unease over aesthetic standards, as well as accusations of 'dumbing down' discussed at conferences within the sector (Finnis 2008) and by media commentators and critics (Jacobson 2006, 2008). These types of discourses have gone hand in hand with the great concern over the potential for culture's collapse into

commerce and the supposed need to defend aesthetic values and excellence that gathered pace in the 1980s (Hewison 1995: 257, 272) and continues today (Carey 2005). Commentary often resorts to the idea that the concept of value for money is perhaps incompatible with expensive performances that may attract too few audiences willing to pay the full costs of production, arguing that the concerns of the Thatcher era began the move away from aesthetics to monetary concerns (Belfiore 2002).

This problematic status of cultural excellence is perhaps the major difference between present cultural policy and that which had persisted over the previous fifty years, whereby cultural excellence is a source of unease, rather than certainty in government discourses and narratives (Mulgan and Worpole 1986: 21, Belfiore 2002, Green and Wilding 1970). Despite the debate surrounding excellence, and the way that some aspects of the UK's Department for Culture Media and Sport's (DCMS) cultural policy seem to give scant reference to aesthetic excellence (DCMS 2004) the concept still maintains a presence within New Labour's cultural policy (Oakley 2004, Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005). As recently as January 2009, in a speech announcing plans for a permanent 'British City of Culture' prize, the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, Andy Burnham, spoke of both the 'world class culture' and the 'cultural value' existing in Britain, promoted by both DCMS and the Arts Council. DCMS documentation offers more substantive evidence of the continued, if less prestigious, role of aesthetic excellence within New Labour's cultural policy (Burnham 2009). Since its first annual report in 1999 the DCMS has included an aim or objective of a broad access and participation based concept of excellence (DCMS 1999, 2004), a concept which has endured to take its present form as a commitment to 'Support talent and excellence in culture, media and sport'

(DCMS 2008:4). This commitment is most succinctly summed up by a 2004 essay *Government and the value of culture* (Jowell 2004), written by the then DCMS Secretary of State Tessa Jowell. *Government and the value of culture* represents Jowell's reassertion of the place of aesthetic value in cultural policy, an attempt to bring the concept out of debates over both elitism and 'dumbing down'. Whilst Jowell still shows the place of the Victorian concept that the best culture, as a set of values and experiences, will have a 'civilising' effect, akin to Bennett's (2000) rationalisation of DCMS access policies, there is a stress on the concept that culture is at the heart of what it is to be human. Whilst cultural funding still has to justify itself in this modern context, as opposed to Keynes' time when it's worth was not questioned, Jowell sees the best of culture as worthy of funding in its own right, as a good in itself.

The idea of excellence in British cultural policy may seem far removed from the questions of city governance and local cultural policy, but the commitment to excellence represents an important strand in the cultural policy context for local initiatives and uses of cultural policy as well as being an important influence on the cultural policy debates discussed later in the Chapter. This aspect of 'excellence' in British cultural policy is therefore the first example of the dual narrative presented in this Chapter, a narrative of the development of cultural policy itself in concert with the evolution of cultural policy studies. The type of debate over culture suggested by this discussion of excellence is also echoed in the narratives of arts and cultural policy in the two case studies, Liverpool and NewcastleGateshead. As Chapters 4 and 5 show the move away from art and cultural policy as the promotion of excellence, towards cultural policy for social and economic concerns is one of the dominant themes in the two site's cultural policy and

therefore in the thesis' overall insistence in the importance of paying close attention to the role of place in shaping policy outcomes.

Cultural policy as a form of social policy

The longstanding commitment to aesthetic excellence may still be in evidence from DCMS literature but it has been leavened by the New Labour government's attempt to use culture for a range of social policy objectives, not only by granting access to those most 'civilising' aspects (as shown by Jowell's 2004 discussion and Burnham's 2009 speech) but also by showing a commitment to the profound power of art and culture to have a transformative effect on citizen's lives (DCMS 2001). The second part of current cultural policy centres on access to culture, as part of a wider agenda designed to combat social exclusion. Whilst Garnham (2005) accounts for current cultural policy in terms of a capture by the needs of the economy, with an agenda influenced by the needs of the arts and culture professionals (Garnham 2005: 27) there are a wealth of references to participation and access in Arts Council and DCMS literature suggesting it occupies a key part of cultural policy, separate from economic elements. For example *Beyond Boundaries* restates the Arts Council's commitment to community involvement in building individuals', and communities', identities (ACE 2002: 8-9). Access to culture also forms a major part of New Labour's wider political agenda and DCMS sees culture as having a crucial role in combating social exclusion and encouraging regeneration of communities in non-economic ways (DCMS 2004, Urban Task Force 2005). Indeed DCMS annual reports make explicit references to widening access and participation to culture (DCMS 1998, 2000, 2008). DCMS has also reported to New Labour's Social Exclusion Unit on the ways culture can combat social exclusion, citing its ability to build individual self confidence as well as

strengthening communities. Combating social exclusion also forms part of DCMS's core objectives, set out in 2001 (Creigh-Tyte and Stiven 2001).

The concern with access to culture and combating social exclusion has several antecedents and are again linked to longer term trends within cultural policy, as well as with innovations at local government level. The key here is the way cultural funding has had to be justified since the 1980s, and so is now linked to government agendas of combating social exclusion (West and Smith 2005). This way of justifying funding represents a break with the Thatcher government's economic understanding of culture. Coupled with this is the narrative of culture as a way of life. The idea of culture as a 'way of life' (Williams 1989:6) embracing all aspects of the way a given social or national group live, as opposed to just culture as aspects of excellence amongst the visual and performing arts, is the basis for the use of culture to combat the problem of social exclusion.

The expansion of social inclusion and access programmes is well rooted within the Arts Council itself, reflecting a concern that goes back to the Victorian era. The original royal charter for the Arts Council in 1947 included provisions on participation, and the Keynesian ideas which founded the Arts Council, influenced by the Bloomsbury set, saw art as way of raising the working classes to a better life. Bennett (2000) cites Victorian ideas of bettering the working class by allowing them access to art and museums as replicated by current DCMS concerns with 'making the best things in life available to the largest number of people' (DCMS 1998). Although class analysis and questions of moral degeneracy may have disappeared there are still parallels between the bettering of the working class and modern concern with the impact of culture on socially excluded

communities (Bennett 2000: 1412), although the DCMS may use the post-Thatcher language of investment.

The existence of Government policies using culture to combat social exclusion may have a long history within the Arts Council, but it has also been rooted in practical developments within local government and the cultural sector. Local authorities began to question the promotion of a narrow conception of excellence via 'high art' with programmes designed to reflect citizens lived experiences of culture (Belfiore 2002) and so expanded their cultural provisions to allow access and participation for excluded groups in the 1970s and 1980s. At present there is a statutory expectation that local authorities will have cultural strategies to ensure quality of life for people within their boundaries (Council of Europe 2005), and this development has its roots in outreach programmes of the New Left councils exemplified by the Greater London Council's (GLC) programmes of anti-racism and gay rights of the early 1980s (Mulgan and Worpole 1986: 74, Hewison 1995: 238, Liverpool City Council 1987). This can also be seen in Labour's calls for access and participation within the arts at local and central government level (Mulgan and Worpole 1986: 29). These developments are paralleled by the rise of inclusive social policy and outreach programmes within cultural institutions, so for example Tyne and Wear museum's outreach work, initiated to lessen the effect of the 1980s recession (Newman and Mclean 2004:169). Just as the discussion of excellence links in with the rest of the thesis' narratives of local cultural policy, the summary of the use of cultural policy to alleviate social issues is one that will be shown to play a key role in the three local authorities profiled for the thesis' case studies. These general trends play out at local level in different ways and with differing decision making contexts, whereby the political instability in Liverpool opens the

space for innovative uses of cultural policy to address social problems, whilst it is the stability and long term policy development, particularly in Gateshead, which underpins the emergence of a 'social' cultural policy on the Tyne.

The general narrative of current British cultural policy can, therefore, be seen to reflect two parallel themes of promoting cultural excellence and allowing access to cultural institutions, projects and events that may have a transformative effect on people's lives, particularly in terms of alleviating social and economic deprivation. However these two themes have developed alongside a major transformation in cultural policy since the 1980s, the use of cultural policy as part of the UK's economy. This 'economic' use of culture is the development which has gathered most attention, from within the cultural sector and from academic commentators. The economic use of culture forms the master narrative under which questions of cultural excellence and social exclusion are discussed and as such it is virtually impossible to understand New Labour's cultural policy without exploring these trends.

Cultural policy as economic policy- from 'culture as a way of life' to the creative industries

In keeping with the bipartite nature of this Chapter's narrative of the parallel growth in cultural policy practice and analysis, it is instructive to consider the work of Nicholas Garnham (2005). Garnham was one of the main influences on the development of the GLC's cultural policy and would subsequently go on to be a major authority in the development of the academic field studying cultural policy (McGuigan 1996:81). Garnham's work is important in the context of this discussion as he identifies (Garnham

2005) a shift in British cultural policy from cultural provision (along the lines of promoting excellence and inclusion) to the concept of the creative industry. Post-war cultural policy in Britain had a split between mass cultural activities on the one hand e.g. ITV, regulated by government and subject to economic constraints, and the provision of subsidy for elite culture on the other. For Garnham this split has been replaced by the concept of the creative industries, a concept with its roots in the strategies for funding adopted by the cultural sector in the 1980s (Garnham 2005). The critical difference between Garnham's narrative and the one discussed already within this Chapter is that Garnham explicitly relates this change to the context of the knowledge economy and information society (Garnham 2005). Garnham's work on the creative industries is useful as they serve as a paradigmatic introduction to the wider 'master narrative' of cultural policy as an form of economic policy, a policy which includes constructing iconic buildings (Plaza 1999); Cultural tourism (Bonet 2003, Law 1992); creative quarters (Montgomery (2003); major events (Roche 2000, Garica 2004); and city branding (Evans 2003, Jensen 2007, Hudson and Hawkins 2006).

The creative industry, which replaced the term 'cultural industry' early into New Labour's cultural policy, reflects the background of the importance of intangible knowledge based goods to the economy, in the context of the EU's insistence on information based economic activity as a way to ensure European economic competitiveness (Garnham 2005: 22). Hewison's (1995) narrative supports this assertion and moves away from the focus on Thatcherite economic concerns to explain the prominence given to the economic position of culture in government policy. Whilst Garnham's assertion may not fully account for of the arts and culture as creative industries (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005) it does illuminate the context of

the development of the concept. The broad definition of creative industries used by the DCMS, which included software production and advertising (Garnham 2005: 26), would not exist without the background of the information society and EU's instance on the need to employ knowledge as a central aspect of economic production. Garnham goes further than the rather restrictive narrative based on the Thatcher's reforms in the 1980s, but there are still other antecedents which need to be noted for a full description of the evolution of the creative industries policy. Although the era in which government uses of cultural industries policy began is the 1980s, the use of culture in the economy is dependent upon a change in the understanding of culture that occurred in the 1960s.

This change is intertwined with a move from the conception of culture as an elite activity concerned with aesthetic excellence, as exemplified by Keynes and the Bloomsbury group (Upchurch 2004) to the conception of culture as a way of life employed by Eliot in the 1920s (Evans 2001) and expounded by Raymond Williams in the 1950s, 1960s and 1970s. The conception of culture as a way of life is important in understanding public and governmental discourses of culture (Hewison 1995: 134). This conception of culture can also be related to the development of cultural policy within English local authorities in the 1980s, as the developed 'much wider definition' (Bianchini 1990:219) of culture. The 'wider' conception of culture was allied with a political programme designed deal with the economic, political and social crisis facing inner city communities, particularly those excluded by virtue of their ethnicity or sexuality (Bianchini 1990). These developments within local authorities are the subject of the following section.

Cultural policy as economic policy- the master narrative of British cultural policy?

The decline of the straightforward justification for cultural policy (in particular cultural funding) based on the need for cultural ‘excellence’ and the ‘civilising’ of the socially excluded (Bennett 2005) is a major break with the cultural policy thinking of the pre-1980s era. Commentators on cultural policy, particularly those within cultural policy studies, now see the contribution cultural policy can make to economic activity as the dominant rationale underpinning cultural policy (Belfiore 2002, Garnham 2005). The role of culture in the economy may be broken up into two interrelated concepts. In the first instance culture is seen as having a vital role as part of national regional and local economies, in terms of job creation, economic growth and Gross Domestic Product (GDP). The other aspect is the role of culture in economic regeneration, an aspect which has particular relevance for use, and the study of, ECoC in contemporary British cities. This second aspect is especially important because of the role that economic uses of culture are playing at local level, in terms of promoting creative industries as well as regenerating city centres.

A range of DCMS documents and DCMS speeches and statements, as well as academic work considering New Labour’s cultural policy, emphasise culture’s role within the economy, specifically its usefulness as an area of economic growth in the post-industrial UK (Council of Europe, Garnham 2005, Evans 2001, DCMS 1998). Indeed this has been a consistent theme since New Labour came to power in 1997, and can be seen in current DCMS themes and reports (DCMS 2008). Indeed when DCMS set out six objectives for its policies in 2001 (Creigh-Tyte and Stevens 2001), four reflected the role of culture in the economy. Therefore much of DCMS

language surrounding economic uses of culture emphasises the potential of culture within the economy to replace traditional industrial production. The DCMS' commitment to an efficient market and to promote British success reflects the need to expand the cultural sector and promote it, especially those aspects related to exports and tourism. Objectives two and three reflect the need to provide an appropriately skilled workforce for the cultural sector, whilst objective six sought a role in urban regeneration. The role of culture in the economy is given a high profile in DCMS annual reports (1998, 2000) and its current strategic priorities (DCMS 2008) also seek to 'maximise the contribution that the tourism, creative and leisure industries can make to the economy' (DCMS 2008), as well as ensuring that Britain is able to 'realise the economic benefits of the Department's sectors' (DCMS 2008). Both Tessa Jowell, a former secretary of state at DCMS, and one of her successors, Andy Burnham have stressed the importance of culture to the economy. Jowell has cited figures suggesting one in ten of the population are involved in this sector (Mirza 2001), whilst more recently Gerry Sutcliffe, Parliamentary Under-Secretary (Sport) at DCMS, has spoken of the importance of the creative industries to the development of the knowledge economy in the UK, as well as being a major area for small and medium enterprise growth. Governmental promotion of the economic role of culture has been matched by a similar enthusiasm from quanos within the cultural sector, promotion bets enunciated in a 2001 speech given by Lord Evans, then chair of Resource: the Council for Museums, Archives and Libraries, which claimed culture could both directly contribute to the economy in terms of jobs and GDP, as well as fostering the entrepreneurial spirit which is necessary to compete in the twenty first century marketplace (Evans 2001b).

The British government's recognition, and embrace, of the economic use of culture is comparatively recent and is generally seen to have begun in the 1980s (Hewison 1995, Garnham 2005, Bianchini 2001). This Chapter has already noted how cultural policy was narrated through concepts of aesthetic excellence and public participation, with the cultural sector often hostile to industrial and commercial activity (Green and Wilding 1970), before the state restructuring and industrial decline of the 1980s (Gamble 1994). Arts Council documents of the 1960s reflect these aspects of access to cultural activity and aesthetic excellence as opposed to the economic potential of cultural activity (Hewison 1995: 119, 122, 155), as did central government approaches to culture generally (Labour Party 1966). Just as central government and Arts Council narratives of the economic uses of cultural policy developed in the 1980s the analysis of these policies began to emerge. Commentators on the rise of the economic use of culture (Bianchini and Parkinson 1989, Bianchini 1989a, Hewison 1995, Bianchini 2001, Belfiore 2002) offer three intertwined developments to account for the prominence of economic objectives in cultural policy. First there is the decrease in funding in real terms given over to cultural activities by central government during the 1980s (Hewison 1995); second there is the internal restructuring of the management of the cultural sector; and finally there are the policies of local authorities during the 1980s. All three of these concerns can be seen as a reflection of the interconnection between cultural policy and the changing British state in the 1980s. Although the final point of the three is most crucial to this Chapter's argument concerning the use of cultural policy by Local Authorities in the UK, this element cannot be seen in isolation from the other two developments that gave rise to Britain's 'economic' cultural policy.

Cultural policy as economic policy: Cultural policy's relationship with the changing British State.

The decline of funding for cultural organisations took place against the backdrop of the restructuring of the British economy during the 1980s and the collapse of traditional industrial sectors that began in the 1970s. In this context commentators, such as Hewison (1995), Belfiore (2002) and Myerscough (1988), point to an acceptance of culture's role in the economy by central government during the late 1980s in order to alleviate economic decline. However even in the 1970s culture was suggested as an alternative form of economic policy, with the potential for tourism around stately homes (Hewison 1995: 191).

Central government's acceptance of culture's potential to replace traditional industries runs parallel to the Arts Council's attempts to justify funding claims in terms of culture's impact on the economy (Belfiore 2002: 94). As early as the late 1970s one can see the concern with declining funds within the Arts Council. Documents like "Value for Money" and "The Arts in Hard Times" (Hewison 1995) reflect the growing awareness of the need for new justifications for funding from within the cultural sector, but it is not until the 1980s that explicit links are drawn to the economic potential of the arts. The essential documents that reflect the start of this link between culture and economy are *A Great British Success Story*, published by the Arts Council in 1985 to put forward the case for culture's economic role and the 1988 publication of Myerscough's *The Economic Importance of the Arts in Great Britain* (Grey 2002: 85). Myerscough's (1988) work is particularly important to this thesis. Consisting of the aggregates of several research projects, one based on Merseyside, Myerscough sought to advocate the importance of the nascent creative industries in the UK, an approach which

was politically important to the development of Arts policy in the UK generally, and in post-Militant Liverpool in particular. The development of the economic use of culture within the cultural sector continues to the present, featuring in a range of Arts Council reports and commissioned studies (for example Reeves 2002) as well as featuring in the narratives offered by national cultural institutions (Lorente 1996d).

At the same time as the Arts Council began to reconstitute its funding strategies based on the language of economic potential, there were major changes that were restructuring the management of cultural policy throughout 1980s. The 1980s saw restructuring of almost every aspect of government (Rhodes 1997), with the influence of the ethos of New Public Management (Leach and Barnett 1997, Ferlie et al 1996) imposed by the Thatcher administrations onto government departments and existing quangos, such as the Arts Council (Kawashima 2004: 34). The introduction of the need for government to follow the three “Es”, of efficiency, effectiveness and economy, following the National Audit Act of 1983, may be seen as a crucial management change, prompting the cultural sector to have to justify any spending to central government in these terms (Hewison 1995: 256). Central government’s attitude towards the cultural sector in this period is best summed up by Richard Luce, the then Minister for the arts, who in 1987 denounced the reliance on, and expectation of, public subsidy within the cultural sector (Kawashima 2004: 30).

This transformation of attitudes within central government, moving away from the unquestioned importance of arts funding, saw the beginnings of an introduction of private sector management concerns into the cultural sector, further reinforcing the change in the language and thinking of the sector’s major funding streams, again best illustrated by reference the Arts

Council. The 1980s saw a shift in Arts Council language, from 'audiences' to 'consumers' and from 'subsidy' to 'investment' (Quinn 1998: 177), as cultural bodies had to appeal to sources other than central government for funds. Business sponsorships were backed by central government, and this alternative stream of funding for the cultural sector may be seen as a direct inversion of the attitudes of the sector towards business in the 1970s, as well as a move away from the fear of commercialisation outlined by this Chapter's earlier discussion of cultural excellence (Green and Wilding 1970). This dual process, of cultural institutions being run along the lines of private enterprises, coupled with the need to find alternative funds from business sponsorships helps to place central governments use of the cultural sector in economic policy in context. As central government cut funds and provided subsidies for business and cultural partnerships, the cultural sector itself participated in the construction of culture as an economic activity, both to secure further funding and in response to management reorganisations. These transformations across the sector (Shaw 1987, Pick 1988) are important as they provide the backdrop to the development of local authorities' use of culture for economic transformation, reflecting the innovations occurring in local government during the 1980s (Atkinson and Wilks-Heeg 2000).

Cultural policy as economic policy- the role of local authorities

The transformation of the role of culture and the cultural sector within the UK had profound consequences for the development of local cultural policy, the policy topic under consideration within this thesis. In keeping with Atkinson and Wilks-Heeg (2000) the story of local cultural policy illustrates the 'creative autonomy' thesis suggested in their study of local government in the 1980s and 1990s. The pressure for local government

reform by the Thatcher administration, shifting local authorities from a democratic to an administrative role, saw a number of 'creative' responses from local authorities to preserve their power and influence at local level (Atkinson and Wilks-Heeg 2000). Subject to the same processes as the cultural sector, with declining funds and a centrally driven demand for the implementation of New Public Management programmes (Leach and Barnett 1997, Ferlie et al 1996) several local authorities responded with a shift towards more proactive cultural policies, with cultural policy as one of the few areas not subject to strict statutory control.

The remit of local authorities before the 1980s covered a broad range of activities, including education, housing and local services. As a result of this Local authorities' cultural provision was patchy and sporadic as they had many other concerns (Green and Wilding 1970:13, Kawashima 2004). Indeed, traditionally the arts and culture had been merely residual matters in local administration. Although local authorities could spend and rise up to 6d in tax for entertainment, by authority of the 1948 Local Government Act, cultural concerns were often ignored. The twin pressures of declining funds coupled with the removal of Local authority's powers by central government and the decline in their role as service providers, due to contracting out and privatisation, gave rise to local authority's use of culture in economic policy as a response to these issues (Mulgan and Worpole 1986: 21, Grey 2002: 84). Against the backdrop of economic decline, especially within metropolitan authorities, new solutions were sought which did not use house building or job creation with local services. These solutions are exemplified in the economic policies employed by local authorities during the 1980s, such as in Merseyside County Council, Liverpool City Council, Sheffield City Council and the often cited example of the GLC (Grey 2002). The

specific (and politically unusual) case of Merseyside and Liverpool is discussed in Chapter 4, as the attempts by local administration in Liverpool to develop an 'economic' cultural policy were to have a profound (and constraining) influence on the specific nature of cultural policy in Liverpool within the thesis' case study period, the run up to hosting European Capital of Culture in 2008.

A more straightforward illustration of the emergence of local 'economic' cultural policies can be seen in the cases of Sheffield and the GLC. In Sheffield a 'New Urban Left' (Elcock 1990) council emerged during the early 1980s, pioneering a cultural quarter within the city for job creation in the face of the declining steel industry (Moss 2002). Moss' analysis of the cultural quarter adds depth to the narrative of local autonomy, as Sheffield City Council is seen as reflecting the broader view of 'culture as a way of life' (Moss 2002: 213) as well as using culture to respond to economic decline. Whilst Moss's (2002) analysis doubts the longer term viability of the cultural quarter, citing the areas 'pioneering' status as a reason for some of the less successful aspects of the policy (such as the disastrous National Centre for Popular Music), the description of Sheffield's is a sound illustration of the development of an economic use of culture at local level, a development which would go on to influence New Labour's approach to culture set out earlier in this Chapter, as well as form another part of the context of local authorities use of culture in the early 2000s.

The second example of local 'economic' cultural policy is perhaps the better known, as the GLC is the usual example given by academic commentators studying local 'economic' cultural policy (Mulgan and Worpole 1986, Grey 2002). As Bianchini (1989b) observes, the GLC used its Arts and Recreation Committee to instigate policies aimed at

expand the ruling Labour group's voter base (1989:36). Alongside funding aimed specifically at funding previously excluded ethnic groups, the GLC attempted to fund and develop cultural activities which would have (eventual) commercial, as well as aesthetic, appeal (Bianchini 1989b:39). The GLC's policy is the parallel example of the process that occurred in Sheffield during the 1980s, although Sheffield may offer a better example of a more coherent policy, given the abolition of the GLC only a year after it began to provide finance for cultural sector businesses start ups (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005: 3) and the longevity of projects like the cultural quarter and the Leadmill in Sheffield (Moss 2002).

These policies were influenced by the 'wider' (Bianchini 1990:219) view of culture that emerged within the New Urban Left, particularly on the left of the Labour party at the end of the 1970s (Wainwright 1986). Cultural policy was thus a strategy to give representation to formerly excluded cultures (Bianchini 1990), preserve power in the face of government restructuring (Kawashima 2004, Mulgan and Worpole 1986, Grey 2002) and as means of combating economic decline. This narrative therefore returns to the wider questions being investigated by this thesis, looking at the role of the local in the development of cultural policy. Perhaps the most notable way that the trends by this paragraph have seen their full expression is in the use of cultural policy within urban regeneration. Urban regeneration policy at local level is an area that brings together this Chapter's narrative of the three themes of excellence, access and economic uses of culture bound together in the cultural policies occurring in British cities throughout the beginning of the twenty-first century.

Excellence, access and economic uses of cultural policy: Cultural policy's role in urban regeneration

The instrumental use of culture in urban regeneration is now a common feature of both central and local government policy (DCMS 2004, Belfiore 2002: 96, Bianchini 1999). Despite the manifold uses of the concept by central and local government (Vickery 2007) there are a series of key policy statements that serve to offer an overview of the link between the three strands of cultural policy discussed in this Chapter and contemporary urban policy. *Culture at the heart of regeneration*, the DCMS's 2004 policy document, is the explicit statement of this link, a link which is further expressed in the DCMS's 2001 policy objectives (Creigh-Tyte and Stiven 2001) committing the DCMS to a role in urban regeneration. Whilst the DCMS most recent annual report (DCMS 2008) has seen its attachment to regeneration superseded by the need to deliver the 2012 London Olympics, regeneration formed the backbone of secretary of state Andy Burnham's recent assessment of Liverpool's year as European Capital of Culture 2008 (Burnham 2009) and is fundamental to the Olympic project in East London (DCMS 2008).

Vickery (2007) identifies four forms of cultural policy linked to regeneration, which maybe distilled into two broad categories: in the first instance places may use large scale, major or 'mega' events (Vickery 2007:19, Roche 2000), such as the Olympics in Barcelona or European City of Culture in Glasgow; the second where an iconic building, sculpture or form of engineering is constructed to have a significant impact on the local economy such as in Bilbao, London or Gateshead (Garcia 2004a McGuigan 2004, Vickery 2007:19). These two uses of cultural policy were linked to a trend to use academic work in cultural policy studies to justify culture's role in urban regeneration, often specifically sighting the work of Richard Florida (2002) or using longitudinal studies considering the impact of cultural policy

(Bailey 2006, Garcia 2005). In *Culture at the heart of regeneration* Florida is named (DCMS 2004: 8) as a key influence on cultural strategy, where culture can be used to attract investment from both government and private sources, as well as to transform the image of urban sites that are in the process of economic restructuring. For Florida a place needs a thriving cultural infrastructure to attract personnel who are part of the knowledge economy (Florida 2002). The use of this concept, whilst relying on Florida's work, also has antecedents within central government discourse. As far back as 1967 ministers recognised the need to establish thriving cultures to attract investment into areas (Green & Wilding 1970). The history of the need for thriving cultural infrastructure to attract investment is also in the context of the perceived success of Glasgow's urban regeneration following its status as European City of Culture in 1990 (Burnham 2009, Richards and Wilson 2004, Booth and Boyle 1993).

Along with the concept of using culture to give make a place attractive to investment by what Florida calls 'the creative class' (Florida 2002) there is culture as a means of directly rebuilding derelict or decaying urban spaces. As suggested by Miles (2005a) cities use iconic cultural buildings to rebrand themselves to attract tourism and revitalise their urban landscapes, hoping to emulate the success of Bilbao's use of Gehry's Guggenheim museum. This type of policy can be traced back to the original royal charter of the Arts Council which had to fund buildings to house cultural institutions. The context of post-Second World War Britain may be vastly different to the current situation, but the Arts Council's role in housing the cultural institutions has played a key role in the development of iconic buildings to regenerate urban spaces.

These intellectual justifications, for changing urban spaces and attracting people and investment have occurred in the context of the emergence of new policies by local authorities and cultural sector bodies. Whilst the Arts Council has historically been charged with housing cultural organisations, the funding cuts of the 1980s have forced it to find new justifications and sources for its funds. Thus the 1986 document *Partnership: making the arts work harder* can be seen in this light, of giving a new urban regeneration agenda to cultural funding (Hewison 1995: 258). This combination of the need to house cultural institutions and the need for funding can also be seen in the role of the lottery funding capital projects, a policy development that is essential to the narrative of cultural policy in Newcastle and Gateshead discussed in Chapters 5 and 7.

As the need to find new funding justifications accelerated in the 1970s and 1980s Local Authorities began to reconfigure their agendas along similar lines to the Arts Council. What Grey refers to as 'policy attachment' (Grey 2002) is now a common phenomenon, whereby requests for funds from cultural sources, e.g. lottery funds, are made with urban regeneration objectives in mind and conversely requests for funds from regeneration sources have cultural policy overtones (Hesmondhalgh & Pratt 2005, Grey 2002). Indeed Vickery (2007) has identified the preponderance of cultural aspects of regeneration programmes, drawing attention to the relative rarity of major infrastructure or building programmes to go ahead without a 'cultural' element (2007:26). The search for alternative funding sources in the 1980s, specifically funds for urban regeneration from central government (by both the arts sector and regeneration quangos) saw the development of several of these cultural infrastructure projects, for example the Merseyside Development Corporation's role in Tate Liverpool. The other alternative

source of funds is European development money (Kawashima 2004: 35, Hewison 1995 : 224, Quilley 2000) and these two sources often resulted in 'grant coalitions' to lever funds from central government and EU sources (Cochrane *et al* 1996), such as Manchester's pursuit of central government regeneration funds based on its bid for the Olympic Games. Indeed as Quilley (1999, 2000) points there is a continuity between local authorities with cultural polices and Labour's current administration, as personnel from these local authorities have been part of the New Labour project and successive governments, David Blunkett being the most obvious example.

A final element in accounting for the present policy of using cultural policy in urban regeneration is the transfer of supposedly successful examples of regeneration from the USA. Although there is a voluminous literature dealing with, and questioning, the concept of direct policy transfer from the USA to the UK (e.g Cochrane's 2006a summary), the 'Baltimore model', of regeneration using urban cultural spaces for leisure, entertainment and consumption (Stevenson 2003: 101), saw a range of policy discussions in both central government across the late 1980s (Hewison 1995: 276) and sparked the interest of local authority actors to construct alternative agendas to counteract central government's economic policies at this same time (Quilley 1999).

The above comment reflects the link between local authority uses of cultural policy and the more general narrative outlined in this Chapter. The narrative of British cultural policy offered by this Chapter has sought to explore how cultural policy has emerged from three, central government, 'uses' of culture: for excellence, inclusion and for the economy. In considering these three uses the narrative has illustrated the way cultural policy emerged as a key area of concern for local government in British

cities, often providing the basis for major urban transformations (e.g. Ward 2003), image renovations (e.g. Boyle and Booth 1993), examples of excellence (e.g. Manchester International Festival) and of social inclusion policies (e.g. Gateshead, as discussed in Chapter 5). What is striking about this narrative is the importance of local administration to the evolution of cultural policy in the UK. However, despite the role of individual local authorities and the link between specific places and cultural policy developments there is little in cultural policy studies that has really engaged with how cultural policy practice has materialised at the local level and how specificity of place has shaped that materialisation. This Chapter is therefore contending that the importance of the specificity of place and space only of limited interest within cultural policy research, despite the Chapter's narrative that has shown the important role in cultural policy for individual urban sites. In order to illustrate this contention, and to expound the thesis' central argument that an engagement with decision-making at local level will help cultural policy research to fully understand cultural policy, this Chapter now turns to a discussion of the emerging field of cultural policy studies, looking at how cultural policy studies developed alongside the cultural policy practice outlined by this Chapter, in order to make clear the necessity of this thesis' work within the research cannon.

From cultural policy practice to cultural policy studies

English speaking, specifically British literature on research into cultural policy falls into two broad categories. Present research into cultural policy involves the analysis of policy, on the one hand, and on the other an engagement with policy makers in an attempt to influence policy formation (Lewis and Miller 2003). Although there is work which transcends this divide, most work can be related to one or the other of the positions

summarised in the debate between Bennett (1992) and McGuigan (2003, 2004), a debate over the nature of research into cultural policy as this field of research developed out of cultural studies.

Bennett (1992) is perhaps the originator of cultural policy research in its present guise, with his specific demand that cultural studies take a much more active part in policy formation and evaluation. In Bennett's view much of the research on culture talked only to itself, and had become increasingly irrelevant to the way in which culture was being used by governments during the 1980s and 1990s. Bennett takes a broad view of what government is, relying heavily on the notion of governmentality, drawn from the work of Michel Foucault (Foucault 2008). The concept of governmentality can be seen as the creation of particular issues and persons to be subject to control, as well as questions of how to govern these subjects (Foucault, cited in McGuigan 2003). This conception of government as a *technique* for dealing with particular, discursively constructed, problems is what prompts Bennett's call for a full engagement with policy. Bennett argues against a prevailing trend in cultural studies that insisted upon the need to critique the role of institutions as defending the hegemony of dominant classes within society (Bennett 1992). In essence Bennett is demanding that research around culture engage with the problems and techniques of governing, directly assisting the needs of those persons and institutions involved in constituting and addressing those problems, so as not to lapse into irrelevant 'banality' (Bennett 1992:32), which Bennett feels stems from the insistence of critique of hegemonic institutions: in Marxist terms Bennett sees the need for 'talking to and working *with* what used to be called the [Ideological State Apparatuses]' (Bennett 1992:32).

In contrast to the above position McGuigan insists upon the continued relevance of the critical position with regard to cultural policy (McGuigan 2003, 2004). For McGuigan cultural policy is a form of dispute over cultural issues and must be seen in the widest possible sense. In this case research into cultural policy is engaged in a critical project of interrogating the cultural policy created by government and power structures, such as media policy or the decision to build the Millennium Dome (McGuigan 2004). McGuigan seeks to show the 'insidious and often hidden connections between culture and power' (2003:141), by engaging in a critique of the current uses of culture in the context of neo-liberal globalisation, whereby nation-states and individual cities have to restructure themselves according to the demands of transnational capital (2004:2). It is therefore the task of research into cultural policy to critique, not advance, the agendas of government.

One can see the present forms of cultural policy research evolving from the Bennett/McGuigan debate. Scullion and Garcia (2005) neatly illustrate Bennett's demand for an engagement with government policy making, whilst McGuigan's more recent work (2004) is an excellent example of the 'critical' position of research into cultural policy. Scullion and Garcia claim the study of cultural policy is in its infancy. As such research into cultural policy faces the necessity of securing funding and 'proving' its usefulness to policy makers. In this context research into cultural policy must fulfil the needs of policy makers, and so Scullion and Garcia cite the needs of evidence-based policy making which can be fulfilled by academic work, giving an opportunity for engagement and influence, which is also reflected in the work of Evans and Shaw (2004) and Evans (2001a).

Evans and Shaw (2004) look explicitly at the role of cultural policy in urban regeneration to identify the forms this takes, as well as the potential usefulness and cost effectiveness of this form of investment and policy programme. Their review of the evidence surrounding cultural policy and urban regeneration leads them to specify three forms of practice: culture-led regeneration, whereby cultural policy is used as a 'catalyst' for regeneration, often based around the construction of an iconic building, such as the Sage Music Centre in Gateshead; cultural regeneration, whereby cultural programmes form part of a wider integrated social and economic regeneration strategy such as the integrated regeneration plans adopted by Birmingham City Council; and culture *and* regeneration, whereby cultural programmes are added onto other policies, like property-led regeneration programmes, and are merely incidental to the overall programme. It is interesting to note that this work was commissioned by DCMS, and as such reflects Bennett's call for the linkup between research and policy making.

Coupled with his work for DCMS, Evans' 2001 book *Cultural Planning* also reflects the linking up of research and policy. *Cultural Planning* is an attempt to catalogue and prescribe cultural policy practice with regard to various aspects of the planning process, both in terms of the built environment and arts and culture provision. Evans goes as far as to include a summary of cultural planning in London to serve as a potential model for cultural planners to follow. Evans also relies on case studies of various cities across time and space, such as Bilbao's use of the Guggenheim museum and Barcelona's use of the Olympics to transform their cities into sites of consumption with a marketable global place brand. However whilst Evans (2001a) and Evans and Shaw (2004) engage with policy in terms of the types of cultural policy in existence, and seek to influence policy makers

by providing lessons in best practice and highlighting potentially failing and risk laden forms of cultural policy, there is no real engagement with how the decisions to adopt cultural policy are taken. In the work of Evans (2001a) and Evans and Shaw (2004) cultural policy is a prevailing, almost global, policy form, adopted on masse, albeit with local variations. Their work does not however account for the process of policy generation and formation, and this is the aspect of much of current cultural policy research that this thesis intends to address.

The city in cultural policy studies

Just as in Evans and Shaw (2004), where cultural policy is seemingly homogenous with little or no variation in decision making, those authors looking to connect cultural policy to studies of cities and more general urban questions present a similar story of homogeneity explained by recourse to global trends (Stevenson 2003). As this Chapter has already indicated British cities have been at the forefront of developing cultural policy as a method of reacting to a variety of external circumstances, such as central government reducing their power and autonomy, as well as economic decline and the renewal of physical infrastructure. British research on this topic can be understood using the framework put forward in the summary of the Bennett/McGuigan debate, whereby on the one hand there are those authors who seek to research topics of relevance to policy makers at national and local level, such as Garcia's work on the perceptions of Glasgow following the 1990 City of Culture, and on the other more critical research, as shown in the work of writers such as Miles (2004, 2005a) on NewcastleGateshead, Mooney (2004) on Glasgow and Jones and Wilks-Heeg (2004) on Liverpool.

In Garcia's work (2005) there is an explicit engagement with the potential lessons for cultural policy surrounding the use of European Capital of Culture status in urban transformations. Garcia analyses the perceptions of Glasgow across various media forms since 1990 to provide empirical evidence of the impact of Glasgow's cultural policy. The empirical nature of Garcia's research, as well as its subject matter, link more directly to practical cultural policy, providing the evidence forms demanded by policy makers in a similar way to Evans and Shaw (2004) and Selwood (2002). Garcia's work is also notable as it deals specifically with ECoC, which has played a major role in the transformation of cities with the title (e.g. Glasgow 1990, Liverpool 2008) and has influenced other cities policies wishing to replicate the perceived benefits accrued from hosting the festival. In contrast more critical work on the use of cultural policy by British cities takes a different form and is closer to the form of research encouraged by McGuigan. In the case of Miles' work (2004, 2005), which attempts to go beyond the critical/useful distinction, there is an explicit engagement with the concept of identity, and the impact on the sense of identity and ownership of urban spaces by the public of Newcastle and Gateshead, whilst both Mooney (2004) and Jones and Wilks-Heeg (2004), who are more explicitly critical, seek to raise critical perspectives and issues surrounding the use of cultural policy in Glasgow and Liverpool that tend to be ignored by both policy makers and media coverage. Thus both approaches raise the perspectives of those potentially excluded from the new cultural spaces, as well as highlighting opposition movements to the 'inevitable' cultural policies offered by local decision makers. However what is clearly absent from these two sets of research is some recognition of the role of decision-making. Work on cultural policy in the city is still seen in the same way as Evans and Shaw (2004) or McGuigan have explained cultural policy more generally, as

a homogenous, monolithic policy development with little or no space for local nuance and virtually no recognition of the impact of place in shaping the form cultural policy takes.

Policy relevance or critical cultural policy studies? Researching European Capital of Culture 2008

In order to better understand the role that place and locality have in cultural policy this thesis uses the example of two cities respective bids to be nominated as European Capital of Culture (ECoC) 2008. ECoC allows for a focus on how Liverpool and Newcastle and Gateshead, the two sites chosen for the comparative study, are seemingly involved in the same cultural policy (bidding to host ECoC 2008) and yet reflect very different political histories, different political cultures and ultimately different modes of governance. The ECoC is more generally useful as it is a major-event (Roche 2000) that has become increasingly important to European cities' cultural policy in recent times, to the extent that Richards (2000) has referred to ECoC as the 'strategic weapon in the cultural arms race', viewing ECoC as an essential tool for the promotion of culture-led regeneration in European cities (Evans 2001). This quote from Richards is instructive of the fashion in which academic commentary has dealt with ECoC. It is significant that academic explorations of the ECoC festival have tended to reflect the wider debate within cultural policy discussed in this Chapter, broadly, although not exclusively, falling into two categories: those which seek to be evaluative; and those which seeks to offer critical engagement. These two categories reflect the twin themes which provide the framework for understanding the literature presented in this chapter, twin themes at the root of the tension between those producing research which is 'useful' for policy makers and those academics who seek to position themselves outside of discourses

which, in their view, have been shaped, and limited, by the demands of those who are in control of the policy process (McGuigan 2004, Anderson and Holden 2008).

The first category of ECoC research is evaluative. Within this category there are a further two forms, those which seek to offer a wider overview of pan-European uses of the year (e.g Richards 2000 Palmer/Rae 2004, Cogliandro and Reading 2000) and those which offer more straightforward evaluations of aspects of an individual ECoC year (e.g Deffner and Labrianois 2005, Garcia 2005, Richards and Wilson 2004 or Heikkinen 2000). It is worth paying particular attention to Palmer/Rae's (2004) work, the EU commissioned overview of all of the ECoC between 1995 and 2004 and Richards' (2000) summary of the history of ECoC as a strategy for tourism. Both identify the impetus of the original ECoC, or 'City of Culture' as the title was initially formulated in 1985, as a means of celebrating European culture in line with the developing partnerships in commerce and technology within the then European Economic Community (EEC) (Palmer/Rae 2004:41). In its first wave, between 1985-1989, the 'City of Culture' title was attached to the traditional cites of European cultural importance, a 'cannon' of cities including Athens (1985), Berlin (1988) and Paris (1989), which hosted festivals that were, in effect, limited to artistic programmes (Richards 2000). It was not until Glasgow, in 1990, that the use of the 'city of culture' was transformed into what Palmer/Rae describe as 'A powerful tool for cultural development that operates on a scale that offers unprecedented opportunities for acting as a catalyst for city change.' (2004:23).

All of the literature discussed by this section, whether critical or evaluative, shares Palmer/Rae's view that Glasgow 1990 was the turning

point for ECoC to act as an integrated event for a host of urban programme (2004:47). Whilst the cities hosting ECoC in the 1980s had reflected various aims based in *cultural* concerns, Glasgow was the first to see the cultural festival as an opportunity for urban transformation, with a programme of capital infrastructure development, tourist promotion an attempt to ameliorate its rather chequered image (Richards 2000, Garcia 2005). Thus host cities subsequent to Glasgow displayed a language of urban development, often with explicitly economic aims (Palmer/Rae 2004:47, McGuigan 2005). These specific uses of ECoC for wider, 'non-cultural', urban programmes is highlighted by evaluative studies of programmes in Thessaloniki (Deffner and Labrianois 2005), Rotterdam (Richards and Wilson 2004) and Helsinki (Hakkinen (2000) which all reference the perceived 'success' of Glasgow's year in 1990. What is common to all of these evaluative studies is the peripheral place for questions of governance, which tends to be discussed as an afterthought to the analysis of the impact of hosting an ECoC, even where, in the case of Thessaloniki, governance failures were crucially important to understanding the limited and as negative effect that the 1997 programme had on the city (Deffner and Labrianois 2005:257).

The governance lacuna present in evaluative work on ECoC is mirrored in critical work on the cultural year, where little of the general critical overviews have engaged with the decision making process surrounding ECoC. The most stringent critics (e.g. McGuigan 2005, Mooney 2004) see the festival reflecting their construction of neo-liberal urban regeneration discourses and comment on the 'exclusionary' nature of the ECoC. Indeed McGuigan is explicit in his reading of contemporary cultural policy, including the 'use' of ECoC, 'The predominant rationale for cultural

policy today is economic, in terms of competitiveness and regeneration, and, to a lesser extent, social, as an implausible palliative to exclusion and poverty' (2005:238). This assertion forms the root of the work of Mooney (2004) and Jones and Wilks-Heeg (2004), who draw particular attention to the variegated impact of hosting an ECoC (in Glasgow and Liverpool, respectively) attempting to draw attention to the way that concepts of culture are contested and 'undesirable' narratives of space and place are banished from official discourses. In a similar vein Anderson and Holden (2008:148) use Deluzian theory to question the 'character' of Liverpool constructed by the ECoC 2008. The misgivings surrounding regeneration and renewal of public space versus 'local' cultures is a key feature of Evans' (2003) generalised narrative of the conflict between regeneration programmes, cultural policy and festivals such as ECoC and existing local cultures. Whilst much of this critical literature seeks to associate discussion over the use of ECoC with wider social, and in particular, political economy questions there is a similar deficit of attention paid to the decision making process in the areas under consideration by critical research.

This summary of the range of literature on ECoC shows how this thesis fits in with existing research by exploring the decision making process around ECoC in the contemporary British city. The lacunae in the literature on ECoC are all related to the need for work on place specific cultural policy, as there is such a dearth of such investigations, save for writers like Bassett (1993), Quilley (2000) and Cochrane *et al* (1996)'s investigations into city governance based on theoretical frameworks from urban studies and political science. Thus also there is the need for place specific comparative research; there are some antecedents for the approach adopted by this thesis within the existing cultural policy literature, particularly those works insisting on

the importance of the local in shaping the form cultural policy takes. Although Bassett (1993) attempted to apply an urban studies framework to understand decision making in relation to Bristol's cultural policy, two more recent papers can provide a bridge between studies of ECoC and wider debates in cultural policy, namely Garcia's (2005) study of media coverage of Glasgow 1990 and Crespi-Vallbona and Richards' (2007) evaluation of the La Mercè festival in Barcelona.

In the first instance Garcia's (2005) study of media coverage of Glasgow, whilst essentially an evaluative piece, draws attention to the importance of place and history for giving specific understandings of how cultural policy, in Glasgow's case hosting ECoC 1990, emerges and is influenced by place (2005:842). Similar sentiments are evident in Crespi-Vallbona and Richards (2007) evaluation of Catalan cultural festivals. Although not dealing directly with the ECoC event, Crespi-Vallbona and Richards study stakeholders' views of the decision making process, highlighting the role of place and space in shaping the emergence of cultural policy (2007:108, 120). Their argument also seeks to move away from commentators who concentrate on Barcelona's use of cultural policy as an aspect of potentially divisive urban regeneration (e.g. Garcia 2004, Bianchini 1993:14). Crespi-Vallbona and Richards give a narrative which seeks to illustrate how post-Franco Barcelona was confronted with place-specific constraints in building a cultural policy infrastructure to promote a uniquely 'Catalan' cultural policy (2007:117). These two papers have been highlighted as they are examples of the few discussions of cultural policy that engage with decision-making and produce findings which show the role of history and culture in constraining (and to some extent determining) local cultural policy outcomes.

Conclusion: the need to study decision-making in cultural policy

As the preceding sections have shown, even in discussions of major cultural policy events, such as ECoC, British and English speaking academic research has tended to underplay the importance of place and has given little regard to the role of place specific decision making. As a result of this the fundamental concern underpinning this thesis is that there is relatively little written interrogating the decision-making process surrounding cultural policy, even though there is much seeking to account for the reasoning behind policy and the purposes for which it is constructed. As this Chapter's review of the literature has demonstrated the tendency is for research to focus on outcomes of policy, either in terms of evaluation of policy to directly feed into policy production (e.g. Bennett 1992, Evans and Shaw 2004), or critically analysing and engaging with cultural policy adopted at both local and national levels (e.g. McGuigan 2004, Mooney 2004, Hewison 1995). In the limited cases where studies of local decision-making touch on cultural policy, they tend to illustrate the need for more detailed in-depth research, and raise questions of the relevance of their analysis across various places, prompting the necessity of comparative study. This Chapter has shown how all of this literature seems to have developed in spite of the importance of the role played by the local in how cultural policy developed in the UK, in particular the use of cultural policy for both social and economic policy purposes.

By way of conclusion the Chapter now turns to the few examples which attempt to understand local, cultural policy, decision making. The most recognisable illustration of this type of work is Cochrane *et al* (1996) and Quilley (1999, 2000) on Manchester. Cochrane *et al*'s work uses the insights of regime theory in the creation of growth coalitions, drawn from

American work, to explain the process of Manchester's bid for the Olympics. Cochrane *et al* look at the personalities involved in bid as an urban regime to attract government grants to Manchester. In this case regime theory is used to structure the narrative of decision-making surrounding the attempt to stage a major cultural event in Manchester. Regime theory posits that urban governance is run by a coalition of interested parties, usually drawn from elected officials coupled with business and property interests (Harding 1995).

Quilley's work (1999, 2000) is concerned with the move from municipal socialism to an entrepreneurial Manchester using culture as a catalyst to transform the city via a new economy and new forms of investment. In describing the forms of policy adopted and the influence of discourses of place marketing and the city as a site of post-industrial cultural consumption Quilley's work raises the question of how actors narrate the policy process and the ideas that drive the agendas they seek to advocate, the role those understandings play in their interactions with other actors in the policy process, as well as which specific actors are involved. In the case of Quilley's work the need for an institutional mapping exercise (discussed in Chapter 3) is made clear, in order to determine those involved in sharing and exchanging resources in the decision-making process. Coupled with this, the need for comparison is shown by Quilley's narratives of Manchester. The underlying importance of comparative work has been illustrated by the above discussion of current research, as there is little comparative work because research is specific to individual, case study, cities like Glasgow or Barcelona.

Two pieces of research act as a bridge between this overview of cultural policy literature that has opened the space for a discussion of the

importance of space and place in local cultural policy and the methods that this thesis will use to explore the questions arising from this synopsis. O'Callaghan and Linehan (2007) explore use of ECoC in Cork 2005 for regeneration and associated conflicts. Their work concentrates, like Cochrane *et al* (1996), on using the insights of regime theory to understand the production of specific cultural policy, in this case Cork's year as ECoC in 2005. Seeking to offer a critical narrative, O'Callaghan and Linehan (2007) detail the shift to entrepreneurial governance, in a similar fashion to the narrative offered by Quilley's work, describing the conflict over participation, access and the meaning of culture. Cork's 2005 experience reflects the role of an urban regime concerned with promoting growth, and O'Callaghan and Linehan's (2007:316) analysis shows the importance of local political structures in shaping a 'growth led' cultural policy, as opposed to projects designed to foster mere image reconstruction Heikkinen (2000) or promote individual cultural values (Crespi-Vallbona and Richards' (2007). The use of regime theory is discussed extensively in Chapter 3, although here it is sufficient to detail the limited use of a theoretical framework that has a concern with local politics, culture and power relations as the basis of its analytical usefulness. The most coherent statement of regime theory when applied to local cultural policy comes in Boyle's (1997) analysis of Glasgow's ECoC 1990 through the lens of the growth coalition. In keeping with work on Manchester and Cork which would follow a similar line of thought, Boyle questions the effectiveness of Glasgow's 'urban propaganda project' and the civic boosterism e.g. Boyle and Hughes (1994), which underpinned the festival. However whilst Boyle's work may offer a critical analysis similar to Mooney (2004) or Jones and Wilks-Heeg (2004) the analysis gives a foundation for this thesis' contention that local government structures have a key role in influencing cultural policy outcomes. Boyle

gives an ultimately nuanced account of how local populations relate to events and how local actors produce them (1997:1989), a production that is based on negotiations between actors and groups with very different policy aims. Detailed analysis of specific places (in Boyle's case Glasgow) shows a range of actors and many communities shape cultural policy outcomes, as opposed to the division of powerful/powerless and the rather superficial narratives offered by critical overviews of local cultural policy (Boyle 1997:1995/6).

The concluding discussion to this Chapter has shown the need to supplement British cultural policy research with a framework for understanding local politics, especially frameworks that offer an understanding of city governance. It is here that the insights of theories of governance, coupled with political science approaches that focus on exploring actors' narratives of their ideas and roles within the policy process are essential. These concepts are drawn from political science. However there is remarkably little research in British political science which deals with cultural policy, which is especially odd as this Chapter has shown the importance of such policy within the UK's current political context. Therefore there are particular interdisciplinary benefits from the use of political science methods to understand an aspect of British government that is currently of interest to across a variety of academic disciplines. It is to these methods and ideas that the next Chapter will turn.

Chapter 3

METHODOLOGY: SYNTHESISING URBAN THEORY, POLITICAL SCIENCE AND CULTURAL POLICY STUDIES

Chapter two highlighted the need for research that pays close attention to local decision-making with regard to cultural policy. This need stems from the way that while many authors (e.g. Mooney 2004; Garcia 2004; Wilks-Heeg and Jones 2004; Miles 2005a; Evans and Shaw 2004; Evans 2005; McGuigan 2004) are interested in the impacts of cultural policy, there is a dearth of research, from English speaking academics, on the decision-making structures around cultural policy. In addition, where there is research into this area, it tends to be specific to a single location, rather than comparative. Decision making is also generally under-investigated by research concerned with European Capital of Culture (ECoC), where comparative studies of decision-making processes surrounding the ECoC are notable by their under-representation, save for passing references in general studies of ECoC cities (e.g. Palmer/Rae 2004) or bids for ECoC (Griffiths 2006).

The need for this research translates into three questions within the thesis' comparison of local decision-making: 1) How is cultural policy produced at local level? 2) What are the decision-making structures surrounding cultural policy? 3) How do these structures differ over time and space? To address the issues raised by the literature, as well as answering the research question, the thesis is based on a comparison between Liverpool and Newcastle and Gateshead during the years 2001-2005. The two cities selected were both involved in a bid for the European Capital of Culture 2008 award (ECOC). As Chapter 2 discussed, ECOC status is a key part of local cultural

policy programmes as cities seek to replicate the 'Glasgow effect' (Jones and Wilks-Heeg 2004), as well as a significant area of interest for cultural policy research. Aside from its role in the transformation of the contemporary European City, ECoC is used as it provides a clear shared policy within the two case study areas. The competition for ECoC 2008 status was run under rules set by DCMS, within a framework agreed by the EU (BBC 2003), which means the ECoC provides a comparative policy with a clear and defined goal: winning ECoC 2008.

Because the ECoC 2008 was awarded to Liverpool in June 2003, comparisons of the two case studies have a clear point at which the decision-making structures changed to respond to the granting, or failure to secure, European Capital of Culture status. Unlike other policy areas where local responses to national and European changes may differ radically and take time to enact (Atkinson and Wilks-Heeg 2000) the clear moment of the decision on Capital of Culture is an exact point at which to assess the type of cultural policy decision-making structures that existed before and after in the two cities.

The bids from the two areas represent different types of decision-making structure, Liverpool reflecting a decision-making structure based around a single city council, whilst NewcastleGateshead involved two local authorities. As such they serve as excellent comparative examples of two different types of decision-making structure set up around the pursuit of the same objective. Indeed as Chapters 6 and 7 show, the two places represent very different forms of urban governance arrangements. The bid process and the award allows for the study of the impact of external changes on the organization of the structures around cultural policy in the two areas. This helps the thesis to show the extent to which these structures adapt, gain or

lose members, how the distribution of resources alters and if they collapse entirely following external 'shocks'. This discussion gives the basis for the thesis' conception of Newcastle and Gateshead as a 'cultural policy regime' a strong local governance network with a central role for cultural policy, involving cross local authority partnership as well as local arts and cultural organisations. The comparisons with decision-making structures in Liverpool show how Liverpool's political history and institutional inertia has prevented the evolution of governance arrangements comparable to the cultural policy regime found in Newcastle and Gateshead, despite the similarly important role of cultural policy within Liverpool's economy and society.

Although it was an important element of the narrative of the bidding for ECoC 2008, the thesis does not directly discuss the reasons behind the award of ECoC 2008 to Liverpool. This is for three reasons: First there has already been some academic (e.g. Griffiths 2006), and extensive media (e.g. BBC 2003, Hunt 2003), attention given to this question. Second, because the thesis is looking at decision making surrounding cultural policy, the exact reasoning behind the judges' decision to award Liverpool the ECoC 2008 does not form part of the central interest of the thesis, nor does the reasoning behind Liverpool's win fit with the methodological framework presented in this chapter. The thesis seeks to understand cultural policy decision making from the point of view of the decision makers, in this case those making decisions in Liverpool and Newcastle Gateshead, rather than understanding the judges of the competition to be ECoC 2008. Finally, related to the second point, a discussion of the reasons for the ECoC 2008 going to Liverpool would have proved distracting to the main themes within the thesis, creating unnecessary difficulties of access to data and leading to an ultimately tangential discussion.

The thesis' methodological argument develops in four stages. It begins with a consideration of theories of governance, a consideration which sets the context for an examination of research into urban policy. Urban studies has two main paradigms, critical political economy and urban regime theory. Critical political economy is shown to be inappropriate for the area under investigation by this thesis, with a detailed exploration of urban regime theory leading to its acceptance as the framework for this thesis' study. From recent work in regime theory the thesis puts forward the concept of a cultural policy regime as a heuristic device for interpreting the two case studies, Liverpool and NewcastleGateshead. However, as the discussion of the cultural policy regime proves, regime theory lacks the explanatory power to account for the differences between the two sites. As such the thesis suggests the use of institutional theory as a form of explanation, grounding decision making and policy difference firmly in local history and culture.

The theoretical basis of the thesis points towards the appropriate methods with which the data to support the thesis' argument may be gathered. These methods consist of the use of semi-structured interviews and archival research, supported by reputational analysis and an organisational mapping exercise. These techniques are used in the context of interpretivism (Bevir and Rhodes 2003a), the theory that represents a bridge between regime theory, institutionalism and the practical matter of gathering data. Finally the ethical issues associated with these methods are considered as a guide to best practice within the thesis' methodology.

Governance by Networks

Local decision making can be placed in the context of existing work within political science, particularly political science's focus on developing a

theoretical framework to describe the changes in government occurring across the post-industrial world under the influence of state restructuring and the 'New Public Management' of the 1980s (Castells 2001, Osborne and Gaebler 1992). A key concept for organising research into the transformation of government, from the state as a 'rower' to a 'steerer' (Osborne and Gaebler 1992) has been that of governance. Governance as an 'organising framework' points to the need to interrogate actors outside of those areas traditionally explored by work on government, particularly in regard to local government (Denters and Rose 2005, Stoker 1999).

Governance is best described in the work of Bevir and Rhodes, who see the term as a 'weasel word used to obscure, not to shed light' (2003b). In the early work on governance it was often stated that it had too many meanings to be useful (Rhodes 1997: 15, Stoker 1998) as it conflated a theoretical construct, a descriptive and narrative device, as well as a normative position (Jessop 2002). Indeed as Jessop (2002) has argued governance:

'has been hailed as a new social-scientific paradigm, a new approach to problem-solving that can overcome the limitations of anarchic market exchange and top-down planning in an increasingly complex and global world, and as a solution to the perennial ethical, political, and civic problems of securing institutional integration and peaceful social co-existence.' (Jessop 2002:2)

For Rhodes government is best understood as decision-making by top down, hierarchical forms of control based in the public sector, whereas governance involves the sharing of resources in decision-making by a disparate group of actors drawn from various settings: public, private, and

increasingly from outside the nation state. The prevalence of network type governance takes place in light of the process of the hollowing out of the state, whereby the government has lost control of certain functions as a result of programmes which moved control to the EU and the private sector during the 1980s (Rhodes 1997). Within this thesis the term governance is used to understand the importance of the blend of public, private and voluntary sector organisations administering cultural policy at local level. This definition is closest to the understanding of governance put forward in the work of Stoker (1998, 1999), who offers the conception of governance as an 'organising framework' for research, to allow investigation of the policy formation and political action. This investigation allows for an understanding of how the governing process has changed. As such the framework offers guidance as to what is of interest for research, rather than giving either a historical narrative or specific theoretical implications.

Rhodes' definition of governance has not been uncritically accepted over the decade since its inception. Critical positions of Rhodes' work have tended to centre upon geographical and subject variation in the policy process. Governance, when understood as 'networks', fails to fully capture the possibility of variations in policy process precisely because of its insistence on the preponderance of networks. Networks may exclude other forms of behaviour and forms of policy process, when a rigid conception of governance as networks is used, missing important variations, such as the continued existence of forms of hierarchical control. Drawn from the work of Davies (2002), Jessop (1997a) and Whitehead (2003) this problem is the 'over-rigid flexibility' of network theories of governance.

A related criticism is broadly similar to the problem of over-rigid flexibility, centred on the forms of policy creation and implementation which

are hierarchal, partnership relations, whereby the policy process is subject to clear line of control, with little or no scope for negotiation (Whitehead 2003, Davies 2002). This has strong echoes in Jessop's (1997a) theory of meta-governance whereby the state is much more capable of directly influencing the context with which a network operates. These ideas are reminiscent of Lukes' 3rd face of power (Lukes 1972), whereby the state can control the form of a network, for example by only allowing a partnership to exist, rather than networks creating themselves free from state control and as such institute at a distance, hierarchical, control. This discussion of the problems of governance as both a theoretical construction and a narrative descriptor lead the thesis away from uncritically accepting Rhodes' (1997) and Bevir and Rhodes' (2003) understanding of the term and the associated changes to local administration, particularly with regard to urban cultural policy. Critical work on governance shows the requirement for research using the concept to be open to the possibility of regional or local variation in the structure of policy networks, a requirement that is especially important for comparative work.

Duncan and Goodwin (1988) have drawn attention to this aspect of variation in decision making (and policy) processes and outcomes, whilst explaining its occurrence by recourse to the particular dynamics of the capitalist state's internal development. Similar insistence on the possibility of variation, although outside of the Marxist framework proffered by Duncan and Goodwin (1988), is found in the insights offered by Meegan and Mitchell (2001). For Meegan and Mitchell local geographies affect the kinds of policy problems (as understood by a wide variety of actors), as well as the process of responding to those issues and the actors involved in the responses. This is not to overstate the political aspect of the policy process

(although it is to some extent a 'restatement' endorsed by Hay 2004a) but rather to state the importance of attention to local variation without explaining this away by grand narratives of governance by networks or state development theory.

Meegan and Mitchell's (2001) work gives an example of the above insight as they show how policy developed at EU level, which is implemented by what Duncan and Goodwin would accept as 'state' structures, is subject to transformation by local geographies. Therefore even the form of policy adopted at state level and the kinds of geographies which influence that policy may have to be explained via narratives of locality, ideography's of uniqueness which can be compared and contrasted, rather than explanations derived from totalising theory (Kay 2005: 562). It is in this context that the research's insistence on the need for comparisons is most crucial, and Meegan and Mitchell's insight is essential to this thesis: that policy questions, policy actors and policy outcomes vary with geography and, as Chapters 4 and 5 illustrate, history and political culture.

Towards a research framework: political economy approaches to local governance

As a theoretical framework for understanding cities, the governance trends discussed above are limited by their ubiquity (Gissendanner 2003). The empirical data on governance within cities suggests a common shift away from the traditional pattern of local authority control (Stoker 1999) and as such suggests governance is a useful description of recent trends, rather than an explanatory device (Gissendanner 2003:664) for understanding both shared, and differential, governance practices. In terms of this thesis' investigation of local cultural policy the ideas of governance provide the

starting point to select a framework that will account for the differences in the case studies presented in Chapters 6 and 7. Within the urban studies canon there are currently two main approaches seeking to give explanations for city governance (Moulaert *et al* 2007). On the one hand there are those writers, often with a critical perspective, seeking to explain transformations to the urban environment in terms of changes to wider political economy, particularly at the global scale. On the other are more micro centred approaches which attempt to ground urban change by grasping the importance of local context.

Building on the work of David Harvey (1989a), political economy has seen a recent shift to considering the role of culture within local economy. For Harvey the end of the Fordist mode of production in the 1970s lead to increased competition between cities to attract footloose, globalised, capital investment (1989a). Far from being the autonomous site for the type of governance suggested by Rhodes (1997), in Harvey's formulation the entrepreneurial city guarantees the primacy and reproduction of capitalism as a result of constraints of competition (1989a:15). This intra-city competition manifests itself in policies of civic boosterism and 'entrepreneurial' modes of governance, whereby the needs of capital replace the interests of other local groups (1989a:9). The modern city is marked by 'the serial reproduction of science parks, gentrification, world trading centres, cultural and entertainment centres, large scale interior shopping malls with postmodern accoutrements and the like' (Harvey 1989a:11), a reproduction that furthers inequality whilst crushing diversity.

The writers who have followed Harvey's analysis have tended to locate explanations for these local trends within grander theories of how specific regimes of accumulation are regulated. This strand of Neo-Marxist

regulation theory, exemplified by the work of Bob Jessop (1990), explores the role of regulatory regimes in stabilising these post-Fordist regimes of accumulation and when applied to the practice of city governance produces explanations for specific policies, such as culture-led regeneration (Evans 2001) that are tied to changes in the political economy in which individual cities are based. For instance Quilley and Ward (1999) understand changes to urban policy in the North East of the UK as a reflection of longer term trends in industrial policy and economic demand, with a crucial role for the relationship between capital and the trade union movement in the region (1999:28). Their explanations for urban policy are framed 'from above', but with little by way of evidence of either local decision-making structures or individual decision-makers' roles in their narrative of the North East.

Regulationist approaches, such as Quilley and Ward (1999), whilst dealing primarily with the relationship between capital and the local state, have filtered into explanations for cultural policy at local level (Gibson and Kong 2005, Kong 2005). Stevenson's work (2003) and McGuigan's (2004, 2005) explicit statement of urban policy using culture as a response to neo-liberal governance trends locate the explanations for cities' use of culture in regeneration and urban policy in changes to political economy. These explanations are echoed by Zukin (1998) and Smith (2000) who sees the transformation of spaces in the city towards sites for conspicuous consumption as simply middle class revanchism, part of an urban environment now explicitly shaped by neo-liberal spatial control (Coleman 2004).

However political economy approaches to urban policy, especially urban cultural policy are inappropriate as a theoretical framework for this thesis, based on two objections. The first is that by locating explanations for

policy in globalised trends, or higher levels of political and economic structure they miss the importance of local context in shaping policy outcomes. This objection is clearly shown in Latham (2000) and the debate between Latham (2006a, 2006b) and Cochrane (2006b, 2006c), as political economy approaches reduce individual cities to ‘epiphenomena of more profound underlying socioeconomic structures’ Latham (2000:1700). Horan extends this critique, by describing how global economic restructuring is a two-way intervention that specific empirical examples show is influenced by local politics (1991:120), especially how the governance arrangements in a place are organised and who is involved or excluded (Horan 1991:120). Horan discusses the need for a more micro analysis in reference to local economic policy, but this remains true across a range of policy sectors. The second is more practical, as there is actually very little research (save for perhaps Bassett 1993) which has sought to use theoretical frameworks from urban studies to understand cultural policy in cities. As a result, for the thesis to use the political economy approach would merely be to reproduce the limitations of existing research. Rather, as this discussion has alluded to, the second set of urban studies theories, the micro approach of regime theory, will give more depth to existing work on cities’ cultural policy and will help to avoid the reductionism asserted by Latham’s (2003) critique of macro level political economy.

Towards a framework for studying local cultural policy: Urban Regime Theory

Urban regime theory has become the second dominant paradigm for urban studies, particularly in the USA (Imbroscio 1998:233). As with any dominant paradigm there are debates as to its limits and to its usefulness, but essentially it is concerned with how local coalitions function. In American

definitions an urban regime is a 'coherent pattern of policies and programmes promulgated by a governing coalition' (DiGaetano 1989:263), where governing coalitions are understood as 'set of actors, who, when working together, have the capacity to govern' (Stone 1989:179). The urban regime is the manifestation of the trends described by the section on governance, as steering of local policies is now based on partnership and shared resources, as opposed to local governments command and control. The theoretical framework of regime theory interrogates these partnerships in order to ascertain 'how and under what conditions do different types of government coalitions emerge, consolidate and become hegemonic or devolve and transform' (Lauria 1997b:1), a research aim that matches the aims of this thesis.

Regime theory began with the work of Clarence Stone (1989) on Atlanta's governance, investigating how, despite changes of administration and leadership, certain policy continuities could be detected in the city over time. In Stone's typology the urban regime is founded where local government, the decision maker, comes together with local business, the group which tends to own land in American cities and can offer resources for local administrators plans (Stone 1989). Stone (1993) sets out has 4 types of regime depending on the policy aims, ranging from keeping the status quo though to fostering changes in conditions for marginalised social groups.

Stone's classic statement of regime theory has been subsequently modified by further empirical research and has been adapted for use in the UK context (Stoker and Mossberger 1994). In the UK the idea of a regime has come to take on the meaning of a 'political coalition', where 'central to the coalition are the elected politicians and city managers or local bureaucrats who service them' (Dowding 2001:15). In Dowding's

reformulation the regime theory concept is one where local government drives partnerships, with a keen eye on the prospects of re-election, although the role of business still remains. The importance of business is also present in Jones and Ward's (1998) analysis of partnerships in British cities detailing how different forms of local partnerships give different characters to city governance. In light of these comments regime theory would seem to present the appropriate methodological framework for this thesis, although by examining critiques of regime theory its usefulness can be made clearer.

Regime theory is not without criticism, especially when placed in comparison with the macro level understandings offered by regulation theory. Essentially regime theory is place specific and localist, meaning the case study approach limits the possibility of producing generalisations (Kilburn 2004:633). This is the strongest, and most valid, critique of regime theory, although its impact is lessened in the case of this thesis. As Chapter 2, and the above discussion of regulation theory has shown, there is little written on cultural policy using the regime theory approach, meaning that the valuable micro-level data generated by the regime theory framework can help to supplement existing work on local cultural policy (Griffiths 1993, Jones and Wilks-Heeg 2004).

The localist tendency within regime theory has consequences that form the second critique, that regime theory is not appropriate for understanding local politics in the UK. Writers such as Harding (1997) and Davies (2003) have all pointed out that the role of the British local authority is very different to its equivalent in the UK. Harding, for example, draws attention to the fact that local authorities are often land owners in British cities, contrasting with the position of the private sector in the USA (1997:300). The driving force of local governments need to use the resources

of private sector land-owners is not as pronounced in the UK, casting doubt on the viability of regimes that are not created by the same compulsions driving urban governance across the Atlantic. Coupled with local differences casting doubt on the theoretical basis for urban regimes, the role of the state is very different in the UK. Davies (2003) and Bassett *et al* (2002b) have all drawn attention to the role of central government in creating partnerships at local level, forcing coalitions together, rather than the organic process of business and local government cooperation seen in the USA.

The role of business is the final critical issue for the application of urban regime theory to British cities. Whilst John and Cole (1998) have indicated urban regime theory maybe a way of narrating the changing relationship between local authorities and business (1998:393), Davies (2003) has been the leader for a group of critics seeking to play down the relevance of urban regime theory in the UK (Imbroscio 1998). Essentially Davies' (2003) critique builds on the doubts over the transfer to the UK of a theoretical framework grounded in the local experience of American cities. For Davies, based on a study of British governance partnerships, business is marginal to local governance (Lowndes and Skelcher 1998), meaning regime theory has a peripheral position in explanations of the UK experience (Davies 2003). To use regime theory to understand partnerships that are not between the local state and business is to stretch the concept beyond Stone's original intentions (Davies 2003). Davies' concept stretching would seem to be a significant critique, particularly as the case studies in this thesis replicate the peripheral role for business in the coalitions governing cultural policy. However recent work in regime theory has sought to show how it can move beyond a close focus on policies concerned with economic growth and identify regimes that are not solely based on business' influence. Stone's

(2004) return to regime theory is instructive for this case and, along with work in the field of local environmental policy (e.g. Gibbs and Jonas 2000), gives the justification for this thesis' conception of a cultural policy regime. For Stone regime theory is about understanding the process of how wider forces play out at local level, which means there is no iron law demanding business involvement in local governance for a regime to exist (2004a:9). Rather regime theory is about how a cross sector of organisations pool resources to come together around shared goals, goals that lead to the co-operation continuing over time. In light of this understanding of regime theory, Stone points to the possibility of 'non-business' regimes (2004b:40), a possibility substantiated by work on environmental policy.

Gibbs and Jonas (2000), While *et al* (2004) and Jonas & Gibbs (2003) all use regime theory to interrogate the way environmental policy, and local environmentalist groups, have influenced local governance. The work of Gibbs and Jonas (2000) is especially pertinent to this thesis as they explore whether an 'environmental' policy regime could exist, in contrast to political economy approaches to local environmental policy that have tended to ignore how green politics is shaping city governance. Indeed their later work details how political economy approaches have tended to 'read off' environmental policy from local discourses, rather than exploring decision making in specific sites (2003). Although they give no firm conclusions as to the existence of an environmental regime, the framework of regime theory is crucial to understanding decision making in the fragmented, negotiated and brokered governance of the contemporary city (Gibbs and Jonas 2000).

The practical existence of environmental policy regimes is shown in the work of Pincetl (2003), which suggests the efficacy of using urban regime theory in non-business contexts. For Pincetl (2003) regime theory, in

the form associated with Davies' critique, fails to capture the role of civic organisations, particularly those outside of the traditional sphere of American urban politics. These groups are often cultural, as organisations such as galleries and orchestras provide the civic infrastructure that regimes that are solely orientated to the needs of business may lack (2003:981). Using the example of park provision in Los Angeles, Pincetl shows the role of nonprofits in steering decisions over land use, decisions that existing applications of both urban regime theory and political economy approaches assumes are taken by partnerships between local administration and business. The history and culture of Los Angeles, along with the Californian electoral system, created conditions that were amenable to organisations from civil society taking the lead in shaping the policy agenda and administering how that policy was carried out (2003:990).

Pincetl's example from Los Angeles, along with recent developments in regime theory suggests the appropriateness of using regime theory to understand cultural policy making, giving a framework to structure the narratives of Liverpool and Newcastle and Gateshead. Although this approach has not figured in existing literature on cultural policy there are antecedents in the work of Griffiths (1995), which attempts to use regime theory to understand cultural policy in Bristol, whereby cultural policies gave rise to governance partnerships (1995). Based on the above discussion the thesis puts forward the idea that a cultural policy regime may be the most appropriate way of understanding governance in Newcastle and Gateshead, whilst raising questions about the role of cultural policy in Liverpool.

Environmental literature has extended the conception of an urban regime and the cultural policy regime takes its place within this trend. The cultural policy regime is a form of urban regime not fully articulated within

the existing literature of regimes focused on business partnerships, such as service delivery regimes (Downing *et al* 1999) growth coalitions (Stone 1989) or Conservation regimes (Lee 2006) and the literature that seeks to give more prominence to organisations from civil society (Imbroscio 1998). The cultural policy regime follows Downing *et al*'s (1999) codification of the urban regime in the UK, accepting the eight key requirements for a British version of local regimes (1999:518), whereby the local regime has longevity, is based on a distinctive policy agenda shared by coalitions of groups and organisations that cross sectoral boundaries, often lead by strong 'entrepreneurial' leadership. The longevity of the policy agenda is shown by its ability to survive leadership and personnel changes as the agenda creates formal mechanisms for partnership. What marks out the cultural policy regime, most clearly expounded by Chapter 7's outline of cultural policy on the Tyne, is that actors from the cultural sector (the Arts Council on Tyneside) form an influential part of the governing coalition in the area and that cultural policy itself is high on the local agenda. These are the two fundamental characteristics of the cultural policy regime, the framework for understanding cultural policy and local decision making between Newcastle and Gateshead.

The idea of a cultural policy regime draws attention to the specificity of local decision making, and that specificity's influence on policy outcomes. However the cultural policy regime is a lens through which the case study narratives can be structured and understood. What regime theory lacks is a convincing explanation for the development of local regimes (or in Liverpool's case the lack of development of the regime.) Downing *et al* (1995) point to three cases of 'failed' regimes in local government in London. All three (Westminster, Tower Hamlets and Lambeth) failed

regimes were deficient for reasons related to local context. These examples illustrate how the framework of regime theory needs to be supplemented with theories that help to *explain* urban regimes, especially as the cultural policy regime does not use the typical explanation in regime theory, which is that business and local administration are drawn together by the necessity of resources sharing for growth.

Institutionalism as a way of explaining the cultural policy regime

As a result of regime theory's potential lack of explanatory power the thesis is required to synthesise this framework with a position that may help to account for local cultural policy. The thesis focuses on how the local shapes policy outcomes, in light of existing interest in how cultural policy can be related to global trends. In this context new institutionalist theory provides the explanatory force necessary to back up the narratives derived from regime theory. New institutionalism is useful as it is concerned with how institutions shape and influence behaviour, the question that the thesis wishes to investigate in the context of cultural policy. The usefulness of new institutionalism has also been alluded to in much of the urban regime theory literature, whereby narratives of local governance are directly related to local circumstances (Stone 1989, Jonas and Gibbs 2003), a contention strongly echoed by institutionalism's insistence on the importance of institutions in shaping policy and behaviour. At a local level institutionalist work suggests history and culture can act as constraining or enabling factors within differing forms of governance, encouraging or discouraging specific formations and arrangements. However both institutions and institutionalism are problematic terms as there is considerable debate surrounding the meaning of the term 'institution' (Lowndes 2005, Deeg 2001) as well as a

variety of methodological and theoretical approaches associated with institutionalism (McAnulla 2007, Thelen 1999).

Primarily institutions are not organisations; rather they are the norms, rules and practices that shape political action (Gonzalez and Healey 2005:2058). This definition serves as a good starting point to understand institutions, but a clear understanding of what institutions are and what they do is essential to the thesis, as the idea of institutions shaping practice is the key factor in explaining the differences between Liverpool and Newcastle and Gateshead. Debates on the meaning of the term institution are perhaps as old as social science itself, reflected in the work of social theorists like Weber (2002) and Parsons (1979). Indeed there is a strong argument that no definition has been reached in current research, reflected in debates over the past thirty years. Grafstein (1988), for example, develops an understanding of institutions as significant human creations which are dynamic, not static artefacts. These creations structure human interactions. In contrast much of the work that has used at local level has centred on the constraining role of institutions (Gains *et al* 2005), whereby they come to represent the 'rules of the game' for local policy making, as opposed to being deeper lying structures of the type put forward in traditional social scientific understandings of the term structure (e.g. Parsons 1979, Giddens 1984). Thus the extent of institutions' influence is centred on a debate between those authors proposing institutions are constraining on behaviour and those authors seeing institutions as mere human creations.

Grafstein(1988) uses examples from Marxist theory, where institutions have clear ontological status and rational choice theory, where institutions are products, aggregates of human decisions. Grafstein's work does not solve this debate, but asserts that institutions are not transcendent and their operation is

a topic for empirical research. These debates, and lack of agreement on the nature of institutions, are also reflected in Ostrom's (1986) discussion of the term. Recent work in political science still shows evidence of similar confusion, although there is a useful working definition that can be drawn from current debates. The problem of whether to see an institution as a creation or a constraint can be seen in caveats from Bevir (2005) and McAnulla (2007). There is still a core problem that institutions may be reified, to use Bevir's term, turned into objects that decide policy via a determining role on actors' ideas and actions. A corollary to this is offered by John and Cole (2000), with the contention that institutions must be seen as reflecting existing power structures and cultures, rather than creating or constraining them.

Debate on this topic is hardly surprising in social science literature because there is a danger of promoting an overly deterministic or structuralist conception of an institution. A way to overcome this danger can be seen in a useful working definition drawn from the work of Lowndes (2005). Lowndes' work is mainly associated with the 'new institutionalist' paradigm; a variety of institutionalism distinct from rational choice approaches (Thelen 1999). Lowndes' work on local government reform is an excellent starting point to illustrate how new institutionalism seeks to assert a role for institutions in shaping and implementing policy (Lowndes 2005, Lowndes and Wilson 2005).

Lowndes shows how New Labour's reforms of local authorities' political structures have interacted with local institutions to produce the circumstances of 'business as usual' (Lowndes and Wilson 2005:292). Despite considerable constitutional and organisation change, local authorities' individual institutions have remained remarkably similar in the

pre- and post-reform periods. The reasoning behind the lack of any significant organisation transformation is the crucial role played by institutions that are specific to individual local authorities in filtering reforms and adapting them to local circumstances (Lowndes and Wilson 2005).

Lowndes' argument leads to an understanding of the institution as 'the rules of the game' (2005:279), rather than as an organisation or actor, an understanding that draws support from a variety of sources e.g. Deeg (2001) Peters (2005), McAnulla (2007). These 'rules of the game' may be formal, such as a constitution, or informal as part of an organisations political culture or an individual actors conception of their 'public service ethos' or departmental position. Institutions are not static, they are characterised by their ability to be stable and reproduce their stability over time. Thus the rules may influence or limit potential behaviour, but these rules are human products and are not reified. The role of history and culture as an 'institution' that constrains behaviour and limits the possibilities for policy development is an important way of developing the concepts in governance theory to show how networks may be shaped by context, rather than developing with a unilinear path across varying spatial and temporal sites. In particular it shows how history and culture may play a decisive role in the evolution of networks and governance in urban areas. From a methodological standpoint this definition lead to the assertion that 'institutions do not determine behaviour, they simply provide a context for action that helps us to understand why actors make the choices that they do' (Immergut 1998:26), a position that means an understanding of local institutions, local culture and history, will be needed to understand local cultural policy.

The thesis' methodology and the role of the Interpretive approach

Just as regulation theory has been criticised for giving an overly structural explanation of urban politics, the use of regime theory and the new institutionalist perspectives may face a similar fate. To militate against Bevir's criticism of the reification of institutions (2005) the interpretive approach is the starting point for the thesis' methodology in practice. In order to create narratives of decision-making in local cultural policy, and reflecting the influence of institutionalism, it is important that people's beliefs are placed in the context which forms them, as well as compared, contrasted and conjoined with those of other actors to develop potentially convincing narratives of policy formation and adoption. One way of doing this, which seeks to make sure agency is not ignored by an institutional account of decision making surrounding cultural policy, is by using the interpretive approach developed in the work of Bevir and Rhodes (2003a, 2003b) on governance. Bevir and Rhodes' use the interpretive method to interrogate elite actors' understandings of governance, as they seek to decentre institutions, rejecting the idea they fix behaviour. Using the example of civil servants, Bevir and Rhodes' discuss how different conceptions of the traditions of British government shaped conceptions of, reactions to, and therefore the reality of, civil service reform in the 1980s. The interpretive approach can be further illustrated by Newman and McLean's (2004a, 2004b) research on social exclusion and museums. Policies designed to alleviate social exclusion are interpreted in vastly different ways by different actors, and have widely differential effects. As well as interpretations of policy Newman and McLean cite how the construction of who or what is represented by the term 'social exclusion' can be at odds with a given actors self-description and social interaction. As such the interpretive approach offers the opportunity to explore how actors self-describe the institutions from within which they operate, and go some way to illustrating how these

self-descriptions may influence policy. These understandings in turn give rise to further self-descriptions by other actors, creating a collage effect of a narrative exploring cultural policy decision making in the two case study areas.

Overall the interpretive approach is important as it draws attention to the importance of people's specific beliefs. To reveal these beliefs, the interpretive approach, much like governance, does not provide a prescriptive methodology, although most studies using it have employed a combination of elite interviews and archival methods. Criticisms of interpretivism (e.g. Finlayson 2004, Hay 2004a) have show how only looking at one element of the policy map, such as actors self-descriptions, may result in only a partial understanding of policy, both in terms of the structures from which policy emerges, the form policy takes and the content of that form. Bevir and Rhodes (2003) recognise the validity of this criticism, that the interpretive approach is necessary but not sufficient. They accept Hay's (2004a) contention that 'ideas matter' as ideas will, in some senses, act as institutions. Here the question is one of how those actors within the local cultural policy process understand and relate to the structures surrounding that process.

Partial descriptions, both of policy and of the institutional circumstances can be seen, for instance in the work of Whitehead (2003) and of Bevir and Rhodes (2003a), and this thesis counteracts the limits of these works by employing the interpretive method within the frame-work of regime theory and institutionalism. Therefore the ultimate theoretical grounding of the thesis is the concern with the role of institutions as setting 'the rules of the game' for how decision making structures and policy develop differently across specific urban areas. Policy will often involve a

variety of actors and the narratives enunciated by those actors involved cultural policy gives the 'thick descriptions' (Bevir and Rhodes 2003, Giddens 1984) of the interaction between voluntaristic exercises of power and the constraints of history and culture which produced the bids for ECoC 2008.

The interpretive approach sets up the exact methods used by the thesis, which are a combination of the creation of a historical narrative to illustrate the importance of history and culture to the cultural policy decision making process in the two case study areas; semi-structured interviews to take in the insights of the interpretive approach, allowing actors understandings of the world to fill in the narrative of the decision making process; and a supporting role for both reputational analysis and an organisational map. These methods take place against the backdrop of a historical timeline of events during the 2001- 2005 period when the two cities, Liverpool and NewcastleGateshead were involved in the competition for ECoC 2008.

Historical Narratives

In order to understand the process of decision making, and the institutional forms it takes in the two case study areas, the thesis initially began with desk based research of documents in the public domain to construct a historical narrative of cultural policy in the two cities. A narrative is an attempt to 'organize a sequence of events into a whole so the significance of each event can be understood through its relation to that whole' (Elliot 2005: 3), whereby the narrative is a chronology, rather than just the simple story of events (Elliot 2005: 7).

Elliot identifies two types of narrative: first and second order. First order narratives are the stories that individuals tell about themselves, whilst second order narratives are the chronologies constructed by researchers (Elliot 2005: 13). The history constructed by this method is a combination of both first and second order narrative. This narrative was constructed in the first instance by using local newspaper sources, drawn from the *Liverpool DailyPost*, *Liverpool Echo*, *Newcastle Journal* and *the Sunday Sun*. It was then supplemented by using documents in the public sector, such as council policy documents, and the strategies published by other bodies subsequently identified by the institutional mapping exercise. The research then used semi-structured interviews with key individuals, drawing on the insights of Kavanagh (1991) and his belief in the necessity of using historical accounts of policy in the social sciences. Although Kavanagh recognises the debate surrounding the use of contemporary history, as it does not give sufficient distance for the historian to make an objective assessment of the facts (Kavanagh 1991: 484), the method was still useful for the thesis.

Aside from the necessity of constructing a narrative history of the context of cultural policy to illustrate the way history and political culture play the role of institutions, structuring the ‘rules of the game’ for cultural policy, historical narratives served more practical purposes within the research. The construction of a historical timeline gave a clear idea of the key events around cultural policy in the case study areas, such as the decision to bid for European Capital of Culture status, as well as structuring the thesis’ use of essential policy documents and the understanding the dates of key decisions. The historical narrative also served as an organizing perspective for semi-structured interviews, choosing the participants involved in the interviews and in constructing the institutional map.

Research Interviews

The interview is 'the great bastion' of social science research (Briggs 1994: 1) and can be used to research a variety of questions. It is therefore an exceptionally useful technique for the social scientist. The interview is a type of qualitative method (Denscombe 2003). As with other qualitative methods, interviews have as the starting point words, as opposed to more quantitative methods that begin with numbers (David and Sutton 2004: 35). Basing research on words reflects the way in which qualitative research is concerned with how people understand the social structures surrounding them, and create meaning within those structures. As a result of this concern qualitative research tends to involve people's descriptions of the phenomena under investigation, as opposed to analysis of those phenomena with numeric values, which is the concern of quantitative methods (Denscombe 2003: 232). The descriptions generated by qualitative research are the starting point for analysis based on people's understandings of the world, as suggested by the interpretive approach of Bevir and Rhodes (2003a). Qualitative research also allows for multiple, often ambiguous and potentially contradictory accounts of the world to emerge. These potentially competing accounts are then subject to analysis by the researcher, in this case analysis using the other methods detailed in this section.

The essential problem with qualitative research is its specificity. There is the danger with qualitative research that the findings from the research may not be applicable to other instances of similar phenomena (Denscombe 2003: 281). It is here that the thesis makes use of comparative case studies along with the various methods to ensure the potential transferability of any conclusions. Using interviews has a major advantage over other potential methods. The interview can produce data on a particular

topic, data which is rich in in-depth narrative detail, unlike statistical methods that do not investigate research questions in this manner. It is this aspect of the interview as a research method that makes it useful and links it to the theoretical foundations of the thesis (in particular the interpretive approach). The research is about how practitioners' view the decision making process and so there is a need to get the type of in-depth data that the interview can produce, data which may not be produced by using other methods such as questionnaires (Denscombe 2003: 189).

There are, of course, a host of problems presented by the use of the interview (Burnham *et al* 2004). In the first instance there is the issue of access. As public figures are to be interviewed the research will have to be able to reach them at appropriate times and places. The problem is lessened as the subjects are mostly concentrated at local level, although the problems of gaining access to public officials still apply. The interview may produce unwanted data, especially because of the semi-structured format. It is proposed that the use of the other methods will allow the researcher to ask detailed and specific questions and avoid the collection of data that is potentially available from other sources, as well as making sure the researcher has existing background knowledge of the topics in question. There is also the possibility of the interviewee feeling uncomfortable or refusing to talk about a particular topic. By ensuring informed consent is sought from all interview participants it is felt that the risk of this occurring should be minimal. Informed consent requires full disclosure of the nature of the research project, as well as the intended uses of the interview (David and Sutton 2004: 364). It also requires that consent be gained for any quotations used, and the opportunity given for the participant to withdraw from the research at any time.

Closely linked to the issue of informed consent is the danger of the interview producing inappropriate or distorted information (Briggs 1994: 13). This can happen because an interviewee may not be from a culture that recognises the format of an interview, or be familiar with the interview context. The situation surrounding the interview can also have a profound effect, especially if the interview takes place in the participants' home (Briggs 1994: 23). In addition the researcher may suggest loaded or leading questions to illicit the kinds of responses felt to be most appropriate to the research. In the context of the present thesis it is felt that there should be no problems with participants involved in decision making feeling unused to the interview context, and an adherence to the ethical principles discussed below should alleviate any danger of the use of inappropriate or leading questions. Briggs' work suggests that there are essential steps to be taken to produce good interview results, results which cannot have their reliability questioned. Briggs (1994) suggests the researcher must not use language and concepts that are alien to the participant. The other research methods suggested, particularly the historical narrative, ensure that this will not be the case.

The use of interviews is aligned with existing research methods in this area, as well as underpinning the other methods used in the thesis. The work of Richards (1997) serves as a good example of the interview method, coupled with historical narratives. Richards's studies civil service reform in the 1980s, using interviews with civil servants along with analysis of diaries from the public officials involved in the process of reform. This existing research, which employs the kinds of semi-structured interviews suggested by Newman & McLean (2004a, 2004b) serves as guidance for the interview process. Overall sixty-two interviews were conducted, from a range of organisations that are detailed in appendix 2 Choosing these interviewees

and getting a full picture of the decision-making process required additional methods, including reputational analysis and an organisational mapping exercise.

Reputational analysis and Institutional mapping

The thesis uses two additional methods to identify potentially important interviewees and to structure the narratives offered in subsequent Chapters: reputational analysis and institutional mapping. Reputational analysis has its roots in the work of Floyd Hunter (1953) and his analysis of community power in American cities during the 1950s. Essentially it seeks to rank local actors in terms of their importance to decision making and to get a sense of how is powerful in a given community. Although it has links with British applications of regime theory (Harding 1991, 1997, Stoker and Mossberger 1994) the technique has, to an extent, fallen out of use.

A valuable illustration of reputational analysis can be seen in the recent work of Kriesi *et al* (2006), who begin by asking questions based on their identification of the relevant actors within a policy network. The questions employed by Kriesi *et al* start by asking participants in interviews to name the organizations and actors in a policy network that have been influential in policy making in the last five years and the thesis used a similar approach to aid selection of questions within the semi-structured interviews. Once the initial lists were constructed interview participants were asked to specify the most influential actors, whether people or organisations, and eventually the single most influential actor. From this process one can get a sense of who is felt to have the most significance within the local cultural policy networks, and one can move to investigate the types of resources available to the actors that allow some to be influential in the decision

making process and others to be potentially irrelevant or excluded. The second element to Kriesi *et al's* (2006) method involves looking into the interactions by the interview participants with others in the policy structure. Interview participants are asked to specify the types of interactions they have had with actors within the network. The participants are asked to grade the interactions ranging from 'close collaboration', indicating significant co-operation had occurred in policy making, to conflict, whereby major disagreements had taken place. Closely connected to this second element of questions is a final question concerning who the participant had 'targeted', which is the extent to which the participant had attempted to either influence another actor or forge co-operative relations with them.

The thesis followed Kriesi *et al's* (2006) methods, but employed them in a much looser fashion, using them to structure questions within semi-structured interviews. This type of reputational analysis allowed the thesis to reflect the ways in which actors are more or less important to the decision making process, and reflecting which actors interact with each other. It also clears the ground work for much more detailed discussions with interview participants about the forms the interactions take as well as in depth explorations of the resources held by the more or less influential actors as well as their understanding of their place within the decision-making structure.

The details of the decision-making structure were informed by a process of organisational mapping. Comparatively little has been written on the practice of organisational mapping, although it is implicit in many of the studies on governance within the UK. As a result it is underused as a method within the social sciences generally and political science in particular, even though the need to identify the actors within a policy network, the varying

levels of resources available to them, and the potential links and conflicts between them is essential to all studies of governance. There are a very small number of recent methodological investigations of the technique of organisational mapping (Aligica 2006), as often where the use of mapping is made explicit (e.g. Wilks-Heeg and Clayton 2006) the techniques surrounding this method are not fully explored. Aligica (2006) discusses the theoretical underpinnings of mapping as a general exercise, asserting that any initial attempt to construct a map will be dependent upon the interests of the map maker, in the sense that the selection of territory to be mapped and the tools used to illustrate that selection will be determined by the needs of the map maker (Aligica 2006). In the case of this research the map aimed to explore decision-making surrounding cultural policy in two English cities. As such the map focused on specific organisations and actors within these decision making structures, based on the theories of governance discussed above. The use of this method and the features to be included on the map, stem from the theoretical foundations of the thesis, its concern with the relations between actors, their understandings of the policy process and their relations with other actors within the decision-making structure. Aligica (2006) suggests use of institutional maps must work within a theoretical paradigm which supports their use. This form of method is appropriate to a paradigm that:

‘a) emphasise(s) social actors rather than disembodied properties of those actors, b) gives a special attention to the interpersonal relations, roles and processes, c) focuses more on the analysis and interpretation of institutions, situations and events and less on general laws, regularities and variables and d) finally takes seriously into

account social change and captures the dynamics of change in real historical time' (Aligica 2006)

The initial phase of identifying the actors within the network is supplemented by drawing out and identifying the links between them. Initially this is done by analysing policy documents and the self-descriptions of the role of each actor. Reputational analysis set up the thesis' description of the actors positions within the decision-making network. More detailed, subsequent, semi-structured interviews revealed the relative resources each actor had within the network, as well as their position within policy construction. This gave a dynamic map of the two networks in the two areas, and allowed for comparisons of the changing makeup of the networks following the decision to award European Capital of Culture status to Liverpool. The mapping exercise is therefore dependent upon the three other methods, archival research, reputational analysis and semi-structured interviews.

Ethics

Employing several different methods to answer research questions prompts the need for ethical reflection. The interview raises a range of potential ethical problems, along with minor ethical concerns implied by the other methods in the research. The implications resulting from the use of the semi-structured interview method are outlined by several authors (Denscombe 2003, Elliot 2005, Briggs 1994, David and Sutton 2004), most focusing on the potential invasions of privacy (Denscombe 2003: 190), the risks connected with collecting potentially sensitive data (ESRC 2006) and potential distortions of the participants thoughts and feelings during the interview process (Briggs 1994).

Elliot (2005) has discussed the potential for exploitation of the research subject, especially if one ignores the surroundings and context of the interview. Elliot highlights the way that power relations in interview situations may lead to subjects feeling disturbed by the experience of the research interview. Elliot writes in the context of using research interviews to construct people's narratives of their experiences, often in relation to traumatic or difficult situations (such as situations of abuse and mistreatment). Whilst the specifics of Elliot's work may not be strictly relevant to this research, one must be aware of the potential problems of the interview when considering ethical issues. This need is illustrated by an example cited in Elliot (2005), where seemingly unobtrusive interviews with mature students concerning their educational histories drew out very 'clearly painful experiences' (Elliot 2005: 137). The awareness of this potential in interviews, especially those that involve significant individual narratives of past events, even just as part of the policy making process, creates significant ethical dilemmas. In order to alleviate these potential dilemmas the research is guided by the ESRC's Research Ethics Framework (2006) and the ethical principles set out therein. These principles are complimented by the ethical standards and guidelines of the Social Research Association (SRA).

The ESRC's (2006) begins from the standpoint that social science research requires its own ethical framework, as social science research raises issues that are separate to, and different from, other scientific areas, such as biomedical research. It is taken as axiomatic that all forms of 'primary' research will raise ethical questions, whatever the subject matter (ESRC 2006: 2). Although this thesis did not involve interviews with groups defined by the ESRC as vulnerable, e.g. children, neither did it involve questions surrounding sensitive topics e.g. drug use or experiences of violence, nor did

it adopt 'intrusive' interventions, there was still a need for the thesis to have a sound ethical basis in the ESRC guidelines, especially in light of the discussion of Elliot's examples. This is further highlighted by the ESRC's accurate assertion that all research, however seemingly unobtrusive and unproblematically straightforward always involves an element of risk (ESRC 2006: 21). Whilst it is not foreseen that the research will expose participants to risk of physical harm, there is the potential for the conflicting narratives of the decision making process to damage a participant's 'standing within occupational settings' and perhaps their social standing. As a result all quotations are anonymous with only general reference, where relevant, to an interviewee's organisational position.

The research methods outlined above, drawn from the theoretical discussion at the beginning of the Chapter stress the need to obtain the informed consent of participants, and the commitment to the ESRC's ethical principles (discussed below) minimised the risk of obtaining information by deception (ESRC 2006: 24), and made the potential risks generated by the research clear to participants. As per the SRA's guidelines it all transcribed information to be used directly in the research was be subject to agreement by the participant in question, and the participant had the opportunity to withdraw their consent if they felt the research had gathered the data in an inaccurate or inappropriate manner.

In addition to the ethical issues raised by interviews there are associated, if not directly comparable, ethical concerns created by the mapping exercise and the construction of the narratives of cultural policy in the two case studies. It should be noted that no part of this research occurred in isolation, and that all aspects of the research feed into and influenced each other. Thus interviews could not have been conducted without the historical

narrative, that narrative without the mapping and the mapping would have been incomplete without the use of reputational analysis; in turn reputation analysis is dependent upon interviews, and so on. These methods come together to give as comprehensive a response as possible to the research questions. The three methods triangulate (Denzin, cited in Olsen 2004) to produce a rounded and nuanced account of decision-making in the two case study areas.

Throughout the research none of the major ethical issues highlighted by the ESRC were raised in these methods. The ethical questions within these two methods for answering the research questions were reducible to the ethical issues surrounding interviews, whereby minor, additional, ethical concerns raised by the other methodological techniques employed by the thesis are dealt with in the ESRC guidelines (ESRC 2006). In the case of the historical narrative as well as using interview data, there was a strong reliance upon desk based research. This aspect of the research employed the use of documents, such as policy statements, council plans media articles and other documents in the public domain. The public nature of such information, none of which required freedom of information requests, did not raise any significant ethical issues as the ESRC explicitly states that these forms of data are not considered 'personal data' warranting significant ethical discussion. It is hoped that the discussion of methods and the ethical issues surrounding those methods will ensure that, in line with the SRA's guidelines, the research methods are of the highest standards and are the most appropriate and fit to purpose, necessitated by the research question, rather than by the needs of the researcher.

Conclusion

This thesis is founded on the combination of disciplines, theories and methodologies. The thesis takes the insights of theory from political science and uses these insights to develop a set of methods to explore questions raised by cultural policy literature. From political science the thesis shows how theories of governance and institutionalism give access to the structures surrounding the policy process, whilst the interpretive approach offers an agent-centred position from which to explore the narratives of those involved in the policy process. These political science perspectives are applied at local level using the framework of urban regime theory, a framework which the thesis extends by suggesting the existence of a 'cultural policy regime' in one of the case study sites (as is detailed by Chapter 7).

The theoretical discussion is the basis for the choice of methods, methods which grow out of the ground offered by the combination of structure and agency in governance and the interpretive approach. The use of historical narratives, semi-structured interviews and reputational analysis all point towards the importance of understanding individuals reasoning for their actions, as well as their perceptions of the context in which they operate. This concern with agency is mirrored by an interest in the structuring property of local political history and culture, property which is best seen via the mapping exercise, supported by historical narratives and semi-structured interviews. Historical narratives form the basis of Chapters 4 and 5, which discuss the history of cultural policy in Liverpool and Newcastle and Gateshead, but these narratives are supported by evidence from the semi-structured interviews as well mapping work on the key organisations and their interrelationships in the period before the ECoC 2008 bids. Reputational analysis and mapping are of most notable importance in Chapters 6 and 7, where the discussion of local cultural policy, based on the

case study of ECoC 2008, ties back into the political science theory discussed by this Chapter. However the understandings generated by reputational analysis and the mapping exercises would be incomplete without the historical narratives from Chapters 5 and 6, narratives which show the contrasting effects of local history and culture. The synthesis of methods is what allows the thesis to show how Liverpool and NewcastleGateshead had such superficially similar, but fundamentally different sets of decision making process for cultural policy, and, indeed, how one developed a cultural policy regime, whilst the other faces the prospect of abandoning the successes which are supposed to have come from the ECoC 2008 experience (Liverpool Culture Company 2009).

Chapter 4

THE 'LIVERPOOL WAY' OF CULTURAL POLICY

The previous Chapter demonstrated the need to use methods drawn from political science and studies of urban governance to understand local cultural policy. This demonstration therefore requires a detailed knowledge of the context shaping and constraining the emergence of cultural policy in the two case study areas. As this, and the subsequent Chapter show, the wider political culture in Liverpool and in NewcastleGateshead is especially important in understanding decision-making structures that emerged around cultural policy during the bidding stage for ECoC 2008 as well as the years after 2003, when Liverpool was given the right to host the festival. In Liverpool, unlike Newcastle and Gateshead, cultural policy was a peripheral concern, as a result of the city's political culture that played out against the economic and political situation following the end of the Second World War. Since the 1980s the central policy making body in the city, Liverpool City Council (LCC), saw efforts to develop cultural policy frustrated by primarily political (both personal and institutional), as well as economic and social, circumstances. These assertions are backed up by an extensive discussion of the (relatively recent) history of politics in Liverpool. This discussion applies the institutionalist theory described in Chapter 3 to local political culture, local political culture that in Liverpool had an almost determining effect (North 1990, Peters 2005) on the failure of LCC to adopt and, crucially, sustain cultural policies. What is especially striking in the narrative of Liverpool's political culture is the way that a city famed for its cultural infrastructure, generally constructed during the Victorian era, ended up with

a set of political circumstances that would militate against a long term commitment to cultural policies and specific cultural organisations, in the years following the reorganisation of English local government in 1974. Political culture and history in Liverpool drove its major political organisation, the City Council, to be a poorly run, failing body by the end of the 1990s. Whilst political culture had a malign effect on the local authority, the ‘rules of the game’ (Lowndes 2005:279) represented by the ‘Liverpool way’ of politics gave little room for a commitment to cultural policy during the 1980s and 1990s at a time when, as Chapter 2 has shown, local authorities in the UK, such as the GLC, or those in Sheffield, then later Glasgow and Manchester were beginning to innovate and commit to urban strategies that used culture for a variety of civic ends.

Unlike in Newcastle and Gateshead the chronology of events in Liverpool is an essential facet of the cultural policy narrative (This chronology is given in detail by appendix 3). A chronology is fundamental in Liverpool as there is an almost path dependent (Gains *et al* 2005, Deeg 2001) character to cultural policy in Liverpool, as a result of specific moments when decisions were taken that shaped the cultural policy context in the city. Events such as the abolition of Merseyside County Council (MCC), in 1986, the creation of Merseyside Development Corporation (MDC), in 1981 and the changes within LCC following the expulsion of Militant in 1987, all presented possibilities for alternative directions that cultural policy could have taken in Liverpool, but previous decisions, for instance the creation of National Museums Galleries Merseyside (NMGM), constrained an limited the range of cultural policy options. As a result of the importance of chronology the Chapter eschews the thematic approach used to understand Newcastle and Gateshead in favour of explicitly stating the role of previous

decisions in influencing the evolution of the cultural policy context that forms the background for Chapter 6's discussion of the policies for ECoC 2008 in Liverpool.

The Chapter is based on a combination of archival research and interviews with key stakeholders, particularly those working in the various organisations discussed by this Chapter. The Chapter is therefore both a summary of context and the presentation of data gathered from fieldwork. This combination is as a result of the relatively under-researched position of decision-making in local cultural policy described by Chapter 2, necessitating research interviews to construct a narrative of essential issues, particularly the history of the relationship between the LCC and the cultural sector in the city. The Chapter begins by setting out this political culture, this 'Liverpool way' of politics, how this culture developed from a diverse range of antecedents, including the nature of employment in the city, the city's voting patterns, religious cleavages, as well as the internal organisation of the city's political parties in the post war period, with a focus on the Local Labour Party. It is impossible to account for the second half of the Chapter, a discussion of cultural policy in Liverpool, without understanding the roots of the political culture that shaped cultural policy. The 'Liverpool way' is largely constructed from archival research, but sets up the context for the Chapter's use of interview data in an exploration of how LCC's sporadic and often highly unstrategic attempts to develop cultural policy and specifically relationships with the local cultural sector foundered on the rocks of the LCC's institutional culture and the method of doing politics found amongst politicians and political parties in Liverpool.

The era of the Militant Tendency, and the Labour administration that emerged after the 47 Militant councillors were removed from office in 1987,

are of utmost importance to this Chapter's consideration of LCC's lack of strategy surrounding cultural policy. The Tendency did exceptional amounts of damage to Liverpool's relationship with central government, the surrounding local authorities, and most crucially, its relationship with the city's cultural sector (Ben-Tovim 2003). Militant showed little or no interest in cultural policy at a time when other, similar local authorities were beginning to develop innovative uses of culture, often as a response to problems with central government. This lack of interest in cultural policy was partially a reflection of the 'Liverpool Way' of politics, and partially a reflection of the wider political issues facing the city, especially those around the low quality of housing in Liverpool. Even as Militant did not develop a cultural policy, it was the administration that had to take decisions that would shape the landscape of cultural administration in Liverpool, as its response to the abolition of Merseyside County Council in 1986 led to the creation of what would become National Museums Liverpool (NML) and radically alter the patterns and levels of funding administered by the regional arts association, Merseyside Arts.

The decisions taken by the Militant administration set the pattern for much of what followed within the LCC, as the authority found it difficult to sustain long term strategies and policies in the face of the infighting and faction that characterised Liverpool's politics into the 1990s. Cultural policy, where it existed at all in the city during the 1990s, was influenced more by the Arts Council, The Merseyside Development Corporation and the EU's Objective One funding programme. Where the LCC attempted cultural policy, for instance in music policy or hosting major events, the LCC's lack of capacity for cultural issues, as well as the local political character saw to it that there were few initiatives that could be described as successful, or

indeed sustainable. Indeed the plethora of initiatives and organisations operating in the city by the end of the 1990s, along with the moribund nature of the LCC, placed Liverpool in the position of a city that lacked effective leadership in almost all policy areas. As the historical narrative detailed below shows, Liverpool, despite the wealth of its cultural infrastructure (Green 1996) seemed an unlikely site for a bid to become ECoC 2008, given the city's previous lack of competence and interest in cultural policy (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993, Cohen 2007) and the problems facing the LCC at the end of the 1990s. This discussion concludes, therefore, by outlining the lack of any discernable governance network for cultural policy, the potential difficulties facing any governing coalition attempting to involve the cultural sector and how this would have to be constructed in order for the city to be an effective bidder for the ECoC 2008.

Understanding Scouse culture

Liverpool is a difficult city to categorise, with an intensely contradictory history. As this Chapter illustrates its political culture is beset with tensions, with lines drawn along religious, class, geographic and racial lines. Much of what follows in this Chapter is an analysis of how the institutions of Liverpool's political culture have constrained and limited cultural policy and yet the wider culture of Liverpool has been vibrant, productive and deeply influential on global cultural trends. This assertion can be understood from a range of examples from popular culture, particularly music and football, but must be read in light of a key caveat, which is the nature of mythology in Liverpool.

Bill Drummond eloquently sums up the problem for writers attempting to understand Liverpool's culture, as 'Liverpool has never been

interested in the facts when it comes to weaving its own myth' (2007:223). Thus the narrative of Liverpool culture is one grounded in the mythology of place created by the intersection of class and ethnicity found in an Atlantic seaport (Belchem 2000). This indefinable nature of Liverpool's culture, although in itself part of the mythology, is captured in a quote given by John Power, from Liverpool bands *The La's* and *Cast*, in Paul DuNoyer's *Liverpool: Wondrous Place* (2002:200):

'Coming from Liverpool you've got a different attitude. You do think you're better than the rest. And that's a start. I mean, fuckin' hell, you've got a good history there. It's better that coming from fuckin' Bolton. It's a melting pot. You can tell scousers walking down the street. I can't imagine us coming from a different city. And if we had we'd be different people'

Power's comments capture the sense that a strong and unique local culture exists; separate from the rest of the UK. Indeed for DuNoyer Liverpool is 'the capital of itself, deeply insular, yet essentially outward looking' (2002:5). The insularity, on the one hand, expresses itself in a profound sense of community (Reade 2009) based on the 'seafaring cosmopolitanism' (Belchem 2000:xii) of the outward looking port. This sense of community was influential in Liverpool's community art movement, for example The Blackie, housed in the grand Victorian buildings that the port brought into the city (Gathercole 2007). The port is also important in shaping musical culture, perhaps the most important aspect of Liverpool's cultural life.

As a result of the port, Liverpool developed both a vibrant nightlife to entertain those passing through the city and was also the site for important cross cultural dialogues, particularly for guitar-based pop music (DuNoyer

2002:208). The role of entertainment in the city created a range of nightclubs and bars, and this tradition would prove a fertile ground for later developments in the city's dance music scene in the 1990s (DuNoyer 2002). The cross-Atlantic dialogue between American and Liverpoolian musical traditions, ranging from Billy Fury's late 1950s rock'n'roll, through the importance of the Beatles' contribution to Western culture to, latterly bands like Shack and The Coral's adoption of the psychedelia of Arthur Lee and Love, is the defining aspect of Liverpool's contemporary culture, as the city's reputation for musical creativity remains as strong as ever.

That is not to say Liverpool's influence and cultural productivity is restricted to music. At the same time as the Beatles, the 'Mersey poets' (Brian Pattern, Roger McGough and Adrian Henri) were proving influential in the late 1960s wave of 'popular' poetry (Bowen 1999), whilst the city's two football clubs have set the standard for success in the post-war English game. Whilst Everton achieved some success in the 1960s and 1980s, Liverpool FC were to become the most successful club in English football history, having a profound influence on English football via tactical innovations (Wilson 2008) and winning an unprecedented 5 European Cups. The fan cultures of the two clubs were also influential, in both the fanzine movement of the 1980s (DuNoyer 2002:196) and in introducing the 'casual' look, based on European sportswear, to the terrace and the high street (Hewitson 2007).

Whilst the self-expression of local football fans would prove influential on contemporary popular culture, Liverpool has also held an important position within the British and wider, global, art scene. Tate Liverpool, the Tate Gallery's building in the North of England, opened in 1988, to house parts of its international collection (Biggs 2007). A decade

later, at a time when contemporary British art was securing a place within mainstream British culture, the Liverpool Biennial was established in 1998, with its first exhibitions in 1999, to give an outlet to contemporary International, British and local Liverpool art.

The story of Liverpool culture is therefore a story of profound influence against a backdrop of a city in decline. The culture of the seaport detailed above would be crucial in shaping the political culture in the city, a political culture that, as the rest of this chapter shows, would find it profoundly difficult to integrate cultural policy into its major organisations, especially the City Council.

The roots of political culture in Liverpool

‘But then, in politics, as in so many things, Liverpool has always been different’

Michael Crick (1987:215)

Liverpool’s political idiosyncrasies are the subject of much academic and popular commentary (for instance see Murden 2006, Lane 1987, Kilfoyle 2000, Davies 1996, Ridley 1986 and Carmichael 1993). What would seem to be the ideal location for a working class, Labour stronghold in the north of England is characterised by sectarianism, the stagnation associated with ‘boss politics’, and periods of no overall control by a single party within the City Council (Lane 1987:125, Parkinson 1985:19). The political instability and inertia within the Council played out against the backdrop of Liverpool’s economic and social decline from ‘one of the world’s greatest seaports’ (Belcham 2006) to a pariah city by the 1990s (Wilks-Heeg 2003). The city’s ‘pariah’ status reflected the highest

unemployment rates of 'any English conurbation in every decade since the 1950s' (Parkinson 1985:13) and the significant social problems, such as population decline, high crime rates and urban disorder, associated with such a catastrophic economic performance (Murden 2006:429, Evans 2003:28).

The social and economic circumstances confronting Liverpool during the post war period provide the landscape for (although they do not explain) many of the political problems within the city. Indeed the social and economic circumstances are an interesting contrast with NewcastleGateshead, which faced similar, if much less severe circumstances. Liverpool saw a severe decline in population in the post-war period, dropping from 850,000 to 480,000, the collapse of the docks and shipping industries (Williams 2004: 107) leading to catastrophic levels of unemployment in the 1980s and reflecting the end of Liverpool's status as a 'world city' (Wilks-Heeg 2003: 39). These social and economic issues are one half of the story of the emergence of political culture in the city. As Williams (2004) identifies the social and economic collapse in Liverpool gave the city a quintessentially 'anxious' character (Williams 2004:107), a character that is underlined by the conduct of politics in the city. The type of political culture in Liverpool shaped cultural policy in a way that is in direct contrast to Chapter 5's narrative of cultural policy in the North East, and represents a powerful institutional influence for Chapter 6's analysis of policies surrounding the bid for ECoC 2008. The curious aspects of Liverpool's twentieth century politics are worth retelling as they give an insight into the political context that had such a profound effect on the city's style of government, as well as its institutional problems. Without understanding the roots of the prevailing political culture it would be impossible to follow Chapter 6's institutional analysis of the ECoC 2008. It

is this detail that separates the thesis' concern and focus on the role of place in shaping cultural policy that contrasts with much of the literature discussed by Chapter 2.

Liverpool has unique status in English politics, as a result of its sectarian social structure and its economic position within the British Empire (Lane 1987). In contrast to other northern English cities, such as Manchester, Liverpool had a much weaker Victorian Liberal movement (although its influence can be seen in Liverpool's cultural infrastructure) and was very late in embracing the Labour party. The city did not follow the pattern in Manchester or Leeds of a move to reform minded Liberalism in the Nineteenth century (Lane 1987) and stayed Tory until 1955, thirty years after the rise of Labour in most other northern city councils. Indeed Lane points out that by 1955, when Labour first took control of the council, Liverpool had seen 100 years of unbroken Tory rule (Lane 1987:125). The reasons for the peculiar nature of Liverpool politics are complex and subject of much scholarship and debate (Davies 1996). Whilst one former councillor suggests that 'booze and bigotry' (Davies 1996:233) explains the Tory dominance, the reasons are a multifaceted mix of sectarianism, the structure of employment within the city and the local party system.

The sectarian nature of Liverpool is easily seen by an overview of elections in the city before the Second World War. Liverpool had an Irish nationalist MP until 1929 and a 'Protestant Party' with elected members on the city council until 1971 (Lane 1987:125). Voting at local level tended to split between Conservatives, Protestants and Catholic parties, with the Labour Party's development hampered until it absorbed predominantly catholic wards following Irish independence and the end of the Catholic Party in the 1920s (Murden 2006, Lane 1987). As well as being crucial to

understanding the political culture, and the practice of politics surrounding that culture, which developed over the twentieth century, the religious divide between Catholic and Protestant was influential in preventing the development of the Labour party, and would have a significant knock on effect on the Liverpool's Labour party that would be one of the determining factors in the rise of the Militant group in the 1980s.

Although sectarianism is an important element in the development of Liverpool's twentieth century political culture it is important to stress other crucial factors. As well as sectarianism the structure of local employment had a profound effect on politics in Liverpool. Although the working class vote continued to be divided along sectarian lines before the Second World War, the divisions also reflected varieties of occupation. The working class drew its work primarily as a result of living next to the docks, and as such occupations reflected the primacy of the docks as a source of work (Davies 1996:233). Work on the docks was overwhelming casualised with labourers hired in the mornings and afternoons according to the needs of the ships landing on the Mersey (Milne 2006). However there were differing levels of skills and specialisations on the docks, and the stratification of the dockland labour force was reflected in working class voting patterns (Davies 1996).

The casual nature of dock work was crippling for *organised* labour and the trade union movement, in which Liverpool was seen as both an 'organisers graveyard' (Lane 1987:127) and 'the last place God made so far as industrial solidarity was concerned' (Davies 1996:17). Thus the usual evolution of Trade Unions along with the local Labour Party was distorted in Liverpool, with a result that the unions never assumed a preponderant position within the Labour party in Liverpool. The lack of strong union representation within the Labour Party, coupled with the role of the city's

alderman system and a strong business vote, gave the city's politics a very different character to elsewhere in the North of England (Davies 1996, Wainwright 1987).

Perhaps more important than the casual nature of dock work, or the variety of occupations found within the working class was the absence of the type of middle class seen in other Northern Cities. There was little or no manufacturing base to produce a Liberal voting middle class, and whilst some of the cities merchants were Liberal reformers, the city lacked the factory owners and factory jobs that gave regular skilled employment and provided the basis for a local Liberal Party in other Northern cities of the period (Kilfoyle 2000). Therefore Liverpool was, in effect, a sectarian Tory city until the end of the Second World War (Lane 1987). The Labour Party failed to gain footholds in those sections of the population who were not Catholic or associated with Trade Unions (Davies 1996) and was hampered by the electoral system. The sectarian legacy, Tory dominance and 'boss politics' (Kilfoyle 2000:22) lead one commentator to remark how the popular image of Liverpool that developed in the 1970s and 1980s, as a city that was a hotbed of militancy, strikes and radicalism 'bears little resemblance to its past' (Davies 1996:18). This picture of the city gives a basis for understanding how the context for decisions around cultural policy emerged, particularly the influence of political culture on constraining the ability of the City Council to produce long term plans and policies after local government was reorganised in 1987. The narrative of Liverpool's political history shows how understanding local context underpins the way that the research in this thesis differs from existing work in cultural policy. Rather than relating cultural policy to global trends, the thesis links cultural policy to local institutions. In Liverpool's case the type of sectarian political culture

in the city shaped the practice of politics that in turn would go on to be reflected in the cultural policy that developed around the ECoC 2008. This is especially true when considering the type of political leadership that evolved along with the ECoC 2008, a style of leadership that was highly personalised and in contrast to the style of partnership building found across the Tyne.

The highly personalised style of leadership surrounding ECoC 2008 can be linked to a historical legacy of boss politics within the city, whereby even into the early 1970s Liverpool was a city of bosses. Bosses on the waterfront, bosses on the factory floor and, perhaps most significantly, bosses within political parties. The city has a history of powerful men (and it almost always has been men) who exerted control over their political group. In the Conservative party there had been a long tradition of powerful bosses (Crick 1986:39, Kilfoyle 2002:2) and long before it came to power this tradition had been adopted by the Labour party in Liverpool. By 1939 the mould within the Labour party was set, reflecting similar organisations within the local Tory party, rather than the organisation of local Labour branches within English Cities. The pattern was 'a horse-trading approach to political organisation where things were arranged through nods, winks and favours done for friends, relatives and constituents' (Lane 1987:138). Across the city there was little community involvement, very low membership levels and a strong religious element within local wards as well as significant tensions with the local Trade Unions (Davies 1996).

The electoral system before local government review and reform in the 1950s and 1960s also favoured 'boss politics', with powerful aldermen reinforcing the political system which favoured those who could keep power and influence close to their own group (Davies 1996:136, Kilfoyle 2002:2). There is also (unsurprisingly) the sectarian element to consider. Because of

the overwhelming power of Catholic elements within the Liverpool Labour Party, the party had absorbed the networks of the catholic political machine, as well as the church's suspicion and distaste for more democratic forms of organisation and the advancement of women within the party (Davies 1996, Lane 1978). The influence of sectarian politics also meant the party was broadly 'right wing', and had little room for concerns around community participation and the demands of Trade Unions. In effect, the operating practices of the former catholic parties, and the exclusion of trade unions and the Methodist groups from the more powerful positions within Labour, all contributed to the concentration of power in the hands of a ruling 'boss' within the party (Lane 1978).

Boss politics reached its zenith in the 1950s under Jack Braddock as Labour Leader. Braddock controlled the council by a system of patronage which offered status to local people willing to toe Braddock's line, whilst excluding others who might have been more critical. The policy of excluding those who were not totally dependent on Braddock for their position within the party, and the hangover of exclusionary policies from the old Catholic party produced a Labour organisation that was effectively a closed shop by the mid 1960s, with low levels of constituency membership, as there was little room for new members within Braddock's Labour (Murden 2006:450, Kilfoyle 2000, Lane 1978). This form of political control, and exclusion of the 'wrong sort of candidate' or member (Crick 1987:40) continued after Braddock's death in 1964, under Bill Sefton. By the 1970s boss politics within the Liverpool Labour party had created fertile ground for the eventual Militant takeover that would come to fruition in the 1980s (Crick 1987, Kilfoyle 2002).

As a corollary to the 'boss politics' of the Labour party the city developed a strong grassroots tradition within local politics, a tradition which was particularly active in the late 1960s and 1970s, with rent strikes (Sklair 1975) and community co-operatives as well as protests against school closures in the late 1970s into the early 1980s (Carspecken and Miller 1985). This 'alternative' source of political organisation is paralleled by the development of autonomy in the cultural sector, discussed more extensively in Chapter 8. These developments, when coupled with the closed nature of Liverpool's ruling political elite, particularly within the Labour Party under the control of Jack Braddock (Kilfoyle 2000, Taaffe & Mulhern 1988:36) explains the way in which the city did not develop a Labour stranglehold over the council, in direct contrast to almost every other Northern city. Indeed 'boss politics' would contribute to the emergence of the Liberals as viable political force within the city, as well as ensuring the rot that set into the Labour party could not be removed.

Explaining the role of political history in Liverpool: towards a 'Liverpool way' in local political culture

The previous section has shown how the style of leadership associated with 'boss politics' in the city became the dominant form of political practice within Liverpool's politics. The tendency for powerful men to concentrate power and exclude those who threatened them continued throughout the 1970s and 1980s, meaning that there was little room for consensus building and the construction of the types of partnerships seen in the North East. In the terms of institutional theory discussed by Chapter 3, boss politics became one of the core institutions in Liverpool's politics. Essentially no political platform, policy or party could become successful in the city without an understanding and engagement with this crucial

institution. Therefore the consideration of 'boss politics' as an aspect of political culture in Liverpool shows how that institution played an almost determining role in political life, shaping the type of politics during the 1980s and after. This specific aspect of political culture can be fitted into the general discourse and practice of Liverpudlian politics, the 'Liverpool way' of local politics and administration.

Previous sections have shown the importance of local culture to political behaviour in Liverpool. However there is a methodological caveat worth noting, because it is difficult to discern the extent to which the popular image of Liverpudlian politics is a narration of how local politicians and people would like to see themselves, and the reality of day-to-day political behaviour. Certainly writers like Lane (1987), Kilfoyle (2000), Davies (1996) and Ridley (1986) all comment on the 'Liverpool Machismo' (Ridley 1986:132), a style of political leadership which involved public and private aggression, a reluctance to back down in arguments, a strong, albeit underlying, threat of physical violence and an absolute refusal to cede power to individuals and groups that were seen as untrustworthy (Kilfoyle 2000, Ridley 1986, Davies 1996, Murden 2006).

Notwithstanding the above concerns, the roots of this particular style of political discourse come from two sources. Against the background of the wider culture in the city discussed in the previous sections, the casualisation of the labour force produced a type of leadership that was interested in short term gains and 'seizing temporary advantage', an advantage gained by those with the quickest wits and ability to command and control (Lane 1986:10). Coupled with the kinds of personality necessary to survive in Liverpool politics was the comparative lack of middle classes, following the decline of the merchant class after the First World War (along with that of the port)

(Lane 1978:340), and the lack of a middle class 'intellectual' group within the Labour party (aside from some notable exceptions, such as the 1987 administration), as a result of the 'boss politics' discussed in the previous section. Indeed 'boss politics' necessitated the advancement of those who depended on those in control of the parties, and the council, for their status (Crick 1987:39) rather than their wealth or professional position within Liverpool. The 'macho' political culture can also be linked to the broad exclusion of women from the upper echelons of the Labour party (Bessie Braddock notwithstanding) (Davies 1996:234). The Labour leadership of the city from the 1950s onwards, with one or two notable exceptions, was white and male, adding to the 'aggressive' tenor of political debate.

Lane (1986), Ridley (1987) and Carmichael (1993) expand on the effects of the 'strongly belligerent civic chauvinism' (1993:388) as this style limited the influence of moderate voices, as well as producing a rather anti-intellectual strain to the political character. Thus political discourse in Liverpool featured a 'hostility to middle class ideas' from outside ruling groups, and 'an exaggerated rhetoric and intellectual poverty' (1993:388) limiting the capacity for innovation in policy and keeping indolence an essential trait of Liverpool until the Militant period.

To conclude the discussion of Liverpool's way of conducting politics it is vital to note that, as Newman and McClean (2006) have argued, political discourses limit what can and cannot be acceptably discussed and considered as appropriate within organisations. In the case of LCC, not only did the 'Liverpool way' prepare the ground for the Militant seeds to blossom in the 1980s, but also the 'Liverpool way' that developed in the post war period (in contrast to the grandeur of Victorian Liberalism, civic architecture and cultural infrastructure in the Nineteenth Century) no longer seemed to have

no place for art and culture within its rather narrow spectrum of policy concerns.

The influence of the ‘Liverpool way’ of politics on the Militant tendency

Following Lowndes (2005) the above description of the ‘Liverpool way’ of political culture shows the ‘rules of the game’ (Lowndes 2005:279) for decision making within Liverpool politics and specifically within the LCC. The ‘Liverpool way’ conditioned the type of politician that would emerge within the city’s major institutions, such as the trade unions, and within the city council itself. This style of political behaviour and organisation, along with short-sightedness of ‘boss politics’ within the Labour party, was instrumental in the emergence of the Militant tendency, and its eventual control of Liverpool City Council. Every discussion of the history of LCC or the development of its policy and strategy over the long term will inevitably discuss the rise of Militant within the Liverpool District Labour party and its role within the Labour administration of 1983-1987. This Chapter, although focusing on cultural policy, is no different, because it was Militant that would take the decisions that shaped the landscape for cultural policy in present-day Liverpool and Militant represents an excellent example of how an institutional analysis can help to further understand cultural policy practice, because Militant were so obviously shaped by the ‘Liverpool way’ of doing politics. Whilst the Militant era ushered in a short lived era of progressive cultural policy following the Tendency’s ejection from office, Militant was responsible for driving a wedge between the major artistic and cultural institutions in the city and the city’s government, as well as failing to respond to the challenges facing the cultural sector following the abolition of Merseyside County Council (MCC). It can be argued that the perception (and in some cases, reality) of Liverpool Council as a body that

was poorly managed and difficult to work with lasts even up to the present (Ben-Tovim 2003:232). This last point, explained in detail in Chapter 6, is particularly significant as the fear of failure surrounding ECoC 2008 would lead to specific forms of governance for the festival, governance forms that had difficult repercussions for relationships concerning cultural policy in the city.

Militant came to power following a decade of stagnation. During the 1970s there had been an almost unbroken period of no overall control in LCC, following the emergence of the Liberals within Liverpool in the early 1970s (Parkinson 1984). Although Labour were often the largest party it was Liberal and Conservative members who dominated the budget setting process, focusing on keeping the rates low, rather than expanding services to cope with Liverpool's expanding social and economic problems (Parkinson 1984:18). Budget rows and lack of political leadership were a death knell to any attempt to create long term strategies for the city, particularly in response to the growing housing crisis that had become a key electoral issue for both Labour and the Liberals. Parkinson sums up the impact of the inertia and instability of the 1970s describing it as 'a crucial lost decade for the city', a decade in which:

'the council's inability to get a coherent strategy for the city as it was undergoing massive social change and economic decline and the unwillingness to take the difficult decisions necessary to provide reduced services for a declining population, left an extraordinarily difficult legacy for any party running the city in the mid-1980s. Decline would have been difficult to manage if the city had had enlightened leadership. That it had to endure such political incoherence instead seemed a cruel stroke of fate.'

(Parkinson 1985:24)

It was against this backdrop that Militant came to prominence in the District Labour party in Liverpool. Members of the Trotskyist Militant Tendency rose to prominent positions within the Labour group, partially as a result of the rotten state of the party following the decline of the ‘boss politics’ system after Bill Sefton became leader of MCC in 1974, and partially as a result of their insistence on the centrality of fighting central government for funds (Crick 1987). In a city where one third of all employment was in the public sector, and the LCC employed 30,000 people (Ridley 1986:130), it is unsurprising that the call for more funding, and ‘no cuts in jobs or services’ was electorally successful (Carmichael 1993:395). The style of leadership, and rhetoric associated with boss politics’ was to resurface in the 1980s under Militant, as Militant continued the ‘Liverpool way’ of political behaviour. One interviewee working in one of Liverpool’s major arts organisations during the 1980s summed up the Militant’s style of political discourse: ‘The acid political rhetoric of Militant which was, you know, oppositional and confrontational too.’ The Tendency would also use the caucus system operating in the DLP to get candidates and policy adopted (Kilfoyle 2000), thus further replicating the ‘boss politics’ patterns of excluding undesirables from the party (Murden 2006:457).

Militant’s battles with the government over budgets have been well documented (Taaffe and Mulhern, Kilfoyle 2000, Parkinson 1986, Crick 1987, Midwinter 1985, Carmichael 1993) and it is perhaps unnecessary to go into specific details at this juncture. What is worth noting is the effects of the eventual failure of Militant’s strategy of brinkmanship. The period would do lasting damage to Liverpool’s national image and relations with central government, as well as the private sector, to the extent that: ‘The city council

was seen by its potential local and national partners as an organisation that could not take decisions, and the ones that were taken were not always particularly good ones' (Ben-Tovim 2003:232).

Militant came to power at the height of the economic crisis in Liverpool, with a city plagued by poor housing and mass unemployment (Wilks-Heeg 2003). In this context culture was low on their agenda. Indeed one long serving elected member of the LCC sums up the problem facing those within the council who were interested in a cultural agenda:

'I think if you've got a poor city and if you back to the 80s, I mean, Liverpool went through a very very difficult time. There was, I mean almost weekly there were factories closing down... and if you look at parts of the city there was unemployment of 24, 28 %, so I am not sure that if you've, I'm not sure that given those circumstances, a city would be saying, come on city council, let's be spending some money on, on a new theatre production or a new festival'

This evidence would make it seem inappropriate to question the lack of cultural policy within an authority facing severe social and economic crisis. However circumstances outside of the LCC's control would suggest the importance of Militant's lack of interest in culture. Whilst Chapter two has shown how other local authorities were taking the first steps in developing cultural policy during the early 1980s, in Liverpool Militant had an acute effect on cultural policy in Liverpool in several ways, especially when taking decisions that would shape cultural policy in other areas of the UK.

In the first instance Militant was hostile to art and culture because of its ideological position. Effectively art and culture were seen as bourgeois

pursuits, with little meaning for the ‘workerist’ Militant group (Kilfoyle 2000), in keeping with the wider ‘Liverpool way’ of distrusting art and culture. Militant’s main concern was with housing and jobs, and given the financial constraint limiting the council, which had become the key political issue in Liverpool following the rent strikes of the 1970s (Smith 1984). Thus ideology and policy came together in the low density housing estates constructed on the periphery of the city centre (Ridley 1986:133). Militant’s policies of promoting housing on the outskirts of the city centre, and its distrust of business meant that LCC devoted little time or energy to infrastructure in the city centre. This was a particular problem for most arts and cultural organisations that tended to be based in the city centre, the area that gained least attention from the Militant administration (Evans 1996:9). Second, Militant’s ideological position also had an impact on dealings with community groups in the city. Militant supported a strongly municipal vision for Liverpool, with council control at the centre of that policy (as evidenced by the hostility shown to housing developments that did not emanate from the Municipal buildings (Crouch 2003, Murden 2006). This meant Militant were hostile to voluntary sector groups, particularly those who claimed to represent communities where Militant did not have an existing power base, such as The Black Caucus in Liverpool 8 (Ridley 1986:133, Liverpool Black Caucus 1986). This hostility also carried over into relations with art and cultural groups who had strong roots and links with the voluntary sector in Liverpool. At the same time a third issue faced LCC, as it lacked the capacity to deal with art and culture, as its infrastructure had effectively closed following the migration of cultural policy and management to Merseyside County Council in 1974, as well as the attendant loss of funding for art and culture. Hence cultural policy was not only irrelevant to the Militant project, but it was also not a policy area in which LCC had an *obligation* to take an

interest. Finally it is unsurprising that Militant did not have cultural concerns because of the political context and the 'Liverpool way' of politics. The distrust of 'middle class' intellectual ideas within Militant during the 1980s (Carmichael 1993:388) can be traced back to the 'boss politics' system that had developed in the within the city's Labour party in the 1950s, a system which excluded those individuals who were a potential threat to those in power. Thus Ridley concludes that within the Liverpool party:

'There is no leavening Hampstead-type intellectuals or middle class professionals. By enlarge there is little leisure-time interest in the sort of things that interest non-manual left wingers elsewhere'

(Ridley 1986:132)

A useful illustration of Militant's hostility to 'bourgeois' culture can be seen in *The city that dared to fight* (Taaffe and Mulhern 1988), Militant's official history of their time in control of LCC. Taaffe and Mulhern, writing from an explicitly Militant position, discuss the needs of the Liverpool working class, and the struggle against a Tory ruling class based in London, with allies in the right wing of all of the major institutions of the state. Unlike developments in sections of the 'New Left' in the UK in the 1970s and 1980s (Wainwright 1987), what is notable about Taaffe and Mulhern's work is the exclusion of discussions of cultural issues from the discussion of Liverpool politics in this period, and the notable absence of comment on the impact of abolition of the MCC on the city's cultural life. This is not to dismiss the book as a source, but it illustrates the way that the 'workerist' (Kilfoyle 2000) concerns, and the focus on the political struggle with Westminster excluded what militant saw as more 'bourgeois' concerns.

The single-mindedness of Militant over the issue of housing, and the attended importance attached to the 'no cuts' agenda meant that the LCC's relations with the cultural sector reached a historic low and in short, LCC had little or no cultural policies through out the Militant period (in keeping with the post-war tradition in Liverpool, but a major break from the civic grandeur of cultural investment in the pre-war era, as outlined by Longmore (2006). Academic work (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993, Cohen 2007) has commented on the lack of relationship between LCC and cultural institutions and Chapter 8 comments on the cultural leadership which developed as a result of this lack of relationship. However the problems are best illustrated by comments from interviews with current, and former, senior staff from Liverpool's large arts organisations, and the council, at the time:

'There wasn't [a relationship]... the only relationship was we paid them rent'

Or

'Initially our only source of funding was the Arts Council and the City Council had no interest and sort of avoided us like the plague'

Most would concur with one comment that LCC 'had no cultural functions at all'. A consultant who worked closely with Liverpool's arts organisations during the 1980s and would later work on the ECoC bid summed up the political stance of militant discussed above:

'We were dealing with a City Council that only had one line, it's about class, to them the arts was part of a class they didn't want to associate with'

The 'Liverpool way' of politics can therefore be seen to be shaping the outcomes of cultural policy in the 1980s, as Militant's class-based analysis of the issues facing the city and the appropriate methods to respond to those issues excluded any sort of cultural policy response. As the quotations show cultural policy was seen to be alien to politics in the city and certainly irrelevant to the work of the City Council. In addition to reflecting the role of the institution of the 'Liverpool way' in shaping cultural policy, the exclusion of cultural policy from the City Council's concerns created a vacuum for cultural policy governance, a vacuum that would be filled by other administrative bodies working within the city. This story reflects a remarkable continuity with the narrative and analysis of ECoC 2008 offered in Chapter 6, reflecting another vacuum of cultural policy leadership influenced by the same institution described by this Chapter. This vacuum of cultural policy leadership took place against the backdrop of a radical transformation of the government and administration of Liverpool. During the 1980s the city was host to a number of initiatives from central government aimed at alleviating Liverpool's acute social and economic circumstances (Couch 2003). These initiatives, such as the Development Corporation, ran parallel to major reforms of local government across England, reforms which included the abolition of the Merseyside County Council. These central government initiatives, coupled with existing regional bodies filled the vacuum left by the LCC's lack of interest in cultural policy, creating a situation where culture was subject to models of governance, by many institutions in the area, as opposed to the kinds of government found across the UK, as reflected in Chapter 2's discussion. This reminder of this Chapter turns to consider this governance of cultural policy in light of the political institutions set out by the preceding sections. In particular there is an underlying narrative of organisational instability and lack of partnership

work across the many organisations with a role in administering cultural policy. The story of governance is the practical manifestation of the role of Liverpool's political history and culture in constraining cultural policy outcomes, a role that, as Chapter 6 shows, continues to the present day.

The Governance of cultural policy: The MCC

The Militant period was in keeping with the existing political traditions in Liverpool, ignoring cultural policy whilst other local authorities were beginning to develop strategies that would develop cultural programmes for policy ends such as urban regeneration and community cohesion. Cultural leadership in Liverpool during the 1980s and 1990s came from outside the City Council, as other organisations took the responsibility for the development, administration and governance of culture in Liverpool. Two brief case studies, in addition to Chapter 8's description of the role of Liverpool's cultural organisations in leading cultural policy, can usefully illustrate this point: First, events surrounding the abolition of Merseyside County Council (MCC) and the creation of National Museums and Galleries Liverpool (now National Museums Liverpool), and second the role of Merseyside Arts, the Regional Arts Association for the area.

Before the creation of the County Council in 1974 Liverpool City Council had given comparatively large grants to its cultural institutions as well as administering the major metropolitan art and artefact collections at the Museum and the Walker Art gallery. Anecdotal evidence from senior figures from the major art institutions as well as from councillors from both the city and county council illustrates the level of commitment, for instance generous financial support for Royal Liverpool Philharmonic Orchestra, as well as other funding commitments to local theatres and galleries.

Following its creation in 1974 the County Council assumed responsibility for art and cultural provision on Merseyside, in parallel to the Arts Council's regional body, Merseyside Arts. The county was effectively responsible for all of Liverpool's cultural provision, dealing with its museums, galleries and theatres, thus removing the need for cultural officers and policies from within LCC. The County Council was also associated with a more progressive group of Labour councillors who took much more of an interest in cultural policy, coupled with the MCC's institutional capacity to administer arts and cultural funding. Indeed for one interviewee working in the cultural sector during the early 1980s:

'MCC was like the GLC, it wasn't at the same level...but there was a feeling of shared, that we we're all up to the same thing'

The MCC was abolished in 1986, as part of a major restructuring of local government in England (Atkinson and Wilks-Heeg 2000). Leach and Game (1991) provide a context for the comparatively fractured state of politics on Merseyside following the abolition of the MCC, drawing particular attention to the 'negligible' influence of co-ordinating arrangements, as Merseyside became dependent on informal, ad hoc networks to co-ordinate the response to abolition, as opposed to more formal structures that prevailed in other metropolitan county areas (Leach and Game 1991:147). Attempts to secure the 2/3 majority of local district councils to support the creation of joint boards to run cross-county services were hampered on Merseyside by the refusal of councils to work with each other, the distrust of Militant by the other councils, with particular opposition from the Conservative controlled councils to Militant in Liverpool (Leach and Game 1991:165), and the suspension of the several members of St Helens council (Kilfoyle 2000). Merseyside failed to create a section 48 agreement

for dealing with grants to voluntary organisations, as a result of Militant's lack of interest in cultural provision and the voluntary sector, as well as the fractured nature of post-abolition Merseyside. Again this situation reflected the political culture within Liverpool, as the 'boss politics' and aggressive style, coupled with the refusal of the districts to work with each other meant a cultural settlement was virtually impossible.

It is ironic that in their summary of the effects of the abolition of the metropolitan counties Leach and Game point to the way that 'the great majority of services that were provided by the GLC and [Metropolitan County Councils] have continued to be provided' and that there were 'none of the cataclysmic 'collapse of services' bringing cities grinding to a halt' that had been feared pre-abolition (Leach and Game 1991:142). Whilst this analysis rings true for cultural provision in areas like Tyne and Wear and Greater Manchester, and for statutory services on Merseyside such as transport provision, Leach and Game do not capture the effects of abolition in the cultural sector in Merseyside.

The abolition settlement profoundly shaped the form of cultural provision in Merseyside resulting in the creation of National Museums and Galleries Merseyside (NMGM) and the transfer of funding arrangements to either LCC or Merseyside Arts. The creation of NMGM (or National Museums Liverpool (NML) as it became in 2003) gave Liverpool a unique position within England, as its museum service, and its major galleries, became autonomous from the city and directly funded by Westminster. In effect several of the major cultural institutions in the city at the time: the two Museums and the Walker Art gallery were nationalised. The reasons for this are shrouded in urban mythology, particularly with the often repeated claim that Militant planned to sell off most of the collections to fund the city's

debt. The reality is perhaps more mundane, as Merseyside Arts lead the negotiations with central government to get a settlement for the major arts institutions in Liverpool. As the previous sections of this Chapter have shown, at the time of abolition Militant had neither the political interest in the galleries and museum, the institutional capacity to administer the organisations, nor, most crucially, the financial position to be able to cope with major cultural institutions being added to the Liverpool's rate bill, illustrated by a comment from one Merseyside Arts official:

'Liverpool and the other Labour councils not only refused to pick up the tab, they refused to even talk about the abolition of the county council'

Thus the creation of NMGM following the abolition of Merseyside County Council can be seen as the practical manifestation of both the lack of interest shown by LCC in cultural policy, the critical economic conditions in Liverpool, as well as the incoherent political arrangements prevailing on Merseyside at the time. Abolition of the County Council had a complex effect on Merseyside. The effect manifested itself most obviously in the impact on the cultural life of the city of Liverpool, removing its major art and museum collections from the cities' control and moving funding decisions for the city's artistic venues to a disinterested and ill-equipped City Council. Several interviewees working within the sector point to abolition as a very difficult time for many of the artistic institutions within Liverpool, and cite abolition as the nadir for cultural policy within the city. One interviewee working for the Merseyside Arts described the process of having to simply shut down former revenue clients of the county whose funding needs had been transferred over to Merseyside Arts. As well as smaller revenue clients two of the cities theatres would suffer over the longer term, and within four

years of abolition the Everyman, then later in the 1990s the Playhouse would be closed due to bankruptcy (Turnbull 2009) only re-stabilising when the two merged in 2000.

The transfer of NMGM to an independent body funded by central government also damaged the prospects for cultural policy in Liverpool as the council lost the opportunity to expand the city's capacity for cultural administration, and meant there would be little partnership, and no little friction, between the LCC and the main cultural body within Liverpool, a similar relationship that was to develop with the Merseyside Development Corporation's role in opening the Tate Liverpool. Contrary to the more injurious consequences of the abolition, the settlement surrounding NMGM and the expanded influence of Merseyside Arts preserved cultural collections from the worst excesses of the Militant administration, and gave opportunities for the key contributors to what would become the city's first cultural strategy in 1987 (LCC 1987), the cultural aspects of the EU's Objective One funding programme on Merseyside and eventually Liverpool's bid for European Capital of Culture 2008. However the capacity building that came in other Local Authorities in the post-abolition era, especially in Gateshead, was absent in Liverpool.

The governance of cultural policy: Merseyside Arts

The other organisation influential in the course of Liverpool cultural policy was Merseyside Arts (MA), the body set up to replace the Merseyside Arts Association and act as the Arts Council's administrative body in the region. Merseyside Arts was influential for three reasons: funding, policy and personnel. In the first instance MA became the funding body for almost all of the cultural organisations in the region following abolition. Across

England Central government moved funds from the county councils to the precept of the Arts Council (Bailey *et al* 2005) and a similar situation occurred on Merseyside, but with a reduction in the overall funds offered by MA to former MCC clients. By replacing MCC, MA fulfilled a role that LCC was simply not capable of. However this role changed as MA was closed during the reorganisation of regional arts bodies in 1991, and the new body Arts Council North West became both more geographically and politically distant from the cultural scene in Liverpool (MA's officers were formerly in the Blue Coat chambers).

Second, MA became one of the pioneers of the use of art and culture for economic and social policy. Traditionally the Arts Council had viewed economic 'uses' of art and culture with suspicion, as this concept did not fit within the two dominant theories of arts funding used in the early 1980s: community art and 'high art' (Bianchini 1989a, also Chapter 1 of this thesis). Indeed one official who worked for the MA at the time sums up the tension over funding projects and studies that made the case for the economic and regenerative uses of culture:

'I think nationally at that point in time, I think one of the problems was the Arts Council in those early years! The Arts Council kept thinking we shouldn't be using arts money to do this'

In line with developing this wider use for art and culture, MA commissioned the Mysercough report on '*The Economic Importance of Arts in Britain*' and various other studies showing the importance of cultural activity to Merseyside's economy, making the case for funding economic uses of culture. MA also developed an integrated strategy for art and culture on Merseyside, stressing the importance of linking cultural funding to tourism

to apply for ERDF and ESF funds from the EU (Vaughan and Booth 1989:29). The policy innovations within MA tied into its funding for cultural projects, as it also used money from the governments Urban Programme to fund art and culture development.

‘I would say about 50% of the cash we were spending that year, certainly 50% of the projects we were supporting, were projects that had that broader implication than just arts’

This conception of how to use different forms of funding for cultural purposes would go hand in hand with the policies advocated by the post-Militant administration that came to power in Liverpool in 1987. However these policies would enjoy little success as a result of the wider political circumstances constraining cultural policy making in the city, ‘the Liverpool way’ of politics and the lack of capacity within the LCC.

The cross-over of the policy of using central governments urban regeneration funds for cultural projects reflects the final area in which MA was influential, as various personnel from MA would go on to either chair the highest profile committees within the 1987 administration at LCC, or become consultants who were exceptionally influential in co-ordinating the cultural aspects of the City’s Objective One programme. The post 1987 saw the lessons learned by key staff at MA start to emerge within LCC’s policies and it is to these developments which this Chapter now turns.

The governance of cultural policy: LCC in the post-Militant era

The previous section has shown how the political arrangements and political culture in Liverpool had a profound influence on the (lack of an) evolution of cultural policy during the late 1970s and 1980s. The political

inertia on the council, and its subsequent capture by Militant; the role of MCC and Merseyside Arts as the key cultural administrators and funders in Liverpool; the creation of NML and the failure to devise a post-abolition settlement for culture by the Districts; and the poor relationship between the LCC and the arts sector all contributed to mean there was little prospect of cultural policy emerging in Liverpool during this period. The following section discusses what Bianchini and Parkinson (1993) refer to as the 'tale of missed opportunities' that surrounds cultural policy following Militant's control of LCC, with particular reference to key policy failures in music policy, urban regeneration policy and the continued problematic relationship with the cultural sector in the city. The three examples show how the constraints of the 'Liverpool Way' and the organisation incapacity of the LCC caused severe problems for the nascent cultural policies attempted by the post-Militant administrations.

A year after abolition Liverpool would see the greatest ever shake-up of its political life. 1987 would prove to be a crucial year for cultural policy in Liverpool, as a result of two, interrelated, events: First the House of Lord's decision of 12th March to uphold the surcharging and expulsion of forty seven elected members of Liverpool City Council would radically alter the political makeup, although not the infighting, on the council; second following the elections in May 1987 Liverpool City Council began to make tentative steps towards institutionalising a strategy for arts and cultural industries.

The council initially published an *Arts and cultural industries strategy* (LCC 1987), making the case for the use of art and culture to develop Liverpool's economy and to get funding for cultural projects from central government's urban programme (LCC 1987:2). The document was

designed to be part of a wider strategy to reinvigorate the city centre and promote tourism in Liverpool (LCC 1987:8). As well as proposing the economic and social uses of culture (reflecting the presence of elected members influenced by MA's policies), the strategy proposed partnership with the various artistic funding bodies in the city, reflecting the new administrations realisations of the financial limitations confronting the city, and the recognition of the need to reach out following the insularity of the militant era (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993:164).

Initially the policy met with considerable success, particularly in the field of visual arts. In 1989 the LCC established the first municipal film office in Britain (the Liverpool Film Office (LFO), and even underwrote a BBC production in the city (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993:166). The LFO reflected the ethos of partnership within the LCC's strategy, as did various community projects. Hope Street Limited, a partnership between the Everyman and LCC, set up in the late 1980s to provide training and development for people aiming to enter the cultural sector is the outstanding example of this, and it, and the film office continue today. Other longer term projects included funding Movieola, the organisation that would form the basis for Foundation for Art and Creative Technology (FACT), the multimedia cinema and gallery that opened during the city's ECoC 2008 bid.

The LFO and other aspects of the council's programme of using non-cultural funds, especially the Urban Programme, were also influential nationally, following their dissemination at the 1989 British American Association conference in Glasgow. Finally the council instituted a black arts officer, funded by Merseyside Arts, which seemed to be a first step to institutionalise arts policy, as well as the beginnings of repairing the fractured relationship with the city's Black community (Gifford et al 1989).

As Bianchini and Parkinson (1993) point out there was still a crucial failure to reform the internal operations of the council, leaving culture in a rather peripheral place, as well as a funding crisis across the city as the council failed to find the funds to reach parity with Arts Council money that was previously administered on a county wide level by MCC (1993:173). This initial commitment shown by LCC to art and culture, albeit narrated in within the economic language prevalent across the cultural sector in the 1980s (Hewison 1995), met with extensive problems. The City Council faced further funding crisis during the late 1980s, as well as the continuingly fragile political situation within the council's ruling Labour group. One of the central problems affecting Liverpool in the late 1980s was that the Militant period became a continuation of the stasis and inertia that had dogged politics in the 1970s. Just as no overall control and budget restraint lead to a financial and political crisis in the council at the end of the 1970s, the end of Militant saw a 'long' decade of instability extend into the 1990s. The process of ridding the party of Militants, and the damage done to the political process within LCC and to perceptions of Liverpool (Ben-Tovim 2003), created a difficult backdrop for the creation of cultural policy, as the 'Liverpool Way' of political culture continued to dominate the LCC. By 1989 Militant had resurfaced (Kilfoyle 2000) and the strategy of selling off land to cover the LCC's deficits championed by the individual councillors associated with cultural policy had begun to divide opinion within the Labour group, eventually leading to the isolation (and in some cases expulsion) of the more progressive amongst the Labour group of the time (Kilfoyle 2000). The period of innovation came to an end by the early 1990s as this decade saw a return to decline management, under the control of the more traditional right wing of the Liverpool Labour party (Kilfoyle 2000). It is against this backdrop that several examples of the fallout from the

economic, political and administrative crisis emerge, to show the lack of political strategy, and the absence of an institutional position, for cultural policy: Music policy, urban regeneration policy and the LCC's relations with the major arts and cultural institutions in the city.

In the first instance, music policy saw initial interest from LCC soon evaporate as a result of political issues facing the council. In 1991 LCC commissioned 'Music City' a response to a 1987 study entitled 'City Beat' suggesting the LCC should invest in setting up a music production and management company to facilitate the exploitation of Liverpool's strong musical culture and generate income for the council (Cohen 2007). In keeping with other developments in 1987, and unlike the Film Office, there was initial enthusiasm for the proposals of 'City Beat', but little long term commitment, meaning this aspect of cultural policy was never embedded within LCC. Indeed, by the time LCC received the 1991 report music policy had moved off the council's agenda, and the report was met with little interest. The possibility of LCC taking the lead in developing the city's music 'industry' during the early 1990s all but collapsed with the disastrous staging of a memorial concert for John Lennon in 1990, which was met with almost universal criticism (Gray 1990) and was an over budget flop. Indeed one interviewee, an elected member from LCC, mentioned the concert specifically when asked what the role of culture was within LCC during the early 1990s:

'There wasn't one. There were a number of events that took place, not very big or good and we had a number that took place and went disastrously wrong, the John Lennon memorial council for example cost the council a lot of money'

In her discussion of the issues and problems connected with music policy Cohen (2007) shares the concerns of Bianchini and Parkinson (1993) that the LCC's attempts to establish a coherent music policy was 'a tale of missed opportunities' (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993, cited in Cohen 2007:290). Cohen also draws attention to the specific nature of Liverpool's cultural policy context, describing the way that music policies which appear rhetorically similar to initiatives in other cities, such as Sheffield in the UK and Austin in Texas, are heavily conditioned by the role of popular music within the local economy and within local culture. In Liverpool, a city facing severe economic crisis in the late 1980s and early 1990s, music was seen as a form of escape, as bands would get a 'big break' and then leave for London, the centre of the UK's music industry. Indeed the nascent 'industry' of music production in Liverpool was viewed in parts with suspicion, and in parts with incomprehension, by those members of the council who were not part of the group of progressive councillors (dubbed the 'Sainsbury Set', mocking both their perceived middle class status and their shopping habits) driving cultural policy (Kilfoyle 2000:215). As the 'Sainsbury Set' lost influence in the early 1990s, and music policy became associated with expensive events, such as the John Lennon memorial concert, leadership for music policy shifted to other stakeholders in Liverpool's governance, especially those associated with the EU's Objective One programme.

Secondly, and in a similar fashion, Bianchini (1989), Bianchini and Parkinson (1993) and Green (1996) have drawn attention to the role of culture in LCC's attempts to create solutions to the city's economic and social problems. The cultural industries strategy appeared at the same time as strategies for the city centre and for tourism. For Green these three documents show how the LCC began to see art and culture as a key part of

its regeneration strategy. Indeed Bianchini and Parkinson (1993) makes the argument, supported by interviews with councillors and officers working in the city council during the late 1980s/early 1990s, that the ‘cultural turn’ within LCC represented the use of culture as ‘an instrument’ (Bianchini 1996:168), with an underlying institutional distrust of art and culture policy. This led to the role of cultural policy in urban regeneration becoming essentially peripheral after the initial wave of interest dissipated, once again reflecting the lack of organisational capacity for long term strategy within LCC, as the ‘Liverpool way’ set the ‘rules of the game’ (Lowndes 2005:279) for cultural policy making in the city.

Initially LCC was innovative in linking its cultural aims to the government’s urban programme funds (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993). Whilst Militant had focused its use of central government funds on housing policy, the post-militant administration switched its priority (against the backdrop of central government’s instance (Couch 2003) to the development of the city’s economy. This use of Department of Environment (DoE) funds was not only innovative, but also produced a series of organisations designed to facilitate training and vocational development within the cultural industries. On a much grander scale the council developed a scheme to redevelop a major part of the city centre by encouraging cultural industry growth (Bianchini and Parkinson 1993). Once again this policy was to meet with external constraints. In an attempt to balance the budget the council sold off land around the Duke Street area to a private developer to create a ‘creative industries quarter’, leading to internal criticism of the policy (Kilfoyle 2002:255). The subsequent failure to acquire grants for the project, and the bankruptcy of the developer led to the ‘creative industries quarter’ meeting the same fate as the John Lennon concert (Evans 1996:12) and

attracting considerable opposition and distrust from the local creative community (Duffy 1996, Stewart 1996). Therefore urban regeneration policies can be seen in the same light as the music policy begun by the council after 1987: innovative, with some groundbreaking strategies, particularly the use of urban programme funds to set up training programmes, but with the eventual failure of large scale projects (Cohen 2007:275)

At the same time the City Council's relationship with the art and cultural organisations of Liverpool did not undergo a radical shift, despite the higher profile for cultural policy in the post-abolition period. Interviewees described a 'thawing' of relations between the sector and LCC, but a general failure to move cultural policy up the agenda. For one interviewee, from one of Liverpool's major cultural organisations, the relationship improved simply because of the personnel changes within the elected members:

'It was a time of when the city was really strapped for cash, Militant were in power; it was very hard to convince them to put money into the arts but we had some enlightened councillors in the wake of the Militant thing, some councillors who were following the sort of GLC model'

However even as individuals who were more sympathetic came to wield greater influence within the council the lack of institutional capacity present within the LCC hampered the construction of a longer term working relationship, illustrated by a comment from another cultural sector employee:

'There were always individuals but they didn't know how to take that agenda into the council'

‘ so even if there had been the political will to have a conversation about culture there was actually nobody to have that conversation with, as there were no council officers with any experience or knowledge of the arts or culture, so to be honest there want much of a change’

And a former officer concurs with these assertions:

‘We had people who recognized the value of the arts, but we were in no means centre stage in terms of council regime’

Overall the picture is one if an organisation searching to create a response to the conditions in the late 1980s and early 1990s, and trying to incorporate art and culture into that response. The lack of relationship between the LCC and the cultural sector would prove influential in the development of the cultural sector’s leadership capacity, as is illustrated by Chapter 8’s discussion of cultural policy in the post-ECoC 2008-era. In the 1980s and into the 1990s the position of cultural policy was better than under Militant, and individual councillors were much more responsive to the needs of the cultural sector but there were still the kinds of structural, institutional issues that surrounded most of LCC’s policy and service delivery (Carmichael 1993:402) and the inability to produce longer term strategy, an inability that had begun in the 1970s, lingered on. The ‘Liverpool way’ identified by the first half of this Chapter continued to exert influence, even as administrations with radically different ideologies took power within the LCC.

The governance of cultural policy: the roles of MDC and Objective One funding

Previous sections have discussed the lead role taken by MA and MCC during the 1980s. This section turns to discuss two other influences on the cultural policy associated with Liverpool's bid for European Capital of Culture 2008; Merseyside Development Corporation (MDC) and the EU's Objective One programme. Central Government's response to the problems facing the city in the early 1980s, the Merseyside Development Corporation and, following the Toxteth riots, the Merseyside Task Force (MTF) (Crouch 2003) were to prove central to LCC adopting the cultural agenda, and in giving Liverpool a major cultural asset, the Tate gallery. Cultural governance, at a time when the LCC was involved in the managed decline of the city, was therefore directed by institutions that were often in direct conflict with LCC. These final remarks offer the final piece in the jigsaw for revealing the picture of the cultural policy landscape during the build up to the bid for ECoC 2008. This picture is completed by an outline of the difficulties facing the LCC's internal administration, which serves as a way of opening up comparisons with the type of government found in the North East, as well as the form that the *governance* of culture takes in that region.

The Merseyside Development corporation (MDC) was one of the first two development corporations set up by the Thatcher government in 1981 (Couch 2003). The MDC was created as a way of prompting economic activity via private sector partnership and property development, as a response to both the economic problems on Merseyside and the perceived failure of local government to tackle the issues confronting Merseyside (Theokas 2004). MDC's role in cultural policy is convoluted, as it began with a policy of promoting economic investment along traditional lines, before adopting a more cultural approach linked to tourism and the development of the Albert Dock. The change of emphasis came following

central government's response to the Toxteth riots, which saw the creation of the Merseyside Task Force a cross-departmental body led by the then high profile Department of Environment minister Michael Heseltine (Parkinson & Duffy 1984). MTF represented central government's 'eyes and ears' on Merseyside, courting the private sector whilst having a problematic relationship with local agencies because of a lack of representation for elected members represented (Parkinson and Duffy 1984:84).

Whilst senior LCC officers would eventually work well with MTF (Parkinson and Duffy 1984:88), a body that would have a significant role administering Objective One funding for Merseyside (after it became Government office for Merseyside), it is unsurprising that there was tension between LCC and the MDC. The tensions, between a central government body designed to use entrepreneurial methods and work in partnership with the private sector, and the City Council whose literature proclaimed its 'socialism' at every opportunity, was both ideological and also spatial. A central issue was over funding opportunities, as Militant saw funds given to the MDC from central government that it felt were due to the LCC (Murden 2006). Rows over funding resulted in a spatial division within the city centre, as a redevelopment occurred on the waterfront, just as Militant were abandoning the city centre. A consultant working with the cultural sector during this period describes the council's perception thus:

'There was a clear line, the golden mile between MDC and LCC and that side got money and the other didn't, as the city decayed'

As the above tension occurred MDC began to develop an explicitly 'cultural' programme for regenerating its designated area. MTF also attempted to develop various 'creative' responses to the urban problems

including giving MDC the task of running the Liverpool Garden Festival. Coupled with the Garden festival the MDC took up plans from MCC to transform the Docks by refilling the Albert Dock with water (Murden 2006). There is much debate over the impact of the International Garden Festival, seen by some as a success which attracted 3 million visitors and transformed derelict land on the river bank (Murden 2006) but by others as a grossly offensive circus designed to distract from the social and economic problems facing Liverpool in the early 1980s (Murden 2006), where 'jobs not trees' were needed (Theokas 2004:153). The City Council also refused to take over the site following the conclusion of the festival, leading to the existence of a large empty space by the mid 1990s(Theokas 2004) and twenty years of stagnation (Theokas 2004).

More successful was the MDC's transformation of the dockland areas, including the opening of the Tate Gallery in the Albert Dock. MCC had originally opened the maritime Museum in 1980 on the derelict dock, and as part of its tourist-led regeneration scheme MDC looked for a high profile, flagship attraction. It was timely that MDC's regeneration plans for the docks tied into existing plans by the Tate to create a gallery in the North of England, and with MDC's financial assistance, and the support of Tate director Alan Bowness the Albert Dock was selected as the site for the Tate project. The dock was of particular significance to Tate, given its proximity to the Tate and Lyle sugar works which had recently closed. The replacement of mass employment by an art gallery was not the only controversial aspect of the Tate. One local artist compared the opening of the Tate to Nero fiddling against the backdrop of a blazing Rome (Riley 2008), and academic commentators reflect the difficult political status of the Tate; Lorente (1996) has pointed to local distrust of the Tate, with the gallery seen as a 'Trojan

horse, sheltering officials sent by the right-wing government in London for the conquest of left-wing Liverpool’, whilst Williams (2004) discusses the perceived role of the Tate in ‘civilizing’ the North of England (Williams 2004:112). Interviewees also commented on this initial distrust:

‘of course when Tate opened initially there was a lot of hostility towards the Tate because people felt it was kind of this big thing from somewhere else and what did it have to do with Liverpool’

Despite the initial distrust the Tate has gone on to form part of the successful regeneration of the Albert Dock site, representing an essential aspect of Liverpool’s current cultural infrastructure. The success of Tate, along with the difficult, if influential legacy of the Garden Festival, shows that it MDC’s role in perusing cultural policy in Liverpool. MDC’s apparent success began to influence the post-Militant plans for tourism and culture-led regeneration, and whilst the Garden Festival is controversial to this day, the Tate plays a key role in Liverpool’s existing cultural offer and formed part of the LCC’s bid for ECoC 2008. It can be convincingly stated that the MDC, for all its failures to bring in private investment and transform the local economy, was the driver in the creation of the first flagship cultural development in the city. MDC’s role represents a part of the move from cultural *government*, by the local authority, to cultural *governance* whereby a host of agencies and actors is involved in producing cultural policy (Rhodes 2000). This process would eventually culminate almost two decades later with Liverpool’s Local Strategic Partnership leading on cultural policy after 2008. In the case of MDC, during the 1980s and 1990s, it worked in partnership with the Tate, as well as NMGM after 1987, in the culture-led regeneration of the Albert dock section of the city (Williams 2004).

Much in keeping with the narrative of MDC, the EU's Objective One programme offers a similar insight into the move from *government* to *governance* in Liverpool. Objective One status for Merseyside was to have profound effect on Liverpool. Granted because the regions GDP per capita was tending towards below 75% of the EU average (Murden 2006:473), Objective One funding comprised a £1.5 billion package which would eventually run for ten years (Evans 2002). At its core the governance of Objective One required partnership of the agencies in the region to facilitate funding bids (Meegan 2003), and was part of LCC move towards integrating itself into the 'multilevel governance' of Liverpool in the 1990s, along with initiatives like central governments City Challenge (Couch 2002).

In cultural policy terms Objective One is important because it offered funds directly for cultural industries, as one of its five drivers included a cultural aspect (Brown 1998). Objective One was used to develop a series of initiatives promoting the growth of small scale cultural industries, including the Merseyside Music Development Agency and Merseyside ACME (Arts Culture and Media Enterprise) (Cohen 2007). In its second phase Objective One also funded several capital developments for the city's cultural assets. The importance of Objective One, aside from funding projects that would form the basis for various parts of the cultural policy surrounding ECoC 2008 (particularly the community projects that originated in Speke and Garston) was in changing the attitudes of councillors involved in LCC, especially those who were to serve as part of the Liberal Democrat administration post-1998. One longstanding LCC councillor described the impact:

'if you had a good cultural and arts offer then that economic growth would not simply be around culture and arts but actually would spill

over into physical regeneration, job creation, retention of graduates, skills enhancement and so on, all which help the economy to be stimulated. There is a lot that you can look at to prove that culture and arts does actually stimulate growth elsewhere in the economy’

The Governance of Culture: LCC in the 1990s

Whilst interviewees described the importance of programmes like Objective One in raising awareness of the cultural agenda, as well as the overall shift to governance in Liverpool, the LCC still faced familiar problems by the early 2000s leading up to the bid for ECoC 2008. The years leading up to the end of the century saw further stagnation within LCC until the Liberal Democrats took control of the council following the elections in May 1998. The reforms initiated by the Liberal Democrat administration went hand in hand with the bid for ECOC 2008, and as such most are discussed in more detail in Chapter 6. To conclude this Chapter’s illustration of the context of cultural policy during the ECoC 2008 bid it is worth summarising the position of the LCC in the late 1990s. The previous section has noted how other actors, such as NMGM, MDC, and MA filled the ‘cultural’ space left by LCC, so cultural policy within LCC continued its stagnation into the 1990s, typified by a rather lacklustre bid to be ‘City of Architecture 1999’ (Liverpool City Council 1994), as LCC participated in the ‘managed decline’ of a city associated with a period of no overall control in the council and a vacuum of political leadership.

Overall the performance of Liverpool City Council as a strategic body, across a range of policy areas was seen an exceptionally poor by the end of the 1990s. As a 1999 IDEa (Improvement and Development Agency)

peer review report indicates the City Council was characterised by (amongst other issues):

- 1) Weak and on occasions non-existent corporate management of key strategic issues
- 2) Hostility and mutual distrust between councillors and senior officers
- 3) A failure to produce effective corporate plans for implementing major policy initiatives
- 4) Generally poor quality and high cost services
- 5) Disengagement by the council from the real interests and needs of local people'

(IDeA 1999:1)

Further illustration of the political issues associated with Liverpool's political culture are summarized in various extracts from the IDeA report, which noted that the 1980s still influenced how the council behaved (1999:3); that there were no corporate process for getting members plans a reality (199:4); No cross departmental working (1999:5); a lack of long term planning (1999:7); a 'can't do' culture with staff (1999:8); And legacy of over involvement in personal appointments and minute details by members (1999:14). Issues of departmentalism, boss politics and a failed infrastructure all still characterised the LCC in 1998, just as they had done in 1987, 1983 and in the 1970s. Research with the cultural sector during this period reflects the chronic political and management problems facing the LCC:

‘When I went to Liverpool they were very much sought of “you can’t do that” and in Manchester it’s very much a question “well what do you want to and we’ll see what we can do to help” (Brown 1998:22)

Overall Liverpool could not be characterised as a city with a strong arts and cultural policy in the years leading up to the bid for Capital of Culture. An interviewee from LCC summed up the councils position, and much of this discussion, perfectly:

‘I don’t think it was deeply felt, and I think to be honest, during the whole period of the 90s you could never say that the council had a proper culture agenda, I think there were people working who were working as both council officials and as councillors who had cultural, who had some degree of cultural investment and were keen to kind of look at other ways of promoting you know culture, but I think, I think it was a long way from art for art’s sake, a long way’

Conclusion

This Chapter has discussed political culture and history in Liverpool as a way of illustrating two points: first, the role of key ‘institutions’ (Lowndes 2005) in setting the limits for policy making, in particular around culture, in Liverpool; second, how Liverpool was, institutionally speaking, an unlikely site for a bid to be ECoC 2008. For sure the city has an impressive cultural infrastructure (Longmore 2006) but the wealth of artistic and cultural organizations and history is in contrast to the legacy of a political past and political culture which militated against a commitment to long term strategies such as an ECoC 2008 bid.

The Chapter has shown how political culture can be seen to act as a key 'institution' for Liverpool, in Lowndes' (2005) sense, acting as 'the rules of the game', limiting what could and could not be acceptably discussed and considered as appropriate within the city's government and administration. In the case of LCC, not only did the 'Liverpool way' prepare the ground for Militant's seed to take root and blossom in the 1980s, but also that the 'Liverpool way' would seem to have no place for art and culture within its rather narrow spectrum of policy concerns. Additionally LCC never developed a capacity for art and cultural policy after arts administration was transferred to the newly created Merseyside County Council (MCC) in 1974. Indeed Liverpool's local authority did not develop any internal cultural infrastructure at all, an underdevelopment that was exacerbated by the abolition of MCC in 1986. Before the decision to bid for ECoC 2008, the LCC did not have a strong background in hosting major events or in cultural policy (Parkinson and Bianchini 1993), nor did the LCC have the infrastructure associated with an art and culture department. The lack of infrastructure and the general institutional distrust in art and culture can be seen by various examples of LCC's refusal to engage with, or fund, cultural projects in the 1980s and 1990s (Parkinson and Bianchini 1993).

The Chapter has also constructed a narrative that opens up the contrast with the thesis' other case study, based on Newcastle and Gateshead. NewcastleGateshead's pursuit of the ECoC 2008, in contrast to Liverpool, developed from a longstanding interest in, and use of, cultural policy in Gateshead, coupled with the close knit nature of political culture in the region. This political culture encouraged the partnership between Newcastle City Council, Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council and the Arts Council North East (Northern Arts, as was); a partnership which transformed the

urban landscape on Gateshead's side of the Tyne, as well as reinvigorated the cultural infrastructure in Newcastle. Chapter five covers NewcastleGateshead's history in more detail, but at this juncture it is sufficient to note that the contrast between the two case studies' history of cultural policy forms the basis for the understandings of the decision-making structures that emerged during the bids for ECoC 2008 and is the starting point for the discussion of the governance regimes analysed by Chapters 6 and 7.

Chapter 5

A NEWCASTLEGATESHEAD WAY OF CULTURAL POLICY?

In contrast to Chapter 6's discussion of the constraining role of local culture in Liverpool, Newcastle and Gateshead reflect a very different background. The North East has a long history of developing arts administration, for example the creation of Britain's second Regional Arts Association in the 1950s (Baldry 1981), as well as the first arts development officers in local authorities (Beaumont 2005). Gateshead, in particular, had one of the first community arts programmes in the country, contrasting with other, similar, local authorities' funding of more traditional arts organisations. This story forms the basis of the Chapter, as it is a story of developing cultural policy partnership in the context of a regional culture that promotes political cohesion and co-operation. As a result the Chapter expands upon existing discussions of NewcastleGateshead's cultural policy 'success' (Minton 2004) by mirroring the contextual work on Liverpool from the preceding Chapter. This discussion is essential as, just as in Liverpool, it shows the way that political culture and context takes on the role of an 'institution' as discussed and described in Chapter 3, which is to say local political culture becomes 'the rules of the game' (Lowndes 2005:279) within which cultural policy production takes place.

In order to consider the role of institutions (Peters 2005) on Tyneside the Chapter draws upon the same methods utilised by Chapter 4, but employs them in a more thematic way, because of the specific circumstances of the North East. A combination of archival research and semi-structured interview data constructs a narrative of the institutions representing the background for the discussion of the ECoC 2008 case study in Chapter 7. In

contrast to the Liverpool narrative, which was based on a detailed understanding of the chronological development of major events in cultural policy, the narrative of Newcastle Gateshead is based on the themes of Geordie culture, political cohesiveness and the role of the cultural sector (although a chronology of key events is outlined in Appendix 4). The Chapter shows how these play out in the production of the circumstances amenable to the governing coalition analysed by Chapter 7. The thematic approach presents a narrative that serves as a supplement to existing research on cultural policy on the Tyne (e.g. Beaumont 2005, Bailey 2005, Bailey *et al* 2004, Miles 2004, Minton 2004), a supplement that fuses this existing research with academically under-explored aspects of Tyneside life, specifically the history of politics within the local authorities in Gateshead and Newcastle.

The context in Newcastle and Gateshead is a reflection of the more general developments in British Cultural Policy identified in Chapter 2, particularly the role of the local authority in producing cultural policy, as well as the more ‘entrepreneurial’ (Harvey 1989) stance taken by the Arts Council in the region. This context is analysed using the framework of institutional theory outlined by Chapter 3, and used by Chapter 4 to demonstrate how local institutions created difficulties for the development of cultural policy in Liverpool. In the case of Newcastle and Gateshead the narrative is based on a consideration of culture on Tyneside, looking at how the Geordie culture in the area has taken on a uniqueness that sets the boundaries for political action. The impact of Geordie culture is seen in subsequent descriptions of politics in Newcastle, the relationship between Newcastle and Gateshead and politics in Gateshead. The descriptions of politics within the two local authorities are intertwined with discussions of

the evolution of their respective cultural policies, an evolution which is essential to understanding the differences with Liverpool. These areas all show how the culture described by the first part of the Chapter plays out to promote particular governance forms, especially partnership with the cultural sector. Partnership with the cultural sector is exemplified in discussions of the role of Tyne and Wear Development Corporation (TWDC) and Northern Arts, with a focus on Northern Arts' role in promoting cultural policy and assisting the dissemination of lottery funding to Tyneside. Thus the Chapter moves from a description of the specific culture in Newcastle and Gateshead, to case studies of developments in cultural policy and individual projects that are instantiation of that culture to justify the general assertion that political culture in the region is essential to the formation of the governing coalition explored by Chapter 7.

Tyneside culture

Running throughout this thesis is the contention that it is impossible to understand later Chapters' cultural policy case studies without a sound grasp of the local cultural context. This is as true in Newcastle and Gateshead as Chapter 4 has shown it to be in Liverpool. The North East of England shares with Liverpool a sense of geographical peripheralness. Its regional capital, Newcastle, is located closer to Edinburgh than London, and, much like in Liverpool's 'scouse' culture, a strong sense of 'Geordie' identity pervades the area (Moffat and Rosie 2002). However the 'exceptionalism' (Belchem 2000) which pervades the culture of Liverpool is of a different character to the culture and identity of the conurbation on the Tyne.

Newcastle sits as the regional capital for the last English outposts before the Scottish boarder, a position stretching back to Roman settlements. The city draws population from five borough councils, as well as having close links with nearby cities Durham, Sunderland and Middlesbrough. The city is central to the North as its infrastructure pulls in pulls in Cumbrians, as well as acting as the North East's capital city (Lancaster 1992:56). The city of Newcastle is not a 'free standing' site, in contrast to the relative historical relationships between Liverpool and Manchester, but rather depends on its integration into the North East region for its importance and status (Vigar *et al* 2005:14). This creates something of a tension, in the sense that Newcastle is the regional centre, but is dependent on the surrounding area and cities for its status. The area was traditionally dominated by manual working class occupations. Coal mining was a primary economic activity, coupled with exports of the mineral and also a long history of armament manufacturing on the Tyne. However the area did not develop a similar dependency on commercial importing and exporting as in Liverpool, with diversity in manufacturing and industrial production, as well as the coal industry. Indeed Lancaster (1992) sees Newcastle as a nineteenth century commercial controller of the nearby coal industry (situated across the river in Gateshead) rather than as a great industrial city. Its industrialisation came later than that of Manchester or Birmingham, which was reflected in the local class structures that underpinned the local culture, and would go on to play a significant role in the forms of cultural policy adopted in both Newcastle itself and in Gateshead.

The industrial backdrop of life on the Tyne profoundly shaped the local culture, in a similar way to Liverpool, albeit with a very different outcome. Lancaster (1992) describes the primarily oral culture that is

reflected in an interest in heritage, with major exhibitions focusing on the lives of the local population in the arms and coal industries (Lancaster 1992:66) rather than more avant-garde internationalist work. Indeed whereas Atlanticism in Liverpool led to an art scene in the 1960s looking to be based in, yet also transcend the city, Newcastle and Gateshead's culture had been more reflective of working class life. Interviewees expanded on Lancaster's (1992) argument, indicating how culture in the region was seen in the broadest sense, transcending the usual reduction of culture to high art practice (e.g. Arnold 1993). This type of 'culture-as-a-way-of-life' (Williams 1989) has been indicated by academic work such as Cameron (2003) and Chatterton and Hollands (2001) and recent coverage in the press (Hunt 2003, Doughty 2009), describing Newcastle's 'party city' tag. This 'party city' tag shows the longstanding importance of working class drinking culture in the city, another aspect of the broader meaning of culture on Tyneside. As this culture has expanded into a tourism policy it can be seen to have considerable links to what Lancaster (1992) describes as the city's carnival culture of drinking linked to the oral culture of storytelling in pubs, and working class theatre.

There is a corollary to the oral culture in the city is reflected three forms of urban architecture in the city, centred on the importance of shopping as a form of cultural expression, the central role of football in the city's cultural landscape and finally the comparative lack of major art and cultural infrastructure from the Victorian and Edwardian periods. The predominance of the working class as cultural leaders in the city led to a more open retail culture which lacked the traditional class segregation and by the post war period contained a range of department stores seemingly 'open' to all social groups (Lancaster 1992). This type of shopping culture, which

transverses traditional class boundaries, was present on Merseyside but reflected more of the class structures of the city. The role of shopping has shaped the urban spaces on the Tyne to the extent that by the late 1990s Newcastle offered two major shopping malls, and the Metro centre in Gateshead was, at the time of its opening, one of the biggest malls in Europe. Whereas subsequent paragraphs illustrate the rather limited development of cultural infrastructure in the region before the early 1990s, the role of shopping, reflecting its importance to working class culture-as-a-way-of-life (Williams 1989) has had a profound effect in shaping the areas urban form.

The role of football gives a second illustration of the importance of Geordie culture in the region. As Hughson (2004) and Moffat and Rosie (2006) have identified football is an essential part of Geordie identity, and Hughson makes the link between working class culture and football an explicit part of his analysis of cultural policy in contemporary Newcastle. St James' Park provides the focus for this cultural expression, as a site that displays the importance of culture-as-a-way-of life to the area (Hughson 2004) and its use in the iconography of the rest of the local cultural infrastructure is indicative of the importance of football as an expression of working class life that supports other expressions of Geordie identity such as theatre and television (Hughson 2004).

Finally the cultural infrastructure in Newcastle can be seen to reflect the type of culture described by this section and be related to the local class structures, in particular the dominance of the working class in the artistic and cultural development of Newcastle and an interest in cultural forms based more on process, rather than outcomes to be housed in grand buildings. The carnival culture is reflected in Newcastle during the Victorian era, where cultural buildings and programmes expressed the tension between working

class culture, the regional demand for an oral culture based on working class life and the city's symbolic attempt to assert its importance to the region. This tension is in contrast to Liverpool, where the Victorian and Edwardian architecture and cultural infrastructure was a display of wealth and power, reflecting the middle class merchants' control over civic life (Longmore 2006). Whilst Cross *et al* (2005) point to the opening of the Literature and Philosophical society during the Nineteenth Century and the creation of local museums as evidence of the growth of a cultural sector similar to other Northern Cities, Lancaster (1992; 2003) describes the way in which working class cultural taste was shared by the middle class elites of the city, elites who often lived outside Newcastle itself. Although not politically influential, as they would come to with Labour's dominance of the region's politics in the twentieth century, the working class ideas of cultural excellence were shared by those middle classes who chose to live in the city itself (Lancaster 1992). The spatial aspect of Newcastle's class structure is an important issue when drawing comparisons with Liverpool, as the middle class who lived in Liverpool as part of the commerce surrounding the imports on the docks were absent in Newcastle, as the exporting of coal tended not to breed the same variety of civic minded local elite. For sure there was considerable architectural investment surrounding the work of John Dobson and developer Richard Grainger in the 1830's, but the civic infrastructure developed as part of a thriving Nineteenth Century regional capital did not extend to cultural development, as was the case in, say Manchester or Liverpool up until the early twentieth century (Lancaster 1992). Working class culture was thus influential in shaping the regional interest in an oral culture that expressed itself through the cultural forms described by this chapter and were housed on football terraces, public houses and the high street. The fact that this type of culture was shared by both middle and working classes meant there was

little motivation to construct the kind of cultural infrastructure built in Liverpool during the Victorian and Edwardian eras.

Victorian and Edwardian cultural infrastructure gives a clear example of the differences between the two case study sites, particularly reflecting the type of art and culture favoured in the two places. In Liverpool civic infrastructure reflected the ‘civilising’ (Arnold 1993) nature of the arts, whereas in Newcastle the working class culture was well represented in the story of infrastructure development (Lancaster 2003). Lancaster (1992) cites the opening of the Laing gallery in 1901 as the first major art gallery in Newcastle, a generation after Liverpool’s Walker opened, and almost 100 years after the first major art collects were displayed in Liverpool (Longmore 2006). When opened the Laing did not have a collection, and Newcastle had to borrow locally to fill the space. Indeed the Shipley art gallery in Gateshead owes its existence to the refusal by Newcastle to pay for the upkeep and housing of John Shipley’s bequest to the city (Moffat and Rosie 2006). As a result of the comparatively late arrival of a gallery in Newcastle, the city represents an unusual story for a major Northern city. During the period where other places, such as Liverpool and Manchester, were founding their cultural infrastructure as part of wider programmes of civic grandeur, Newcastle reflects local policy makers and funders interest and commitment to art and culture reflecting local life, a commitment that left the cultural infrastructure relatively underdeveloped until the 1990s.

The lateness of cultural infrastructure development has had a strong legacy for Newcastle’s contemporary culture and cultural policy. The city’s cultural interests in the post war period have taken two forms, reflecting the importance of working class life and its predominant role within the city’s cultural landscape. In the first instance Lancaster points to an oral culture

that is reflected in an interest in heritage, with major exhibitions focusing on the lives of the local population in the arms and coal industries rather than more avant-garde internationalist work (Lancaster 1992). Indeed whereas Liverpool's Atlanticism led to an art scene in the 1960s looking to be based in, yet also transcending the city, the scene in Newcastle has been more reflective of working class life.

The culture of Newcastle, and indeed more widely on Tyneside, is of working class life, reflecting William's (1989) view of culture. The type of cultural infrastructure in Newcastle, the importance of football and its regional peripheralness all add to the uniqueness of an idiosyncratically 'Geordie' culture, a culture that underpins political action on the Tyne. Indeed, just as in Chapter 4's discussion of Liverpool the role of Geordie culture is to form one fraction of the whole of the 'rules of the game' (Lowndes 2005:279) shaping cultural policy in the region, and specifically the decision making structures associated with Newcastle and Gateshead's joint pursuit of the ECoC 2008. As the following sections show Geordie culture, much like the 'Liverpool way' on Merseyside had a profound effect on what was, and what was not, possible within local politics generally and local cultural policy in particular.

Politics in Newcastle

The type of Geordie culture described above influenced political culture within the city, particularly in terms of the internal structures of Newcastle City Council. The following discussion reinforces this assertion, as it shows the political legacy of the local political scandals of the 1960s, as well as the relatively minor role played by cultural policy in the Council's agenda before the late 1990s, creating a narrative of a council discovering

cultural policy at the same time as seeking to remain the regional capital in the face of local economic decline. The discussion goes some way to illustrating the tension between Newcastle's role in setting the limits of what was to be acceptable for cultural policy on Tyneside, as evidenced in Council policy and the mistrust of particular cultural forms outside of the 'Geordie' mainstream discussed in the previous section, whilst lacking the flexibility afforded for policy innovation across the river in Gateshead. The political history of the NCC is also important as it opens the space for discussion of the way cultural policy developed between Newcastle and Gateshead, and how that policy was able to embed itself within the structures of the two local authorities. This illustrates the importance of political institutions (in Lowndes' (2005) sense of the term) in shaping cultural policy an accounting for the distinct form it took in comparison to Liverpool.

Newcastle has traditionally been a Labour stronghold, a city dominated by its working class both in its unions and in its political parties (Wainwright 1987:141). However that is not to say that the middle class of the city were unrepresented within Newcastle politics, but rather that working class interests, as with art and culture more generally, dominated the ruling Labour party. Indeed the Labour group had a strong middle class element within the ruling elite of the party, best characterised by Sir Jeremy Beecham, the leader for 17 years (1977-1994) following the corruption charges brought against T Dan Smith, the NCC's leader during the 1960s. The issues of political corruption surrounding T Dan Smith over housing and regeneration are a useful contrast with Liverpool. Minton (2003) notes how the task of projecting Newcastle as the regional capital was important to the city during the 1960s and in Dan Smith the city found a politician who had a strong belief in this agenda. Under Smith, who ran NCC for six years in the

1960s, NCC proceeded on a major programme of urban demolition and rebuilding (Elliot 1975), based around Smith's vision of Newcastle as the 'Brasilia of the North' (Pendlebury 2001:120). Smith used his position as leader to create the country's first free standing planning department (Pendlebury 2001) and gave the modernist inspired planners considerable power, particularly over developments within Newcastle city centre. The planners forecasted widespread demolitions around the historic Grainger town section of the city, much to the horror of sections of the local population, and many of the plans collapsed when Smith was removed from office following a corruption scandal at the end of the 1960s (Pendlebury 2001). Smith's leadership style at the time can be contrasted with the 'boss politics' in Liverpool, where Smith had risen to his position as a result of the prevailing political culture within the Newcastle Labour party and the NCC itself, whereby previous leaders had been 'chairmen' but not policy innovators. Smith used this vacuum to take control of key chairs as a result of his personal charisma, as opposed to the boss politics dominating Liverpool's Labour party at the time (Elliot 1975). Smith is important as his leadership was based on charismatic patronage within the council, as opposed to having total control of all aspects of the party within the city of Newcastle itself. Green, in his 1981 study of NCC describes the way in which traditional 'heartlands' concerns, particularly over housing, limited the possibility of the leader gaining total control over the local party (1981:70). To a certain extent one can see continuity and stability within NCC, despite the scandals surrounding Dan Smith running throughout the post-war period. Unlike the situation in Liverpool, where factionalism made the Labour party's period in office difficult, and impacted on its ability to govern the city, infighting within Newcastle's Labour party, whilst it certainly did exist, did not have the same effects as in Liverpool. Political conflict was perhaps

ameliorated by the structural position of Labour in the North East, as the dominant party with little to rival it in the post-war period (indeed up until the early twenty-first century), again in contrast to the three party instability in Liverpool during the 1970s and the crisis associated with political control in the 1980s.

A further point of comparison between LCC and NCC is the role of the left in the 1980s. A resurgent Labour left in Liverpool took two forms, the nadir of Militant and the more progressive 'Sainsbury Set'. There is debate over the nature of the new urban left in Newcastle. Although there was the emergence of a small progressive left group within the local Labour party, the 'centre-right' leadership of Sir Jeremy Beecham was broadly unchallenged, allowing for stronger regional coalition building (O'Toole 1996). This narrative is supported by Wainwright's (1987) survey of the new urban left in the UK, which sees Newcastle as a traditional local Labour group, strongly influenced by the concerns of local unions on the one hand, and some middle class leadership on the other (Wainwright 1987), reflecting a typical pattern of Labour local government in the UK (Wainwright 1987).

NCC therefore, is a broadly stable Local Authority, not subject to the wild vicissitudes of outrageous fortune that would plague Liverpool, but perhaps more fluid and divided than the rather static political system across the Tyne in Gateshead, which is discussed later in this Chapter. This stability gave a platform for the development of cultural policy in Newcastle, but was also to limit the possibilities for that policy until the mid 1990s. The city's role as regional capital, the distinctive constraints of Geordie culture and the conservatism with the Labour group in the council are the institutional (Lowndes 2005) setting in Newcastle. Without an understanding of these

themes it would be difficult to fully grasp the importance of local circumstances to the development of cultural policy.

Cultural policy in Newcastle

The political settlement in Newcastle outlined by the previous sections gave rise to a cultural policy that was influenced by the wider culture of the city and region, but was also in keeping with Chapter 2's discussion of cultural policy within England's cities. The role of local institutions can be seen in the general discussion of cultural policy in Newcastle, as well as specific instances of how local context has affected events. This can be illustrated by the abolition of Tyne and Wear County Council in 1987. Newcastle, Gateshead and the other local authorities in the region were able to negotiate a section 48 agreement for a county wide committee for arts and culture. Tyne and Wear Museums and Galleries (TWMG) were given responsibility for the former county's cultural provision, with its director nominally a member of staff for NCC. TWMG shows the familiar regional pattern, as the key actors within cultural governance shared positions on various bodies and quangos (This regional cohesiveness was similarly reflected in the crossover between Northern Arts and NCC, Gateshead Council, and University of Northumbria at Newcastle). In contrast to Liverpool there was an obvious working relationship between the museums service and NCC (as well as Gateshead), commented upon by an interviewee from a local cultural organisation:

'So I wouldn't' want to overplay the relationship but a strong relationship between the Council and museums is clearly very very important. Whatever governance arrangement is in place you need a strong relationship with the Council and museums so we've got that'

This quotation reflects some of the tension underpinning cultural policy in NCC, as the interviewee comments on the importance of not ‘overplaying’ the NCC/TWMG relationship. The beginnings of Newcastle’s cultural policy settlement can be seen in the creation of TWMG, as NCC faced a revenue shortfall when central government refused to offer funding for the city’s major theatre, the Theatre Royal (Bailey *et al* 2004). Thus the role of cultural policy before the end of the 1990s within NCC is neatly captured by a comment from one of its senior officials:

‘Newcastle City Council’s approach to the arts in some ways, well, it had been chequered. Let’s put it that way. It had been a lot of politics’

The ‘politics’ in question are elaborated by Minton’s (2003) paper for Demos, considering cultural policy in Newcastle and Gateshead, which points out the rather restrained support for the cultural agenda in NCC before the end of the 1990s, as culture was associated with a particular faction on the council (Minton 2003). This lack of support for cultural policy can be explained by the overwhelming interest in promoting Geordie culture, an interest that shows the local character of cultural policy concerns and differs from the status of cultural policy in Liverpool, which reflected the wider institutional culture within Liverpool politics. NCC funding reflected the cultural interests discussed in the preceding section, as arts projects that did not display the concerns of local identity and representing local, working class life were treated with suspicion, as opposed to being ignored entirely by LCC. The NCC’s focus on ‘Geordie’ culture was a key point of discussion for those working in the cultural sector in the 1980s and 1990s. One interviewee described this state of affairs; a situation that the interviewee felt limited the potential for artistic and cultural production in Newcastle:

‘I remember somebody telling me when I first I arrived there, the only thing that will work in Newcastle is if it’s made by, with and for Geordies. I.e., just do work that reflects the lives and concerns of Geordie people, and then you will do well. If you try to do anything beyond that, people won’t come’

This quotation indicates how the nature of local culture influenced the kind of cultural artefacts produced by practitioners in the city and had a determining effect on the potential for the development of cultural policy before the late 1990s. The importance of reflecting wider Geordie culture was also expressed by interviewees from within NCC. An NCC official describes the role of cultural policy up until the late 1990s, reflecting the suspicion of ideas that did not pertain directly to the existing tradition of cultural production:

‘I think [cultural policy] was a lot further down the agenda. I think there are logical and explicable reasons for that and I think we were a lot less subtle in thinking about how culture would apply to other Council policies and there was very much more a perception that culture in its narrowest sense was a middle class elitist’

The rejection of those forms of culture that were seen as ‘middle class elitist’ can be traced back to the context of culture in Newcastle discussed earlier in the Chapter. The important influence of the working class in the city from the Victorian period onwards, coupled with the stability and control of the local Labour party by ‘right wing’ elements (Wainwright 1987) set the ‘rules of the game’ (Lowndes 2005:279) for cultural policy in Newcastle. Cultural policy was a part of NCC’s role as the governing body

for the regional capital city, but the culture that was promoted was traditional, reflecting the longstanding cultural interests of the area.

These ‘rules of the game’ (Lowndes 2005:279) began to change in the late 1990s. The process centred on a shift in the role culture was given within the policy programmes developed by NCC during this period, a shift from the Geordie-centric approach to a much more nuanced view of the potential offered by cultural policy that is outlined in a comment given by a manager of one of Newcastle’s major cultural institutions:

‘They were very suspicious of me, very suspicious of art. It took a lot of time before things changed, and again very reactionary, very scared, but, give them their due, after a time they came round to it and there were some glory years in about 1995, 96, 97, there were some very, very good years’

The reasons underpinning the changing role of cultural policy are legion, including important factors such as: a shift in political factions with the Labour party; more coherent lobbying by the art and cultural sector in Newcastle; the example offered by Gateshead’s cultural policy; the role of Northern Arts, the regional arts association, in making the case for culture; and the funding opportunities offered by the National Lottery. Specific discussion of the role of Northern Arts and Lottery funding forms the basis for Chapter 7’s outline of the bid for ECoC 2008 in Newcastle.

The first three developments fit well with this consideration of the role of cultural policy within NCC, particularly the role of art and cultural organisations in lobbying the council. Before the mid 1990s NCC had relatively low levels of cultural staff and had only informal links with Northern Arts. Interviews with members of the art and cultural sector

exemplify how the position of culture within NCC was seen as such an issue that the leaders of local cultural organisations began to act strategically to lobby NCC with the creation of Newcastle Arts forum, crucially involving the then director of TWMG:

‘There were quite ambitious and driven individuals as part of city landscape who collectively became the Newcastle Arts Forum; we started that in 1993 and that was in direct response to the fact that we felt culture was not high up on local agenda; there wasn’t a strategic approach to cultural development and it was all very piecemeal and whilst there was some very good practice it wasn’t coordinated’

The group used the developments in Gateshead to lobby NCC, initially exploiting the longstanding rivalry between the places:

‘Undoubtedly and there was a sense of ‘come on guys, we can’t let Gateshead get all the brownie points.’ We used that as a tool to generate a sense of aspiration.’

The lobbying by NAF was assisted by the existence of TWMG and the position of their then director within NCC. The close knit nature of Tyneside politics, as well as the government infrastructure, created conditions where the NAF were able to influence the changing mood with the NCC.

Concurrent to the creation of NAF was the cultural policy on the other side of the Tyne. It was not until the NCC began to perceive Gateshead’s initial cultural policy as successful, along with GMBC’s and Northern Art’s use of the Year of Visual Arts in 1996, that the groundwork for an expanded role for cultural policy would be laid. This process would culminate in 1998 with Gateshead’s the Angel of the North and the

realisation of the potential offered by Lottery money. The many influences necessary for NCC to begin a more comprehensive cultural policy illustrates the kind of governance networks that form the backdrop for policy production in Newcastle and the wider Northeast. In 1997 a potential cultural strategy was created by the director of TWMG, in his role as an employee of NCC, for the ruling Labour group, and following the resulting political manoeuvres NCC began to take a more concerted approach based on '*Towards a cultural strategy*' that would culminate in the political partnership with Gateshead discussed in Chapter 7.

The journey taken by NCC is reflected in the debate surrounding the provision of a permanent home for the Northern Symphonia (Griffiths 2004). This journey was from a city authority sustaining an infrastructure dominated by the need to reflect local culture to a council that would, in partnership, bid for ECoC 2008 with culture, and officials from the cultural sector, in a key role within council policy. This debate encapsulates the position of arts and culture within Newcastle Council during the 1990s and shows the beginnings of the changing role of cultural policy. The attempt to house the Symphonia, over a period of ten years (Griffiths 2004) had generated extensive argument within NCC. When NCC did not support the project, Gateshead took the opportunity to commit to building a new home for the Symphonia. Two quotations from research interviews, with an employee from the cultural sector and an elected member from NNC, cover the details of the debate, but also show the constraints, in terms of the expectations of Geordie culture, the lack of faith in the transformative potential offered by cultural policy, but also the limits on funding arts and culture and finding space in the North East's regional capital:

‘The Sage Music Centre was offered to Newcastle first and The City Council declined to accept the invitation to bid for it because The Council at the time refused to contemplate providing a quarter of a million pounds subsidy on an annual basis. Many of the arguments were straightforward political in that many of the members in the leading group at the time – that was The Labour Party – felt that there was no purpose to people living in poorer parts of the city in The City Council being involved in something that was seen as special for the toffs. Others of us said this was a magnificent opportunity and it was a lack of vision on the part of The Council at the time’

‘The irony is that at the same time The Council refused to provide a quarter of a million subsidy for a music centre, we were and still are providing hundreds of thousands of pounds on an annual basis subsidising The Theatre Royal. So there was that dichotomy and difference of treatment but I think it illustrates neatly the role that arts was felt to take’

This debate over the Sage, and the illustration of the funding needs of the cultural sector in Newcastle displays the crucial differences in the understanding of cultural policy across the river in Gateshead. From this example it is especially important to note that although the two places cultural policies took divergent paths and the rivalry between the two banks of the Tyne would have seemed to militate against the kind of co-operation that would coalesce around the bid for ECoC 2008, broader regional institutions underpinned the cultural policy practice set out in Chapter 7.

The relationship between Newcastle and Gateshead

The development of a joint bid for ECoC 2008 between Newcastle and Gateshead was dependent on the partnership between the two authorities. Initially this partnership would have been impossible because of the rivalry between the two areas. There had been a longstanding rivalry between Newcastle and Gateshead, and a traditionally tense relationship between the local authorities. The rivalry between the two places, and local authorities, is well known locally, and interviewees gave extensive anecdotal evidence to illustrate the rather fractured state of affairs up until the 1990s. One interviewee from NCC recalled the extent of the rift between the two areas:

‘These rivalries between cities, between neighbouring cities is incredible and Gateshead and Newcastle was unbelievable. Unbelievably bad, they wouldn’t speak; the councils wouldn’t speak to each other’

Meanwhile another NCC interviewee recalls an apocryphal tale that goes some way to describing the state of cross river relations, particularly in cultural policy:

‘The classic definition of that – in the 1960s when local radio started up, there was a prospect of that time, it didn’t actually happen, that local council might become involved in local radio. Then the leader of Gateshead council said they wouldn’t get involved because nobody in Gateshead could possibly be interested in anything broadcast from Newcastle.’

The thawing of relations came with the perceived success of Gateshead’s cultural policy, set against the context of New Labour’s move to a city-region based policy for English Core Cities. Joint partnership work was cemented by the bid for ECoC 2008, in which the two authorities

produced a joint cultural strategy (Newcastle City Council and Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council 2002) along with subsequent shared strategies for housing, land use and economic development. The partnership reflects a transformation in the governance of the area, as well as a new urban regime based around local authority partnership and an influential cultural sector. Underpinning this thaw was the perceived success of Gateshead's cultural policy (Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council 2006:8), particularly its use of the International Garden Festival in 1990, its participation in the Arts Councils Year of Visual Arts in 1996 and the construction of the Angel of the North in 1998 (Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council 2006). The use of cultural policy in Gateshead was in turn underpinned and influenced by the prevailing political culture in GMBC, the 'rules of the game' (Lowndes 2005:279) that would promote a particular type of cultural policy that would be influential across the Tyne, and indeed, across the UK and Europe (Beaumont 2005).

Political culture in Gateshead

Gateshead as a town has long struggled for an identity relative to its larger neighbour. As previous sections have illustrated how Newcastle saw itself as (and indeed holds the position of) regional capital whilst Gateshead had developed into somewhat of a suburb to Newcastle (Lancaster 1992:58, Theokas 2004:175). Thus the town struggled for its own identity and sense of place outside and distinct from Newcastle. The story of its cultural innovations must be seen in this context as well as part of the traditional rivalry between the two sites.

Whilst the town struggled for identity in the shadow of Newcastle, politics in Gateshead is marked by more stability than across the river. The

council has always been under Labour control since its creation in 1974, George Gill, leader during the bid for ECoC 2008 was in charge for 17 years (1985-2002), and there was crucial longevity in his officer team, particularly with chief executive Les Elton. Both the limited academic research into politics within GMBC (Jobling 2007) and case study interviews focus on the continuity of leadership which has marked GMBC, both in terms of elected members and council officers. GMBC was also marked by success in service delivery, with high scores in the inspection regimes instigated by central government towards the end of the 1990s (Minton 2003). Thus Gateshead is seen as an authority with a reputation for being a competent, well run local council which has had stable leadership, in contrast to Newcastle after Sir Jeremy Beecham stood down as leader and presenting a clearly different governing culture to that prevailing in Liverpool.

The stability within GMBC is present within the Labour party, the dominant political group in the council. This views of the local Labour party are drawn from interviews on both sides of the Tyne, as a result of the lack of academic (and indeed consultancy) research on the Labour party in Gateshead. Whilst some interviewees were critical of the dominance of the Labour group as a potential 'democratic deficit' for the area, with an approach which is, to quote a former member of the region's cultural sector: 'Very old Labour; it's very Stalinist in its approach'. Others, such as this interviewee from NCC, pointed to the benefits that Labour control had for policy development and delivery:

'well there is a political unity in Gateshead, it is more like a one party system than perhaps in Newcastle and in other places that it is easy to make people commit, they go for the same thing and they go for the one thing and they don't change their mind'

The benefits of stable political leadership that was able to operationalise policy agendas is balanced, in interviewees comments, by the questions of democracy in a town with virtual one party control over the post war period. The impact of stability is undoubted, as political stability gave GMBC the opportunity to develop longer term strategies for their response to the problems facing the borough following the decline of the coal industry. Whilst interviewees dispute the existence of a 'master plan' of community and cultural policy, the nature of political culture within GMBC allowed grand projects, such as the International Garden festival in 1990 (Theokas 2004), the Metro Centre, also opened in 1990 (Chaney 1990) and the public sculpture programme to have long gestation periods, with institutional support during the difficult times present in the development of these major projects.

Art and culture policy in Gateshead

The previous sections outline of the political stability in GMBC went hand-in-hand with the wider context for cultural policy in the borough. There is much debate over the precise beginning of the cultural programme within Gateshead. Some commentators (Bailey 2006:2) point to the decision taken in the 1960s to expand the local stadium, but by the 1980s there was a well established public sculpture programme in the borough which became recognised with several national awards in the 1990s (Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council 2006:5). Gateshead focused more closely on community art projects for two reasons. In the first place it reflected the local Geordie culture discussed at the beginning of this Chapter, allowing for the reflexivity favoured by the region's citizens and audiences. Second there was a crucial historical legacy in the borough that favoured a more community centred approach. Although the borough possesses the Shipley art gallery,

opened in 1917 to house the bequest of a local lawyer who had originally offered the same to Newcastle (Moffat and Rosie 2006:283), the town lacks a similar scale of cultural infrastructure found in Newcastle. The Shipley, as a result of its modest size and collection, compared to the galleys of Liverpool and Newcastle, was to have a significant, albeit indirect, influence on the cultural infrastructure in Gateshead. The lack of a major gallery as a revenue client, as Newcastle faced as the regional capital funding the Laing, Northern Stage and the Theatre Royal, gave Gateshead the freedom (and funds) to create more innovative cultural policies that were not tied to specific buildings or to physical infrastructure. A senior GMDB officer describes the policy opportunity presented by the lack of ‘traditional’ infrastructure in the borough:

‘Gateshead had a very strong public art programme. It had an arts policy very much community based. One of the things about Gateshead was that it had only one public art gallery so that everything it did was out in communities, a big arts in hospitals programme’

Whereas the debates on the beginnings of the cultural policy in Gateshead give no definitive starting point, it is certainly true that by the time of the abolition of TWMCC GMBC was in a curious position. It had begun to develop a public art programme, but as a result of arts infrastructure being planned and directed (and largely funded) at county level, Gateshead had, in effect, little or none of the arts infrastructure which characterised other, post-abolition, Northern English boroughs. One interviewee from one of Gateshead’s cultural organisations illustrates the dichotomy present in Gateshead’s late 1980s approach, as the infrastructure and experience of

dealing with the art and cultural sector was transferred from county to borough:

‘Gateshead had a strong commitment to arts and culture, but they weren’t used to working with independent arts organisations. They didn’t have any revenue clients so it was all new territory for them’

And by the end of the 1990s a combination of the stability within GMBC, the regional culture and Gateshead’s relative lack of cultural infrastructure had a profound effect on embedding cultural policy within GMBC, as officers and councillors described the role cultural policy plays in the council:

‘In Gateshead culture is an overarching issue so it isn’t how cultural policy gets made, it’s simply how policy gets made in Gateshead. Of that we use culture in a positive and driving way to achieve the things we want to achieve so it isn’t segregated out’

This comment illustrates outcome of those background ‘institutions’ (Lowndes 2005) influencing Gateshead. These type of comments, echoed by many interviewees, show how Gateshead had freedom to innovate policy, whilst that policy is shaped by the ‘rules of the game’ (Lowndes 2005:279) of both the GMBC and Geordie culture. This further illustrates the importance this thesis attaches to understanding how local context shapes local policy. The importance of context can also be seen from a Gateshead interviewee’s view of the importance of political stability to specific areas of cultural policy. The following quotation displays the stability that allowed the council to take the cultural policy opportunities that arose in the 1990s, as well as working in partnership with other organisations in the region:

‘What we didn’t have was lots of political changes either, you had that sustained vision and I think that made a big difference for Gateshead. I also think to be fair; it was at a time which was very good at being opportunistic. There was the Garden Festival, the National Lottery and I think it also coincided with a time of great clarity and vision and organisations like the Arts Council or what was then Northern Arts. I think it is fair to say that the lottery and the role of the Arts council and some of the big iconic developments can’t be underplayed such as European funding, SRB funding and Gateshead was very adept at maximising those opportunities’

To exemplify the importance of context, as well as fully explaining the role of culture within GMBC in the years previous to the case study of bidding for ECoC 2008, three examples from the above quotation, of the International Garden Festival, the Angel of the North, and GMBC’s ability to ‘maximise opportunities’ can be considered in further detail. As with the discussion of Newcastle’s reaction to the abolition of TWMC these three examples allow a consideration of how the broad theme of the thesis, the need for close attention to be paid to how local circumstances shape cultural policy, play out in individual parts of GMBC’s cultural policy. For example, the International Garden Festival, in 1990, shows the themes enunciated by the previous section. The festival was generally considered to be a success, particularly because a large swathe of the planning for the festival had been taken up with ensuring a sustainable legacy for the site following the end of the event (Theokas 2004). Aside from one section of the land that failed to be developed following its sale to a private firm, the festival site was reclaimed for mixed use and housing (Theokas 2004). The International Garden Festival took place on derelict coal land, owned by GMBC. Unlike Liverpool

the International Garden Festival was not run by the local Development Corporation, which had largely remained on Newcastle's side of the Tyne. Gateshead Council used a festival company, as a streamlined decision making body, but retained oversight of the festival by making sure major financial and planning decisions had to be taken by elected members. A planning officer was also seconded to the festival company (Theokas 2004). However the festival also reflected the close-knit nature of political organisation in the North East, as Gateshead brought in sponsorship from the surrounding local authorities (Theokas 2004).

The apparent planning and regeneration success is perhaps of lesser importance than the impact hosting the Garden Festival had on GMBC's officers and elected members. The perception of the possibilities offered by a large scale cultural event, whilst at the same time continuing community outreach and public sculpture programmes, was influential within GMBC. As well as the quotation from the previous section, two interviewees from GMBC illustrate this assertion, in contrast to the difficult legacy left by Liverpool's hosting of the event in the early 1980s. One former GMBC councillor narrated the festival as a way of seeing the potential offered by cultural policy:

'The thing was the garden festival was the initial part where we could see what could be achieved with the cultural process and that was very important that we got that'

And another felt the International Garden Festival served as a 'turning point' because of the cultural programme associated with the event. The International Garden Festival can be seen to have paved the way for later developments in cultural policy, such as the Year of Visual Arts and the

Angel. Whereas in Liverpool the Garden Festival stands as a byword for the failure to integrate different strategic actors into a cultural policy, in Gateshead the effect was to show to potential funders, partners and the rest of the region, GMBC's capacity for strategic planning and event management. This capacity was particularly important in forging GMBC's relationship with Northern Arts as a participant in (and funder of) Gateshead's cultural projects, such as the Sage Gateshead, the Baltic Gallery and the Angel of the North.

The Angel of the North has become perhaps the leading icon of the North East, save for the Tyne Bridge. It is ironic that the sculpture is in Gateshead and was almost entirely driven by GMBC and the commitment of the council's then leader and chief executive. The process of building the Angel cemented GMBC's reputation as an effective organisation able to carry through cultural projects and having the vision to commit to an initially unpopular cultural development (Beaumont 2005), as it showed: 'A will and determination on the part of local arts activists and politicians to provide the area with the cultural facilities that it deserved' (Bailey 2004:57). The Angel grew out of two developments; the community orientated arts programme within GMBC, as a result of their lack of major institutions; and the public sculpture programme begun by the borough in the 1980s. Key decisions around the angel were made by the Art in public places panel within GMBC, reflecting the longer term growth of institutional capacity for cultural policy in contrast to Liverpool, in particular, but also Newcastle during the 1990s. The narrative of the importance of understanding local context set out by this Chapter is seen in the development of the Angel, which perfectly reflects the political culture within Gateshead, exemplified by a comment from an official from the Arts Council:

‘It’s a Council that once it says it’s going to do something it does it. Never wavers. The Angel of the North is the classic there. There’s a big debate in the chamber about the Angel of the North. Once they decided to do it come hell or high water they were going to deliver the Angel of the North’

The Angel emerged in the face of considerable scepticism from both local media and sections of the local population. Initially the concerns were those associated with the conservative nature of Geordie culture, particularly whether non-arts money was being diverted to pay for the project (Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council 2006). Part of the success of the Angel came with the GMBC’s attempt to involve the population of the borough in the process of commissioning and building the sculpture, particularly with the use of mini-Angels around Gateshead. The story of the Angel, told here by another Arts Council executive, is thus the overall narrative of GMBC’s cultural policy, of a reflection of local culture, adapting to local circumstances as well as political stability and long term policy development:

‘I think a sort of combination of some key officers and some key elected members and probably politically a stability that perhaps other local authorities didn’t have in the sense that what you had was some elected members who were very confident, ambitious and visionary and who had the confidence to be able to decide to do something ambitious and not to be swayed by it, so if you look at The Angel of the North – when that was first being promoted there was actually the local media and it’s amazing when you see how the Angel has been adopted, that the local media waged a big campaign

about what a waste and all the rest of it and yet there was the confidence politically to say we're going to do this'

These two quotations above reflect the dominant narrative offered by most of the interviewees involved in this research. Indeed it is a narrative shared by cultural practitioners, for instance, Anthony Gormley, the Artist behind the Angel, credits GMBC's leaders, the 'personalities' of the councillors and officers in Gateshead, as the reason for the Angel project coming to fruition, despite initial public and media criticism (Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council 2006:23). However the final example of the role of contingency and opportunity is important to consider as it illustrated the way that the local 'rules of the game' (Lowndes 2005:279) underpinned the dominant narrative of a powerful council committed to cultural policy.

The concluding section of this Chapter explores the role of the Arts Council in shaping cultural policy in the North East and providing an important element within what would become cultural *governance*, but here it can be noted that that GMBC was willing to take up the opportunity presented by the *Case for Capital* strategy devised by Northern Arts in 1996 to embark on a major regeneration programme for the riverside. The ability of GMBC to take potential cultural opportunities is nowhere better illustrated than in the case of the Sage music centre, one of the facilities identified in Northern Art's 1996 strategy. The North East was not well served by an orchestra until 1958 (Griffiths 2004) when the Northern Sinfonia was set up. The Sinfonia was based in Newcastle Town Hall, but the venue encountered significant problems over the late twentieth century, prompting the Orchestra to attempt to bring NCC in as a partner and funder of a new venue during the 1990s. As the previous section has discussed NCC were not in the political or financial position to fund the project, and lacked the political will to

support what would become a difficult ten year process to re-house the Sinfonia (Griffiths 2004).

The failure to reach an agreement with NCC, and the backing of Northern Arts lead Gateshead to offer a site on the bank of the Tyne. As part of the long term strategy of regenerating the area GMBC already owned the potential site, and had the belief in the potential of cultural policy following the experience with the International Garden Festival, the Year of Visual Arts and the developing plans for the Angel. Crucially Northern Sinfonia also had a strong education and community participation programmes (Griffiths 2004) which dovetailed with the approach adopted by Gateshead's public and community art policies.

Regional cohesiveness and partnership

This Chapter has considered how local culture, particularly political culture, influenced the development of cultural policy in both Newcastle and Gateshead. The narrative offered in this Chapter has been one of political stability as the basis for, in Gateshead's case, an innovative use of cultural policy against the limitations of a cultural infrastructure interested in reflecting the lived reality of local life, rather than having grand buildings, and in Newcastle's case a journey towards embracing cultural policy with the backdrop of its role as regional capital and its existing arts and cultural commitments. These narratives are supplemented by the role of regional political culture in the North East as a factor in facilitating the regime outlined in Chapter 7. The close knit nature of politics in the North East is the final 'institution' (Lowndes 2005) that prepares the ground for the cultural policy regime. This institution contrasts with the instability and lack

of cultural policy competence that mark the context for Liverpool's bid to be ECoc 2008, which is detailed in Chapter 6.

Contemporary discussions of politics between Newcastle and Gateshead have been limited to general discussion of politics and governance in the North East (Robinson and Shaw 2003) or using Newcastle council as a case study for various commentaries on recent local government reforms (Coaffee and Healy (2003). Robinson and Shaw (2003) discuss the plethora of elected and non elected governance bodies in North East, coupled with the low turnouts and apathy towards the traditional forms of political participation that have come to characterise much of the regions politics. Regional governance, by various elected and non-elected bodies, including One North East (the Regional Development Agency) Government Office North East and the Regional Assembly is confused and confusing, and marks part of the wider shift in power from Local authorities which were extremely powerful local actors before the 1980s (2003:30). The shift has been seen especially acutely in housing policy, a policy field that has a difficult history in Newcastle since the scandals of the 1960s.

Confusion over regional governance arrangements can be contrasted with the close knit group actually running the region. The region has been traditionally Labour controlled with a very strong trade union influence, leading to what O'Toole (1996:163) calls 'immense levels of political integration'. Research interviews are useful to illustrate the very small number of individuals making governance decisions. As one senior NCC official put it:

'If you've got the leader of local authorities together with the leader of what was then TV or the local broadcaster, with leading figures

from the private sector, there was a group of about no more than 10 people who I would say ran the region. This has always been in a sense a weakness but in a sense it's been a real strength of the North East'

As the above quotation identifies, the close knit politics has problems, particularly in terms of who is able to take decisions within political structures that are not dependent on direct elections for their authority. Boards are dominated by white, middle class, middle aged men reflecting the legacy of union involvement and traditional Labour politics in the region (Robinson and Shaw 2003), with an increasing marginalisation of formerly working class union members as a result of government appointments. Governance in the North East is, for Robinson and Shaw, becoming governance by clique, of 'people like us' (2003:36) who are seen to be competent by one board and so are appointed to others. The closed nature of regional governance is a national issue reflecting a decline in representative democracy and the power of the directly elected (Wilks-Heeg and Clayton 2006) but this 'closed shop' has been especially influential in cultural policy in the North East. The idea of a close knit group of influential individuals within the region was echoed time and time again across research interviews by participants from the North East, whether they were decision makers, officers, cultural administrators or practitioners and irrespective of which side of the Tyne they worked in. A similar quotation, specifically concerning cultural policy summarises this aspect of regional politics:

'I think that the nature of the region is such that it's a relatively small group of people who across the whole public policy and cultural policy agenda work very closely together'

Chapter 7 builds on the above narrative and shows how cultural policy emerged from the cohesiveness and close knit nature of regional control. The cultural policy partnership forged between the two local authorities certainly improved the traditionally tense working relationships across the Tyne, but it would not have developed without the ‘institution’ of regional cohesiveness present in the governance of the North East. The high levels of integration and cohesiveness amongst those individuals and agencies that are in control of the local state in the North East was therefore essential for a cultural policy regime to emerge. Four examples support this claim. In the first instance there has been considerable staff transfer between major arts organisations, such as the Arts Council in the region and Newcastle and Gateshead’s local authorities, particularly at senior level. As well as staff transfer, the close knit nature of regional politics gave the opportunity for major regional arts associations to be closely linked to the individuals involved in decision making from both public and private sectors. Again interview evidence, from one such staff member, illustrates the ‘institution’ of regional cohesiveness and the extent of the comparative integration within cultural policy in the region:

‘I mean I’ve related quite a lot to our colleagues in the equivalent arts and business around the region, the company regional directors. They were all quite staggered maybe because of the cohesiveness or relatively small size of the region as well, that we actually had such close links between the business community and the arts community’

The other three examples conclude this demonstration of the importance of regional integration- one drawn from the years following the abolition of TWMCC; one from TWDC; and finally one from the Arts Council.

The regional 'integration' made for smooth running of arts institutions controlled by the committee structure instituted after the abolition on the metropolitan county in 1986. A TWMG staff member pointed this out in an interview, commenting how running post abolition cultural policy across all of the Tyne and Wear boroughs was made straightforward by a cohesive group of Labour members:

'The old committee wasn't very complicated..... Generally it would have been Labour dominated'

This is in obvious contrast to Liverpool, where the political insatiability, the city's 'institution' of political inertia made a post-abolition settlement impossible, with a legacy that is still seen in the existence of NML outside of local control. In the example from TWDC their holistic programme of public sculpture, which centred on community consultation saw initial tension between the NCC and the Development Corporation, but this tension gradually developed into a much stronger working relationship (O'Toole 1996), a relationship that would lead to the chief executive of TWDC, Alistair Balls becoming the Chief executive of the Newcastle Gateshead Initiative (NGI). This exactly reflects the type of political culture that this Chapter is describing as central to understanding the North East: how a relatively small group of people are involved in running key institutions. Finally, the most substantive example of the role of regional cohesiveness in the area of cultural policy comes from the Year of Visual Arts in 1996. Interviewees expanded on the narrative of the Year of Visual Arts offered earlier in this Chapter, pointing out how what would become the cultural *governance* settlement prevalent on the Tyne by the mid-noughties took its nascent form in the kinds of partnerships developed during the Year of Visual Arts. An interviewee working in the cultural sector at the time felt

that the potential for co-operation latent within cultural policy was shown by the Year:

‘the potential that the Year of Visual Arts ’96 demonstrated, especially in terms of, of its ability to bring people together around fairly limited resource show that there was a potential...in the region for people to work together towards’

Potential that was realised as Northern Arts was able to bring together the small number of actors involved in the governance of the region and to involve them in a cultural agenda.

Regional cohesiveness is therefore the final aspect of the context for the comparisons between Liverpool and Newcastle and Gateshead. As this Chapter has demonstrated the North East has a very different political history and culture when compared with Merseyside, and these differences are equally stark when considering the two areas’ art and cultural infrastructure. The Chapter has not only shown the differences and tensions between Newcastle and Gateshead, but also how the two cities moved closer together using cultural policy against the backdrop of a cohesive and coherent set of regional governance structures. This process by which regional governance structures create a governing coalition concerned with cultural policy can be given a final dimension by assessing the importance of regional bodies: first the influence of the Development Corporation on cultural policy; second the substantial role of the Arts Council in the region.

Cultural governance

Chapter 4’s discussion of the move from *government* to *governance* in local cultural policy gives a sense of how other actors and organisations

stepped in to fill the vacuum created by the lack of leadership from LCC. In the North East the story is different, as a result of political stability within the area's local authorities, the close knit nature of regional politics and also because of the nature of local arts funding in the region. This difference is the corollary to institutional theories described in Chapter 3, as the background of local institutions influenced the governance of culture in a very different way to Liverpool, producing a strong partnership between the two local authorities and the Arts Council in the region. This same process of local institutions shaping the governance of culture can be observed from the role of the Development Corporation, as although it created some initial hostility, the position of TWDC in Tyneside's governance soon replicated the overarching trend towards co-operation and partnership displayed in the rest of this Chapter. TWDC is worth noting because of the staff transfer between it and NGI, the organisation that would run the ECoC 2008 bid, but it does not have the same status as the Arts Council in this Chapter's narrative. The Arts Council in the North East, created in 2002 when Northern Arts, the Regional Arts Association was wound up, is the more detailed substantiation of the general trends within the region and serves as an important illustration of the form of cultural governance on Tyneside.

There is much dispute surrounding the role of Northern Arts, the regional arts association (which became Arts Council North East in 2003) in cultural policy in the North East. Some research (Bailey 2004) and interviewees see it as an organisation that was the major leader in cultural policy, whilst other interviewees questioned its role in changing the 'hearts and minds' of those decision makers, particularly within NCC, who were sceptical towards giving cultural policy a more central role. However the role of the Northern Arts in capital funding for the region serves to illustrate the

way cultural policy making has become much more integrated in Newcastle and Gateshead, unlike the more disparate cultural governance arrangements in Liverpool. This integration is the basis of the type of cultural policy regime set out in Chapter 7's discussion of the ECoC 2008 bid in the North East.

Northern Arts developed a core argument for expanding cultural provision in the region, by making use of Lottery funding in the mid 1990s. Much of the transformation of cultural infrastructure in the North East, and in Newcastle and Gateshead in particular can be traced to Northern Arts' *'The Case for Capital'* strategy published in 1996. Northern Arts identified the lack of uptake of cultural provision in the North East as inextricably linked with the region's lack of facilities (Bailey 2006). The provision of classical music in the North East is a case in point, as the Northern Sinfonia, despite having a strong reputation in Europe (Griffiths 2004), lacked facilities to take advantage of the orchestra's undoubted quality. *The Case for Capital* stressed the need for an infrastructure to expand cultural participation, as well as showing how lottery funding could be used to fund previously impossible capital projects. One interviewee from the cultural sector referred to the document as 'a shopping list [saying] this is what this region needs'. The usefulness of Northern Arts strategising cannot be overstated, as it allowed cultural organisation, and in particular GMBC to present a coherent justification for lottery funding, as part of a longer term transformative strategy. Comments from an interviewee working in the cultural sector during the late 1990s sums up the position:

'The Arts Council had played an important role strategically in the region saying these are the things we need. So that had identified things like a regional music centre and it meant that the arts council

nationally when it was looking at lottery priorities had a very clear framework in the region'

During the mid 1990s Northern Arts became a major promoter to national funders for cultural policy in the North East (Bailey 2004), but it did not succeed in making the case for cultural policy with NCC until after the Year of Visual Arts in 1996, and the capital funds from the Lottery had begun to be spent in the region. By contrast, in Gateshead's case the influence of the regional Arts Council on cultural policy success was unquestioned and the importance of Northern Arts for GMBC was widely held by many interviewees, for example this comment by a high ranking Arts Council official:

'[Northern Arts] did change hearts and minds. What [GMBC] did in Gateshead was because of the influence of The Arts Council. It would be delusional to suggest that it's not. It has been influential'

The seeds of cultural policy sown by Arts Council strategy and funding fell on fertile ground in Gateshead. The borough's public sculpture and community art projects, although they reflected a stronger community art orientation than was popular within the Arts Council nationally at the time, dovetailed into the *Case for Capital* (Bailey 2004:52). Gateshead then used its reputation for political stability, and its ability to deliver arts projects, such as the Garden Festival, to take the opportunities, such as the Sage Gateshead and the Baltic, offered by Northern Arts' strategy and lottery funding (Bailey 2004). In Gateshead the links between GMBC and Northern Arts represented a foundation for the partnerships that administered the ECoC 2008, links which were a sign of the underlying institutions in the

North East that have been described by this Chapter, particularly regional cohesiveness and the importance of Geordie culture in cultural policy.

Changing ‘hearts and minds’ and constructing the kind of cultural policy regime discussed in Chapter 7 was more difficult across the river in Newcastle, where the role of Northern Arts is the subject of much discussion and dispute within interviewees narratives of the period. Most recognised how funding constraints were exceptionally important in the local government landscape during the 1990s (and indeed up till the present e.g. Atkinson and Wilks-Heeg 2000, Wilson and Game 2006) and suggested the possibility of supplementary capital funding was a powerful motivator for those unconvinced of the case for cultural policy, particularly in a region where the prevailing political context was not openly in favour of projects seen as disconnected from the wider Geordie culture. The ability to draw down large amounts of lottery funding was particularly influential within NCC than the wider, more contentious case for the benefits of a strong cultural sector made by groups like NAF. A senior official from NCC sums up the influence of the potential offered by lottery funds:

‘At the time there was bits and pieces of money floating about and the availability of lottery funds didn’t half help. At that time you have to remember that there were vast amounts of lottery cash. If we put half a million quid on the table, you had a good chance of getting five million back’

Despite the possibilities offered by lottery funds, there was dispute within the interviewees about the precise role of Northern Arts in making the case for cultural policy to a rather sceptical set of elected members within

NCC. For one interviewee from the local cultural sector Northern Arts was just a funder, rather than a policy making organisation:

‘Northern Arts was lottery funding, they didn’t change hearts and minds, as capital funding did’

This interviewee cited the political debate surrounding the creation of a draft cultural strategy in 1997 as further evidence for this point of view. During the early 1990s, before the Year of Visual Arts and subsequent cultural strategy in NCC, another cultural sector official described a fractured relationship between Northern Arts and NCC:

‘I think they fought constantly with the city council’

And another, from Northern Arts, pointed to the detrimental effect that Newcastle’s status as regional capital had on the relationship between Northern Arts and NCC:

‘It’s certainly true that when I worked at Northern Arts, Newcastle’s reputation was very poor. At Northern Arts as with a lot of regional organisations, they feel a duty to what I call, spread the jam. So basically to keep everybody happy and to make sure all the resources don’t go to one place. So I would say there is a mistrust of Newcastle and a desire to bend over backwards to demonstrate they weren’t Newcastle biased.’

These descriptions, of the tensions between NCC and Northern Arts, as well as the perceived limitations of Northern Arts’ role as a policy maker are in contrast to the partnership that developed with GMBC. Changing the relationship between Northern Arts and NCC, as well as providing the basis for the type of cultural *governance* associated with the bid for ECoC was

therefore a longer term process of changing ‘hearts and minds’ as described by the interviewee from Gateshead. This longer term process of (and Northern Arts rather disputed role in) moving NCC towards placing cultural policy as a key focus for their policy programme in the noughties can be seen by the Year of Visual Arts in 1996, which along with the *Case for Capital*, began to make the case to NCC for a more comprehensive cultural policy, as well as furthering the ambition and ability of Gateshead’s cultural plans.

The Arts Council of Great Britain (ACGB) launched the ‘Year of Visual Arts’ across various sites across Northern England in 1996. Northern Arts was particularly influential in bringing this Arts Council festival to the North East, and took the lead in organising and facilitating the festival. The year included various high profile arts events, including showcasing the work of contemporary artists such as Bill Viola in Durham and Anthony Gormley’s *Field for the British Isles*. Duke *et al* (2008:68) cite the year as the key moment for bringing the cultural infrastructure on both sides of the Tyne together, particularly advancing Northern Arts *Case for Capital* strategy within GMBC. Various interviewees support this assertion, and the year was seen as particularly important by those working within the Arts infrastructure in Northern Arts. By contrast, within NCC the year allowed those associated with the cultural agenda to begin to make the case for an expanded cultural policy to the rest of the council, rather than serving as a unique epiphany across the region. As one former NCC officer notes:

‘1996 year of visual arts was key in helping people who were trying to get political support for culture to understand the way in which a change of image via culture could benefit the region, but it was a North East wide event. It was important, but it was because Visual

Arts happened with number of people working on culture at the time, if it had just been a year in isolation it wouldn't have worked'

The Year of Visual Arts is a key event because of its success in spurring on those individuals involved in promoting a cultural agenda, as well as showing the kinds of benefits, in terms of image transformation, tourism and social and economic regeneration that a major cultural event could bring. Whilst there is dispute over the exact importance of the Year to the cultural policy story, it can be usefully contrasted with other large scale events in Liverpool, such as the International Garden Festival. This contrast shows how the political culture in the North East, and the strategic lead of Northern Arts built on the success of the Year, rather than the Year creating the same kinds of governance issues that were found in Liverpool.

The narrative of the Year of Visual Arts' role in NCC is supported by parallel developments within NCC, which included moves towards embracing a more prominent role for cultural policy. These moves are the final illustration of how the general themes in this Chapter manifested themselves in the specific practice within LCC. In late 1996 NCC commissioned the director of Tyne and Wear Museums to produce the foundations of a comprehensive cultural strategy for the council. The document '*Towards a Cultural Strategy*' was the precursor to the ECoC 2008 bid from NCC and the beginnings of '*Building Bridges*' the joint cultural strategy produced by NCC and GMBC in 2002. The adoption of the 1997 framework is an interesting case in comparative political culture, a case that once again makes reinforces this thesis' insistence on the importance of local context in shaping policy outcomes. NCC's strategy which recommended strong partnerships with other local authorities and continued a very broad definition of culture can be usefully compared to Liverpool's

innovative production of a similar cultural strategy, the Arts and Creative industries strategy of 1987, which also had a strong emphasis on local partnership and a broad definition of culture. However the 1987 strategy, following initial interest was never fully realised as a result of the lack of institutional capacity within LCC and the political culture and infighting present at the time. NCC's more stable political culture and better record of relationships with local cultural partners that had developed over the 1990s allowed the 1997 strategy to begin to embed itself within NCC policy, giving cultural policy the position within regional governance outlined in Chapter 7.

Conclusion: how regional political culture shaped the development of cultural policy

In keeping with the overall argument within this thesis, this Chapter has set the context for Chapter 7's case study of the decision making structure surrounding ECoC in Newcastle and Gateshead. What this Chapter has shown is the way that local culture on Tyneside has a unique and specific character, summed up by the Geordie distrust of policies and practices that are not reflective of local life. Geordie culture is intertwined with the political context in the North East, where regional cohesiveness and partnership working are the dominant modes of government and administration. These characteristics of the local context have been shown to shape specific cultural policy events, such as the Garden Festival and the Year of Visual Arts, as well as having a profound influence on the working relationships of the organisations involved with cultural policy. NCC, GMBC and the Arts Council in the region have all been shown to reflect the Geordie milieu, just as LCC reflects the role of the 'Liverpool way' of policy and practice in the other case study.

The contrast between the circumstances and institutions in the two case studies is striking and contributes much to the thesis' overall insistence on the importance of looking to local situations for ways of understanding and explaining cultural policy. In Newcastle and Gateshead there were excellent prospects for cross river partnership (notwithstanding the traditionally difficult relationship between the two local authorities) as a result of local culture and practice, as seen by the detailed examples given in this Chapter. The cross river partnership was clearly highly influenced by the local cultural infrastructure, although the exact extent of this influence, especially within NCC, is disputed. The role of local cultural infrastructure, as part of the wider local environment cemented the governing coalition that would go on to bid for ECoC 2008, giving the area the hallmarks of the kind of cultural policy regime, a regime which the analysis in Chapter 3 suggests is the appropriate framework for understanding this mode of governance. In Liverpool by contrast the 'Liverpool way' created a situation where the LCC had little or no experience in cultural policy and lacked the internal infrastructure to deal with a bid for ECoC 2008. Externally the plethora of initiatives and organisations that had seen difficult or frustrated partnerships with the LCC meant the kind of governance coalition that emerged on Tyneside was unlikely to evolve in Liverpool, particularly a governance coalition that required any involvement from the local cultural sector. In Liverpool, as Chapter 4 has argued, this was as again as a result of local factors, leading to the conclusion that the structural or global explanations for the emergence of cultural policies within British cities (McGuigan 2004; 2005) would be well served by supplemental research which focuses on specific cases of local decision making. The foundations of this contention are cemented by the two case studies of ECoC that follow in Chapters 6 and 7.

Chapter 6

LIVERPOOL EUROPEAN CAPITAL OF CULTURE 2008

This thesis is an attempt to repoliticise studies of cultural policy, in the sense of supplementing the research into cultural policy set out in Chapter 2's discussion of the literature in this field. The task of supplementing existing cultural policy literature is carried out by a close examination of the specificity of place in shaping cultural policy, more exactly the importance of understanding local decision making structures and how they affect, and in turn are affected by, the use of cultural policy in the contemporary British city. So far Chapters 4 and 5 have detailed the role of local political culture and history in shaping the context in which cultural policy is made. The following Chapters now turn to the case studies of two localities' bids to be European Capital of Culture 2008. This, and the following, Chapter give a detailed outline of the way the governance structure in the two case study localities took two very different forms: in Liverpool a pragmatic coalition of actors aiming to win ECoC 2008 status that rapidly dissipated in the years following the award of ECoC 2008 in 2003; in Newcastle and Gateshead a cross river partnership which brought together the significant policy actors in the region to create what this thesis argues became a 'cultural policy regime' on the Tyne. These two narratives are viewed through the theoretical framework of regime theory, looking at how, on the one hand, cultural policy was the basis for the cross river partnership between Newcastle and Gateshead and, on the other, resulted in governance problems in Liverpool. The explanations for the differences in the respective sites' regimes are explained by the institutional theories set out in Chapter 3, theories that show how local culture and history constrained potential political action. In Liverpool local culture and history was not

amenable to cultural policy, nor to governance partnerships, whereas the opposite appears to be true in Newcastle and Gateshead.

In order to tell this story of the differences in governance and decision-making, and the way these differences are related to local 'institutions' in the sense described by Chapters 3 and 4, this Chapter presents a narrative of cultural policy in Liverpool during 2001-2006. The Chapter is divided into two parts, chronologically, discussing the bidding years before 2003 and the changes in governance that followed the preparations for hosting ECoC 2008. The Chapter's argument is advanced by an analysis of data from interviews with the elite actors involved in cultural policy making in Liverpool. First the Chapter strongly asserts the role of local institutions in shaping the governance of cultural policy (Peters 2005). This is illustrated by a narrative that demonstrates how the bidding team became the Culture Company and how the subsequent governance problems associated with the Culture Company can be related to the 'Liverpool way' of politics and in particular, cultural policy. The Chapter scrutinises individual decisions during the bid and the years after, such as the effects of setting up the Culture Company on the art and cultural sector in the city to discuss why the governing coalition in the bid dissolved. Overall this Chapter's narrative is one of the creation of a coalition of organisations, individuals and popular interest with the aim of becoming ECoC 2008, a coalition that all but collapses once that aim was achieved, as the 'Liverpool way' of cultural policy meant there was little prospect for the bidding coalition to embed cultural policy within the LCC's working practices and create the kind of partnerships that characterise the cultural policy regime between Newcastle and Gateshead.

Bidding for ECoC 2008 (2000-2003)

One interviewee from LCC summed up the role of cultural policy within LCC when interviewed in 2006; three years after the city had been awarded ECoC 2008 status:

‘There was no cultural policy to speak of. And still, there is no cultural policy to speak of to be honest. *What there was, was a strategy of sorts, for Capital of Culture*’ (emphasis added)

Another LCC interviewee gave a more subtle description of the way ECoC transformed LCC’s interest and commitment to cultural policy because the city had to prepare to present a successful ECoC year. The quotation shows how this senior officer viewed culture as initially a minor aspect of LCC policy that came to the forefront as a result of ECoC 2008:

‘[There was] a sort of subtle shift to the extent that something that would have been relatively minor became a bit of an issue to be dealt with, because the spotlight was now shining on what is culture is going to do for the city’

These two quotations give a sense of the context of the LCC’s bid, as the same issues associated with cultural policy outlined in Chapter 4 existed even after the city had won the right to host ECoC 2008. The fact that this continuity existed within the LCC’s cultural policy is the first illustration of the role of institutions in Liverpool acting as the ‘rules of the game’ (Lowndes 2005:279) for cultural policy.

The second comes within a case study of the bid for ECoC 2008. Bidding for ECoC 2008 in Liverpool was a pragmatic exercise, involving a small group of individuals. In contrast to the formal partnership engendered

between Newcastle and Gateshead, in Liverpool the bid involved a small team, described by the bid as no more than 20 staff (LCC 2003). Initially the bid was formed by the 'triumvirate' of LCC's leader, Mike Storey, LCC's Chief executive Sir David Henshaw and a consultant closely involved with Manchester's bid for the Olympic and Commonwealth Games, Sir Bob Scott. These initial three were joined by Sue Woodward, an associate of Scott's from Manchester, seconded from Granada Television. This small core team used primarily personal connections to bring in consultants and LCC directorates, as well as regional institutions and Liverpool's cultural sector. Most interviewees described the team as 'a very informal group' and concurred with this assessment from two consultants seconded to the bidding team:

'It was a small team, very motivated; we did bring in other bits of the council when we needed to; it was a really small team'

'That was it really, lots of freelancers and then it grew administratively but it never got bigger than 8 or 9 people and the core team was 3 or 4 and Bob to do the bid, and it worked really well'

The informal, personalised culture of the bid is seen quite clearly in comments made by various consultants who became involved as a result of Bob Scott's interest in their work:

'So when the bid come together and [one of our associates] had a big part in shaping it as well, I think people have been talking about the work we've done and Bob Scott approached us and said he wanted us to lead on the community side of it... Bob also brought in Claire McColgan [eventually the Culture Company's Executive Producer] to work with us'

This core team operated outside of the traditional rules and regulations of a local authority, often with little or no links to the majority of elected members, save for their support at events or in press coverage of the bid. One 'backbench' councillor remembered his perception of the bidding team:

'I'd say that there was very little direct policy making involvement of the majority of people elected to the council, probably the leader, the chief executive and then one or two cabinet members and probably some key advisers, including I'd imagine some key consultation with figures in the opposition, because you have to have an all party process. But I would imagine that three quarters of the members were limited to supporting it in terms of for particular decisions or not rocking the boat on what could otherwise have been controversial'

The type of decision making structure that emerged around the bid is important to the thesis' discussion of Liverpool and the comparison with Newcastle and Gateshead for three reasons. The governance of the bid is an illustration of the type of focused coalition aiming at a single policy outcome as described by Cochrane *et al's* (1996) and Quilley's (1999) work on Manchester. However, in Liverpool's case, rather than aiming for either a 'grant coalition' or an 'entrepreneurial consensus', the bid team in Liverpool were focused only on winning ECoC 2008. Unlike in Jones and Ward's (1998) descriptions of grant coalitions, in Liverpool there was no great partnership with business and the private sector within the city, rather the essential structure of the bidding coalition was based on the links between LCC, the city's cultural sector and regional central government bodies such as NWDA and ACNW. The focus on winning ECoC 2008 meant the group of organisations that came together for the bid was easily broken up following the award of ECoC 2008 to Liverpool in 2003, as the purpose of

their co-operation was achieved. This shows the thesis' contention that the political culture and context in Liverpool is vitally important in shaping the process of cultural policy making. The traditionally weak links between the LCC, the city's art and cultural sector and regional Non Departmental Public Bodies (NDPBs), allied to the institutions of the 'Liverpool way' described in Chapter 4 meant the partnerships constructed for the bid would not be sustained, meaning the bidding for, and build up to, the ECoC 2008 in Liverpool can be seen through the theoretical framework of regime theory and explained by concepts drawn from the New Institutional work discussed by Chapter 3.

The philosophy and practice of the bid

The philosophy and practice of the bid is a good example of the importance of policy constraints, showing how cultural policy in Liverpool was not merely a reflection of wider neo-liberal trends in urban politics (Smith 2000), but rather how policy concerns that were particular to Liverpool shaped cultural policy in the city. The philosophy and practice of the bid also displays some of the internal and external pressures on policy making: on the one hand the reform of the LCC by the Liberal Democrat administration that took full control of the council in 1998, and on the other the impact of central government's reform of local administration in the Local Government Act 2000. Indeed as LCC struggled with internal reform and external reconfiguration, Newcastle and Gateshead faced a very different set of circumstances, outlined in Chapter 7, which led to the creation of that region's cultural policy regime. Once again these differences illustrate the central contention of the thesis, regarding the importance of local context in understanding cultural policy.

In Liverpool, in keeping with the narrative offered earlier in this Chapter, almost every interviewee depicted the bid as a flexible, dynamic team of individuals, quite distinct from traditional local authority practice. This quote from an LCC councillor is typical

‘There wasn’t a body; it wasn’t ‘councilised’ or institutionalised, other than what it had to be because you had to pay stuff through the council, because it was a fairly small, flexible, dynamic team it was very un-council like’

This pragmatic, ‘un-council like’ approach would prove to be exceptionally effective in generating the circumstances necessary for Liverpool to win the ECoC competition. However, this approach would also have long term consequences reflecting the ‘rules of the game’ (Lowndes 2005:279) underpinning LCC’s long term distrust of (and unease with) cultural matters. The organisation of the bid is almost inseparable from the way the bid reflected both a shift away from ‘traditional’ UK council practice, the ‘usual’ way of conducting council affairs in Liverpool and the new philosophy of the Liberal Democrat regime’s response to the efficiency problems outlined by the IDeA inspection in 1999 (IDeA 1999).

An arts official recalled the change in tone within the relationship between arts organisations and the LCC, as part of the wider change in political philosophy present in the Liberal Democrat administration:

‘The Lib Dems took a stronger interest in the arts, they were keen to put a certain period behind them, and the choice was rather stark: you either want a Liverpool Phil or not, you can’t harvest some of the orchestra and if you want to have a symphony orchestra it costs this

much, and here we are bidding for capital of culture, well it's odd if you leave out the orchestra isn't it'

And as the new administration tried to move away from that 'certain period' of Militant in the 1980s and stagnation and stasis in the 1990s, reforms to LCC's organisation structure took shape. These reforms reflected a wider move to public private partnerships across the LCC, as a result of changes in local government rules begun by New Labour's Local Government Act 2000, coupled with the Audit Commission's damning reports on the LCC itself. These reforms took place with parallel shifts within the Council towards joint venture companies to provide customer services (with British Telecom) and a public/private outsourcing of the former corporation of Liverpool's works division. The bid, therefore, bore the hallmarks of this philosophical shift.

As well as outsourcing a proportion of the bid to freelance consultants the bid reflected the attempt by LCC's leadership to transform the council by breaking down entrenched working practices which were seen to be creating highly inefficient outcomes within the LCC (Melville 2002:11). A discussion with a former LCC assistant executive director throws light on these two policy aims:

'The changes happened before we got Capital of Culture, that was 2003; the re-structure of the council had been changed before 2003. There was a debate about where the Culture Company originally went and it was perhaps going to be more arms length from the council, than it presently is. I'm not sure it affected the structure of the council in that sense. One of the things that was really very important to change was what they call the silo nature of the camp; I

noted it when I first came; you could be doing almost the same thing as the department next door and not know about it.'

These examples give a sense of the pressures shaping cultural policy in Liverpool, reflecting the unique, political circumstances in the city and, more precisely, the LCC's internal governance problems. Against this backdrop it is possible to understand the evolution of the 'small core team' towards the more formal structure instantiated in the form of the Liverpool Culture Company. By the end of the bidding period the informality of consultants and the small core team had begun to give way to the structure outlined in the bidding document, a structure that allowed a wide range of stakeholders to come together behind the bid. Thus the bid attempted to raise popular support from those individuals considered 'influential' within the city by bringing them into the stakeholders group, which contained over 100 such people, representing ethnic, religious, differently-abled and other minority communities of the city. The stakeholders had an 'advisory' role, as well as being offered the opportunity to participate in particular events during the bidding phase. The consultation reflected the building of a consensus within the city around ECoC 2008, in order to minimise dissent and incorporate potential objections from groups which may have felt marginalised. Interviewees, in this case a former Culture Company board member, recall the form of the meetings and their perceived functions:

'I at one stage invented an away day session in the St George's Hall and invited a whole lot of people from the arts community along at the very early stage of the bid, and said "okay guys we've got a big mountain to climb here, what are we going to do?" And it was mostly about brainstorming but it was an attempt to engage people within this sort of work and then we had a series of Stakeholder meetings

and these evolved in format. But they worked as a way of doing something which most cities are quite bad at - being transparent about what's happening. Here are the people that were working on this bid project and it slowly emerged that this really was quite a big deal, started out as a bit of an oddity with just Bob and more or less nobody else and as it grew and gathered momentum it dawned on people that this was actually quite a big deal. So the stakeholders event which was every 2 or 3 months I think, they were not very structured opportunities to find out what was going on and have your say'

A similar form of consensus came with the participation of regional bodies such as the Arts Council and NWDA. Regional bodies' involvement took a very different form to their equivalents role in Newcastle and Gateshead, as during the bid in Liverpool they were involved for the resources they offered, rather than as policy makers or leaders, as the Arts Council was in the North East. This again reflects the policy context of Liverpool and the particular form the bidding structures took in the city, where the role of regional bodies was summed up by a paragraph in the bid document:

'The fact that the Bid has been endorsed by the North West Development Agency, North West Arts Board, North West Sports Board, Sport England North West, the North West Tourist Board and the North West Cultural Consortium as their sole regional representative in this national competition is eloquent evidence of their support for Liverpool's concept of a city bid on behalf of the whole region'

(Liverpool City Council 2003)

The role of regional bodies was to provide support for the bid, rather than to be decision makers or lead the bid was agreed by several interviewees from the North West Cultural Observatory, NWDA and ACNW. Two interviewees, one from the Arts Council, the other from a local cultural organisation, sum up the general perception that regional bodies had been drafted in for support, rather than with a view to longer term policy making and partnership. The first describes Liverpool's interest in getting that organisations support:

‘They were keen that the bid had our endorsement and support’

And the other gives a more detailed description of how the bid team interacted with key regional actors:

‘What [Liverpool] did do was make sure that all influences, which I would count ourselves as one, were informed and involved with what they were doing. They didn't do it as a solo act- they identified what I suspect they saw as the key decision makers in the region, and informed them and worked with them and kept very close with them’

As the core team created bidding partnerships and sought endorsements they were subject to scrutiny by the board, a board which was in turn influenced (and had membership drawn from) the City Council itself and the regional partners such as ACNW and NWDA. The board had a dual role, to oversee the operation of the Culture Company but also to further entrench the participation of key stakeholders from the stakeholders group. As a high ranking LCC official recounted during an interview:

‘The role of the board was to think strategically on issues, and also to give, and also to bind in the various stakeholders. So there was a local business person on the board, a local community relations person...so you had people who were Liverpudlians, but who also had a voice for the particular sector’

The role of individuals in the bid

The quotation above touches on the importance of influential individuals in the bid and the following section offers a consideration of the role of the most powerful key players in the bidding process. This is a useful way to return to the core themes of the thesis: the importance of local context; the way the past shapes policy development; and the unique and particular forms of governance associated with superficially similar policies in different localities. In the Liverpool case personality was all important with two specific examples relating the crucial role played by individual agency and personality in the ECoC 2008. These two examples reflect the way that individuals were able to initially move beyond the institutional constraints of the ‘Liverpool way’ and the organisational inertia of the LCC to act as catalysts for the governing coalition bidding for ECoC 2008. However in keeping with the analysis of the role of individuals offered by Ball (2008) and the effects of institutions on attempts to change or reform organisations, particularly those of English local government described in Lowndes *et al* (2006) and Lowndes and Leach (2004), individual efforts that gathered a partnership to win the ECoC 2008 were to prove unsustainable in the long term, as a result of the institutional constraints described in Chapter 4.

The first example has already been touched on, as it is focused on the importance of the triumvirate driving the bid: Mike Storey, David Henshaw and Bob Scott and does not need to be re-examined in much further detail save for noting it is unlikely that other leaders in the same organisational positions (particularly Leader of the Council and Chief Executive) would have approached the bid in the same way. Associated with this is the way Chapter 4's argument on the problems of leadership in Liverpool can be seen to have influenced the bid and this can be viewed in light of this story often repeated by the former leader and others involved in the bid:

'Peter Bounds and I were coming back from a conference in cities in the isles in Glasgow and the council car came to pick us up to drive us back, and on the way back, we, Peter said "look, can we do a bit of work, we've got this correspondence to go through" and remember, Liverpool had bid to be European City of Architecture in, actually it wasn't a very good process, we got badly beaten up by that process in all sorts of ways, and Peter had been chief executive at the time of bidding for City of Architecture, and he said, "we've got this circular for us to bid to become European Capital of Culture, presumably we don't want to do that." Now remember as leader of the council, my mantra right from day one was "Liverpool wants to become a major European city". I'd said that because we had premier football teams, European because European cities are successful, inclusive, dynamic, you know, growing. So I used that from day one. The first thing I said to the media upon becoming leader of the council. And I thought immediately, that bidding to become Capital of Culture actually took us, you know, towards that goal, of being a European city, European Capital of Culture. So he said "we don't want to do that, do we", and I

actually remember he was sitting in the front seat, and I leaned over and said “*well actually Peter we do*”

(Emphasis added)

The second aspect concerns the specific role of Sir Bob Scott in bringing the bid team together as an effective bidding coalition as well as having the ‘resources’ (Rhodes 1997 Lowndes *et al* 2006) to manufacture a successful bid. Essentially all interviewees, such as this one from the Culture Company, made some comment on Scott’s role in the bid as an individual with experience of bidding for high profile events (Quilley 1999, Cochrane *et al* 1996):

‘Bob created a very simple agenda, with clear ideas that people could pick up and repeat, and he tried to position Liverpool as favourites, with a focus on celebrating things that Liverpool was good at’

As a result of the importance of Bob Scott the organisational structure of the bid bore the stamp of his personality. Scott’s personality and way of working flourished as it was in tune with the prevailing ideology of the Liberal Democrat administration and the more ‘entrepreneurial’ (Jessop 1997b) aspects of their reforms of the LCC. Further comments from the same interviewee clearly states the importance of Scott’s working practices:

‘There was structure but it was, I think it was, I think that the informality came, probably largely from the way in which Bob Scott works. You know, he’s he, kind of works his own way through these things. I mean, I’ve had a few run ins with Bob about all sorts of things, but to give him credit, I think he knew some, he knew, he knew how to do some things really well he knew how to orchestrate

certain things really well. And I think you know without Bob, we wouldn't have got it.'

Finally, Scott was instrumental as a local coalition builder. An official from one of Liverpool's cultural organisations saw Scott's role as stepping in for LCC at a time when its relationship with the arts sector was fragile and before it had made a high-profile cultural appointment, in order to broker the support of an initially sceptical cultural sector, in a way that few others would have been able to do:

'if you like Bob became a sort of arts officer for the city, in a sense, and he had a far, far greater, I mean you need some exceptional insights to the arts, from his theatre experience, and he understood how it worked and what it's like to run an orchestra or an art gallery and how difficult it is and generated a much better empathy between the city and the arts, at working level, people realised that this bloke knows what it's like'

Overall then the role of Bob Scott in the bid cannot be underestimated, with a high proportion of interviewees citing his presence as the key reason for Liverpool's victory, and indeed point to him as the person or institution who was most influential and importance to cultural policy in Liverpool during the run up to ECoC.

This discussion of Bob Scott's role is a bridge to link Liverpool's cultural policy to the wider theoretical framework of regime theory. As this Chapter has already alluded to the coalition brought together by the bid would not last and did not develop into the type of cultural policy regime that Chapter 7 argues emerged between Newcastle and Gateshead. Downing *et al* (1999) have commented on the need for a regime to survive changes in

leadership and personnel, particularly over longer periods of time, if individual, contingent, governance arrangements are to be understood as 'urban regimes', such as those discussed by Bassett (1993) in relation to Bristol or the 'environmentalist' regimes outlined by Pincetl (2003). The importance of Bob Scott to the bid, the subsequent management issues within LCC, and the changes to the way cultural policy was governed after Liverpool won ECoC 2008 status (and Sir Bob's health problems) show how fragile and dependent on individuals the entire edifice of cultural governance had become, without an organisational commitment to maintaining the coalition created for the bid. This link between Bob Scott's role and the theoretical framework of regime theory is explained by recourse to institutionalist theory. Scott, and the management structure around him, represented a very different pattern of working practices compared to the usual form of LCC administration outlined by Chapter 4. These management practices and the personalised links with the cultural sector did not result in a sustained cultural policy regime as a result of the impact of the existing institutions within Liverpool generally and within the LCC in particular. The lack of institutional capacity for cultural policy, the legacy of power remaining in the hands of a few individuals in control of the city's political system and the dearth of traditions of partnership in Liverpool all resulted in the impact of Scott's leadership ebbing away as he stepped back from direct involvement in the city's cultural policy, leaving little long term change in the gap he left behind, at least where the governance of cultural policy was concerned.

After the gold rush: the role of the Culture Company (2003-2006)

Following the win in June 2003, LCC and the nascent Culture Company, the organisation set up to win the ECoC 2008 competition, were

faced with a series of policy dilemmas. The bidding phase had been marked by coalition and network building, based around the shared goal of winning ECoC 2008 and the bid had reflected an ultimately pragmatic attitude towards the win, elucidated by a Culture Company employee:

‘there was always this kind of tension about who was going to be delivering, I mean I am sure this has come up in every single conversation that you have, who is going to be delivering, but I have to say at that point, at that point, that’s not what everyone was concerned with, the bit of the team I was with, all we were concerned with was how are we going to get the bid to win’

And depicted in similar detail, albeit on a specific policy, by a senior Culture Company staff member:

‘[They] are going to these institutions in the year 2000 and saying “great idea we’ll be Capital of Culture”. And, quite rightly, [the arts institutions] said “bollocks you only give us eighty grand a year, we’re not going to get behind that”. So what you’re looking at is the city saying “alright we’re going to be more committed to arts and culture on the back of your support”.’

The pragmatism was complimented by the lack of overall guidelines for an ECoC celebration. As a former Culture Company official commented, the title was unlike other major events such as the Olympics or Commonwealth games, due to its much greater length and its lack of overall implementation guidelines from the institution awarding the title, in this case the EU:

‘Even if you used the benchmark of looking at how Capital of Cultures have been developed in other European cities over the past 10 years, um, actually to define capital of culture is very loose, where as the IOC and indeed I say majority of the world’s population, have a pretty clear picture of what the Olympic games is. ‘

The end of the pragmatic, goal orientated aim of winning ECoC 2008 and the transition to hosting the festival was therefore a time of instability. The decision to establish a semi-autonomous institution to deal with the run up to 2008, the post-bid Culture Company, would have severe medium term consequences. These consequences, detailed by the rest of this Chapter, and the decisions that caused them can be explained by the ‘Liverpool way’ of politics and cultural policy. The institutions underpinning politics and culture, both in Liverpool and within the LCC itself constrained the policy choices possible in the years following 2003 and the role of these institutions is seen very clearly in the form of the Culture Company.

Initially the Culture Company was devised as a company limited by guarantee, with an external board to oversee its operations. However there were a series of contradictory structures in the initial organisation of the Culture Company that created severe governance problems. The Culture Company was staffed by a mixture of new appointments and existing council officers from various LCC departments including leisure services, children’s services and the council’s communications and media department. All of the staff were employees of LCC, seemingly a contradiction of the Culture Company’s status as a company separate from LCC. The Culture Company came under effective direct control by LCC following the resignation of its first Chief Executive, Kevin Johnson, and his replacement by Sir David Henshaw, the LCC’s then Chief executive in 2004. There were a number of

reasons influencing the initial structure of the Culture Company, not least of which was the shock at Liverpool winning ECoC 2008 status. Most interviewees commented in some way on their surprise that the city had overcome the challenge of the supposed ‘front runner’ NewcastleGateshead.

This type of reflection, from a consultant involved in the bid, is indicative of the general narrative given by the majority of participants in the research:

‘First of all, I think, first of all, people were genuinely surprised to win the bid. I mean, even though everybody was doing that, we will win, we will win, I think seriously a lot of us thought Newcastle would get it. And so I do think it came as a genuine shock to people, but possibly not to Bob, because they probably knew, but I think to a lot of people it came as a shock’

The shock at winning the ECoC 2008 was also tempered by the need to carry out the plan outlined (and indeed committed to) in the winning bid. The bid was based around inclusion of Liverpool’s communities (a central theme of the bid had been ‘the world in one city’ LCC 2003) and was heavily dependent on private sponsorship and central government funding, as the ECoC title itself was worth comparatively little. An LCC official associated with the bid was very clear on the need to raise funds as a key motivator for giving the Culture Company a level of autonomy:

‘if you’re giving money to the City Council I suppose you might say well why would you give it to the City Council, but if you have a separate company it’s much easier to lever it and access that funding.... I think it much easier to get those sponsors by having a separate company, and if the City Council got involved with all its

baggage, political baggage as well as managerial baggage, so you know, having a separate company I think was the right thing to do'

The baggage mentioned in the above comment reflects a more pressing issue hanging over the City Council, an issue that was unique to Liverpool. The competitive nature of the bidding process had 'crowded out' (van Oorschot and Arts 2005) less grandiose plans from other potential cities and there was much speculation from the press (Hunt 2003), from government and other national and regional institutions, and from those within the City, as to whether the political history in Liverpool had taught the lesson that City Council would not be able to deliver the event. A consultant to the bid summarises thus:

'All the way through the bid the question was can Liverpool deliver, can Liverpool deliver? That was the big question that was coming from the panel, or one of the big questions (...) And there was undoubtedly nervousness about it'

And an elected member of LCC sets out the concerns driving the need for strong central control, but also to dissociate ECoC from the 'baggage' associated with the LCC:

'on the other hand, specifically the City Council had got a lot of criticism for failing to deliver on major projects and the Chief Executive [David Henshaw] was seen to be troubleshooting to make sure that more major projects didn't fail and that leadership was critical for delivering improvements'

Finally there was the perception, held by those taking the decisions over the Culture Company, connected to the need for sponsorship and LCC's

very poor record of delivering major events that the City Council, or indeed any Local Authority, would not be able to deliver ECoC successfully. One of the three people involved in the decisions over the post Bid Culture Company revealed:

‘Well, decisions were made.... that really, if you were to deliver Capital of Culture, uh, it would be very difficult to deliver it by the City Council, because the City Council has a whole host of sort of structures and legal requirements. I mean, you think of procurement rules for example, it’s very difficult to imagine sort of the arts side having to go through all that sort of tendering and procuring route... Because of the kind of commercial framework they had to operate in, the council had to evolve a completely different set of procedural rules around for example procurement issues. Still within the legal framework that local authorities have, but allowing much more freedoms and flexibilities so that things could be agreed upon and delivered, particularly when we were procuring individual artists.’

The central shift in governance surrounding ECoC 2008 came, therefore, with the move from a cultural policy designed to establish a successful bid for ECoC 2008, to a cultural policy concerned with delivering the 2008 event and the organisation, the Culture Company, entrusted with delivery of that event. This introductory section has shown how the Culture Company, and thus the governance of cultural policy, was shaped by external constraints (winning the bid) initial decisions (about the form the Culture Company took) and the institutions of the ‘Liverpool way’ of cultural policy (the fear of failing to put on a successful festival and the LCC’s poor reputation for hosting major events and administering art and culture). All of these factors were significant in the collapse of the governing coalition and

the failure of a cultural policy regime to embed itself in the governance of Liverpool. The following sections give a sense of how these ideas play out in specific examples from the post-bid era in Liverpool, with particular reference to the role of the Culture Company.

Governing the Culture Company- the role of the board

Previous sections have outlined how the Culture Company's board played a dual role in the bid, as an oversight mechanism, and, perhaps more importantly as a way of bringing the disparate bidding coalition together. The changes to the board that followed over the next three years illustrate the transformations of the governance network around cultural policy in Liverpool, the short-lived nature of the 'bidding regime' that had begun to emerge and can be explained by the role of local institutions in influencing individual policy makers ability to create effective governing structures.

A high ranking member of the Culture Company's staff told the complicated tale of the board:

'Well, Drummond [Bone, Chair of the Board 2004-2007] came later as well so there was actually three boards in some ways. There was the bidding board which was kind of an advisory board, then there was the Culture Company when we won in 2003. That was a big board. That was like twenty-six, thirty people. That was ridiculous and they tried to keep everybody happy who helped on that board and then Drummond and I did this rationalisation this time last year when we cut it in half basically. What we did is we selected organisations we wanted on the board and also individuals so we knew we needed representatives from TNP, NWDA, those type of organisations and they're the type of people we've got on there'

The board moved from its 'arms length status' of advising to becoming a method for scrutinising the Culture Company (unfortunately this scrutiny would eventually prove ineffective with a further reconstitution of the board in 2007), as recounted by a former board member:

'Well the original board I think was very much an advisory board and it was very large and really was at some arms length distanced from what was actually happening so the council was doing the hiring and indeed the firing of various people in the delivery organisation at the beginning and the board were really kept informed and asked to advise but it was pretty arms length.'

With the new board driven by the desire for:

'A different kind of control if you like over the Culture Company. By different kind I mean differentiated from the city council but actually to some extent acting as a real board as a company board would act because the big advisory groups weren't doing that.'

And, as the same interviewee concludes, the new system produced a board that was focused on overseeing the artistic programme, rather than providing a forum for the governance network surrounding cultural policy to come together or running the Culture Company as a 'company':

'We created a memo of understanding to The City Council which stated quite clearly what The Culture Board was responsible for. It wasn't responsible for employment; it wasn't responsible for standing orders, procurement, finance. It was responsible effectively for the guidance and oversight of the artistic programme. So it took the

artistic programme away from the politicians and away from The City Council's bureaucracy'

The example of the board is a useful way of seeing the transformation of cultural policy governance in Liverpool. As the enthusiasm generated by the bid gave way to practical political questions over funding, control and influence over the event the organisation structures which had allowed cultural policy to function, by bringing together a varied set of actors with unique resources necessary for the realising the aim of winning ECoC 2008, began to collapse, some by design and some by accident. This collapse is part of the more general story of a governance failure which was specific to Liverpool, based on its political history and culture.

The Culture Company, governance failure and the role of local institutions

The confusion over the role of the board is magnified by the issues surrounding the Culture Company itself. A member of the Culture Company's board narrated how the repeated reconfiguration of that board added to the sense of stasis connected to the doubts pertaining to the Culture Company's status:

'There were then quite difficult negotiations about the way in which a reconstituted board and the council would relate to each other and some of that was personality based and we put in train legal negotiations – the company had its own lawyers, the council had its own lawyers and we had a third party drawing up the understanding. Now that took a lot longer than it should have due to problems within the council.'

The negotiations over the status of the Culture Company are therefore vitally important to this governance story. During the final stages of the bid, and shortly after the award was made, the core bid team constructed a model for the delivery of ECoC 2008 that was quite unlike the 'flexible' structure associated with the bid. The bidding coalition began to break down as different interests had diverging perceptions of how the bid should be run, what form the celebrations should take, and the organisational arrangements to provide the ECoC 2008 itself. A number of competing interests vied for influence of the new body, creating a crucial policy dilemma: what was the status of the Culture Company?

This question was to become a problematic governance arrangement based almost totally on the uncertain status of the Culture Company *vis-à-vis* the LCC, which would prove to be the source of considerable political problems and lead eventually to the need for legal clarification and settlement of the working relationship between the two organisations in 2006, three years after the Company was originally set up. It is this moment that represents the major difference between Liverpool and Newcastle and Gateshead and as such highlights the importance of understanding local context in cultural policy. The designation of the Culture Company constituted the end of the possibility of a cultural policy regime emerging in Liverpool, as decisions over the Culture Company's form caused severe ruptures between the various members of the coalition brought together to win the bid. The narrative of the Culture Company, reflected in the quotation opening this section and what follows, is in keeping with the importance of the local 'rules of the game' (Lowndes 2005:279) of the institutions of political culture within Liverpool and more specifically within the LCC, as cultural policy returned to business as usual after its initial importance during

the bid for ECoC 2008. When considered in the context of the urban studies literature discussed in Chapter three (e.g. Jessop 1997, Harvey 1989, Smith 2000) the case of cultural policy in Liverpool gives two important lessons. The first is the uneven uptake and impact of cultural policy programmes and projects on local governance. This point is developed more extensively by the comparisons analysed in Chapter 7. Second is the possibility of governance failure, where regimes do not emerge as a result of local institutions. This phenomenon, discussed by Dowding *et al* (1999) and Dowding (2001) is especially well illustrated by the specific examples that follow, examples which focus on the governance problems associated with the Culture Company.

As the previous paragraph suggested, the end of the bid saw the institution of the 'Liverpool way' re-emerge to have a profound effect on the cultural policy in the lead up to ECoC 2008. The existing culture of government and administration within LCC shaped the form taken by attempts at governing cultural policy, as the institutional inertia associated with the LCC reasserted itself in questions over the status of the Culture Company. The confusion over the precise nature of the Culture Company was a major part of all of the research interviewees, with no single clear narrative on the Culture Company emerging. Overall interviewees descriptions of the Culture Company in the years following the win fall into three categories: it was an institution separate from LCC, a separate 'company'; it was a council department; a confusing combination of both a separate company and an LCC directorate.

Only a minority of interviewees, in this case a Culture Company employee, described the Culture Company as being totally separate from LCC and subjected to control and scrutiny by its board. In effect the Culture

Company was seen as a local government agency, set up to deliver ECoC 2008, but without any direct input from LCC itself:

‘No, it’s a separate company but most of the workers come from the council, but many of them who are employed on short term contracts are working for the Culture Company rather than the council which has caused us problems’

A much more common view, given here by another Culture Company employee and an LCC elected member, was that the Culture Company was a department of LCC, effectively a directorate like education, children’s services or regeneration, subject to scrutiny from LCC itself:

‘It is a council department because we’ve also got within us tourism, the old events team that have always been here and delivered the cities events.’

‘It’s like any department in the City Council’

The other common response, given here by a former LCC cabinet member, was one of confusion, as interviewees were unsure as to whether it was part of the council as a directorate, or a separate company:

‘I think after the award was made, I think the, well there was the problem with the status of this new company, which I don’t think is really ever been resolved actually but it was part of the council and yet it wasn’t part of the council.’

This confusion was particularly acute over issues of who had responsibility and accountability for the Culture Company, as one former high ranking

Culture Company illustrates when discussing who employed the Culture Company's staff:

'No it's not a council department. The Culture Company is a company but the accountable body is the council so in other words we function to all intensive purposes as a company but we do not have ultimate control either of finances, we have no right to employ so the council has to. Therefore you have the situation where all employees of the company are employees of the council'

A final quotation, from a senior LCC officer, summarises the general governance problem caused by the confusion over the Culture Company's status:

'There was a big, a very big discussion about it and I think the view was that from the Council's perspective, it wanted a separation from the development of the artistic program. They felt that was right. It felt it would be able to have a vehicle which perhaps had more freedom or flexibility over things. So lots of solid reasons. I'm not sure whether that has worked up to now, because it has focused a huge amount of energy and effort around governance issues'

This final quotation provides a link between the general governance problems in Liverpool and the theories of urban cultural policy outlined in Chapters 2 and 3. In Liverpool governance failure shows how the emergence of cultural policy, particularly when linked to civic boosterism or city branding, can have an uncertain and uneven development as a result of the local political context. The importance of understanding how a desire within the LCC to move away from the organisation's reputation as inept when dealing with cultural policy and large scale events, whilst being concerned

about the LCC's ability to respond to the local cultural sector's requirements for ECoC 2008, suggests a particularly local character to the cultural policy in Liverpool.

Just as the first half of this Chapter described the local character of a coalition of organisations, interests and individuals with the aim of securing ECoC 2008, the problematic nature of the Culture Company gives a similarly local aspect to the planning and development of ECoC 2008. Whereas in Newcastle and Gateshead cultural policy, as a result of the 'rules of the game' (Lowndes 2005:279) in the North East, sustained the conditions for the emergence of what this thesis calls a cultural policy regime, a similar political settlement did not emerge in Liverpool. As Downing *et al* (1999) have argued one of the underlying characteristic of an urban regime is longevity, a characteristic which was not present in the narrative of cultural policy in Liverpool. This lack of longevity and the reasons for the breakdown in the bidding coalition can be illustrated by a discussion of the problems that the status of the Culture Company generated for the major cultural organisations, such as the Bluecoat, Unity, Tate, Everyman and Playhouse and the Biennial. These problems can be divided into two categories: issues over funding models and issues over the LCC's institutional lack of understanding of the art and cultural sector. These problems would see the 'Liverpool way' of cultural policy begin to return, as the lack of organisational capacity for culture within the LCC and the Culture Company affected the shared interests that had coalesced around the bid.

In the opinions of those interviewees from the major cultural organisations vast amounts of time and effort were wasted over funding problems that seemed irrelevant, at best, or were power struggles, at worst. Although this is not an unusual experience for cities hosting major events, for

example the build up to Manchester's 2002 Commonwealth Games, these issues were key concerns and played out against the background of the 'Liverpool way'. An interviewee from one of the city's major cultural organisations details some of the problems:

'There was a lot of wasted time actually trying to get the Culture Company to see how they could have a service level agreement with us that was actually relevant and not sort of off the shelf local authority service level agreement because we don't work like that....it's silly for the Culture Company to get tied up with this thing about 'we've got to get all our twelve sponsors and our logo and this wording etc' and that was one of the problems that we had early on with them that we felt they were using this stuff so they could retain control.'

Whilst another goes on to show what was both an antecedent and a consequence for the breakdown of the bidding coalition, that the Culture Company effectively ignored the existing cultural infrastructure and created its own. Again these types of issues have been common in the build up to other ECoC years (Palmer/Rae 2004), but the problems were especially difficult given the longstanding lack of relationship between LCC and the cultural organisations in Liverpool. An overview of the sector's criticisms was offered by a former head of one of the 'Big 8' arts and cultural organisations in the city and was shared by almost all of the arts organisations interviewed:

' I mean you can see what's happened to the team there and the kind of appointments they've made and the kind of premise starting point was basically, to supplant the kind of existing cultural structure with

another kind of cultural infrastructure to deliver a different kind of cultural program that the cultural organizations would never deliver. So now it's kind of defaulted back to this point before which is what I was saying along with everybody else which was you need to channel it through the cultural organizations because we've got the resources, the networks, the expertise, the knowledge etcetera to work with. Alright we're going to do something slightly different but it's all there. You know, and basically there was a view that it wasn't there. You'd never do that with sport, you'd never say you know, you'd never turn on Liverpool whatever and you'd never say "Actually we're going to try, Actually we really want to create a different kind of club because Liverpool is too kind of red and Everton is sort of too blue." So you know it's like absurd, its completely absurd. But that's kind of where, where it's kind of got to.'

As the analysis in this Chapter has stressed, the above kinds of problems, common to large scale events, can be seen as an example of how institutions within Liverpool, particularly the LCC's longstanding problems when dealing with art and culture generally (and cultural policy in particular) conditioned and influenced the build up to the ECoC 2008. More evidence from interviews with the major cultural organisations displays the same issues of a lack of cultural policy capacity with the LCC and its historically weak relationships with the city's cultural sector. The lack of clarity over the Culture Company's status meant that the problems over working practises were felt to reflect the concerns and culture of both the Local Authority:

'And I think that the culture within the Culture Company is partly influenced by the fact that it's still; a lot of the systems go through the local authority'

And the marketing team within the 'separate company' established to run the bid:

'A lot of the people weren't that known in the arts sector or knew how we operated on the ground they had to learn as they've gone along and I wish there would have been a better way of integrating people into the understanding the city because it has been arts organisations waiting for them to make the approached but people not knowing how to approach them because they don't know who is doing what.'

It is perhaps most significant that these quotations all touch on the role of institutions in shaping cultural policy, in addition to the governance issues raised by the status of the Culture Company. They have shown the importance of institutionalism in understanding Liverpool's cultural policy. This discussion can be concluded by looking at the impact of confusion surrounding the Culture Company on the LCC's Regularly Funded Organisations (RFOs) within the art and cultural sector in Liverpool, to show how the thesis' demand for a consideration of the local, rather than the global, helps us to understand cultural policy.

Data from interviewees shows how as a result of a) the concerns by officials around sponsorship and commercial contracts as well as b) wanting the Culture Company to seem (and indeed be seen as) separate from the LCC, because of the perception of LCC as an unstable organisation with a very poor record of service delivery and finally c) the Culture Company's remit for delivering the 2008 festival, cultural RFO's in Liverpool were subject to much instability over the 2003-5 period. This instability therefore rooted in the 'Liverpool way' of cultural policy as the 'rules of the game' for

cultural policy in Liverpool and within the LCC were practically manifested in RFOs governance issues. The issues arose around the decision to give control of cultural funding from LCC over to the semi-autonomous Culture Company. This created initial teething problems, particularly around the uncertainty concerning guidelines surrounding bidding for funds and confusion over the status of the Culture Company, as an official from one of Liverpool's smaller arts organisations recalled:

‘The Culture Company terminated all service level agreements, so [we] had to apply for funds. With LCC we met with [them] once a year to talk through our service level agreement, we ticked a number of boxes and signed a form and so long as we did our quarterly report, our annual report, and so long as we kept our profile high in the city we weren't threatened. Post bid the process became much more fragmented, as 2004 the service level agreement was terminated and bidding for funds began. The difficulty was the transition between the bidding team and a management team and they failed in so many areas in making that transition.’

This critical stance was enunciated by several smaller arts organisations interviewed as part of the thesis, with particular emphasis on the ‘fragmentation’ and ‘uncertainty’ surrounding the shift from being an LCC RFO to delivering cultural events on a project-by-project basis for the Culture Company. The other side to the officials' narrative of this transformation was a sympathetic perspective offered in several interviews with local artists and arts workers, here from a consultant who worked on the bid, around the demands placed on the Culture Company in the initial phase of its existence:

‘Here’s the other side of the coin, to be a little bit fairer, the other side of the coin is they were inundated, as soon as they won the bid, everybody had, you know, an idea that they wanted to do, and people thought that there would be loads of money, so they were trying to manage incredible expectations, with at that point not much time, everybody’s got phones ringing off the hook, everybody’s got a mad scheme they’ve been dreaming up with and you know, and they all think that the Culture Company should fund it, and so that’s not much fun when you are trying to manage that’

The problems described by this section have been discussed in order to show how the specifics of the relationships within the governance of cultural policy in Liverpool were so problematic. On the one hand it is possible to read the above issues as an expression of the trends described by authors exploring the ‘entrepreneurial city’ with reference to wider globalised transformations (Jessop 1997). On the other it is useful to see the RFOs narratives as a reflection of local culture, a local culture that militated against coherent governance arrangements. This insight gives a significant supplement to those arguments which seek to understand local cultural policy by reference to epiphenomena of wider neo-liberal processes (Harvey, 2008; McGuigan 2004), showing how a grasp of the local helps to place global trends in context and highlights the possibility of policy failure (Jessop 1997).

‘Embedding’ cultural policy in Liverpool (2003-2006)

This Chapter’s stress on the need for structural understandings of cultural policy to be augmented by local narratives is given its final elucidation by an examination of the extent to which cultural policy

embedded itself within the LCC in the years subsequent to the award of ECoC 2008 status in 2003. In Newcastle and Gateshead there was significant staff and policy transfer from the cultural sector into the two local authorities, whilst in Liverpool the narrative of the status of cultural policy is very different. Interviews with decision makers specifically explored the role of cultural policy within the LCC, as a point of comparison with Newcastle and Gateshead. As the rest of this Chapter has indicated there was no emergence of a cultural policy regime in the city, whereby there was somewhat of a return to business as usual with regard to cultural policy in Liverpool.

Interviewees' views, irrespective of the sector from which they were drawn, divided into three, ranging from those who felt there was evidence for the 'embedding' of cultural policy within LCC from the cross directorate nature of the Culture Company's programmes; those who were unsure as to the future of cultural policy within the city; and those who felt the pragmatic nature of the bid meant LCC would not have followed up its commitment to culture had it not been ECoC and would never fully embrace cultural policy in the future. The second two groups, which accounts for the majority of interviewees, were unified by the shared uncertainty as to the status of cultural policy, an uncertainty which was rather problematic considering the city was approaching a major cultural festival that was seen to be at the heart of local policy within the city.

The first group can be seen from this statement by an LCC official, asserting the influence of hosting ECoC 2008 and cultural policy (via the Culture Company) on the council's external policies and programmes as well as the impact on the LCC staff themselves. This quotation, from a LCC

officer at the periphery of the decision-making process, shows the general view of this minority of interviewees:

‘One of the key things for me would be obtaining the Capital of Culture for 2008. There was a big project that involved every school child across the city, and that involved arts and culture. There were competitions around capital of culture where schools were allowed to produce banners that would be used in the councils advertising and to promote the capital of culture. We used it in environment for recycling. We used competitions there as well as involving the school. We used local artists. We used it for regeneration, I mean most of our local neighbourhood street signs have local art from schools; you know 20mph zones and stuff like that. So I think over the years it’s formed a great part of what and how we operate as an authority. Internally, even more so. We’ve got our own internal magazines and intranet, and every week since I’ve been here there are always advertisements or competitions or information regarding the arts and the culture across the city, be it promotion tickets, like 2 for 1 tickets to attend the theatres or attending art exhibitions, so I think it has formed part of what we do.’

A more ‘pragmatic’ set of ideas was most clearly articulated by a former executive director of LCC:

‘If you’re saying, does it become mainstream? Is it something that people think about, I think that would vary a little bit. I had involved these sorts of programmes and initiatives in a range of things for years and be that things like education awareness through to things like literacy programmes.... So when I took over as director this was

like common place, this is what we did and we were involved in a whole lot of stuff, but not all of the services of the council were like my own portfolio so there were different areas that would have different takes on that. I think the education portfolio was strong in delivering programmes that were highlighting and embedding cultural and community based activities, but then of course they were dealing with schools which is a very keen part of the audience etc. Whether you could say that the main corporate functions from the council, you might argue that perhaps they were not too much of a priority. If you talked about other bits, then you would have a completely different view. So I think Liverpool along with a lot of authorities has gone a long way in both recognising the added value that comes with it, understanding that it has quite a strong reach because it acts as a bridgehead between the more sort of statutory parts of the council and its wider role as a civic leader in bringing together other parts of the wider city communities. So from my point of view I think Liverpool, with a lot of other authorities is on a journey.'

And this view reflected the uncertainty expressed by many of the interviewees from Liverpool's art and cultural organisations:

'My main concern, a concern which many of us share is the legacy what happens in 2009 if all this funding, all the council's funding for the arts is going through the Culture Company and when the Culture Company ceases to exist, which it might or it might not, they're talking maybe keeping it on. But if it has no reason to be there because the year's over, does that mean that the budgets just evaporate? Or does it mean the city has a real commitment, it really is

embedded in their thinking, that culture is important and they're going to maintain the levels of support and that's what we don't know'

The final set of views are best illustrated by the director of one of the city's largest cultural organisations, who described the rather *ad hoc* and fractured working relationship with the City Council and declared a very pessimistic outlook when asked to discuss whether, on the one hand, cultural policy had become embedded in LCC and, on the other, whether this would mean any turn around to LCC's long history of cultural policy failure:

'[There] isn't much of a relationship between [my organisation] and LCC. I know [the key figures] but there is no formal mechanism for meetings. It's partially historical, as the Culture Company set up a few consultancy boards, but they have now all been abolished. So there's no formal mechanism for [my organisation] to feed into the council's plans. They are so preoccupied with 08 delivery that there is no long term strategy. [my organisation] is doing their [its] own work, as [my organisation] doesn't have a plan or strategy for culture from LCC.

A less positive, although more hopeful view was given by an interviewee closely associated with the Culture Company itself:

'I think everyone is pushing the city and the Culture Company board has recently written formally to the city seeking reassurance that the city does have a long term strategy.... Now I don't think that has been embedded and I think in a way this has been a kind of fortunate occurrence, I think we kind of fell into it but it is changing and I think we are winning the battle and embedding it'

The questions about the extent to which Cultural Policy had become embedded into LCC therefore provides a key contrast with Newcastle and Gateshead. This contrast is central to the argument in this thesis, and stands as a metonymous finding for the whole of this research. The Chapter's discussion of the lack of cultural policy regime, the constraints on policy making as a result of earlier decisions and the role of institutions within Liverpool's political history culture all led to a situation whereby there was considerable disagreement across research interviews over the role of cultural policy in the LCC. In Newcastle Gateshead, as Chapter 7 describes, cultural policy was at the heart of a cross-river partnership, whereas in Liverpool, despite hosting ECoC 2008, it was still peripheral to policy making in the city. All of the interviewees involved in making policy decisions, or in managing and administering cultural organisations reflected a genuine unease and unawareness of the role of cultural policy outside of hosting ECoC 2008 with little or no planning or conception of its role in the future. This conclusion, as pessimistic as it seems, is both in keeping with the narrative of cultural policy in Liverpool offered by Chapter 4 as well as being supported by external audits of the council's performance, for example during the period covered by this thesis the audit commission found that:

'Other than for Capital of Culture, there is a lack of clarity around what the Council's ambition and vision for cultural services will mean for local people and how it will be delivered... there is little recognition within high level corporate plans of the role of culture in delivering strategic priorities' (Audit Commission 2006:8)

And that:

‘The Council has not explicitly identified culture as being central to delivering against its priority aims..... There is a lack of clarity about overall cultural ambitions.’ (Audit Commission 2006:30)

Conclusion

This Chapter has presented a narrative of Liverpool’s successful bid for ECoC 2008. This narrative is one of a pragmatic bidding coalition, constructed by key individuals, which dissipates after the ECoC 2008 is won. The collapse of this coalition, and the failure of a cultural policy regime to emerge, despite cultural policy taking a central place in the urban and administrative transformation of Liverpool, is explained by using institutionalist theory to understand the impact of local culture in shaping cultural policy governance. The initial governance coalition aiming to win ECoC 2008, a coalition that was specific to Liverpool and reflected the political philosophy of the Liberal Democrat administration, as well as local circumstances. As Stone (2006:26-27) has argued developments in governance often clash with the institutions underpinning organisations’ cultures. This Chapter has shown this process in Liverpool, as the fears of the LCC’s reputation for cultural policy failure and mismanaging major events shaped the form of the post bid governance arrangements. These arrangements reverted to LCC control, as the Culture Company grew to replace the coalition that was behind the bid. The flexible, personalised bidding team that was able to bring together the resources offered by various stakeholders gave way to an organisation in which initial decisions about its form gave rise to various policy problems. When taken as a whole the individual examples given in this Chapter contribute to the thesis’ argument that local context is most significant in understanding local cultural policy. The examples of a ‘pragmatic’ bid, the reorganisation of the Culture

Company's board and the points of contention between the Culture Company and the art and cultural sector in Liverpool are all examples of how understanding local decision making in cultural policy extends the work of those writers keen to locate explanations of policy practice in the processes of local economic restructuring in face of global economic change (McGuigan 2006, Jones and Wilks-Heeg 2004). Whilst writers such as Jessop (1997) Smith (2000) and Richards (2000) respectively relate local experiences to wider concepts such as the entrepreneurial city, the revanchist city or the city as a global brand, this Chapter puts forward a way of seeing how the local can be equally as important as these concepts in understanding the contemporary city's use of cultural policy. The importance of the local also adds to the literature seeking to evaluate or advocate cultural policy in cities, by offering important lessons as to the local limitations of cultural policy and provides, by the contrast with NewcastleGateshead, a case in point of best practice.

The 'delivery' focus of the circumstances in Liverpool provides an excellent contrast with the other case study in this thesis, Newcastle and Gateshead, where the governance arrangement surrounding cultural policy, especially those prevailing after the award of ECoC 2008 to Liverpool, are much closer to what this thesis will go on to argue is a form of urban regime not fully articulated within the existing literature on regimes for service delivery regimes (Downing *et al* 1999), growth coalitions (Stone 1989) and Conservation regimes (Lee 2006) amongst others (for example Stoker and Mossberger's (1994) typology). As Chapter 7 presents, the idea of a 'cultural policy regime' gives additional depth to the theoretical framework of regime theory, whilst grounding the explanation for the cultural policy regime firmly in local institutions.

Chapter 7

'NEWCASTLEGATESHEAD' AS A CULTURAL POLICY REGIME

NewcastleGateshead offers a stark contrast to Liverpool and represents a story of how local circumstance allowed cultural policy to become embedded into local decision making structures. On Tyneside local institutions were amenable to securing a place for cultural policy in the political agenda of the governing coalition that had been developing in the run up to the bid for ECoC 2008. This Chapter explains this process by revealing the existence of a cultural policy regime on Tyneside and accounting for that regime using institutionalist theory. This account runs throughout the Chapter as this theory connects local politics, history and culture to policy decisions to explain how the cultural policy regime in Newcastle and Gateshead emerged from a sympathetic local environment.

Rather than strictly adhering to the structure of the before and after narrative that structured the discussion of Liverpool's ECoC 2008 bid, this Chapter concentrates on using specific examples from Newcastle and Gateshead to advance its contentions. The Chapter favours a case study approach, as the years before, and subsequent to, the ECoC 2008 bid saw a strong continuity in policy and practice. The governing coalition was largely unaffected by the lack of ECoC 2008 status, in contrast to the nugatory impact on governance in Liverpool. The Chapter advances its assertions by deploying four examples. These examples are initially placed in the context of the local institutions on Tyneside, by a section that expands Chapter 5's analysis of local circumstances in the North East. Once this context is understood it is possible to see how a cultural policy regime developed around the Newcastle Gateshead Initiative (NGI), set up as part of moves

towards cross river co-operation. NGI played a significant role as the lead organisation in the ECoC 2008 bid, a role which helped to formalise the co-operation between Newcastle and Gateshead into a cultural policy regime. Culture10 and the continuity of cultural policy in the face of organisational change gives a sense of the longevity and stability of the urban regime in the years after 2003, stability which is in turn connected with the character of local institutions. Finally the Chapter considers the importance of the regional Arts Council in putting the 'culture' into the cultural policy regime and making Newcastle Gateshead's governance arrangements distinct from other ways of administering cities outlined in Chapter 3's summary of urban studies approaches to comprehending the contemporary city.

A cultural policy regime between Newcastle and Gateshead: Context

The story of cultural policy in Newcastle and Gateshead is one of stability and partnership, shaped by the local institutional context on the Tyne. Chapter 5's discussion of local institutions described how the area is characterised by regional cohesiveness and cross-organisational collaboration in local political behaviour, a long term interest in promoting cultural policy (especially in Gateshead) and a concern to reflect local Geordie culture. There are several examples of how these institutions played out in the run up to the bid, reflecting a trend towards culture gaining a significant place on the local policy agenda and the importance of local context in influencing the rise of cultural policy.

Whereas there were few antecedents for the ECoC 2008 bid in Liverpool, in the North East the process reflected a much longer story of cultural policy tied into the regeneration of the region (Bailey *et al* 2004, Miles 2004). The longevity of cultural policy was summarised by a cultural

official from the North East, who drew attention to the importance of the position that cultural policy had taken around the time of the ECoC 2008 bid:

‘I think it’s, it’s important in the same way that the Capital of Culture bid didn’t spring out of mid-air, you know there’d been this history of big projects and ambition here and likewise before Gateshead took on this series of major capital projects which have had a transformative effect on the reputation and other things about Gateshead, they had a very long history of steady, good investments in arts development’

‘The other thing I think is the continuity and this is underlying a lot of the capital development as well, that there’s been great continuity in both the cultural sector and in the local authorities.

In Liverpool cultural policy’s place on the political agenda was intimately related to the highly personalised role of Bob Scott and the bidding team. After the ECoC 2008 had been won the city returned to the usual ‘Liverpool way’ of local politics, reflecting the LCC’s unease with, and suspicion of, cultural policy. Newcastle and Gateshead’s local institutions meant that, as this Chapter shows, the individuals advocating cultural policy were successful as the local context was receptive to their ideas. The connection between context and individuals, which would give the framework for Tyneside’s emerging cultural policy, can be understood by looking at the role of George Gill, the leader of GMBC in the run up to the bid. Gill’s role within Gateshead, summarised by the following quotations, indicates the type of political stability and regional cohesiveness that Chapter 5’s narrative placed at the centre of Tyneside’s institutions. The first is from an Arts Council employee, the second from a GMBC officer:

‘And as I say key politicians and a series of politicians who were there for a long period of time but also if you look at people like George Gill who was the leader of the council before Mick Henry, that sense of continuity of vision and ambition. What we didn’t have was lots of political changes either, you had that sustained vision and I think that made a big difference for Gateshead’

‘Gateshead was at least a traditional, working class, old Labour local authority and George Gill, who was the leader in Gateshead during the nineties, and he was as Old Labour and as traditional and absolutely archetypal old in style Labour leader but George one day got this stuff and he became the most passionate supporter, and he took that local authority that was full of reactionary old Labour figures and he dragged them forward into the 21st century. ‘

These two quotations also allude to Chapter 5’s depiction of the close-knit nature of elites on Tyneside, an institution that becomes crucially important to the examples presented later in this Chapter. Just as important as individuals’ interactions with the local institutions underpinning the position of cultural policy in Newcastle and Gateshead at the beginning of the bid were the perceived successes of previous cultural events and strategies. Cultural policy in Liverpool had either been costly examples of failure, such as the John Lennon memorial concert (Brown 1998, Evans 1996) or the Garden Festival (Theokas 2004), or had been short lived policy programmes, such as the 1987 *Arts and Cultural industries strategy* (Liverpool City Council 1987). In the North East the events like The Year of Visual Arts in 1996 and projects such as the Angel of the North were all influential in the development of a central role for cultural policy in the North East, as role which was frequently referenced in discussions of how the bid developed as

a partnership between NCC and GMBC. Discussions with officials from arts organisations through to the Local Authorities in the North East confirm the narrative suggested by Chapter 5 that the build up to the ECoC saw the embedding of cultural policy throughout regional governance across the Tyne. Thus events like the Year of Visual Arts were seen by administrators from ACNE and Northern Arts as a crucial 'stimulus' to the ECoC bid:

'I was there during the period when the bid was linked to the renaissance that took place in the North East in the Nineties and in a way the kind of predecessor for Capital of Culture was Visual Arts.... In a way NewcastleGateshead as a concept you could say came out of Visual Arts year and what followed because it was the stimulus for so much. The public arts programme in Gateshead was already underway but the Angel was hugely stimulated by the Visual Arts UK 1996 process. It also brought Newcastle and Gateshead together'

Although Chapter 5 also highlighted the doubts raised by NCC officials as to the significance to the Year of Visual Arts, the influential successes also came in the form of capital funding from the National Lottery which allowed both Gateshead and Newcastle to significantly expand their local cultural infrastructure. In Newcastle in particular the capital programme lead to extensive work, as a NCC officer recalls:

'The Capital Programme which I still maintain is the biggest of any core city in the country. Nowhere else has refurbished four theatres, three contemporary art galleries, a specialist centre for dance, a specialist centre for an art house cinema, a specialist centre for children's literature, five artist studios. Nobody else has done all that. Okay, none of our projects are individually as big as say The Baltic

but we've done about twenty different Capital projects so that was a hugely important thing and we got a lot of support from the Council for every project that we did'

This was work that fostered the kind of multi-agency partnerships that the region's cohesive political culture fostered and encouraged. The story of Dance City's new centre for dance in Newcastle, as narrated by a former Dance City official, brings together these themes of the importance of partnerships as well as the rising position of cultural policy on the political agenda:

'It took a long time to make it happen. It started off and it went through a whole series of feasibilities and our initial partnership was with Tyne Weir Development Corporation. We didn't have a good relationship with the city actually. When that failed and the Development Corporation had to claw back the site for commercial purposes after three years of funding the city were then in a position where they could rescue us. So they did and they fronted an application to the Lottery for another feasibility for us. And we did it through the city because we knew we couldn't do it by ourselves. In the event that project that was joint project with Northern Stage for an Arts Centre, as opposed to just a discrete dance and theatre Centre; we couldn't find a site, we couldn't make it work but what it did was consolidate a relationship with the city. And then what we did have to do with the city was go and find a third partner, which we did with the Grainger Trust who came in and gave us a site and then we were able to go back to our other funders. By that stage we were committed to the City Council to build the building, project manage it....there was a real team approach to making it work'

These types of narratives show how by the time of the bid the roots of the cross-river partnership were well established. It is as a result of the antecedents discussed in this section that the position of cultural policy can be summarised by two very instructive excerpts, one from an interview with an NCC councillor, the other a GMBC officer. The decline of the scepticism surrounding cultural policy within NCC meant that the council was open to policies using culture, particularly for regeneration:

‘I know that in my role as Leader of the Opposition at that time it was one of those areas where I knew that if I was to propose something that was cultural led regeneration the chances were that it would get support’

Whilst the general role of culture on Tyneside can be seen from the quotation below. Although speaking on behalf of Gateshead, the interviewee’s opinion illustrates the view held by many of the participants in this research

Q: How did the cultural policy get made then?

A: You tell me what you mean by cultural policy....I think you should backtrack round that one and say in Gateshead culture is an overarching issue so it isn’t how cultural policy gets made, it’s simply how policy gets made in Gateshead. Of that we use culture in a positive and driving way to achieve the things we want to achieve so it isn’t segregated out’

This section has shown how cultural policy itself had taken an important place in NCC’s and GMBC’s policies and was beginning to embed itself as part of organisational practice within the two local authorities. This embedding was in concert with the local institutions in the region,

institutions that promoted partnership and coalitions. It is in this context that the development of the governing coalition that coalesced around the ECoC 2008 bid, but would be sustained after the award went to Liverpool, can be understood. The rest of this Chapter, using individual examples from the case study period, details the expansion of this nascent cultural policy regime and accounts for its existence using the framework of institutionalist theory.

The Newcastle Gateshead Initiative and the bid for ECoC 2008 (2000-2003)

The evolution of the cultural policy regime between Newcastle and Gateshead, as well as the role of cultural policy in bridging the once fraught relationship between the two local authorities (Davies 1988) was heavily influenced by the type of governance structure surrounding the attempt to bring ECoC 2008 to Tyneside. The Newcastle Gateshead Initiative (NGI), set up in 2000, brought the two local authorities together in a formal partnership, although it was set up with a remit that was much wider than just the aim to be ECoC 2008. The story of NGI is a narrative of how an area with an existing background in using cultural policy sought to position that policy at the centre of a cross-river partnership to further the perceived successes (Minton 2003) that cultural policy had already brought to the region. In this sense the NGI narrative is an account of the formation and formalisation of the cultural policy regime, rather than the creation of a loose bidding coalition that emerged in Liverpool. The events after 2003, discussed later in this Chapter, give a full justification for the use of the cultural policy regime framework, although even the initial development of NGI can still be explained through the institutionalist framework, which stresses the interconnection of local policy and local context.

The first link to local institutions comes from an understanding of the creation of NGI. Rather than emerging as an *ad hoc* reaction to the challenge of bidding for ECoC 2008, NGI's creation was in keeping with the regional coherence present within North East governance and the longer term trends to co-operation and partnership that had developed in cultural policy, particularly between the regional Arts Council and the two local authorities. During the late 1990s the thaw in relations between NCC and GMBC discussed in Chapter 5 crystallised into a joint project between the two councils, the NewcastleGateshead Partnership, set up to 'investigate potential collaboration....in transport and access, culture-led regeneration, and tourism' (Newcastle City Council 2007). As the partnership developed the two authorities looked to work together via an organisation to promote the region and bring in investment. It was this aim which saw the establishment of NGI, the body that would ultimately be given responsibility for the ECoC bid. Thus, unlike the Culture Company in Liverpool which had an uncertain relationship with the city council before and after the ECoC 2008 bid, Newcastle and Gateshead would use a separate organisation from outside the Local Authority to run their bid.

In further contrast to the Culture Company, NGI was an organisation set up for a separate purpose, and indeed had a much longer history than the Culture Company. This is as a result of the way the NGI developed from The Newcastle Initiative (TNI), which had been set up as a 'business leadership' project in 1988, part funded by the Confederation of British Industry (CBI) (Davoudi and Healey 1994:19). TNI developed strong links to the local business community, as well as being closely involved in the local governance network which developed with Newcastle's bid for City Challenge funding in the early 1990s (ibid:19). At the same time as the

decision to bid was being discussed by NCC, GMBC and ACNE the two local authorities used the existing TNI structure to create the regional marketing agency, operating in a similar way to TMP on Merseyside. Effectively NGI began as a joint destination marketing organisation, as both sides of the river began to see what they had to offer each other. Interviews with NGI representatives gave the background and context to the beginning of the partnership, describing how the rivalry had begun to fade as a result of the evolution of cultural policies on both sides of the river:

‘Gateshead has an authority of about 200,000 people; Newcastle, 300,000 people so fairly small places in their own right that had about a 1000 years of rivalry but more importantly both of them had turned their back on the river for the previous 20 years so with the demise of heavy industry you had two conurbations next to each other but not really collaborating or working together and some politics behind that: Newcastle had a development corporation in the eighties; Gateshead didn’t; it had a garden festivals etc so I would say a healthy rivalry. Having said that, they had both progressed in different ways, particularly Gateshead with its cultural stuff. Although to be fair to Newcastle sometimes over played, when in effect Newcastle nurtured and developed many cultural organisations some of which have ended up on the south bank of the Tyne so their futures were inevitably and inextricably linked’

The development of NGI was also tied into the self-interests of two local authorities wishing to maximise the impact of their assets, as remembered by an NCC officer:

‘Slightly before my time the two Chief Executives got together....I always said this but it was based on absolute self interest. Gateshead, regardless of what they did, the idea of promoting themselves as a separate entity was a pretty unlikely prospect. They don’t have the assets to do that or the brand. For Newcastle, having Gateshead as part of what we were doing gave us huge added value. It was naked self interest in coming together which is always the basis of good partnerships because if you are clear what you’re getting from each other then you can move forward. If you’re just being nice to each other then it’s never enough. So there was absolute naked self interest as I said. Gateshead were becoming part of an established brand. Newcastle were getting effectively the Angel of the North, The Sage, The Baltic and so on to add to their armoury which was a pretty good deal and that kept everyone happy. That deal was done between the two Chief Executives, the two leading politicians, Tony Flynn and George Gill and that provided a very very solid platform’

These two quotations stresses the importance of key individuals, but can also be seen as an indication of the importance of local context, as the partnership was able to succeed based on the propensity for elite co-operation in the region, rather than just being explainable by the charisma of individuals, such as Bob Scott in Liverpool. Local context is also important to the story because it reflects ongoing governance trends, from TNI, via the Newcastle Gateshead Partnership, to NGI, which coincided with the possibility of bidding for the ECoC 2008. NGI was charged with the task of running the ECoC 2008 for a variety of reasons, not least of which was the way it not only fitted into, but also extended, existing governance in the area.

An NGI official involved in the bid tells how NGI was seen as the perfect organisation to run the bid as a result of its existing ‘cross-river’ position:

‘All of that was set in stone from about the end of 2000 and very quickly the councils recognised that we didn’t want to create a new, separate vehicle so [NGI will] become the Capital of Culture bidding team. Therefore, we formed in within NGI, which is an important step forward for us because some of the difficulties were avoided, that would have come with a separate bidding unit that sits outside of the infrastructure of everything else. I also think because it was all the same people, in a sense I suspect that’s why we hit the ground running whereas some other cities took a bit of time to catch up’

The evolution of NGI from TNI presented a ready-made vehicle for a cross-river bid, based on the emerging tourism and marketing partnership. Again the comments in the quotation reflect both the institution of governance co-operation on Tyneside and also the contrast with Liverpool, where the Culture Company created several governance problems as a result of its unclear status. The reference to Tyneside’s institutions can be embellished by further descriptions of the role of NGI, descriptions that give a sense of how the NGI’s formal position buttressed the embryonic cultural policy regime. Here an NGI official tells the story:

‘There was a formal structure because there was a group that met something like every week, which had the key partners of Newcastle-Gateshead, the Arts Council and the RDA. Their job was to ensure that the key partners were fully signed up and supporting what was going to happen. With NGI you got the marketing of NewcastleGateshead and in fact a whole region became synonymous

with the bid for European Capital of Culture. Therefore, the structure of NGI, which had a marketing department and press department, that management team which Neil Rami [Then chief executive of NGI] brought together, which I was on and had those people on it were the real drivers of the benefits of bidding. The purpose of the other group [in NGI] was to ensure that what we were saying as part of the marketing and writing of the bid was delivery. If we happen to win but *us winning was a consequence and not the point.*' (Emphasis added)

This rather strange turn of phrase that concludes the interviewees description of NGI is essential to this narrative, as the type of comment italicised in the quotation provides the clearest substantiation of the Chapter's argument for understanding Newcastle and Gateshead using the framework of a cultural policy regime. Although Chapter 3 has noted the danger that interviewees will create post-factual rationalisations for governance decisions, especially those decisions that were involved in the unsuccessful ECoC 2008 bid, this section justifies the assertion that NGI was not set up with the sole intention of winning ECoC 2008, but rather was a product of the importance of cultural policy to the development of a cross-river partnership. In light of this, two more quotations show the position of NGI as the centre of the two authorities' partnership. In much the same way as a combination of TMP in Liverpool and the Culture Company, NGI brought together the regional governance agencies outlined in the previous quotation as well as much of the relevant private sector. This comment from an NGI official clarifies its position as the lead agency in the bid, in a narrative which is superficially similar to the Culture Company, save for NGI's very clear (and formal)

position in relation to the two local authorities and the wider regional governance infrastructure:

‘The other thing of importance is that NGI is an agency that has a hundred and sixty private sector members. Not just private sector but we have on our membership the two universities, the two colleges, a lot of the big private sector partners, tourism infrastructure, the big hotels. So we kind of connect with a lot of people who would back Capital of Culture and a lot of the infrastructure that would deliver it. We have the airport, the ferry, the metro system. All those people are partners in our company so the idea of NGI [running the bid] was you set something up that is quite light touch, non-bureaucratic, at arm’s length with some political overview but is essentially a free agent and it common ground where you can get the private and other sector agencies engaged’

The importance of the membership of NGI can be seen in the role of the board. The NGI board operated in a similar way to the board for the Culture Company in Liverpool, acting as an overseeing body. However, NGI didn’t have the same function of binding together the cultural sector, or bringing in the ‘great and the good’ as the Culture Company did in Liverpool, because NGI was a formally constituted partnership reflecting the existing shared commitment to cultural policy, a cultural policy that was not based on bidding, nor dependent on winning ECoC (as subsequent sections of this Chapter will show). Of the NGI board, a board member described its role as:

‘Really just a steering group to help the executive team to point themselves in the right direction really, we meet about 6 times a year and it’s more like a steering group’

This ‘steering group’ role reflects the existing coherence of governance arrangements in the North East and the developing links between Newcastle and Gateshead. Whereas in Liverpool there was no facility to bring the disparate collection of influential organisations and persons together Newcastle and Gateshead had the much more active ACNE, TWMG, GNAF, TNI, Northern Rock Foundation and other organisational spaces for partnership and cross sector working to develop, against the backdrop of the more parochial political culture. Indeed an interviewee with positions in several of the previously mentioned bodies described the precise importance of the North East’s political culture in the development of NGI’s role in the bid, linking this narrative to an institutionalist explanation (Lowndes 2005, Peters 2005, North 2000) for the precise governance of cultural policy on Tyneside:

‘There had been in place what had been called The Newcastle Initiative from the late 80s. The CBI in the late 80s started to go into businesses around the country saying you should set up business initiatives and you should work with your local councils. Newcastle was one of the first ones to do that. We’re [The North East] quite good at this kind of networking thing. Everybody knows each other because they’d met and worked with each other. Again it’s partly incestuous but you can make that work to your advantage as well’

As a result of these advantages and its existing position NGI became the cross-authority co-ordinator for cultural policy, as well as the ECoC

2008, and was influential in integrating the cross-river cultural policy which culminated in the joint cultural strategy '*Building Bridges*' (Newcastle City Council & Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council 2002). The writing of the bid reflected NGI's synthesising role, building on the existing cultural platforms of the two areas, the cross-river partnership, as well as linking in with regional polices, such as those of ACNE. A high ranking NGI official described the process, and therefore NGI's role, as answering a crucial question:

'If you're going to publish a document that says 'have you got the capacity to deliver a great European Capital of Culture programme?' you needed to demonstrate that you had great cultural strategies already. Therefore, the work of NGI was to sow them together in a convincing way but they had to be rooted in local authorities and Capital of Culture had to be an extension of what it was the councils were trying to deliver; not in conflict with that because that would be one of the key questions that people would explore; 'you said you won European Capital of Culture in 2004 but we've looked at your cultural strategy and it says something else' so it was my job to collect all that documentation and produce those two huge folders, which said 'yes, everything adds up to doing this'

Chapter 3's discussion of the tensions within urban regimes can also be restated from the analysis of NGI. Although NGI brokered a significant governance partnership between the councils and the respective NDPBs, it had a more complex and contentious relationship with cultural practitioners during the bid. The contentious relationship was a product of their exclusion from the formal partnership and their co-option into the bid. This exclusion is a significant difference with Liverpool and is a sign of the formality of the

governance collation on the Tyne. Whereas in Liverpool the local cultural sector was brought into the bid, in the North East NGI involved the arts sector via consultation by an outside consultancy, as opposed to the 'personal' forms of engagement used in Liverpool (particularly the role of Sir Bob Scott). Several of the senior administrators within the art and cultural sector discussed this process of consultation, with some rather mixed emotions. One related how the views of the sector were gathered by consultants:

'Q: and how were you involved in the bid?

A: Consultancy had been commissioned by NGI in partnership with the City Council; that's probably how it worked. There were those discussions and we were fed into that process. And there were a lot of them; they were themed discussions and we all went to 3 or 4 depending on our interests and backgrounds'

And by enlisting the artistic sector's support for 'public occasions' as part of the bid:

'I was very involved in it in the sense that I was kind of trundled out to meet the panel on a number of occasions, you know when they arrived to view the bid... I mean the NGI organised it basically what they did was they invited artists and practitioners and people that would you know running organisations in Newcastle to be involved in the process with them. I wasn't on any sort of organising committee, I was just an artist that was asked to turn up occasionally and spoke with people'

The sense of implied alienation elucidated in the above quotation was echoed in a series of comments by other senior cultural sector staff, reflecting their belief that NGI and the bid was the property of the cultural policy regime, as opposed to being ‘owned’ by the artistic sector:

‘I think the city went through the process of asking opinions but didn’t really engage with those opinions fully. And I think just made decisions themselves about the way they wanted things to go. I think artists were left slightly in the cold and I certainly think that art was a big problem for the city, it’s a kind of love hate relationship there’

‘I feel we could have been more involved. If I was to characterise this I think that the bid from Newcastle Gateshead was seen very much as an Arts Council related bid’

In a rather perverse and counter-intuitive sense the exclusion of the artistic sector is the final piece of evidence for the cultural policy regime. There was no organisational space for the cultural sector to actively participate in, as the terms of the NGI’s structure was a formal partnership between the two local authorities that involved regional NDPBs. The flexibility of the early years of the Culture Company in Liverpool helped create the sense of ownership that marked the ECoC bid, whereas the formality of NGI would ensure the longevity of a governing coalition based on cultural policy at the expense of direct participation by non-governmental actors from the cultural sector.

This final point develops the overall narrative of NGI as a much more formal arrangement than Liverpool’s Culture Company, with NGI’s clearly defined role as a result of its position as a destination marketing agency, and its position as part of the formal partnership between NCC and GMBC. This resulted in a different approach to the Liverpool bid, one reflecting more

formal consultancy of the cultural sector, as well as more influential roles for regional bodies, particularly ACNE. These differences, as well as the formalisation of the cultural policy regime can be seen in this narrative offered by the former chief exec of NGI, which although highly personalised, superbly summarises the bidding process in NewcastleGateshead:

‘Ultimately I was the executive responsible for delivering the bid. The way we did that was we had my own board, which was, we’re are a limited company so we were a proper organisation with proper management regimes, and my board was therefore my key reporting line and there was also the NewcastleGateshead Partnership that I suppose technically owned the bid. But I was the executive in charge and I set up a bid steering committee, which included two key people from the councils, Paul Rubenstein and Bill McNought. We had other people from the Arts Council and so on; within a year of that I realised we needed a heavy hitter who had an arts background; I don’t have an arts background and whilst I’ve got an interest in the arts and an understanding of quite a lot of the different genres, we felt we needed someone who had 1) arts knowledge and 2) had run a festival because we were trying to create a programme of activity and that was when we persuaded Paul Collard to come back from the States where he was heading up the festival of ideas in New Haven. It took about a year to persuade him. Then we brought Paul in as bid co-ordinator and he, in collaboration, wrote the bid. I mean he really ran much of the process, whereas I personally spent my time getting the financial guarantees from the various partners. So we had a robust financial model quite early on, which was at that stage the government and the DCMS wanted to see but as we later found out

they weren't consistent in what they wanted through the process. The important point was we had a team with shared values and perspectives but we were together very early on; I think we were probably working on this maybe a year ahead the other cities so *we felt confident that we had not created a team outside the cultural policy framework of the area and had a very strong relationship*. The two politicians [NCC and GMBC leaders] who were clearly Labour politicians were still in the honeymoon stage of the partnership but it was all pretty strong' (emphasis added)

Understanding NewcastleGateshead as a cultural policy regime: the post-bid years (2003-2006)

At this juncture it is pertinent to propose a rhetorical question to underline the comparison between NewcastleGateshead and Liverpool: How was it that the local authorities behind the unsuccessful ECoC 2008 bid were able to continue the prominent role for cultural policy and build on the partnership structure that has characterised the bid, whereas the winning city was confronted with the types of governance problems discussed in Chapter 6? Although Liverpool's policy makers faced the problems associated with hosting a major event, this question also develops from having an unclear grasp of the local context that helps to explain the role of cultural policy in the two areas. In Newcastle and Gateshead the cultural policy trends in the area continued as a result of the formalised role for NGI and the longstanding acceptance of the usefulness of cultural policy by local decision makers and partners in the bid. These trends provided continuity for the cultural policy regime between the two localities, a regime whose existence can be directly related to local institutions such as political history and Geordie culture. This analysis of cultural policy on Tyneside in years following the decision by

DCMS to recommend that Liverpool should go forward to the EU for the title of ECoC 2008 is evidenced in two examples: First, Culture10, the organisation created to administer cultural policy after 2003 and; second the effects on the cross-river partnership of the change of administration within the NCC in June 2004.

Following the award of ECoC 2008 to Liverpool there was a period of potential instability in Newcastle and Gateshead, which might have raised questions for the viability of the governing coalition and the cultural agenda. NGI continued as the tourism and marketing agency for the region, but also had to re-establish and re-negotiate its role with other stakeholders. An NGI official admitted that 'loosing' the ECoC competition did raise questions internally amongst NGI staff:

'The fact remained that it did leave a bit of a hole, the Capital of Culture bid was a very galvanizing initiative, and it gave NGI real purpose, and it's probably taken us a couple of years to regain that sense of purpose really, like what do we do now really?'

However the uncertainty translated into the working practices of NGI, it did not destabilise the cross-river partnership. The post ECoC period saw the development of a programme and administration as part of the NGI, known as Culture10, set to run for 10 years until 2013. When discussing Culture10 interviewees all had a similar narrative surrounding the final few months of the bidding period. Although one NGI official did give a reminder of the importance of the investment sunk into cultural policy as a crucial factor in continuing the cultural policy agenda:

'I suppose the easiest way to describe it although cold and analytical is in financial terms. All of the partners have stayed with the

programme so it would have been very easy for them to go away after losing capital of culture and say let's go and do something else but there is still significant investment from all the partners which means we can keep the programme together'

And a minority professed an intuition that NewcastleGateshead would not succeed, there was a general awareness of the need for an alternative if ECoC 2008 did not come to the North East. One NCC councillor's comments sum up the generally defiant attitude following the decision, and the determination to carry on with the cultural policy ongoing across the Tyne:

'Out of the bid came an initiative called Culture10. It was a bid to say bugger Liverpool we'll do stuff anyway, and we don't need it and don't let it distract us from what we need to do'

Whilst a former NGI official gives a more reasoned outline of the general narrative offered by interviewees from across the organisational spectrum:

'Before the decision of Capital of Culture decision for Liverpool we'd got together all the key agencies that had committed to the bid and said plan B: Are you still committed to delivering what we say we want to deliver which is ten years of cultural development and everybody said yes. The meeting happened with the Regional Development Agency which was a key one. It was quite a big commitment for them to say yes, we'll go with figures, we've committed to this'

A further comment from a senior NGI executive gives an overview of the functions of Culture 10 as a facilitator of events which will bring

attention and prestige to the region, as well as reflecting the ‘best practice’ of the art and cultural organisations in the North East:

‘The way it works is that we pull together a programme of festival events across the year some of which we manage directly and curate directly. Some of which are delivered by cultural partners in the region and others we sort of contract for people to deliver. We do it partly on some themes but basically the objective of Culture10 is to raise the profile of the region and engage the population to deliver new visitors into the area.’

NGI continued in a similar role that it had during the bidding phase. An NCC officer detailed the complex, but effective, relationship between NCC, Culture10 and NGI, illustrating how NGI remained a forum for pan-authority cultural policy discussion:

‘I mean cross river initiatives in the cultural sector are generally mediated through NGI and the Culture10 unit. Which doesn’t necessarily mean that everything we do with Culture10 has to take place on both sides of the room but essentially we do try and work by consensus so if we wanted to do something and they didn’t want to do something we would try to come to a consensus about that rather than have a row about it. By and large we do try and work together because what we’re trying to do is to operate more effectively on both sides of the room and to capitalise on the assets that we both have’

Whilst NGI remained the forum for cross-river co-operation, Culture10 is the most obvious product of the cultural policy regime, a regime which survived the loss of ECoC 2008 as a result of the longstanding

position of cultural policy and Geordie institutions, such as political stability. It is therefore possible to understand the role of Culture10 as a consequence of local circumstances, such as the legacy of NGI as the bidding organisation, the pan-regional aspects of the bid and the involvement and influence of ACNE. The regional outlook of Culture10 can also be linked to the style of governance present in the North East, as outlined in Chapter 5. This perspective was outlined by a detailed and wide ranging discussion with a senior Culture10 official:

‘We are in a slightly strange position in that we’re part of the Newcastle Gateshead Initiative, but actually we have a regional role, for example I am working on events in Middlesbrough to give you a sort of breath of the region but that’s mainly because the Capital of Culture bid as you know was a regional bid rather than a Newcastle-Gateshead bid.’

The importance of region, as described in Chapter 5, is one of the institutions underpinning cultural policy on Tyneside and is a good representation of the thesis’ central argument. The same discussion also produced a useful summary of Culture10’s position within the cultural policy partnership across the river, a summary supported by other interviewees, for example these comments by an NGI employee:

‘From a practical level we work very closely with them in terms of solving the things that I sort out with Newcastle City Council and Gateshead City Council is about city advisory groups and health and safety and making sure that entire sort of thing is sorted. We work closely with the arts development teams on both sides of the river, sometimes that’s about helping them to realise their ambitions and

working with them to create bigger projects and sometimes it's about them helping us to create some things'

As this section has shown the cultural policy regime that continued after the ECoC 2008 was given to Liverpool was dependent on longstanding regional trends that can be related to local history, culture and politics. Further evidence for this claim comes from a consideration of the similarities and differences between the role of Culture10 on Tyneside and the Culture Company in Liverpool. The practice of Culture10, as understood by a middle level Culture10 official, was as co-ordinator, administrator, creative partner and project funder:

'I suppose in terms with the arts sector I guess from that, we very much position ourselves as being a creative partner rather than being a funder *per se*, and how that manifests itself really is that we try and get more involved....shaping how not what the content of that is but how it's presented, developed and managed and that sorts of things and we have put time into the content as well but probably less so on that one but do you see what I mean it's not just oh there's the money, it's more active'

The *practice* of Culture10 was therefore very similar to the Culture Company in Liverpool, but without the unclear governance arrangements plaguing the Culture Company and with a specified position within the local, cultural policy, regime. The similarities and differences with policy practice in Liverpool and the continued cultural policy partnership between Newcastle and Gateshead (and the wider region) are also summarised by considering an NGI official's description of how a major event will come

together, co-ordinated by Culture10, but reflecting the policy interests of each member funding, or delivering, programmes:

‘Because of the way funding works we’ve got committed money from the Arts Council, Gateshead Council, Newcastle Council and from the Northern Rock Foundation. We’ve created a structure whereby all of them and ourselves come together to look at the cultural ideas that are emerging and to take decisions as to which ones we want to go with. We then literally say, say there’s an event like the Orange Evolution Festival, we look at that, it’s a music festival, the Arts Council is committed to it because it’s delivering new musicians in the region. It’s largely Newcastle although also Gateshead and two other local authorities will fund it. Northern Rock foundation might get involved in some of the outreach activities and the RDA will see it’s tourism benefit because it’s quite high profile and a lot of marketing.

The story of Culture10 presented above is therefore the story of the continuity of the local regime. The argument for continuity is strengthened by a further example which runs in parallel to the story of Culture10, which is the longevity of cross-river cooperation. This co-operation was reflected in the way the two councils dealt with the failure to secure ECoC 2008 and how the partnership thrived in the face of political changes in Newcastle. All of the interviewees commented on the longer term prospects for the Culture10 programme, the partnership between the two Authorities, and further partnership work with other agencies. As an elected member of GMBC commented the ‘shock’ to the regime of losing ECoC to Liverpool made little or no difference to the cultural policy partnership in place across the region:

‘One of the good things about the Capital of Culture and I think that this is a real credit to the region is that in reality, not succeeding in securing the title has made relatively little difference to the programme of what we were planning to deliver and in fact the fairly routed strategy around the legacy of the bid has meant that politically there is a joint sign up to that and the change in administration really I think hasn’t weakened that.’

The reference to the change of administration reflects a key event for the cultural policy regime in NewcastleGateshead. The common theme discussed by all of the regime theories in Chapter 3 is longevity, particularly the need for the regime to survive changes in personnel or institutions (Stone 2005, Downing et al 1999). Whereas this clearly did not take place in Liverpool, in the case of NewcastleGateshead there are two pieces of evidence for the long term character of the cultural policy regime a) the loss/change of key personnel had little effect on the partnership and b) the change of administration in NCC, from Labour to Liberal Democrat in 2004 did not affect the continuity of the regime. A former ACNE employee showed how as some personnel left, others from the region took their place as part of the different organisations involved in the regime:

‘Jane Robinson who was Deputy Chief Executive at Northern Arts is now Deputy Chief Executive at Gateshead. Paul Rubenstein who is Deputy Chief Executive at Northern Arts and he is now Assistant Chief Executive at Newcastle so the three of us have gone from being in Northern Arts to being in the Local Authority Sector’

Another interviewee, a NCC officer, sums up the effects of the political changes and how it made little or no difference to the running of the regime:

‘Actually it didn’t change that much and one of the reasons was because the Liberals are committed to it. Generally there’s quite a sort of mature relationship between the politicians....completely committed to culture and the arts so it’s not really been an issue. It’s kind of been business as usual’

And when interviewees, in this case an official from the cultural sector, mentioned initial concerns for the relationship the subsequent years proved that the infrastructure and institutional arrangements around Culture10, the NGI and the cross river partnership were robust enough to continue:

‘So one of the interesting things is that I’m sure you’re aware of is that there was a very shaky time for NGI, for this whole enterprise of joint working across the two authorities, all focused on culture and tourism when.... Labour lost control of Newcastle City Council. Now that was sort of very, very touch and go for a couple of weeks the rhetoric was ‘oh yes, of course we’ll carry on working together’ but there was real concern that would they be able to do it, because it’s one thing to have two Labour controlled authorities choosing to club together and do things together but to have Lib Dem controlled authority and a Labour controlled authority? What I think is a measure of, the, the power of, of what’s been happening is that they chose to overcome their political differences and carry on working together’

These final quotations capture the interaction between cultural policy regime and local institutions perfectly. This administrative aspect of the narrative draws on Robinson and Shaw’s (2003) discussion of governance in the North East, whereby the transition of regional cohesiveness and the close

knit nature of senior appointments, where local officials moved from arts administration into local government, shows how cultural policy had become embedded in the working practices of the two local authorities. This unites the formal organisation of the cultural policy regime at NGI with the informal institutions in the region that were receptive to cultural policy's prominence on the regional policy agenda. In terms of the literature on regime theory the post-ECoC bid years are similar to Chapter 3's discussions of environmental policy's place in local governance, where writers like While *et al*'s (2004), Jonas and Gibbs (2003) and Gibbs and Jonas (2000) sought to construct narratives of how environmental policies take a place as part of local regimes. The long term use of cultural policy on Tyneside, set out in this Chapter and in Chapter 5, allied to the other local institutions such as those described by Robinson and Shaw (2003) and Lancaster (1992; 2003) explain the robustness of cultural policy and account for its prominent role in the governing coalition between NCC, GMBC and the other regional NDPBs. In point of fact cultural policy's influence extended existing partnership trends as a Housing Market Renewal Pathfinder, *Bridging NewcastleGateshead*, began in 2002 and by the end of the research period there were moves to reaffirm the two authorities' commitment to joint initiatives, as 2007 saw the creation of a City Development Company and a new Gateshead and Newcastle partnership.

Understanding Newcastle-Gateshead as a cultural policy regime: the role of the regional Arts Council (2000-2006)

As the previous sections have show the longevity of the regime and its position in relation to local institutions such as history and culture gives a sense of the type of governance settlement on Tyneside. The conclusion to the previous section's discussion of the type of staff transfer and closed elite

in Newcastle and Gateshead is also evidence towards the thesis' claim that the urban regime on the Tyne can be explained by reference to local institutions. One question remains to be addressed: Why a *cultural* policy regime? Although Chapter 3 has specified the exact derivation of this framework, and the limitations of its use, the narrative of cultural policy in Newcastle and Gateshead fleshes out the concept in practice.

The thesis has consistently suggested that Newcastle-Gateshead is unusual in regime theory literature (although not unique e.g. Basset 1994, Griffiths 1993) as it is explicitly concerned with cultural policy. Although the policy area is unusual, what is most striking about the governing coalition on Tyneside is presence, and prominent role, of the Arts Council. The Arts Council's role is in contrast to the position usually accorded to the private sector and business by accounts of local regimes (Ward 1996; 2003). Chapter 5's contention as to the importance of the Arts Council in the region can be reiterated by looking at its place within the regime in more detail. This detail is what makes the framework of a cultural policy regime the most appropriate lens through which to view Newcastle and Gateshead. It also directly relates the type of governance practice on the Tyne to local context. As the subsequent section shows, ACNE was one of the 'dominant' players in the local regime. As the example in Liverpool and Chapter 2's discussion of the evolution of cultural policy in the UK has shown, regional Arts Council's had usually been peripheral to local government policy making, save for specific and limited examples in the 1990s (Basset 1993, Grey 2002). The narrative in Liverpool certainly indicates that even as the city pursued a major cultural policy objective, it did not cultivate the kind of relationship that existed between the North East's local authorities and Northern Arts. Discussions with interviewees showed the importance of

ACNE to cross-river governance and its influence on policy making and agenda setting. Although there is dispute over the *extent* of the Arts Council's importance, it is unquestionably a powerful actor within the local regime, to the extent that its presence allows the case study of NewcastleGateshead to be described as a cultural policy regime.

Initially it is important to understand the debates over the role of ACNE. On the one hand a narrative drawn from an interviewee from a local cultural organisation stressed the importance of Northern Arts in convincing other organisations, particularly NCC of the centrality of the cultural agenda:

'The three men who ran Northern Arts while I was there Peter Stark, Peter Hewitt, and Andrew Dixon, I think, were very good in helping to develop a wider arts infrastructure and a more open hearted artistic community. I think they were good people and they did a very good job and they were in a position where they could do that. I think they fought constantly with the city council, and the city council, you know, the city council lost'

On the other, the divisive nature of the differing views of ACNE's involvement in cultural policy was expressed by a range of interviewees from outside the extended association of current and former ACNE/Northern Arts employees. Elected members and officials from NCC and GMBC offered a contrasting perspective, recognising the importance of the Arts Council but downplaying the grand claims offered in the previous paragraphs. One local authority official, from GMBC, rejected the idea that ACNE had an 'agenda setting' role:

'Actually our relationship with The Arts Council is that they are there to be supportive, they are in partnership, they provide us with a

fantastic amount of training and backup but they don't set policy because that's not appropriate and that's what our council does'

And a leading figure from the cultural sector talked very openly about the limits to the role of the Arts Council in setting the agenda in the North East:

'Please God, do not take from Arts Council apparatchiks that somehow or other they invented something which changed views overnight about culture in the North East, that's a very thin argument to put in what is a very complex situation'

The consensus on the role of the Arts Council fell between these two views. The relationship between the local authorities and the arts council was one of partnership, where the Arts Council could be influential as a result of their resources and the working relationship that had developed as part of the regime. The Arts Council were not a policy *making* organisation, but rather they were able to shape policy outcomes as a result of close working relationships, which became especially well-developed during the period of Lottery funded capital programmes and the ECoC 2008 bid. Local authority interviewees, in this case a GMBC officer, gave voice to this consensus with a more nuanced reflection of the role of ACNE, one tinged with realism about the influence of funding, as well as the influence ACNE in terms of policy and the region's agenda:

'I think it would be disingenuous not to be honest and say things like the Lottery have had a substantial influence. The need for us to be mates with The Arts Council in order to benefit from the lottery focuses the mind somewhat. We don't always agree with the way they work or their policies but again in the same way that Newcastle and Lib Dem councillors and Gateshead is under Labour, we have to

find ways of making things work and to accentuate the positive rather than the differences and it's scratchy at times....there have been fairly fundamental disagreements at both major and minor level with them but we've have never had a breakdown in the relationship'

The type of working relationship between the local authorities and the Arts Council suggested by the quotation provides a link to the way ACNE was seen as a vitally important part of the governance regime by all interviewees, even those who were sceptical of the kind of narrative put forward by ACNE employees. One such narrative is in the quotation below, taken from an interview with a former ACNE employee who went on to work for NGI during the bid, who argued the ACNE was the 'centrepiece' of a range of policies which brought Newcastle and Gateshead together:

'So it was entirely natural in the context of the North East for the Arts Council to be driving the economic regeneration agenda because it had been the centrepiece of that for many years. As a consequence of the Year of Visual Arts and the Case for Capital that relationship of the Arts Council was there, the major councils sitting round the table and plotting the future of the North East was well rooted'

This Chapter, and Chapter 5, have consistently argued that the longstanding role of the regional Arts Council is a basis for the cultural policy regime, reflecting the institutional position that cultural policy took in the years leading up to the ECoC 2008 bid. This position continued into the bid for ECoC 2008 and after, as narratives of the role of ACNE suggest. The quotation below, although taken from an interview with a former ACNE official, emphasises the importance of the long-term developments

underlying the position of cultural policy in the region, as well as regional co-operation:

‘It was fairly heavily involved in the Capital of Culture bid. It was decided that we would go for a joint bid, so we identified the Newcastle Gateshead Initiative as being the body that would take forward the bid process in itself but obviously a part of that and I think it is important to say *Capital of Culture was more broad than just an arts agenda and so there were a number of different organisations playing into that* so I think there was an important sense of developing what the programme would be but also committing funding and supporting that ongoing commitment even after the Capital of Culture bid didn’t go ahead. So that sense of let’s find ways of pulling together a kind of £25 million programme which involves commitment from the Arts Council, from the Regional Development Agency, from Northern Rock, from the two councils.’

And further quotations, from the same interviewee, are representative of the Arts Council’s role in bringing in other NDPBs and the rest of the North East into the bid, within the formal framework of NGI:

‘Because we wanted to get the region behind the bid and we were getting regional money from the North East and from other partners like Northern Rock, it was very important that we got the rest of the region in because The Arts Council was the regional body; Northern Arts was the regional body. I helped with the championing in Tees Valley and in other parts of the region. There was no doubt about it there was buying from quite a lot of the region, not all but quite a lot, to the bid’

Finally the position of the Arts Council and the background of long term cultural policy development is concluded by a quotation that makes reference to the type of local institutions which this thesis proposes are crucial in understanding how local cultural policy is made. The character of the North East, its specific politics and the position of cultural policy on Tyneside is all continued within this comment from an ACNE official:

'I think it does. The Newcastle region is the smallest region. We are much closer to the political sector here. Northern Arts is seen as a really major player in the region. A voice that is listened to. We'd led this capital strategy to put right the hundreds of years underinvestment in capital facilities. We delivered big style on that, on those new cultural facilities. The region was very trusting of us as an agency to champion things and to comment.

One of the projects that brought GMBC and ACNE together can be used as a case study to move beyond the disputes between interviewees from the local authorities and interviewees from the Arts Council. The development of the Baltic flour mill into an 'art factory' (Miles 2004 Bailey *et al* 2004) on the bank of the Tyne is an appropriate way to conclude the discussion of ACNE's role within the cultural policy regime, and also to give a final illustration of how ACNE's involvement differentiates NewcastleGateshead from other areas. Although the Baltic saw management and curatorial difficulties towards the end of this thesis' research period, the construction of the gallery gives an excellent case study of the relationship between GMBC and the Arts Council in the region. For the Baltic, which opened in 2002, a partnership between GMBC and the Arts Council developed, a partnership that would go on to feed into the cross-river co-operation, NGI's marketing of the area, the ECoC 2008 bid and the

Culture10 programme. The narrative surrounding the Baltic did not contain the same level divergence of opinion over the role of ACNE and shows the relative positions of local authority and cultural administrators in practice. In putting forward the case for the importance of ACNE an ACNE official felt it had been the ‘mover and shaker’ behind the eventual transformation of The Baltic flour mill:

‘So we were very active players. We were giving birth to things. Again people are quite surprised by this story. When you are talking about The Baltic there was a blank sheet of paper and a derelict building. We had to create not just a gallery. We had to create an institution. A board, an organisation, a new body. We had to give birth to it and help it develop its policy and its focus. Less so as Gateshead because there was an orchestra and Folkworks there but nevertheless we were steering the direction that the project went’

Whilst a regional arts officer described the way that the process was a partnership between the two bodies, each bringing its own resources to bear on the shared aim of creating a new contemporary art space, which in turn lead to more projects and further partnership:

‘In a way Northern Arts made the statement we need the gallery and we need a contemporary art gallery. Gateshead came in with the building and were hugely responsible in implementing that project. They led it, they project managed it. They gave huge support to The Baltic. What then happened was the main feasibility study on The Baltic when it came in said it was a really fantastic project but not feasible. At this point everybody was so excited about doing this project we said it wasn’t good enough. The reason it wasn’t feasible

was two things. One it needed half a million pounds revenue funding a year and secondly it needed a bridge to get people to it. The deal was done that if it was going to happen the Arts Council had to find a way of supporting the revenue in its opening years and Gateshead had to find a way of delivering a bridge which they did.'

The Baltic is where the cultural policy regime can be seen in practice, along with projects like Dance City discussed in the earlier sections of this Chapter. The role of ACNE is the area of demarcation for a cultural policy regime, showing the central involvement of a 'cultural' body, as opposed to either business, property development or more 'traditional' policy actors, such as those drawn from education or health (Stone 2006). This cultural policy regime would not have emerged without the appropriate context and sympathetic local institutions. These factors help to understand how a cultural policy regime is the right way to narrate the Newcastle Gateshead bid for ECoC 2008, a narration grounded in the specificity of locality. By contrast the usefulness of Liverpool is as a stark counter-example of how local conditions can militate against the development of a local regime, even where a particular agenda, in this case cultural policy, is at the centre of a given locality's schemes.

Conclusion

This Chapter has served as a summation of the arguments put forward in this thesis. By using NewcastleGateshead in direct comparison with Liverpool the Chapter has depicted the usefulness of the cultural policy regime framework as well as explaining that framework with institutionalist theory. The narrative of how the ECoC 2008 bid emerged from broader trends within the region, shaped by underlying institutional tendencies, has

been clearly depicted by the individual examples of local context and the NGI. These broader trends also help to explain the formalised nature of the bid for ECoC 2008, as opposed to Liverpool's more *ad hoc* methods. The formal place of NGI within the governing coalition is an obvious point of demarcation with Liverpool, as the stability within the region manifested itself in secure governance arrangements, secure arrangements once again reflecting local institutions. This is in direct opposition to Liverpool's narrative, where the 'Liverpool way' of politics and administration, along with the impact of a long term lack of interest and capacity for cultural policy, were the roots of the Culture Company and its associated governance problems. The importance of locality is also a factor in the longevity of cross river co-operation based on cultural policy, which is essential to the years following 2003, when Liverpool was awarded ECoC 2008. As the analysis of Culture10 and the change of administration in Newcastle reveals the NewcastleGateshead coalition fulfils one of the main criteria for an urban regime, as the policy agenda continued despite the changes of personnel and the shifts of power within the partner organisations. Finally the specific policies of the regime, as well as the high profile involvement of the Arts Council in the region give the regime its distinctly cultural character, a character that is at the root of this thesis' interest in the two case study areas.

Chapter 8

CONCLUSION

'Russ thinks this is another kind of history. He thinks they will carry something out of here that joins them all in a rare way, that binds them to a memory with protective power. People are climbing lampposts on Amsterdam Avenue, tooting car horns in Little Italy. Isn't it possible that this midcentury moment enters the skin more lastingly than the vast shaping strategies of eminent leaders, generals steely in their sunglasses -- the mapped visions that pierce our dreams? Russ wants to believe a thing like this keeps us safe in some undetermined way. This is the thing that will pulse in his brain come old age and double vision and dizzy spells -- the surge sensation, the leap of people already standing, that bolt of noise and joy when the ball went in. This is the people's history and it has flesh and breath that quicken to the force of this old safe game of ours. And fans at the Polo Grounds today will be able to tell their grandchildren -- they'll be gassy old men leaning into the next century and trying to convince anyone willing to listen, pressing in with medicine breath, that they were here when it happened.'

Don DeLillo *Underworld*

DeLillo's description of New York following the 'shot heard round the world' captures the same sense of place as the quotation from Hunter Thompson that opened the first Chapter of this thesis: both quotations offer a sense that it is only through being in a place, knowing the lived reality and performativity (Butler 1990) of a site that can lay bare the nature of how the

world works. This assertion is as true for DeLillo as it is for the rest of this thesis, as the academic analysis of cultural policy points towards the novelistic truth that place matters. Place matters for a number of reasons, reasons which this thesis has sought to explain and to justify. The principle reason for the importance of place is how it casts the form that global trends take, as they make themselves known at local level. Giving substance to this assertion has been the main thrust of this study's argument, an argument which has been advanced in four stages.

The persuasiveness of the thesis' position begins with the literature from which the research question is derived. Anglo-Saxon research into cultural policy, particularly at a local level has tended to fall into two groups, either seeking to advocate and evaluate or be critical. Although this is a simplification of a range of different authors' positions the division captures the general drift within recent, British, or English speaking, cultural policy research. Often overlooking the role of place, these two main preoccupations have tended to bypass questions of decision making in the UK context, rarely confronting the question of *how*, as opposed to *why*, decisions take a given or specific form. Governance, as understood in political science, has therefore been a peripheral concern to studies of cultural policy. This peripheral position calls for research into this area, in order to chart a course between the Scylla of critical work and the Charybdis of mere evaluation and advocacy. Understanding the process of decision-making adds to these two existing bodies, revealing the nuances of cultural policy as it is enacted in varying localities. This analysis of the existing literature concerned with cultural policy leads to the thesis overall research question: how does local context influence decision making in cultural policy?

A range of possible approaches present themselves when considering how to answer this question, but it is the literature on urban governance which provides the frameworks that most enlighten questions of local policy. Coupled with this is the way that urban studies has experienced a cultural turn over the last twenty years, as scholars have attempted to grasp the importance of cultural policy to a range of urban questions. Two schools of thought are pre-eminent in urban studies, regulation theory and urban regime theory. Regulation theory concentrates on providing explanations for the turn towards cultural policy at local level by connecting local developments, often using data gathered from decision-makers' discourses within policy documents, to wider tendencies within political economy at national, European and global levels. Regime theory on the other hand addresses cultural policy from the point of view of the local, often seeking to understand how partnerships between business and the local state have reconfigured urban spaces along the lines of cultural consumption (Ward 2003). Neither theory is fully sufficient to fulfil this thesis' aims, as political economy approaches concentrate on the wrong scale for the thesis' investigation (Jessop 1997), whilst regime theories focus on the specific relationship between local administration and business (Stone 1989). However recent developments within regime theory including Dowding *et al's* (1999) analysis of local government in London and, particularly, work considering the role of environmental policy in local regimes (Gibbs and Jonas 2000, Pincetl 2003) provide an outline of the framework that is appropriate for understanding the local cultural policy. This framework develops from the analysis of the data collected from semi-structured interviews with key policy makers, into the conception of the cultural policy regime that is at the heart of comprehending the narrative of cultural policy

in Newcastle and Gateshead, as well as providing a framework for studying Liverpool.

Explaining the development, or stagnation, of a cultural policy regime requires more than the narrative framework derived from urban regime theory. This is where the thesis fuses work from urban studies with theories from political science, theories which provide compelling explanations for the narrative of the cultural policy regime. Political science offers a range of tools to interrogate the narratives of the cultural policy regime. The two most appropriate stem from new institutionalism and the interpretive approach. Institutional theories are useful because they concentrate on how the 'rules of the game' (Lowndes 2005:279) within a given organisation, policy sector or locality function to influence decision making and policy outcomes. Institutionalism is appropriate because it is a theory which shines a spotlight on the effect of locality, particularly a locality's culture and history, tying into the thesis' concern with the importance of specificity of place. The interpretive approach guides the thesis' use of institutionalism, guarding against overly structural or deterministic explanations deriving from the institutionalist position by ensuring close attention is paid to individual's narratives and that these narratives are accorded significance in the face of the power of local institutions. The interpretive approach also suggests the main method of data collection, which is the thesis' use of 62 semi-structured interviews, allied with extensive archival research.

To demonstrate how local institutions are powerful in the story of local cultural policy the thesis uses a comparative approach that investigates two cities' bidding for European Capital of Culture 2008, during 2001 to 2005. Liverpool, the eventual winner of ECoC 2008 and Newcastle and

Gateshead are suitable case studies as both embedded ECoC 2008 into their respective cultural policies, albeit in very contrasting ways. The European Capital of culture presents an opportunity to track the trend towards using cultural policy within the contemporary city. This trend has been identified by authors from diverse ideological standpoints such as Landry (2000) and McGuigan (2004) and has been subject to various forms of scrutiny. As Chapters 2 and 3 have illustrated, the scrutiny has taken the form of either critical research deigned to reveal the problematic, uneven and deleterious effects of this cultural turn in urban government; or to engage with these trends via evaluations or advocacy research. As the introduction noted it is always dangerous to distil research positions into characters of the authors' original arguments, although the tendency to evaluative or critical positions is clear within cultural policy studies. By focusing on ECoC 2008 the thesis aims to both supplement and transcend these positions.

Bidding for ECoC is part of the emergence of culture on the agenda of the contemporary British city, an emergence which is intertwined with localities' responses to deindustrialisation and the post-Fordist world. The case studies have sought to fulfil the aims of the thesis in proving how these responses owe as much to local influences as to global pressures. The example of NewcastleGateshead showed a *pro-active* cultural policy that gave the city a transformed riverbank, a set of major attractions in the form of new cultural facilities, as well as a way of reasserting local culture and identity (Miles 2004; 2005b). In Liverpool's case the more haphazard implementation of a *reactive* cultural policy has shown how cultural policy is not always strategic, reflecting the deeper uncertainties in a local administration shaped by local history and culture.

The political issues surrounding Liverpool ECoC 2008 can be seen as a result of the types of institutional arrangement that developed alongside the organisations used to bid for and deliver ECoC 2008. The first is represented by the centralising of decisions and power over ECoC 2008. Centralisation is a common theme in public discussions of the reforms that took place in LCC during the late 1990s and the governance arrangement of ECoC 2008 is a continuation of this institutional culture. These governance issues stemmed from the centralisation of decision-making in the hands of the LCC's then Leader and Chief Executive. Whilst this was an exceptionally effective and flexible governance model for bidding, the continuation of this tendency, and its manifestation in the arrangements surrounding the Culture Company, were a crucial constraint for policy actors. This reflects the type of personalised power-politics described by 'the Liverpool way', the constraining institution on governance arrangements in the city.

The second institution is the LCC's lack of capacity surrounding art and culture. It must be noted how the institutional bias away from art and culture that existed within the LCC before the ECoC 2008 policy began does not appear to have been vastly transformed by the ECoC experience. This institutional disinterest meant there were no organisational structures to bring the LCC into partnership with the city's art and culture community, following the initial coalition surrounding the bid for ECoC 2008. This lack of institutional interest, coupled with the centralising tendency within the LCC and the governance arrangements for ECoC 2008 are at the root of the issues that have plagued the build up to Liverpool's ECoC 2008.

On Tyneside the narrative is reflects the importance of local institutions in the same way as Liverpool, but the resulting cultural policy is very different. The bid for ECoC 2008 gave the local authorities in

Newcastle and Gateshead the opportunity to put aside their traditional enmity and create a governing coalition based on cultural policy, spurred on by the ECoC 2008 bid. The role of the cultural sector and the importance of cultural policy to the local authorities' partnership justifies the thesis' description of the area as a cultural policy regime, a concept that builds on and extends recent research in regime theory. This cultural policy regime did not occur in isolation, just as the ECoC 2008 bid was not a snap decision taken by any one individual. Rather the institutions on Tyneside, such as the cohesiveness of the regions' political class; the tradition of partnership and co-operation at regional level between local political organisations; the importance of representation of local culture; and the long term growth of cultural policy programmes, especially in Gateshead, were receptive and amenable to the growth of cross river partnership. The longevity of the cultural agenda, despite the ECoC 2008 title going to Liverpool is connected with the political stability in the region and the institutions formed by the region's history and culture. This longevity showed little sign of floundering, despite changes of personnel and council administrations.

Reflections on this study and paths for further research

Several of the authors (Harding 1997, Jones and Ward 1998) discussed in Chapter 3's review of the potential frameworks for studying urban governance touched on the possibility of synthesizing micro and macro urban theories. When considered separately macro theories maybe to be too generalised, whilst there is a danger that micro theories fall into the trap of methodological localism. However there is a role for macro theories in fully contextualising local cultural policy. For example Harding (1999), Imbroscio (1998) and Quilley and Ward (1999) have all attempted to synthesise regulationist approaches with the urban regime theory at the heart

of this thesis. Although subject to intense scrutiny (and justified criticism from Davies 2003) these endeavours to connect global, structural explanations with narratives of the lived reality of local agency open a point of reflection on the work presented within this study's enquiry.

The focus in this study has been on the micro level, exploring the influence of locality on cultural policy, as a result of the peripheral place that the local occupies in current research. The use of regime theory has proved to be the appropriate framework for arriving at narratives of cultural policy in the two case studies, narratives which have laid bare the importance of local institutions in constructing the patterns taken by local manifestation of the cultural turn in urban life. Whilst these local, institutional, explanations buttressing the use of regime theory have made the thesis' central point clear, they may benefit from being reconnected with global trends in a more direct way, particularly as the prospect of global recession impacts on funding for cultural projects and policy. Although the thesis has not concentrated on macro, global-structural explanations for cultural policy there is potential for further work to connect the two approaches. Given that the thesis has approached cultural policy from the scale of locality, the task of supplementing existing approaches is then one of bringing back global, structural expatiations into the narrative of local cultural policy. This task maybe completed by looking into two areas for further research: into the aims of the governing coalitions discussed by this study; and recent practical developments within cultural policy.

The aims of the governing coalitions were not examined in any great detail by this thesis, as the thesis sought to give a detailed explanation of decision-making in the two case study areas and there is also existing research in this area (e.g. Cochrane *et al* 1996, Jones and Wilks-Heeg 2004).

An exploration of the aims of the two governing coalitions may give weight to the thesis' proposal of the importance of local institutions to cultural policy making. The aims of the two sites governing coalitions are an obvious way to connect the localist research presented by this thesis with global narratives of political economy. The research in this thesis may make a further contribution to urban cultural policy by reflecting on the aims of the two coalitions. How these aims vary, across temporal and spatial scales, as well as according to the organisational backgrounds of individual members and participants in the two sites' governance, is a starting point for work that could locate the intersection of local institutions and global political economy within urban cultural policy.

The opportunities presented by a synthesis of political economy and more localist frameworks to understand the aims of the governing coalitions are the first area of possible future research. The second can be found in three recent practical developments that are pertinent to substantiate the possibilities for future research offered by the findings of this study. In the first instance it is necessary to consider the longer term experience of cultural policy in the North East. Second is a 'micro' level local development surrounding cultural policy governance in Liverpool, a development which may prove instructive for those localities participating in the final development, DCMS' proposed competition to find a UK City of Culture.

First, further research is needed in the North East to establish the longer term viability of the cultural policy regime suggested by Chapter 7's analysis. In Stone's (1989) work on Atlanta the regime survived over a series of decades, weathering political and administrative changes. To fully support Chapter 7's assertions it would be apposite to revisit Tyneside's cultural policy in the years leading up to 2013, when the Culture10 programme is due

to come to an end. This will allow for an exploration of how the regime moves forward when the formal partnership may require potential revisions.

The partnership across the Tyne has been shown to have a strongly formal character, a character which offers benefits and potential shortcomings. Further research would be well placed to examine the tension between the partnership of the two local authorities and the need for a more flexible and responsive system, of the kind developed in Liverpool during the ECoC 2008 bid. In particular, the role of the art and cultural sector, which has an ambiguous place in the governing coalition on the Tyne, bears further consideration, especially in light of the role of Liverpool's cultural sector in cultural policy making in the run up to, and subsequent years after, 2008.

Cultural policy in Liverpool presents many possibilities for future research, particularly in regard to ECoC 2008. Initial assessments of the ECoC 2008 in Liverpool have generally been positive (Liverpool Culture Company 2009) although there has been some literature seeking to question the impact of ECoC 2008, in a similar fashion to critical studies of Glasgow (Anderson and Holden 2008). These assessments of ECoC 2008 have continued the trends identified by Chapters 2 and 3, whereby research is evaluative or critical, with only a peripheral place for detailed questions of urban governance. In light of this continued division it is worth noting how cultural policy was being shaped by the transformed relationship between LCC and the city's cultural sector, a relationship grounded in the history and culture of the Liverpool.

Whilst cultural policy in the city derived increasingly from the Culture Company, in 2006, at the very end of the period covered by this

thesis there was a radical change taking place within the cultural sector itself. Traditionally the artistic and cultural sector in Liverpool had been marked by divisions over funding and particular artistic specialisms, especially during the period of ‘managed decline’ of arts funding after the abolition of Merseyside Arts in 1991. However the increasing ‘municipalisation’ of cultural policy within Liverpool, most notably marked by the role of the Culture Company as a funder, policy maker and the institution providing artistic direction for the 2008 festival, sowed the seeds of a realignment of the cultural policy network within the city. In the Liverpool example the arguments over the resignation of the artistic director, Robyn Archer, in July 2006, brought the major artistic and cultural institutions together to form a caucus that would act as a lobbying group in the first instance, then go on to form part of the policy making network surrounding cultural policy in Liverpool. This development, detailed below, fits in with the thesis’ focus on decision-making and is a further example of how understanding decision-making processes through a grasp of local context can generate findings for both academics and practitioners.

LARC (Liverpool Arts Regeneration Consortium)’s foundation is an illustrative case of a creative response to a perceived failure within the governance settlement for culture in Liverpool. Consisting of the ‘Big Eight’ art and cultural institutions in Liverpool- NML, Tate Liverpool, Everyman and Playhouse, FACT, Bluecoat, Royal Liverpool Philharmonic, Unity theatre and Liverpool Biennial. By offering to tie the 2008 programmes developed by its members into the Culture Company’s plans as a replacement for the departed artistic director, LARC and the Culture Company became effectively a very loose public-private partnership for the provision of 2008, similar to some of the arrangements analysed by Berridge

(1996). The evolution of the group was still in its initial phase during the research for this thesis and there were still misgivings raised by individual members. In effect the arts organisations, in the form of LARC, were filling in the gaps created by the City Council's inertia over cultural policy making, much in the way that Chapter 4 outlined how other local organisations had taken up the leadership of cultural policy for Liverpool in the 1980s and 1990s. In effect LARC were beginning to develop policy strategies and research expertise, particularly with the ACE funded THRIVE programme, as a substitute for the City Council's transfer of cultural policy to the Culture Company, whose focus was on the delivery of the 2008 event. At the time of writing it remains to be seen how the relationship between LCC and LARC will develop, following the end of 2008. What this suggests is another alternative path for the type of cultural policy governance outlined by this study, particularly in localities without a strong background in promoting or administering cultural policy (Jayne 2004). The best practice lessons from research into Liverpool's post ECoC 2008 governance and the growing role of the cultural sector maybe especially pertinent in light of DCMS' proposals for a UK City of Culture programme.

In July 2009 Phil Redmond, who, in 2007 became a leading figure in Liverpool's ECoC, launched DCMS' UK City of Culture programme. The City of Culture was realised as a way of building on Liverpool's success as ECoC 2008, by applying the same rigours of competition to find a city that could use the Liverpool experience of ECoC 2008 to generate 'step change' (DCMS 2009:2) in their locality. The City of Culture programme is expected to bring a range of benefits to the host city, including marketing benefits, the opportunity for a cultural programme and the chance to enjoy the social and economic benefits of hosting a major cultural event, including private

sponsorship and leveraging public funds (DCMS 2009). Government policy is therefore looking to promote the type of local cultural policy used by Liverpool and NewcastleGateshead in their bids for ECoC 2008. It is hoped the aims of the research detailed in this thesis will provide a reference point for understanding how future cultural policy programmes, such as the UK's City of Culture, may play out at local level, by learning the importance of locality and place in shaping cultural policy.

The thesis began with four aims: to show an understanding of the local can reveal the reality of global trends; to show how methods from outside cultural policy studies can help with this revelation; to inform both cultural policy and urban studies; and to begin the path towards further research. Throughout the thesis these four aims have been realised by an in depth look inside the 'black box' (Smith *et al* 1993) of cultural policy making within English local authorities. Looking in detail at decision-making processes shows how local culture and history acts on governing coalitions' structures and policy makers' actions to produce differing governance outcomes, outcomes which impact on how cultural policy is realised in English cities. The evidence of the power of local institutions in Liverpool and on Tyneside represents another layer for the understanding of how the narratives of the cultural turn have become reality in the practice of local policy makers, supplementing existing research and creating fresh possibilities within the emerging field of cultural policy studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abu-Laban, B. (1965) 'The reputational approach in the study of community power' *Pacific Sociological Review*, 8(1), 35-42

ACGB (1984) *Glory of the Garden*, London: Arts Council of Great Britain.

ACGB (1985) *A Great British Success Story*. London: Arts Council of Great Britain.

ACGB (1989) *An Urban Renaissance: 16 Case Studies Showing the Role of Arts in Regeneration*, London: Arts Council of Great Britain.

ACE (2002) *Beyond Boundaries: The Arts After the Events of 2001*, London: Arts Council of England.

ACE (2003) *Ambitions for the Arts, 2003-2006*. London: Arts Council of England.

ACE (2005) 'Social Stratification of Cultural Consumption', *Cultural Trends* 14(3) 213-216

Atkinson, H. and Wilks-Heeg, S. (2000) *Local Government from Thatcher to Blair: The Politics of Creative Autonomy*, Cambridge: Polity Press

Aitkinson, R. (1999) 'Discourses of Partnership and empowerment in Contemporary British Urban Regeneration' *Urban Studies*, 16(1), 59-72

Aligica, P. (2006) 'Institutional and stakeholder mapping' *Public Organisation Review*, 6(1), 79-90

- Anderson, B. and Holden, A. (2008) 'Affective Urbanism and the Event of Hope' *Space and Culture*, 11(2), 142-159
- Anton, T. (1963) 'Power Pluralism and Local politics' *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 7(4), 425-457
- Arnold, M. (1993) *Culture and Anarchy and Other Writings*, S. Collini (ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Audit Commission (2006) *Liverpool cultural services inspection report* London: Audit Commission
- Baldry, H. (1981) *The case for the Arts* London: Seker and Warburg
- Ball, S. (2008) 'New philanthropy, new networks and new governance in education'. *Political Studies*, 56(4), 747-65
- Bailey, C. (2000) 'Audiences, artists and the cultural economy: Reflecting on the experience of visual arts UK' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 7(1), 171 — 196
- Bailey, C. (2006) *Cultural values and culture led regeneration—the case of Newcastle-Gateshead*. Retrieved 10th May 2009 from web site: http://www.fokus.or.at/fileadmin/fokus/user/downloads/acei_paper/Bailey.doc
- c
- Bailey, C., Miles, S. and Stark, P. (2004). 'Culture led urban regeneration and the revitalisation of identities in Newcastle, Gateshead and the North East of England' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(1), 47 — 65
- Bassett, K. (1993) 'Urban cultural strategies and urban regeneration: a case study and critique' *Environment and Planning A*, 25 (12), 1773-1788

- Bassett, K. (1996) 'Partnerships, Business Elites and Urban Politics: New Forms of Governance in an English City?' *Urban Studies*, 33(3), 539-555
- Bassett, K., Griffiths, R. and Smith, I. (2002a) 'Cultural industries, cultural clusters and the city: the example of natural history film-making in Bristol' *Geoforum*, 33(2), 165–177
- Bassett, K., Griffiths, R. and Smith, I. (2002b) 'Testing Governance: Partnerships, Planning and Conflict in Waterfront Regeneration', *Urban Studies*, 39(10), 1757 – 1775
- BBC (2003) 'Liverpool named capital of culture' Retrieved 14th August 2009 from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/entertainment/2959944.stm>
- Beaumont, P. (2005) 'Culture and regeneration in Gateshead' Paper presented at CityScape IV Rijeka, June 2005. Retrieved 14th August 2009 from http://www.nerip.com/reports_briefing.aspx?id=28
- Belchem, J. (2000) *Merseypride: Essays in Liverpool Exceptionalism* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press
- Belchem, J. (ed) (2006) *Liverpool 800 Culture, Character, History*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press
- Belchem J. (2007) 'The new Liverpool: history, culture and identity on Merseyside' In Ehland C. (Ed.). *Thinking Northern: Textures of Identity in the North of England*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.
- Belfiore, E. (2002) 'Art as a means of alleviating social exclusion' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8(1), 91-106

Belfiore E. (2004) *Methodological challenges of cross national research*
Warwick: Centre for Cultural Policy Studies

Bennett, O. (2005) 'Beyond Machinery: The Cultural Policies of Matthew
Arnold' *History of Political Economy* 37(3), 455-482

Bennett, T. (1992) 'Putting policy into cultural policy studies' in Grossber,
L., Nelson, C. and Treicher, P. (eds) *Cultural Studies* London: Routledge

Bennett, T. (2000) 'Acting the Social' *American Behavioural Scientist*,
43(9), 1412-1428

Ben-Tovim, G. (2003) 'Futures for Liverpool' in Munck, R. (ed) *Reinventing
the City? Liverpool in Comparative Perspective*. Liverpool: Liverpool
University Press

Berridge, V. (1996) *AIDS in the UK: The making of a policy 1981-1994*
Oxford: Oxford University Press

Bevir, M. (2005) 'Interpretation and its Others (with R.A.W. Rhodes)'
Australian Journal of Political Science. 40(2) 169-187

Bevir, M. and Rhodes R. (2003a) *Interpreting British Governance*, London:
Routledge

Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. (2003b) 'Searching for patterns of civil society'
Public Administration 81(1) 41-62

Bevir, M. and Rhodes, R. (2006) 'Interpretive Approaches to British
Government and Politics' *British Politics* 1(1), 84-112

Bianchini, F.(1989a) *Urban Renaissance? The Arts and the Urban Regeneration Process in 1980s Britain*. Centre for Urban Studies Working Paper No.7. Liverpool: University of Liverpool.

Bianchini, F (1989b) 'Cultural policy and Urban Social Movements: The response of the New Left in Rome (1976-85) and London (1981-86) in Bramham, P., Henry, I., Mommaas, H. and van der Poel, H. *Leisure and Urban Processes* London: Routledge

Bianchini, F (1990) 'Urban Renaissance? The Arts and the Urban Regeneration Process' in McGregor, S. and Pimlott, B. *Tackling the Inner Cities* Oxford: Clarendon Press

Bianchini, F.(1999). 'The relationship between cultural resources and tourism policies for cities and regions'. In Dodd, D and van Hemel, A (eds) *Planning Cultural Tourism in Europe*, Amsterdam: Boekmanstichting.

Bianchini, F. (2001) *The relationship between cultural resources and urban tourism policies* Glasgow: University of Glasgow

Bianchini, F. (1993) 'Remaking European cities: the role of cultural policies' in Bianchini, F. and Parkinson, M. (eds) *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Bianchini, F. and Parkinson, M. (1993) 'Liverpool city of missed opportunities' in Bianchini, F. and Parkinson, M. (eds) *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Biggs, B. (2007) 'Welcome to the pleasure dome art in Liverpool 1988-1999' in Grunenberg, C. and Knifton, R. (2007) *Liverpool centre of the creative universe: Liverpool and the avant garde* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press pp 182-201

Boland, P. (2008) 'The construction of images of people and place: Labelling Liverpool and stereotyping scousers'. *Cities: The International Journal of Urban Policy and Planning*, 25 (6) 355-369

Bonet, L. (2003) 'Cultural Tourism' in Towse, R. *A handbook of cultural economics* Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing

Booth, P. and Boyle, R. (1993) 'See Glasgow, see culture' in Bianchini, F. and Parkinson, M. (eds), *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: The West European Experience*, Manchester University Press: Manchester

Bowen, P. (1999) *A gallery to play to: The story of the Mersey poets* Exeter: Stride publications

Boyle, M. (1997) 'Civic boosterism in the politics of local economic development- 'institutional positions' and 'strategic orientations' in the consumption of hallmark events' *Environment and Planning A*, 29(11), 1975-1997

Boyle, M. and Hughes, G. (1994) The politics of urban entrepreneurialism in Glasgow *Geoforum*, 25(4), 453-470

Bramwell, B. (1997) 'Strategic planning before and after a mega-event' *Tourism Management*, 18(3) 167-176

Briggs, C. (1994) *Learning how to ask*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Brown, A. (1998) *Music policy in Sheffield, Manchester and Liverpool* retrieved 10th July 2009 from <http://www.e-space.mmu.ac.uk/e-space/handle/2173/12468>

Burnham, A. (2009) 'Andy Burnham's speech to University of Liverpool: five lessons from Liverpool's year as capital of culture' retrieved 10th July from http://www.culture.gov.uk/reference_library/minister_speeches/6182.aspx/

Burnham, P., Gilland, K., Grant, W. and Layton-Henry, Z. (2004) *Research Methods in politics* London: Palgrave Macmillan

Butler, J (1990) *Gender Trouble* London: Routledge

Cameron, S. (2003) 'Gentrification, housing redifferentiation and urban regeneration: 'Going for growth' in Newcastle upon Tyne' *Urban Studies*, 20 (12), 2367-2382.

Carey, J. (2005) *What good are the arts?* London: Faber and Faber

Castells, M. (2000). *The rise of the network society* Oxford: Blackwell.

Carspecken P. and Miller, H. (1985) 'The campaign to save Croxteth Comprehensive' *Critical Social policy*, 5(13), 93-102

Carmichael, P. (1993) 'Political strategy and public finance in Liverpool' *Local Government Studies*, 19 (3), 387 - 407

Chaney, D. (1990) 'Subtopia in Gateshead: The MetroCentre as a Cultural Form' *Theory Culture Society*, 7(4), 49-68

Chatterton, P. and Hollands, R. (2001) *Changing our 'Toon': Youth, Nightlife and Urban Change in Newcastle*. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: University of Newcastle Press.

Coaffee, J. (2008) 'Sport, culture and the modern state: emerging themes in stimulating urban regeneration in the UK' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 14(4), 377 — 397

Coaffee, J. and Healey, P. (2003) 'My Voice: My Place': Tracking Transformations in Urban Governance' 40(10), 1979-1999

Cochrane, A. (2006a) *Understanding urban policy: a critical introduction* Oxford: Blackwell

Cochrane, A. (2006b) 'Making up Meanings in a Capital City: Power, Memory and Monuments in Berlin' *European Urban and Regional Studies* 13 (1): 5–24

Cochrane, A. (2006c) '(Anglo)phoning Home from Berlin: a Response to Alan Latham' *European Urban and Regional Studies* 13 (4): 371–376

Cochrane A., Peck, J., and Tickell, A. (1996) 'Manchester plays games' *Urban Studies*, 33 (8), 1319-1336

Cogliandro, G. & Reading, V. (2000). *European Cities of Culture for the Year 2000. A wealth of urban cultures for celebrating the turn of the century*. Brussels: European Commission.

Coleman, R. (2004) *Reclaiming the Streets: Surveillance, Social Control and the City*. Collompton: Willan Publishing

- Couch, C. (2003) *City of Change and Challenge: Urban Planning and Regeneration in Liverpool*, Aldershot: Ashgate
- Council of Europe (2005) *Compendium of Cultural Policies and trends in Europe: UK 6th Edition*.
- Cohen, S. (2007) *Decline, Renewal and the City in Popular Music Culture: Beyond the Beatles*, Aldershot: Ashgate.
- Creigh-Tyte, S. and Stiven, G. (2001) 'Why does the government fund the cultural sector?' in *UK Cultural Sector*, Selwood, S (ed) London: PSI
- Crespi-Vallbona, M. and Richards, G. (2007) 'The meaning of cultural festivals' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(1), 103 — 122
- Crick, M. (1986) *The March of Militant* London: Faber and Faber.
- Cross, E., Gilliland, L. and Watson, I. (2005) 'Creating a cultural landscape: A context for the Great North Museum' Paper Presented at the Forum UNESCO University and Heritage 10th International Seminar "Cultural Landscapes in the 21st Century" Newcastle upon Tyne, April 2005.
Retrieved 14th August 2009 from
<http://www.ncl.ac.uk/unescolandscapes/english/papers.php>
- David, M. and Sutton, C. (2004) *Social research- the basics*, London: Sage
- Davies, J. (1988) 'From municipal socialism to ... municipal capitalism?' *Local Government Studies*, 14(2), 19 — 22
- Davies J. (2002) 'The Governance of Urban Regeneration' *Public Administration* 80(2) 301-322

Davies, J. (2003) 'Partnerships versus regimes: Why regime theory cannot explain urban coalitions in the UK' *Journal of urban affairs*, 25(3), 253–269

Davies, J. (2004) 'Conjuncture or Disjuncture? An institutionalist analysis of local regeneration partnership in the UK' *International Journal of Urban and Regional research*, 28(3), 570-585

Davies, J. (2005) 'Local governance and the dialectics of hierarchy, market and network' *Policy Studies*, 26(3), 311 – 335

Davies, S. (1996) *Liverpool Labour: social and political influences on the development of the Labour party in Liverpool 1900-1939* Liverpool, Liverpool University Press

Davoudi, S. and Healey, P. (1994) *Perceptions of City Challenge Policy Processes, The Newcastle Case*, Working Paper No. 45 Newcastle: Department of Town and Country Planning, University of Newcastle upon Tyne

DCMS (1998) *Annual Report* London: DCMS

DCMS (1999) *Policy Action Team 10 Report*, London: DCMS.

DCMS (2000) *Annual Report* London: DCMS

DCMS (2001) *Building on PAT 10: Progress Report on Social Inclusion*, London: DCMS

DCMS (2004) *Culture at the Heart of Regeneration*, London DCMS

DCMS (2007b) *Changing Lives and Places: Lessons from Cultural Pathfinders*, London: DCMS.

DCMS (2008) *Annual Report* London: DCMS

DCMS (2009) UK City of culture 2013: Bidding guidance London: DCMS

Deeg, R. (2001) 'Institutional Change and the Uses and Limits of Path Dependency: The Case of German Finance', MPiFG Discussion Paper 01/6, Köln, Max-Planck-Institut für Gesellschaftsforschung retrieved 10th August 2009 from www.mpifg.de/pu/mpifg_dp/dp01-6.pdf

Deffner, A. and Labrianidis, L. (2005) 'Planning culture and time in a mega-event: Thessaloniki as the European city of culture in 1997', *International Planning Studies*, 10(3), 241 — 264

DeLillo, D. (1999) *Underworld* London: Picador

Denscombe, M. (2003) *The good research guide*, 2nd ed, Maidenhead: Open University Press

Denters, B. and Rose, L. (2005) 'Local Governance in the Third Millennium: a brave new World?' In Denters, B. and Rose, L. (eds) *Comparing Local Governance. Trends and Developments* New York: Palgrave MacMillan

Denters, B. and Mossberger, K. (2006) 'Building Blocks for a Methodology for Comparative Urban Political Research' *Urban Affairs Review*, 41(4), 550-571

DiGaetano, A. (1989) 'Urban political regime formation: a study in contrast' *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 11(3), 261–281

DiGaetano, A. and Strom, E. (2003) 'Comparative Urban Governance: An Integrated Approach' *Urban Affairs Review*, 38(3), 356-395

Diamond, J. and Liddle, J. (2009) 'Regeneration Management and Globalisation: Developing a Synthesis?' *Local Government Studies*, 35(3), 293 — 298

Doughty, S. (2009) 'Why stag and hen parties need to behave in our city' *Newcastle Evening Chronicle* 4th August

Dowding, K. (2001) 'Explaining Urban Regimes' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25(1), 7-19

Dowding, K., Dunleavy, P., King, D., Margetts, H. and Rydin, Y. (1999) 'Regime Politics in London Local Government' *Urban Affairs Review*, 34(4), 515-545

Drummond, B. (2008) 'Liverpool will never let you down' Grunenberg, C. and Knifton, R. (2007) *Liverpool centre of the creative universe: Liverpool and the avant-garde* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press pp 230-235

Duffy, T. (1996) 'the leap frog effect' in Lorente, P (ed) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester

Duke, C., Hassink, R., Powell, J. and Puukka, J. (2006) Supporting the Contribution of Higher Education Institutions to Regional Development. Peer review report: North East of England OECD Directorate for education retrieved 10th August 2009 from <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/16/54/35889695.pdf>

Duncan, S. and Goodwin, M. (1988) *The local state and uneven development* Cambridge: Polity Press

- Du Noyer, P. (2002) *Liverpool: Wondrous Place - Music from Cavern to Cream* London: Virgin Books
- Elcock, H. (1990) 'What values for urban politics?' *Parliamentary Affairs* 43 (3), 384-399
- Elliot, J. (1975) 'T Dan Smith in Newcastle-upon-Tyne' *Local Government Studies*, 1(2), 33-43
- Elliot, J. (2005) *Using Narrative in social research* London: Sage
- ESRC (2006) *Research Ethics Framework* retrieved 21st July 2006 from http://www.esrc.ac.uk/ESRCInfoCentre/Images/ESRC_Re_Ethics_Frame_tm6-11291.pdf
- Evans, B. (2007) 'The Politics of Partnership: Urban Regeneration in New East Manchester' *Public Policy and Administration*, 22(2), 201-215
- Evans, G. (2001a) *Cultural planning: An urban renaissance?* London: Routledge
- Evans, G. (2003) 'Hard-Branding the Cultural City from Prado to Prada' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27(2) 417-440
- Evans, G. (2005) 'Measure for Measure: evaluating the evidence of culture's contribution to regeneration' *Urban Studies*, 42(5/6), 959-985
- Evans, G. and Shaw, P. (2004) *The contribution of culture to regeneration in the UK* London: London Met
- Evans K. (2003) 'The contemporary city: a critical perspective' in Munck, R (Ed.) *Re-inventing the City? Liverpool in Comparative Perspective*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press.

Evans, M. (2001b) Economy of imagination *Locum Destination Review* issue 5

Evans, R. (1996) 'Liverpool's urban regeneration initiatives and the arts: a review of policy development and strategic issues' in Lorente, P. (ed) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester

Evans, R. (2002) 'The Merseyside Objective One Programme: Exemplar of Coherent City-regional Planning and Governance or Cautionary Tale?' *European Planning Studies*, 10(4), 495-517

Ferlie, E., Ashburner, L., FitzGerald, L. and Pettigrew, A. (1996) *The New Public Management in Action* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Finlayson, A. (2004) 'The interpretive approach in political science: a symposium' *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 6(2), 129-164

Finnis, J. (2008) *Excellence, good practice, failure and the McMasters report (oh yea and audiences as well...)* Museums Association conference Liverpool 2008 retrieved 1st July 2009 from

<http://janefinnis.wordpress.com/2008/10/10/excellence-good-practice-failure-and-the-mcmasters-report-oh-yea-and-audiences-as-well%e2%80%a6/>

Fischer, K. (2006) *America in White, Black, and Grey: the stormy 1960s* New York: Continuum

Florida, R. (2002) *The rise of the creative class*, New York: Basic Books

- Foucault, M. (2008) *The birth of bio-politics: Lectures at the college de France 1978-79* London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Gamble, A. (1994) *The free economy and the strong state* London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Gains, F., John, P. and Stoker, G. (2005) 'Path Dependency and the Reform of English Local Government' *Public Administration*, 83(1), 713 - 730
- García, B. (2004a) 'Urban regeneration, arts programming and major events' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(1), 103 — 118
- García, B. (2004b) 'Cultural policy and urban regeneration in Western European cities: lessons from experience, prospects for the future' *Local Economy*, 19(4), 312 — 326
- Garcia, B. (2005) 'Deconstructing the City of Culture' *Urban Studies*, 42(5/6), 841-869
- Garnham, N. (2005) 'From Cultural to Creative Industries' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(1), 15-29
- Gateshead Council (2006) 'The Angel of the North' retrieved 14th August 2009 from:
<http://www.gateshead.gov.uk/DocumentLibrary/Leisure/Leaflets/Angel%20Pack%20small.doc>
- Gathercole S. (2007) 'Facts and factions Liverpool and the avant-garde in the 1960s and 70s' in Grunenberg, C. and Knifton, R. (2007) *Liverpool centre of the creative universe: Liverpool and the avant-garde* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press pp.134-155

Gibbs, D. and Jonas, A. (2000) 'Governance and regulation in local environmental policy: the utility of a regime approach' *Geoforum*, 31(3), 299-313

Gibson, C. and Kong, L. (2005) 'Cultural economy: a critical review' *Progress in Human Geography* 29 (5), 541-561

Gibson, L. and Stevenson, D. (2004) 'Urban space and the uses of culture' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(1), 1 — 4

Giddens, A (1984) *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge: Polity

Gifford, A., Brown W. and Bunday, R. (1989). *Loosen the Shackles: The Report of the Liverpool 8 Inquiry*. London: Karia Press

Gissendanner, S. (2003) 'Methodology problems in urban governance studies'. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy* 21 (5): 663-685

Glancey, J. (2001). Gateshead revisited. Retrieved 1st June, 2009 from *The Guardian*

<http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2001/sep/24/architecture.artsfeature>
s

Goddard, A. (2005) 'Accounting and NPM in UK local government' *Financial Accountability & Management*, 21(2), 191-218

González, S. and Healey, P. (2005) 'A Sociological Institutional Approach to the Study of Innovation in Governance Capacity', *Urban Studies*, 42(11), 2055-2069

- Grafstein, R. (1998) 'The Problem of Institutional Constraint' *The Journal of Politics*, 50(3), 577-599
- Gray, C. (2002) 'Local government and the Arts' *Local Government Studies*, 28(1), 77-90
- Gray, C. (2007) 'Commodification and instrumentality in cultural policy' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 13(2), 203 — 215
- Gray, C. (2008) 'Instrumental policies: causes, consequences, museums and galleries' *Cultural Trends*, 17(4), 209-222
- Grey, M. (1990) 'Dead Aid/Instant Bad Karma by the Mersey: The John Lennon Memorial Concert, Pier Head, Liverpool' *The Times* 7th May
- Green, A. (1996) 'Liverpool City Council and the evolution of the 'Creative Quarter'' in Lorente, P. (ed) (1996) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester
- Green, D. (1981) *Power and party in an English city* London: Allen and Unwin
- Green, M. and Wilding, M. (1970) *Cultural Policy in Great Britain* UNESCO
- Griffiths, B. (2004) *Northern Sinfonia: A magic of its own* Newcastle: Northumbria University Press
- Griffiths, R. (1993) 'The politics of cultural policy in urban regeneration strategies' *Policy and Politics*, 21(1), 39-46
- Griffiths, R. (1995) 'Cultural strategies and new modes of urban intervention' *Cities*, 12(4), 253-265

- Griffiths, R. (2006) 'City/Culture Discourses: Evidence from the Competition to Select the European Capital of Culture 2008' *European Planning Studies*, 14(4), 415-430
- Grunenberg, C. and Knifton, R. (eds) (2007) *Centre of the creative universe: Liverpool and the avant-garde* Liverpool, University of Liverpool Press
- Hall, P. *Cities in civilization* London, Phoenix
- Hamilton, D. (2004) 'Developing regional regimes: a comparison of two metropolitan areas' *Journal of urban affairs*, 26(4), 455-477
- Harding, A. (1991) 'The rise of urban growth coalitions, UK Style?' *Environment and Planning C*, 9(3), 295-317
- Harding, A. (1995) 'Elite Theory and Growth machines' in Judge, D, Stoker, S and Wolman, H (eds) *Theories of Urban Politics* London: Sage
- Harding, A. (1997) 'Urban regimes in a Europe of the cities' *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 4(4), 291-314
- Harding, A. (1999) 'North American Urban Political Economy, Urban Theory and British Research' *British Journal of Political Science*, 29(4), 673-698
- Harvey, D. (1989a) 'From Managerialism to Entrepreneurialism: The Transformation in Urban Governance in Late Capitalism' *Geografiska Annaler. Series B, Human Geography*, Vol. 71(1), 3-17
- Harvey, D. (1989b) 'Down towns' *Marxism Today*, January
- Harvey, D. (2008). 'The right to the city' *New Left Review* , 53 September/October, 23-40

Hastings, A. (1999) 'Discourse and urban change: Introduction to the special issue.' *Urban Studies*, 36(1), 7-12.

Hay, C. (1995) 'Re-Stating the problem of regulation and re-regulating the local state', *Economy and Society*, 24(3), 387 — 407

Hay, C. (2004a) 'Restating politics, re-politicising the state' *The Political Quarterly*, 75(1) 38-50

Hay, C. (2004b) 'The normalizing role of rationalist assumptions in the institutional embedding of neoliberalism', *Economy and Society*, 33(4), 500 — 527

Hay, C. and Wincott, D. (1998) 'Structure, agency and historical institutionalism' *Political Studies*, 46(5), 951-957

Heikkinen, T. (2000) 'In from the margins: The city of culture 2000 and the image transformation of Helsinki' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 6(2), 201-218

Henderson, S., Bowlby, S. and Raco, M. (2007) 'Refashioning Local Government and Inner-city Regeneration: The Salford Experience' *Urban Studies*, 44(8), 1441-1463

Hesmondhalgh, D. (2005) 'Media and cultural policy as public policy', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(1), 95 — 109

Hesmondhalgh, D. and Pratt A. (2005) 'Cultural Industries and Cultural Policy' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11 (1), 1-13

Hewison, R. (1995) *Culture and Consensus: England, Art and Politics Since 1940*, London: Methuen

- Hewitson, D. (2008) *The Liverpool Boys are Back in Town Liverpool: The Bluecoat Press*
- Horan, C. 'Beyond governing coalitions: Analyzing Urban Regimes in the 1990s' *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 13(2), 119-135.
- Hudson, M. and Hawkins, N. (2006) 'A tale of two cities- A commentary on historic and current marketing strategies used by the Liverpool and Glasgow regions' *Place Branding* 2(2) 155–176
- Hughson, J. (2004) 'Sport in the city of culture' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(3), 319 —330
- Hunt, T. (2003). It's good for cities to be at war. Retrieved 1st June, 2009 from *Sunday Times*
<http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/article1059324.ece>
- Hunter, F. (1953) *Community Power Structure*, North Carolina: Chapel Hill
- Imbroscio, D. (1998) 'Reformulating urban regime theory: The Division of Labour between State and Market Reconsidered' *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 20(3), 233-248
- Imbroscio, D. (2003) 'Overcoming the neglect of economics in urban regime theory' *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 25(3), 271–284
- Immergut, E. (1998) 'The Theoretical Core of the New Institutionalism' *Politics & society*, 26(1), 5-34
- Imrie, R. and Raco, M. (1999) 'How new is the new local governance? Lessons from the United Kingdom' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 24(1), 45–63

Jacobson, H. (2006) 'Thanks to our abhorrence of grammar, we have raised a generation of blithering idiots' *The Independent* 1st April

Jacobson, H. (2008) 'Howard Jacobson on the Hallé: How an orchestra changed my life' *The Independent* 11th January

Jayne, M. (2004) 'Culture that works: creative industries development in a working-class city' *Capital and Class*, 84, 199-210.

Jemin, H (2001) *Arts and Social exclusion review* London: Arts Council of England

Jensen, O. (2007) 'Culture stories, understanding cultural urban branding' *Planning theory*, 6(3), 211-236

Jessop, B. (1990) *State Theory* Cambridge: Polity

Jessop, B. (1997a) 'Capitalism and its future' *Review of International political economy*, 4(3), 561-581

Jessop, B. (1997b) 'The entrepreneurial city' in Jewson, N. and Macgregor, S. (eds) *Transforming Cities* London: Routledge

Jessop, B. (2002) 'Governance and Metagovernance: On Reflexivity, Requisite Variety, and Requisite Irony' Lancaster: *Department of Sociology, Lancaster University*. Retived 14th September 2007 from <http://www.lancs.ac.uk/fass/sociology//papers/jessop-governance-and-metagovernance.pdf>.

Jessop, B. and Oosterlynck, S. (2008) 'Cultural political economy: On making the cultural turn without falling into soft economic sociology' *Geoforum* 39(3), 1155–1169

John, P. and Cole, A. (1998) 'Urban Regimes and Local Governance in Britain and France Policy Adaption and Coordination in Leeds and Lille' *Urban Affairs Review*, 33(3), 382-404

John, P. and Cole, A. (2000) 'When Do Institutions, Policy Sectors, and Cities Matter?: Comparing Networks of Local Policy Makers in Britain and France' *Comparative Political Studies*, 33(2), 248-268

Jonas, A. and Gibbs, D. (2003) 'Changing Local Modes of Economic and Environmental Governance in England: A Tale of Two Areas' *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(4), 1018-1037

Jones, M. and Ward, K. (1998) 'Grabbing grants? The role of coalitions in urban economic development', *Local Economy*, 13(1), 28-38

Jones, P. and Wilks-Heeg S. (2004) 'Capitalizing Culture' *Local economy*, 19(4), 341-360

Jowell, T. (2004) *Government and the value of culture* London: HMSO

Jury, L. (2002). Boasting and recriminations as Tyneside becomes favourite to win culture title. Retrieved 1st June, 2009 from *The Independent* <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/home-news/boasting-and-recriminations-as-tyneside-becomes-favourite-to-win-culture-title-602943.html>

Kantor, P., Savitch, H. and Vicari, S. (1997) 'The Political Economy of Urban Regimes: A Comparative perspective' *Urban Affairs Review*, 32(3), 348-377

Kavanagh, D. (1991) 'Political science needs history' *Political studies*, 39(3), 479-495

- Kawashima, N. (2004) *Planning for Equality*, Warwick, Centre for Cultural Policy Studies University of Warwick
- Kay, A. (2005) 'A Critique of the use of path dependency in policy studies' *Public Administration* 83(3) 553-571
- Kennedy, M. (2004.) Gateshead unveils latest huge artwork: a barrier at a bus station. Retrieved 1st June 2009 from *The Guardian*
<http://www.guardian.co.uk/uk/2004/mar/12/arts.artsnews>
- Kilburn, H. (2004) 'Explaining U.S. Urban Regimes: A Qualitative Comparative Analysis' *Urban Affairs Review* Vol.39(5), 633-651
- Kilfoyle, P. (2000). *Left Behind: Lessons from Labour's Heartland*. London: Politicos
- Kong, L. (2000) 'Culture, economy, policy: trends and developments' *Geoforum*, No.31, 385-390
- Kong, L. (2005) 'Editorial: Creative cities?' *Geoforum* 36(4), 403-405
- Kriesi, H., Adam, S. and Jochum, M. (2006) 'Comparative analysis of policy networks in Western Europe' *Journal of European Public Policy*, 13(3), 341-361
- Labour Party (1966) *Manifesto of the Labour Party*
- Lancaster, B. (1992) 'Newcastle- Capital of What?' in Lancaster, B. and Colls, R. (eds.) *Geordies: Roots of Regionalism*. Newcastle: Northumbria University Press
- Lancaster, B (2003) 'As seen on TV or why Newcastle/Gateshead didn't win' *Northern Review*, 13

Lancaster, B. and Colls, R. (eds.) (1992) *Geordies: Roots of Regionalism*. Newcastle: Northumbria University Press

Landry, C. (2000) *The creative city: a toolkit for urban innovators* London: Earthscan

Landry, C. and Bianchini, F. (1995) *The creative city* London: Demos

Landry, C., Green, L., Matarasso, F. and Bianchini, F. (1996) *The Art of Regeneration: Urban renewal through cultural activity*, Stroud: Comedia

Lane, T. (1987) *Liverpool City of the Sea*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press

Latham, A. (2003) 'Urbanity, Lifestyle and Making Sense of the New Urban Cultural Economy: notes from Auckland, New Zealand' *Urban Studies*, 40(9), 1699-1724

Latham, A. (2006a) 'Anglophone Urban Studies and the European City: Some Comments on Interpreting Berlin' *European Urban and Regional Studies* 13 (1): 88-92

Latham, A. (2006b) 'Berlin and everywhere else: a reply to Allan Cochrane' *European Urban and Regional Studies* 13(4) 377-9

Law, C. (1992) 'Urban Tourism and its Contribution to Economic Regeneration' *Urban Studies*, 29(3/4), 599-618

Lauria, M. (ed) (1997a) *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy*, Thousand Oaks, Sage

Lauria, M. (1997b) "Introduction: Reconstructing Regime Theory," In *Reconstructing Urban Regime Theory: Regulating Urban Politics in a Global Economy*, Lauria, M (ed) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage

Leach, R. and Barnett, N. (1997) 'The new public management and the local government review', *Local Government Studies*, 23(3) 39 — 55

Leach, S. and Game, C. (1991) 'English metropolitan government since abolition' *Public Administration*, 69(2), 141-170

Leach, R. and Percy-Smith, J. (2001) *Local governance in Britain*
Basingstoke: Palgrave

Lee, C. (2006) "The Conservation Machine: A Challenge to Urban Regime Theory" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Montreal Convention Centre, Montreal, Quebec, Canada Online retrieved 10th August 2009 from
http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p103692_index.html

Leslie, D. (2005) 'Creative Cities?' *Geoforum* 36(4) 403-405

Lewis J. & Miller, T. (2003) *Critical Cultural Policy Studies* Oxford:
Blackwell

Liverpool Black Caucus (1986) *The racial politics of militant in Liverpool*
Liverpool: University of Liverpool press

Liverpool City Council (1987) *An arts and cultural industries strategy for Liverpool*, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council (1994) *Liverpool bidding to host city of architecture 1999* Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool City Council (2003) *Executive summary of the bid for European Capital of Culture 2008*, Liverpool: Liverpool City Council

Liverpool Culture Company (2009) *The Impacts of a Year Like no Other - end of year review*. Retrieved 10th July, 2009 from <http://www.liverpool08.com/downloads/>

Longmore, J. (2006) 'Civic Liverpool: 1680-1800'. in Belchem, J (Ed.) *Liverpool 800 Culture, Character, History*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press

Lorente, P (ed) (1996a) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester

Lorente, P. (1996b) 'Introduction', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester

Lorente, P. (1996c) 'Museums as catalysts for the revitalisation of ports in decline: lessons from Liverpool and Marseilles', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester

Lorente, P. (1996d) 'The contribution of the arts scene to the revilitisation of declining inner-city areas in Liverpool and Marseilles', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester

Lowndes, V. (1997) 'Change in public service management: New institutions and new managerial regimes', *Local Government Studies*, 23(2), 42 — 66

Lowndes, V. (2001) 'Rescuing Aunt Sally: Taking Institutional Theory Seriously in Urban Politics' *Urban Studies*, 38(11), 1953–1971

Lowndes, V. (2005) 'Something Old, Something New, Something Borrowed.....' *Policy Studies*, 26(3), 291-309

Lowndes, V. and Leach, S. (2004) 'Understanding Local Political Leadership: Constitutions, Contexts and Capabilities' *Local Government Studies*, 30(4), 557 — 575

Lowndes, V., Pratchett, L. and Stoker, S. (2006) 'Local political participation: the impact of rules in use' *Public Administration*, 84(3), 539–561

Lowndes, V. and Skelcher, C. (1998) 'The Dynamics of Multi-organisational Partnerships: An Analysis of Changing Modes of Governance' *Public Administration* 76(2), 313-334

Lowndes, V. and Wilson, D. (2001) 'Social Capital and Local Governance: Exploring the Institutional Design Variable' *Political Studies*, 49(4), 629–647

Lukes, S. (1974) *Power: a radical view* Basingstoke: Macmillan

McAnulla, S. (2006) 'Challenging the New Interpretivist Approach: Towards a Critical Realist Alternative' *British Politics*, 1(1), 113–138

McAnulla, S. (2007) 'New Labour, Old Epistemology? Reflections on Political Science, New Institutionalism and the Blair Government' *Parliamentary Affairs*, 60(2), 313–331

McCann, E. (2002) 'The cultural politics of local economic development: meaning-making, place-making, and the urban policy process' *Geoforum*, 33(3), 385–398

McGuigan, J. (1996) *Culture and the Public Sphere*, London: Routledge

McGuigan, J. (2003) 'Cultural policy studies' in Lewis, J. and Miller, T. *Critical Cultural Policy Studies* Oxford: Blackwell

McGuigan, J. (2004) *Rethinking cultural policy* Maidenhead: OUP

McGuigan, J. (2005) 'Neo-liberalism, culture and policy' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11(3), 229—241

Macleod, G. and Goodwin, M. (1999) 'Space, scale and state strategy: rethinking urban and regional governance' *Progress in Human Geography*, 23(4), 503-527

Maconie, S. (2008) 'Knock the Angel of the North all you like - you'll never dislodge it from northerners' hearts.' Retrieved 11th July, 2009 from *The Guardian* <http://www.guardian.co.uk/commentisfree/2008/feb/13/art.arts>

Meegan, R. (2003) 'Urban Regeneration, Politics and Social Cohesion: The Liverpool Case' in Munck, R (Ed.) *Reinventing the City? Liverpool in Comparative Perspective*. Liverpool, Liverpool University Press

Meegan, R. & Mitchell, A. (2001) 'It's not a community round here, it's a neighbourhood' *Urban Studies* 38(12) 2167-2194

Melville, A. (2002) *E-government and Organisational Transformation - lessons : from Liverpool and Hertfordshire* New Local Government Network retrieved 10th August 2009 from

<http://www.nlgn.org.uk/public/publications/free/e-government-and-organisational-transformation-lessons-from-liverpool-and-hertfordshire/>

Midwinter, A. (1985) 'Setting the rate- Liverpool style' *Local Government Studies*, 11(3), 25 — 33

Miles, M. (2005a) 'Interruptions: Testing the Rhetoric of Culturally-Led Urban Development' *Urban Studies*, 42(5/6), 889–911

Miles, S. (2004) 'NewcastleGateshead Quayside: Cultural investment and identities of resistance' *Capital and Class*, 84, 183 – 190.

Miles, S. (2005b). 'Our Tyne': iconic regeneration and the revitalisation of identity in NewcastleGateshead' *Urban Studies*, 42:5, 913 - 926.

Miles, S. (2005c) 'Understanding the cultural case: Class, identity and the regeneration of NewcastleGateshead' *Sociology*, 39(5), 1019-1028

Miles, S. and Paddison, R. (2005) 'Introduction: The rise and rise of culture-led urban regeneration' *Urban Studies*, 42(5), 833 — 839

Milne G. (2006) 'Maritime Liverpool' in Belchem J (ed). *Liverpool 800: Culture, character and history*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press

Minton, A. (2003). *Northern Soul: Culture, Creativity and Quality of Place in Newcastle and Gateshead*. London: DEMOS.

Mirza, M. (2001) *Culture: the word on the street. Can local arts projects really change the world?* Retrieved July 10th 2007 from <http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/00000002D2B7.htm>

Moffat, A. and Rosie, G. (2006). *Tyneside: A history of Newcastle and Gateshead from Earliest Times*. London: Mainstream Publishing.

- Montgomery, J (2003) 'Cultural Quarters as Mechanisms for Urban Regeneration. Part 1: Conceptualising Cultural Quarters', *Planning Practice and Research*, 18(4), 293 — 306
- Mooney, G. (2004) 'Cultural policy as urban transformation' *Local economy*, 19(4), 327-340
- Moulaert, F., Martinelli, F., González, S., Swyngedouw, E. (2007) 'Introduction: Social innovation and governance in European cities' *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 14(3), 195–209
- Moss, L. (2002)'Sheffield's cultural industries quarter 20 years on: what can be learned from a pioneering example?' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8(2), 211 — 219
- Mossberger, K and Stoker, G (2001) 'The Evolution of Urban Regime Theory: The Challenge of Conceptualization' *Urban Affairs Review*, 36(6), 810-835
- Munck, R. (ed.) (2003) *Reinventing the City? Liverpool in Comparative Perspective*. Liverpool:Liverpool University Press
- Mulgan, G. and Worpole, K. (1986) *Saturday Night or Sunday Morning? From Arts to Industry—New Forms of Cultural Policy*, London: Comedia
- Murden, J. (2006). 'City of Change and Challenge': Liverpool since 1945' in J. Blechem (ed) *Liverpool 800 Culture, Character, History*. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press
- Myerscough, J. (1988) *The Economic Importance of the Arts on Merseyside*, London: Policy Studies Institute

Newcastle City Council and Gateshead Council (2002) *Building bridges*
Newcastle, Newcastle City Council

Newcastle City Council (2007) *Developing the NewcastleGateshead
partnership* report to cabinet 21st March 2007

Newman, A. & Mclean, F. (2004a) 'Presumption, Policy and Practice'
International Journal of Cultural Policy 10 (2) 167-181

Newman, A. and McLean, F. (2004b) 'Capital and the evaluation of the
museum experience', *International Journal of Cultural Studies* 7 (4): 480-
498

Newman, A. and McLean, F. (2006) 'The impact of museums upon identity',
International Journal of Heritage Studies 12 (1): 49-68

North, D. (1990) *Institutions, Institutional Change and Economic
Performance* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press

North P. and Wilks-Heeg S. (2004) 'Cultural Policy and Urban
Regeneration: a special edition of Local Economy' *Local Economy*, 19(4),
305-311

Oakley, K. (2004) 'Not so cool Britannia' *International Journal of Cultural
Studies*, 7 (1) 67-77

O'Callaghan, C. and Linehan, D. (2007) 'Identity, politics and conflict in
dockland development in Cork, Ireland: European Capital of Culture 2005'
Cities, 24(4), 311-323

Olsen, W. (2004) 'Triangulation in social research' in Holborn, M (ed)
Developments in sociology Ormskirk: Causeway press

- van Oorschot, W. and Arts, W. (2005) 'The social capital of European welfare states: the crowding out hypothesis revisited' *Journal of European Social Policy*, 15(1) 5-26
- Orr, K. (2005) 'Interpreting narratives of local government change' *British Journal of Politics and International Relations*, 7(3) 371-385
- Ostrom, E. (1986) 'An agenda for the study of institutions' *Public Choice*, 48(1), 3-25
- Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T. (1992) *Reinventing Government*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- O'Toole, M. (1996) *Regulation theory and the British state* Aldershot: Avebury
- Palmer/Rae (2004) *European cities and capitals of culture* retrieved 1st August 2009 from http://ec.europa.eu/culture/key-documents/doc926_en.htm
- Parsons, T. (1979) *The social system* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul
- Parkinson, M. (1984) *Politics and budgets in Liverpool, 1974-1984* Liverpool: University of Liverpool Centre for Urban Studies
- Parkinson, M. (1985). *Liverpool on the Brink*. Bristol: Policy Journals
- Parkinson, M. and Duffy, J. (1984) 'Government's Response to Inner-City Riots: The Minister for Merseyside and the Task Force', *Parliamentary Affairs*, 37(1) 76-96
- Peacock, A. (2000) 'Public financing of the arts in England' *Fiscal Studies*, 21 (2), 171-205

- Peck J. and Tickell A. (2002) Neoliberalizing space *Antipode* 34 (3): 380-404
- Pendlebury, J. (2001) 'Alas Smith and Burns? Conservation in Newcastle upon Tyne city centre 1959–68' *Planning Perspectives*, 16 (2), 115–141
- Peters, G. (2005) *Institutional theory in political science: the 'new institutionalism'* London: Continuum
- Pick, J. (1988) *The Arts in a State*, Bristol: Classic Press
- Pincetl, S. (2003) 'Nonprofits and Park Provision in Los Angeles: An Exploration of the Rise of Governance Approaches to the Provision of Local Services' *Social Science Quarterly*, 84(4), 979-1001
- Plaza, B. (1999) 'The Guggenheim-Bilbao museum effect: a reply to María V. Gomez' 'Reflective images: the case of urban regeneration in Glasgow and Bilbao', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 23 (3): 589–592.
- Plaza, B. (2006) 'The return on investment of the Guggenheim Museum Bilbao', *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 30 (2): 452–467
- Polsby, N. (1962) 'Community power: Some reflections on the recent literature' *American Sociological Review*, 27(6), 838-841
- Quilley, S. (1999) 'Entrepreneurial Manchester' *Antipode* 31 (2) 185-211
- Quilley, S. (2000) 'Manchester First, from municipal socialism to entrepreneurial city' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 24 (3), 601-615

- Quilley, S. and Ward, K. (1999) 'Global 'system' and local 'personality' in urban and regional politics', *Space and Polity*, 3(1), 5-33
- Quinn, R-B. (1998) *Public policy and the arts* Aldershot: Ashgate
- Reade, B. (2009) *44 Years with the same bird: A Liverpoolian love affair* London: Pan Macmillan
- Reeves, M. (2002) Measuring the social and economic impact of the arts: a review. London: Arts Council of England
- Rhodes, R. (1994) 'The hollowing out of the state: the changing nature of the public service in Britain' *Public Administration*, 65(2), 138-151
- Rhodes, R. (1997) *Understanding Governance*, Maidenhead: OUP
- Rhodes, R. and Marsh, D. (1992) 'New directions in the study of policy networks' *European Journal of Political Research* , 21(1-2), 181-205
- Richards, D. (1997) *The Civil Service under the Conservatives, 1979-1997 : Whitehall's political poodles?* Brighton: Sussex Academic Press
- Richards, G. (2000) 'The European Cultural Capital Event: Strategic Weapon in the Cultural Arms Race?' *Journal of Cultural Policy*, 6(2), 159-181.
- Richards, G. and Wilson, J. (2004) 'The Impact of Cultural Events on City Image: Rotterdam, Cultural Capital of Europe' 2001 *Urban Studies* 41(10) 1931-1951
- Ridley, F. (1986) 'Liverpool is different: political style in context' *Political Quarterly*, 57 (2), 125 – 136

- Riley, J. (2008) 'It was, as they say, an auspicious occasion: May 23, 1988' *Liverpool Echo* 29th April
- Robinson, F. and Shaw, K. (1994) 'Urban policy under the Conservatives: In search of the big idea?' *Local Economy*, 9(3), 224 - 235
- Robinson, F. and Shaw, K. (2003). 'Who governs North East England? A regional perspective on governance', in Cornforth, C. (Ed.) *What do Boards do? The Governance of Public and Non-Profit Organisation*. London: Routledge
- Roche, M (1994) 'Mega events and urban policy' *Annals of Tourism Research*, 21(1), 1-19
- Roche, M (2000) *Mega-events and modernity* London:Routledge
- Sayer, A (2001) 'For a critical cultural political economy' *Antipode* 33(4), 687 - 708
- Scott, A (2000) *The cultural economy of cities* London:Sage
- Scullion, A. & Garcia, B. (2005) 'What is cultural policy research?' *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11(2), 113-127.
- Selwood, S. (2002) 'The politics of data collection' *Cultural Trends* 12(4) 13-32
- Selwood, S. (2006) 'A part to play?' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 12(1), 35 – 53
- Shields, R. (1999) 'Culture and the Economy of Cities' *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 6(4), 303-311

- Sharp, E. (2007) 'Revitalising urban research' *Urban Affairs Review*, 43(1), 55-75
- Shaw, R. (1987) *The Arts and the People*, London: Jonathan Cape, Ltd
- Sklair, L. (1975) 'The struggle against the housing finance act' *The Socialist Register*
- Smith, J. (1984) 'Labour traditions in Glasgow and Liverpool' *History Workshop Journal*, 17, 32-56.
- Smith, M., Marsh, D, and Richards, D, (1993) 'Central government departments and the policy process' *Public Administration*, 71(4), 567-594
- Smith, N. (2000) 'What happened to class?' *Environment and Planning A*, 32(6), 1011-1032.
- Stanbridge, A. (2002) 'Detour or dead-end? Contemporary cultural theory and the search for new cultural policy models' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 8(2), 121-134
- Stevenson, D. (2003) *Cities and Urban Cultures*, Maidenhead & Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Stevenson, D (2004) 'Civic Gold Rush' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10(1), 119-131
- Stevenson, N. (2000) 'Globalisation and cultural political economy' in Germain, R. (ed.) *Globalization and its critics: perspectives from political economy* London: Palgrave Macmillan

- Stewart, K. (1996) 'Communities of art' in Lorente, P (ed) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*, Leicester: University of Leicester
- Stoker, G. and Mossberger, K. (1994) 'Urban regime theory in comparative perspective' *Environment and planning C*, 12(2), 195-212
- Stoker, G. (1998) 'Governance as theory: five propositions' *UNESCO* Oxford: Blackwell
- Stoker, G. (ed) (1999) *The new management of British Local Governance*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Stoker, G. (ed) (2000) *The new politics of British local governance* Basingstoke: Macmillan
- Stoker G. and Wilson, D. (eds) (2004) *British local government into the 21st century* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan
- Stone, C. (1989) *Regime Politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*, Lawrence: Univ. Press of Kansas
- Stone, C. (1993) 'Urban regimes and the capacity to govern.' *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 15(1), 1-28
- Stone, C. (2004a) 'Its more than the economy after all' *Journal of Urban affairs*, 26(1), 1-19
- Stone, C. (2005) 'Looking Back to Look Forward: Reflections on Urban Regime Analysis' *Urban Affairs Review*, 40(3), 309-341

- Stone, C. (2004b) 'Rejoinder: Multiple imperatives or some thoughts about governance in a loosely coupled but stratified society', *Journal of urban affairs* 26(1), 35–42
- Taaffe, P. and Mulhern, T. (1988) *Liverpool a city that dared to fight* London, Fortress
- Thelen, K. (1999) 'Historical institutionalism in comparative politics' *Annual Review of Political Science*, 2(1), 369-404
- Theokas, A. (2004) *Grounds for review: the garden festival in urban planning and design* Liverpool: Liverpool University Press
- Thompson, H (2005) *Fear and loathing in Las Vegas* London: Harper Perennial
- Thompson, I. (1996) 'Arts and community: regeneration or gentrification', in P. Lorente, (ed.) *The Role of Museums and the Arts in the Urban Regeneration of Liverpool*. Leicester: University of Leicester
- Tickell A. and Peck J. (1996) 'The return of the Manchester Men: Men's words and men's deeds in the remaking of the local state' *Transactions of the institute of British Geographers* 21, 595-616
- Turnbull, O. (2009) *Bringing down the house* London: Intellect Ltd
- Upchurch A. (2004) 'J.M. Keynes, the Bloomsbury Group and the origins of the arts council movement' *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 10 (2), 203-217
- Urban Task Force (2005) *Towards a strong urban renaissance* Retrieved 10th July, 2009 from www.urbantaskforce.org/UTF_final_report.pdf

- Vaughan, P. and Booth, P. (1989) 'The economic importance of tourism and the arts on Merseyside' *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 13(2), 21-34
- Vigar, G., Graham, S. and Healy, P. (2005) In search of the city in spatial strategies: Past lessons, future imaginings' *Urban Studies* 42 (8), 1391-1410
- Vickery, J. (2007) *The Emergence of Culture-Led Regeneration: A Policy Concept and its Discontents*, CCPS Research Papers, University of Warwick
- Wainwright, H. (1987) *Labour, a tale of two parties* London, The Hogarth Press
- Ward, K. (1996) 'Rereading Urban Regime Theory: a Sympathetic Critique' *Geoforum*, 27(4), 427-438
- Ward, K. (2000) 'A critique in search of a corpus: re-visiting governance and re-interpreting urban politics' *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 25(2), 169-185
- Ward, K. (2003) 'Entrepreneurial urbanism, state restructuring and civilizing 'New' East Manchester' *Area*, 35(2), 116-127
- Weber, M. (2002) *The protestant ethic and the spirit of capitalism* Oxford : Blackwell
- West, C. & Smith, C. (2005) 'We are not a government poodle' *International Journal of Cultural Policy* 11 (3) 276-288
- While, A., Jonas, A. and Gibbs, D. (2004) 'The Environment and the Entrepreneurial City: Searching for the Urban 'Sustainability Fix' in Manchester and Leeds' *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 28(3), 549-69

- Whitehead, M. (2003) 'In the shadow of hierarchy' *Area*, 35(1), 6-14
- Wilks-Heeg S. (2003). From World City to Pariah City? Liverpool and the Global Economy 1850-2000. In Munck, R (ed.) *Reinventing the City? Liverpool in Comparative Perspective*. Liverpool, Liverpool University Press
- Wilks-Heeg, S. and Clayton, S. (2006) *Whose town is it anyway?* York: Joseph Rowntree Charitable Trust
- Wilks-Heeg, S. and North, P. (2004) 'Cultural policy and urban regeneration: a special edition of local economy', *Local Economy*, 19(4), 305 — 311
- Williams, R. (1989) *Resources of Hope: Culture, Democracy, Socialism*, London: Verso
- Williams, R. (2004) *The Anxious City*, London: Routledge
- Wilson, D. and Game, C. (2006) *Local Government in the UK* 4th edition, London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Wilson, J. (2008) *Inverting the Pyramid* London: Orion
- Wood, A. (1998) 'Making sense of urban entrepreneurialism', *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 114(2), 120-123
- Zukin, S. (1998) *The cultures of cities*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

APPENDIX 1 LIST OF ACRONYMS

ACE	Arts Council England
ACGB	Arts Council Great Britain
ACME	Merseyside Arts, Culture and Media Enterprise
ACNE	Arts Council North East
ACNW	Arts Council North West
BBC	British Broadcasting Corporation
CBI	Confederation of British Industry
DCMS	Department for Culture Media and Sport
DoE	Department of Environment
ECOC	European Capital of Culture
EEC	European Economic Community
ERDF	European Regional Development fund
ESRC	Economic and Social Research Council
ESF	European Social Fund
EU	European Union
FACT	Foundation for Art and Creative Technology
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GLC	Greater London Council

GMBC	Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council
GONE	Government Office North East
GONW	Government Office North West
IDeA	Improvement and Development Agency
LARC	Liverpool Arts and Regeneration Consortium
LCC	Liverpool City Council
LFO	Liverpool Film Office
LSP	Local Strategic Partnership
MA	Merseyside Arts
MCC	Merseyside County Council
MDC	Merseyside Development Corporation
MMDA	Merseyside Music Development Agency
MTF	Merseyside Task Force
NAF	Newcastle Arts Forum
NCC	Newcastle City Council
NDPB	Non Department Public Body
NGI	Newcastle Gateshead Initiative
NMGM	National Museums and Galleries Merseyside
NML	National Museums Liverpool

NWDA	North West Development Agency
QUANGO	Quasi Autonomous Non Governmental Organisation
RAA	Regional Arts Association
RDA	Regional Development Agency
RFO	Regularly Funded Organisation
SRA	Social Research Association
TMP	The Mersey Partnership
TNI	The Newcastle Initiative
TWDC	Tyne and Wear Development Corporation
TWMCC	Tyne and Wear Metropolitan County Council
TWMG	Tyne and Wear Museums and Galleries
USA	United States of America
UNN	University of Northumbria at Newcastle

APPENDIX 2 LIST OF ORGANISATIONS AND REPRESENTATIVES INTERVIEWED

Arts Council England

Arts Council North East

Arts Council North West

Arts in Regeneration, Liverpool

Centre for Life, Newcastle

Culture North East

Culture North West

Dance City, Newcastle

Department for Culture, Media and Sport

FACT, Liverpool

Gateshead Metropolitan Borough Council

Liverpool Biennial

Liverpool Bluecoat Gallery

Liverpool City Council

Liverpool Culture Company

Liverpool Philharmonic

Merseyside ACME

Merseyside Arts

Merseyside County Council

National Museums Liverpool

NCJ Media, Newcastle

Newcastle City Council

Newcastle Gateshead Initiative

Newcastle University

Northern Stage Playhouse

Sage Gateshead

Tate Liverpool

The Mersey Partnership

Tyne and Wear Museums and Galleries

Unity Theatre, Liverpool

APPENDIX 3 LIVERPOOL TIMELINE

- 1974 MCC established.
- 1974 MA established.
- 1977-1983 Liverpool is a Liberal controlled council.
- 1977 Sir Trevor Jones (Liberal) becomes leader of LCC.
- 1981 MTF established.
- 1981 MDC established.
- 1983 Liverpool becomes a Labour controlled council.
- 1983 John Hamilton (Labour) becomes leader of LCC. Militant's influence on the LCC begins.
- 1985 Athens is the inaugural European City of Culture.
- 1986 MCC abolished.
- 1986 MA abolished.
- 1986 NMGM established.
- 1986 Tony Byrne (Labour/Militant) becomes leader of LCC.
- 1987 Labour councillors are surcharged and expelled from office in the LCC.
- 1987 Harry Rimmer (Labour) becomes leader of the LCC.
- 1987-1990 Keva Coombes (Labour) becomes leader of LCC. The 'Sainsbury Set' is influential during this period.

- 1988 Tate Liverpool opens.
- 1990 Glasgow is European City of Culture.
- 1990 Harry Rimmer (Labour) becomes leader of LCC.
- 1990 John Lennon memorial concert.
- 1992 Liverpool is a no overall control council, Harry Rimmer (Labour) continues as leader.
- 1994 Merseyside is granted Objective One status by the EU.
- 1996 Liverpool becomes a Labour controlled council.
- 1998 Liverpool becomes a Liberal Democrat controlled council.
- 1998 Mike Storey (Liberal Democrat) becomes leader of LCC.
- 1998 Liverpool Biennial established.
- 1999 NWDA established.
- 1999 Liverpool Vision established.
- 2002 Competing bids to host European Capital of Culture submitted.
- 2002 Liverpool, NewcastleGateshead, Oxford, Birmingham, Bristol and Cardiff are shortlisted for the ECoC 2008.
- 2003 Liverpool announced as ECoC 2008.
- 2003 FACT's building opens in Liverpool.
- 2005 Warren Bradley (Liberal Democrat) becomes leader of LCC.

- 2006 Jason Harborow becomes chief exec of the Culture Company.
- 2006 Robyn Archer, artistic director, resigns from Liverpool Culture Company.
- 2006 ECoC 2008 programme highlights announced.
- 2006 LARC established.
- 2007 Liverpool's 800 birthday celebrations.
- 2007 Phil Redmond becomes creative director of the Culture Company.
- 2008 Bluecoat art gallery reopens.

APPENDIX 4 NEWCASTLE GATESHEAD TIMELINE

- 1973-present GMBC is a Labour controlled local authority.
- 1974-2004 NCC is a Labour controlled local authority.
- 1974 TWGCC is established.
- 1977 Sir Jeremy Beecham (Labour) becomes leader of NCC.
- 1985 George Gill (Labour) becomes leader of GMBC.
- 1985 Athens is the inaugural European City of Culture.
- 1986 TWGCC abolished.
- 1986 TWGC established.
- 1987 TWDC established.
- 1990 The Metro Centre opens in Gateshead.
- 1990 Glasgow is European City of Culture.
- 1994 Heritage Lottery Fund established.
- 1996 *Case for Capital* strategy, devised by Northern Arts, is launched.
- 1996 The Grainger Town urban regeneration project begins in Newcastle.
- 1998 TWDC is wound up.

- 1998 TNI launched.
- 1998 Anthony Gormley's *Angel of the North* completed.
- 1999 One North East, the RDA, is established.
- 2000 NGI established.
- 2001 Millenium Bridge, Gateshead opens.
- 2002 *Building Bridges*, NCC's and GMBC's joint cultural strategy published.
- 2002 Baltic centre for contemporary art, Gateshead opens.
- 2002 Competing bids to host European Capital of Culture submitted.
- 2002 Liverpool, NewcastleGateshead, Oxford, Birmingham, Bristol and Cardiff are shortlisted for the European capital of culture 2008.
- 2003 Liverpool announced as European Capital of Culture 2008.
- 2003 Culture10 programme begins.
- 2002 George Gill steps down from GMBC and Mick Henry (Labour) becomes leader.
- 2003 Northern Arts becomes Arts Council North East.
- 2004 The Sage Gateshead opens.
- 2004 NCC becomes a Liberal Democrat controlled local authority. Tony Flynn becomes leader.

2004 Peter Flynn (Liberal Democrat) becomes leader of NCC.

2006 John Shipley (Liberal Democrat) becomes leader of NCC.