Creative London-Creative Berlin; Notes on Making a Living in the New Cultural Economy

This chapter offers a schematic framework for examining questions pertaining to the actual practices of making a living in the growing cultural sector. By looking specifically at London it also suggests a parallel study of Berlin. Not, it should be pointed out, in a strictly 'comparative' sense, since the dynamics of the flows of peoples and communicative technologies makes such a model redundant. Instead I propose here the beginning of a dialogue, 'a tale of two cities'. What informs the dialogue are the 'lessons to be learnt' from the UK insofar as the government's commitment to encouraging the creative sector on the basis that it must be entrepreneurial surely raises questions for those involved in this area of debate in Germany. If 'cultural individualisation' need not be synonymous with neo-liberalisation, can it be pursued so as to maintain the field of culture as a space for openness, social engagement, and democratisation? These are questions which New Labour studiously avoids, but at a cost. Can other European governments and city councils be persuaded that the cultural sector is potentially a rich source of job creation? Can micro-enterprises in the creative and media fields be provided with social investment sufficient to keep them viable while also expecting them to play a socially valuable role with input into the community? Might a flowering of arts working be re-designated along the lines of the voluntary, not for profit sector?

The article comprises short sections presented in the form of abbreviated commentaries on factors which will inform future work in this field. The article also draws on one case study taken from ongoing research. The

aim overall is to present an account which considers the interface between macro-level understandings of the city and micro-level analysis of working lives. But this focus on London-Berlin does raise various issues. In the context of the growing interest over the last decade within the social sciences and cultural studies in the 'new culture industries', it is often claimed that cities like these have attracted too much attention already. More widely it has been noted that there are perhaps problems in relation to looking primarily towards the global cities of the west like London and Berlin as archetypal spaces of flows, as embodiments of the network society, and also as sites of cultural innovation. How do we understand their exceptionality, their disembedded or 'lifted out' status (Giddens 1991)? Perhaps we should view these cities as large 'incubators' , as cities of the future, with diasporic and often transient populations, with substantial numbers of young people, and with a focus towards the arts, culture and media on the basis of quite different but marked historical reasons.

Creative London

A recent document on London's creative sector produced by the Greater London Assembly provides some useful information in relation to these questions (GLA 2003). First that there has been substantial growth in the city's culture industries in the five year period from 1995-2000, making this London's third largest sector, with a workforce of almost .5 million people. The scale of the capital's domination in the creative industries is also marked, with 110,200 new jobs created in London alone over this period and a further 86, 000 in the South East in contrast to job losses in other parts of the country. What the document does not highlight however

are the more telling aspects of the 'growth narrative', for example with the exception of radio and television the average size of cultural sector enterprises is less than 25 persons, that is, these are very tiny organisations. Likewise the authors do not highlight the fact that while 25% of London's working population have no qualifications at all, 41% of persons in the creative industries are 'professional' and 31% have university degrees. This too gives to the culture industries a uniqueness and distinctiveness, comprising small outlets with very well qualified persons.

We might ask then how does this scenario compare with Berlin? For obvious historical reasons Berlin's 'exceptionality' has been widely acknowledged. Its 'lifted out' identity could hardly be in question, despite re-unification and its status as a capital city. But is there the same kind of growth in the culture industries, and also the same imbalance among the working population in terms of qualifications? What are the conditions which encourage or hinder setting up as a small scale cultural enterprise?

By combining detailed attention to working practices with an equally developed sense of space and by interviewing and visiting on site, a range of these people it might also be possible to get a sense of how they operate as subjects within the 'space of flows', how they also flow through the capital, its institutions, organisations and neighbourhoods and how in turn the city is opened up, transformed by such movements so that its fluidity is understood in terms of this specific kind of labour and not just capital. Do its spaces or neighbourhoods perhaps undergo change in terms of both de-territorialisation and 're-territorialisation of local sub-cultures' (Sassen 2002)? It might also be possible to define this

workforce in transnational terms. How does the work they do connect with where they have come from? Do these other locations figure in the working practices they carry out in London? Many of these workers are based in London but not necessarily producing for the UK market, many if not all of their clients or outlets might be from anywhere in the world. In their working practices they might be passing through London, using it as a site for gathering more skills and expertise before moving on. To what extent then is their attachment temporary or transitional, what is the creative labour flow in and out of the capital? With all of these questions in mind let me surmise that we might expect London's small-scale creative sector to comprise in the near future of a cultural workforce of more mobile and 'transient' individuals on the basis that as jobs and contracts are increasingly casualised and internationalised, creative freelancers find themselves even more nomadic. London becomes a temporary site of intense cultural activity, requiring enormous investment for newcomers (in terms of cost of living) but providing access to valuable learning experiences and skills not found elsewhere. Over time the small- scale freelance cultural workforce will fragment and disperse, and more hopeful newcomers will arrive, all of which in turn suggest that networks will be formed and dissolved more rapidly and according to the duration of 'projects'. Relation to space and attachments to neighbourhood will be attenuated and instrumental, and subject to the logic of this speeded up de-territorialised cultural economy.

How then does Berlin function as a space of flows? Is its cultural workforce as subjected to similar kinds of pressures to move rapidly from one project to the next at the cost of lasting attachments and involvement in neighbourhood or community? Are the networks of Berlin's creative sector as fragile as those in London? Are they as fiercely competitive and

commercialised or does there remain in place forms of social investment and not for profit organisations? Has enterprise culture effectively diminished a politics of cultural work or are there instead more developed possibilities for resisting the full scale 'self reliance' model embraced by New Labour?

Pleasure and Pain

There is a substantial literature on the relation between the global city as a space of culture, and the way in which cities like London, New York and Paris and the kind of urban policies which have been pursued in recent years, foster transformations in the world of work, including the decline of the public sector and the growth of the service sector, the new media, and, of course, enterprise culture (Scott 2000, Sassen 1991). But even when creative work is the focus of close attention what is frequently missing is the importance of the pleasure-pain axis as a shaping characteristic of this kind of work. The role of affect in creative labour and the normative expectation of the pain of insecurity, precariousness and even failure, skewers any comparison with more standard work or employment. Professed 'pleasure in work', indeed passionate attachment to something called 'my own work', where there is the possibility of the maximisation of self expressiveness, provides a compelling status justification (and also a disciplinary mechanism) for tolerating not just uncertainty and self exploitation but also for staying (unprofitably) within the creative sector and not abandoning it altogether (McRobbie 1998). More recently this recognition of work in a post-industrial context offering a kind of inherent reward, something in addition to the idea of self fulfilment in 'normal work', is found in the concept of 'immaterial labour' ie the product of the social tendency

towards collapsing boundaries here manifest in the indistinguishable lines between work and play (Lazzarato 1996). There are obvious difficulties with such a proposal, not least that the blurring of work and play might also in practice eliminate the existence of play-time altogether (see later). But, as Terranova argues the quintessential prototype for this kind of over-working (through the night) on the basis of self expressive output (eg imaginative website) is found in the gift economy dynamics of internet working (Terranova 2000, and see also Ross 2003). There are some points for further consideration here, does the excessive emphasis on talent, uniqueness and creativity in cultural work act as a disconnect factor in relation to other kinds of more normal work for people with similar qualifications eg teaching, or publishing? Does this in a sense isolate and further individualise those trying to make a living in the talent led economy? And when their numbers swell (as they have been doing in the last few years) what are the prospects of 'association'? Will they ever join forces to collectively challenge the conditions which give rise on the longer term to (well documented) assorted pains (including mental and physical illness, sporadic earnings, loss of confidence and so on)?

Across the terrain of the UK creative industries including graphic designers, new media workers, self employed arts administrators and curators, fashion designers, stylists, and many other creative actors, there is a complete absence of labour organisation, with the effect that a now expanded labour market in the cultural sector takes the lead not from unionised actors and actresses (stage, screen and TV), television workers or journalists but instead from a blend of the bohemian individualism of artists and the business ethos of the commercial art director. The small scale independent company (of perhaps two or three people) and the non-organised casualised freelancer come to represent the dominant units of

cultural production. In recent years with the exponential growth of freelance work replacing contract work, with the end of the 'closed shop' in television and in print journalism, with the streamlining of big organisations, and with a vast population of new entrants wishing to join this labour market, union organisation along traditional lines is either seen as irrelevant or simply by-passed. In any case labour relations less frequently (indeed rarely) comprise of a standard contract between employers and employees. The interface of power becomes both more fluid and opaque. As Patterson explains, in television it is the commissioning editors who yield enormous power and the individuals on the other side of the fence whose future livelihoods depend on a combination of reputation and speedy access to a network (Patterson 2001). But the displacement of power in this kind of work, away from the conventional oppositions of manager and workforce and the absence of union representation, only makes antagonisms acutely felt but undirected and often inner-directed (Bauman 2000). Inequities, injustices and malpractices are widely recognised, almost normative, but rarely confronted. The demands of the network (pubs, clubs, hanging out) are frequently such that various categories of persons (eg single mothers) or those without social capital (without a university degree) are precluded, or only gain access with difficulty (McRobbie 2003). Thus there are new barriers to entrance to replace the old closed shop. There is then a single key factor which provides a framework for understanding which is that this is largely self-organised, entrepreneurial activity such that (part time) employment law only partially or spasmodically or periodically applies.

Once again we might ask, how does the question of trade unionisation operate in the context of Berlin's cultural sector? Given that in Germany there has not been anything like the same kind of discrediting of trade

unionism, is it the case that working as an employee in a tiny cultural or new media organisation would usually entail membership and would also mean that working hours would be regulated? Has neo-liberalisation has any impact in the world of creative work? What are the legal conditions for self employment? Do the costs of employee protection make small scale creative companies less sustainable? What about old 70s- style 'co-operatives' do they still exist?

Space of Flows.

Organisational fixity gives way to fluid, flexible and placeless work while network sociality produces its own mysterious, transient yet intimate geographies. These clubs and bars and other locations are predicated on inter-personal exchange and bodily presence. For people seeking this kind of work there are often multiple levels of subcultural capital required to navigate one's way in the direction of a job or a project (Thornton 1996). And with such high degrees of uncertainty the workforce must always be in a 'state of readiness' in that the next contract or project might be bigger or better or lead to greater things (Lash and Urry 1994). As Patterson points out, in television, starting on one job is the point at which it becomes necessary to start thinking about the next job. If the current job is a temporary resting place from which the search for the next job can commence, the nature of the interactions and the exchanges among those working alongside each other will surely reflect some of these tensions. This kind of semi-detached relation to the work at hand also denotes the absence of permanence and durability which Sennett argues were once the features which made work (and the work-place) and life meaningful (Sennett 1998). Where the work itself is also carried out in some indeterminate space, a hot desk or a temporary office, even a local coffee

bar, any prospect of stability or security is likely to give way to feelings of impermanence and insecurity. There is, as it were, no floor, no set rules, no guaranteed pathways. We might surmise that in such an unstructured and individualised work culture, new kinds of groups, affiliations or partnerships as well as relations of dependence and obligation (ie of a non-standard, non-contractual type) might appear, defined according to the spatial relations within which the cultural activity takes place.

Wittel defines network sociality as a form of social bonding which is 'based on individualisation, and deeply embedded in technology; it is informational ,ephemeral but intense and is characterised by an assimilation of work and play' (Wittel 2001 p71), but as he notes there is little ethnographic or observational research on these brittle and perhaps shallow exchanges. It is my intention here to present work-in-progress which strategically locates my own place of work, Goldsmiths College, as the hub of such a network . Its 'hub' status derives partly from its historical reputation in the field of training visual artists. Its geographical location in an area of deprivation with a high density population with low skills few qualifications means that this poverty zone provides a wider setting for the kind of network that comes into being. The college is also home to a range of academics ('radical professionals') whose work spans cultural and media studies, anthropology, art history, sociology and urban studies. This in itself is generative of a hub insofar as seminars, exhibitions, and other events bring various urban activists, youth and community workers and public sector arts administrators into the corridors and seminar rooms of the college.

The case study reported here represents a small proportion of the (self-presenting) respondents in the current research programme (1). It was a condition of participation that respondents have some indirect (or 'flowing', passing through) relation to the college without being enrolled as a student. The self presenting relation (in preference to, say, the use volunteers) is in itself a distinctive feature of this kind of network analysis. It shows for example how the academic institution is sought out as a (public sector) haven from the more commercial aggressive interfaces of pitching, bidding and late night networking for contracts. The flow of knowledge, expertise, 'theory' and information within the confines of the academy is also more open, inexpensive, and less constrained by the fear of 'theft of ideas' so common in the creative world. The college as a public funded organisation, has an ethos of collaboration, partnership and in recent years a keen interest in the small scale arts enterprises (or incubator businesses as they have come to be known) springing up on its doorstep. The direct approaches to myself by cultural entrepreneurs can also be seen as sharp indicators of their own reflexivity, awareness of the need to test out their own practices in the presence of sociologists and cultural theorists. With a deliberately open approach to methodology one led by a sense of the space of flows, it was useful to concentrate on the various nodes of activity taking place at a satellite distance from the college hub in the form of *events, encounters and initiatives.*

Once again we might ask, is it the case that the art schools in Berlin play a similar function as hubs? Do they actually help to pump-prime new businesses in the way government in the UK now favours? Is there anything like the same degree of interaction between academics and lecturers and small scale cultural entrepreneurs? Or does network

sociality take place in a context more removed from the academy? Boris Ewenstein's ongoing research on London –Berlin suggests that the Mitte area in Berlin does have a more distinctive and independent style of network sociality which connects people working across many different activities eg theatre, film, bookshops, bars, clubs, graphic design, and that there is consequently less reliance on the university or art school (Ewenstein 2003).

<u>Assembly</u>

Between the 5th and the 31st of October 2000 174 artists exhibited work together in two old school buildings due for demolition in East London. With sponsorship from David Bowie (www.bowieart) and others, graduates of Goldsmiths College, The Royal College of Art and Chelsea College, took over the derelict spaces and under the title Assembly staged a show that attracted a lot of press attention and very favourable reviews. The catalogue listed all the contributors with either a phone number, an address or email address (and in some cases all three). Contact was made by email in July and August 2001, first to find out if the artist would be willing to take part in an email exchange (given the title Making a Living as a Visual Artist). Of the 137 email addresses provided, about 15 were returned as no longer existing, there were also about 25 politely negative replies from others now living outside the UK. And in the end 41 agreed to take part, returning the questionnaires during an eight week period . There was then a three stage approach, first a questionnaire, then a request to keep an email diary, then a studio visit for a fuller interview and discussion. Thirty full questionnaires were returned completed, the remaining 11 were semi-completed (ie only a few of the questions

answered and so discarded). In total 7 diaries were kept, and within the timescale of the project only three studio visits were made.

This small research initiative provided valuable insight into the daily working practices and the economies of young artists in London. The age ranges were all between 25 and 36, with one former GP turned artist aged 44, and two others were 39. Of the 30 respondents there were equal numbers of male and female, and a wide range of nationalities, including one Pole, one Bosnian, one Colombian, 2 French, one American, one German, one Austrian, two Danes, one South African, and one Swiss, and the rest were British. The majority lived and worked in East London, only five in Lewisham, and a few others in more far flung parts of London, but generally having a studio in East London. The most common provided postcodes were E1, E3, E11. Almost all of them lived in shared flats, paying around £300 a month in rent, more than half had studios with monthly rent varying from unusually cheap (£60) to average £100 per month with a handful a good deal more expensive at £200. Those who did not have studios were able to work at home. These were all highly qualified young people many with up to three degrees. The questionnaires also showed an exceptionally high level of professional commitment. The art work took priority but was funded through a wide range of jobs, many respondents had at least two jobs at the same time, and these were taken on as a means of supporting their 'own work'. Taking all the collected data together (including the diaries) a number of themes emerge;

a) the three art colleges provided a point of contact for bringing together as a 'one-off project' an exhibition whose uniqueness was its scale, ambition and enterprise in terms of space acquisition, sponsorship and

publicity. The positive reviews in the press provided strong material for the CV and portfolio, however the network existed primarily in this instance as event:

b) the transnational make up of the respondents was also marked, the majority of whom were non UK nationals, 'passing through' London in career terms, and already living elsewhere 8 months later (2). Those who were most responsive in relation to the research (especially those who kept a diary) remained in London, had studios or lived in East London and were persistently self-presenting by sending many email and hard copy invitations to all subsequent shows. Indeed the reciprocity factor from the artist's point of view with a research project like this, hinges on contacts with interested academics who might also become reviewers, or write a catalogue essay. Maintaining contact with an institution like Goldsmiths (where part-time tutoring provides a stable income for many arts and media practitioners) and demonstrating an instinctual 'network sensibility' which privileges 'keeping in touch' as an investment strategy, by means of an email address which carries 'academic' rather than 'business' values, is how this kind of network actually works;

c) in relation to making a living within the space of flows, with particular reference to London, and in this case South East London, we could suggest exceptionally high degrees of mobility at local and translocal levels. The respondents converged in East London for studio space and for living accommodation but none of them indicated any special attachment to 'community' or neighbourhood' nor was their paid work in any way related to the area and its social or public services

d) the level of activity was quite frenetic, with each respondent working from dawn to dusk up to 7 days a week, criss-crossing London's many neighbourhoods throughout the day for the purposes of paid jobs and also art work. None had children, though there was mention of partners.

However relatively little time was given over to domestic life, or indeed to leisure, with cooking and eating with friends or partner or a trip to the cinema, usually also work-related the only periods of time off . An overwhelmingly organised and highly structured schedule put paid to the chaotic ideal of bohemian lifestyle, these were clearly 'career artists';
e) despite this heavy investment in art work, financial returns were minimal, those who had sold work over the last year came from the Royal College of Art (known for both its business acumen and for painting and sculpture, both of which are sellable unlike video or installation work). Of the tiny number of artists who had sold work, all but one earned less than £1000 from sales, this exception was Gordon Cheung who had earned £10,000 from sales or leases. The artists spent a lot of time applying for grants, attending seminars with artists' advisors , and hoping to find some means of supporting the cost of their work and studio space, while at the same time still owing substantial amounts for student loans, business loans, and credit cards. They lived from the assortment of jobs which took up a great deal of time with the result that art work was often squeezed into tiny corners of the day or evening. One woman wrote in her diary that she was so tired when she eventually got to her studio, on a Sunday afternoon, that she feel asleep. Another woman taught up to 20 hours a week of aerobics classes, and another had the same numbers of hours of TEFL classes, and one worked a 30 hour week in the Tate Modern bookshop. Another respondent, fully active in chasing commissions and making grant applications as well as playing a key organisational role in the Assembly show reported that her part time job took up 42 hours a week.

To sum up, there were three different ways of earning a living to support the art work. By far the most popular was mainstream art college teaching

for the contacts it brought, as well as access to materials and to a library. However this was highly sought work and often hard to come by. Next were art related jobs, which again had some advantages in terms of contacts and network , access to gallery opportunities, technical equipment, and a chain of other freelance jobs. These included arts handler ie ferrying art works in vans across the city, ('very good for contacts') visual merchandiser (window dressing), graphic design, photographers assistant, record producer, curator ('I got contacts to other artists who are already more settled down, but this did not assist my career in the art world yet') and commercial photographer. Finally there were non art related jobs, including cleaning work, teaching (aerobics, TEFL, in FE colleges) translation work, marketing and pr, sales assistant, maitre d, as well as 'temping'. This level of activity suggests a degree of realism, it is assumed that art work on its own is unviable, but far from this being a problem it is taken for granted so that 'other paid work' is used to prop up and provide the financial underpinning for the real work which is the primary source of identity and of self value and status. This mode of cultural production shares much in common with the novelist who writes at night after a day's work as a sub-editor or proof reader, or the actor who dare not give up the 'day job'. Secondary activities support the primary art work in the hope or expectation that either the art work will eventually pay off or else that a good enough teaching job will allow the artist to abandon at least some of the other work.

What marks out this mode as distinctive in the context of London and the creative industries is not just the multi-tasking and the transnational flow of artists in and out of the capital, but the network sensibility, the know-how about useful contacts and keeping in touch, the cultural expertise in terms of keeping up to date with new art and cultural theories, with films

and exhibitions, with the need to be doing ‘research’, with planning and self promotion and the various means of doing this, in short with the serious business of being an artist. London provided the possibility of finding the kind of work which could maintain the art identity, Goldsmiths was clearly recognised as a hub within the artists’ networking activities, and East London marked a convergence site for studio and also exhibition space, there was little time for domesticity and living space was defined in terms of affordability, such was the speed of flows that special attachment to the spaces of neighbourhood or community was rarely commented on. Despite the difficulties there was high degree of optimism, singularity of purpose and dedication to the art work as a source of self identity. These respondents fulfilled Rose’s account of the emergence of the entrepreneur of the self, ‘individuals are to become , as it were, entrepreneurs of themselves , shaping their own lives through the choices they make among the forms of life available to them’ (Rose 1999).

<u>‘Very little painting sales, no commissions, not signed to a gallery, no dealer.’ Response to email questionnaire.</u>

This ‘life-biography’ (as Beck would call it) shows how the entrepreneurial mode dominates the career in art (Beck 1992). The Assembly artists are highly self reliant. Self organisation requires connection with an art-oriented network, including a point of contact with the public sector for teaching. These people are all avid multi-taskers

moving around the city and beyond at great speed. (Few references were made to other parts of the UK, confirming London's disembedded or lifted out status (Giddens 1991). Highly disciplined and hard working, the respondents reported on endless self-monitoring of their own performances in relation to the many plans and projects they have running simultaneously. This self -reflexivity is so part of the course that the questionnaires, diaries and interviews were set upon with relish. These were also small scale micro-economies relying on huge investments of time, mental and physical effort and there were real costs in terms of leisure, personal and family life. London's extended macro-economy, its public institutions, its private sector and its service sector in particular provided the younger artists with at least the possibility of using other forms of part time work to subsidise their 'own work'.

London's global city labour market has permitted a series of micro-enterprises of art and art related activity whose defining features are low (or no) capital returns, but which generate high cultural capital (Bourdieu 1984, 1993) the value of which is exchangeable in more extended creative labour markets, this cultural capital also bestows status on participants which compensates for the precarious life and the expense of the investment .We might then ask, is this a pattern we might expect to find emerging in other similar urban centres? We might also inquire as to the longer term outcomes for such significant numbers of artists and those working alongside them or supporting them? The Creative Lewisham study (the area in which Goldsmiths College is located) suggests that there are more than 500 arts or creative businesses within the area, but given how recent this growth is and how few detailed studies there have been of this kind of activity (considered over the duration for

example of a lifetime's work) the key feature has then got to be the degree of risk or uncertainty (Landry 2001). These fully flexible units might mutate and transform and develop according to any number of variables. There is no model, these are 'permanently transitional' pathways.

It is difficult also to locate the power relations at work, we might imagine them to be those which exist in and through the mechanisms of self regulation. These are deeply inculcated at a corporeal level, they are the degrees of self exhortation, to make it, to do better, to talk to the right people, to achieve success. Endless self disciplining, the burden of self assessment, and the handling of self promotion as well as the privatisation of disappointment and the internalisation of grievances suggest power to be embedded in the sometimes surely torturous practices based on the normative requirement to be motivated, to keep in touch, to make the effort, to take responsibility for personal success and the many other daily routines of self maintenance. For the artists in the Assembly show these crowd out other possibilities and indeed negate by their sheer forcefulness ideas which run counter to these neo-liberal notions of endless self invention. Gone are the kinds of radical and collaborative actions of the past which drew artists closer to marginalised or disadvantaged groups, gone to are artist community initiatives, there were no signs in the questionnaires of art connecting with social work, or with work with children, the mentally ill, or the elderly. They are radically disconnected and dislocated from 'community'.

Let me conclude this chapter by suggesting that all of these participants could be described as ' new subjects of cultural individualisation', they

are self disciplining and self managing, they understand themselves to be fully responsible for the choices and pathways they have followed, they enjoy this freedom and prefer to take on many tasks or projects rather than consider (even when it might be more lucrative) normal work or stable employment in an art-related field (eg secondary school art teaching). London is for them all a city of network possibilities, but where there is such a burden of expectation to 'make it' as an artist, the global city becomes strangely drained of life and vitality, it is de-socialised as surely as it is neo-liberalised. Or to put it another way, strong commitment to place and involvement in the neighbourhoods of the global city including 're-territorialisation', are increasingly precluded or made impossible by the speeded up economy of art working. The city becomes, not a place of living, but a shadowy backdrop for contacts, parties, events and 'possibilities'. The relationship to the city is tenuous, even ephemeral, not unlike that which shapes the other projects and temporary contracts. It may well be that in the near future, with the growth of a transnational cultural economy, London remains rich as a site for creative transactions and network opportunities, but becomes more locally impoverished as this increasingly nomadic workforce uses the city as a 'hot desk' space for 'passing through', but is unable to generate the kind of income now needed to settle in London. This in turn might well mean that the high hopes for a sustainable creative sector in the city are unviable without a policy change on the part of government. This would require a dramatic re-consideration of the value of the entrepreneurial model for the future of the creative economy.

But how do these conditions play out in the context of Berlin, now or in the near future? Is this the moment to argue for rapid re-socialisation of the small scale or independent arts and cultural sector on a not-for-profit

basis? Such a claim might be made on the grounds of job creation, 'pleasure in work', and also to encourage the re-connection of arts and culture within the socio-political field, ie as a means of re-creating civic culture? Can a not-for-profit ethos allow additional income generated over time, be re-invested in further job creation and in re-paying the cost of initial support and investment by government. Can the cultural and the creative re-kindle community so as to allow for the longer-term commitment to place and space and thus to the re-imagining of 'narrative sociality'?

Notes.

1) To date (August 2003) the full research material from the project comprises of 20 extended interviews based on visits, observational analysis from events, huge quantities of promotional material from contacts and respondents received by email, the email questionnaires from Assembly, and finally from 'hub initiatives ' ie Goldsmiths meetings and seminars.
2) It was difficult to know exactly how many of the 174 artists were temporarily in London, and what the flow rates were backwards and forwards from place of origin. 25 emails were received (mostly from South East Asia) indicating that the artists were back in the country of origin, and hence unable to take part.

References

Bauman Zygmunt, (2000). Liquid Modernity, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.

Beck Ulrich, (1992). Risk Society, Sage, London,UK.

Bourdieu (1984): Distinction, Routledge, London, UK.
Bourdieu (1993): The Field of Cultural Production, Polity Press Cambridge, UK.
Castells Manuel, (1996). The Rise of the Network Society, Blackwell, Cambridge Mass, and Oxford UK.
Castells Manuel, (2002). 'An Introduction to the Information Age' in The City Reader (eds) Bridge Gary and Watson Sophie, Oxford University Press, pp 125-135, Oxford UK.
Ewenstein Boris (2003) PhD Research on Cultural Learning in London and Berlin Goldsmiths College London.
Giddens Anthony, (1991). Modernity and Self Identity, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
GLA Economics, (2003). Creativity: London's Core Business www.london.gov.uk
Landry Charles, (2001). Creative Lewisham, available as report at www.lewisham.gov.uk
Lash Scott and Urry John, (1994). The Economies of Signs and Space, Sage, London,UK.
Lazzarato Maurice, (1996). 'Immaterial Labor', in Makdisi S et al (eds) Marxism Beyond Marxism, pp133-146,Routledge, London, UK.
McRobbie Angela, (1998). British Fashion Design, Routledge, London,UK.
McRobbie Angela, (2002). 'From Holloway to Hollywood: Happiness at Work in the New Cultural Economy' in (eds) Paul Du Gay and Michael Pryke, Cultural Economy, pp97-115, Sage, London, UK.
McRobbie Angela, (2003). Club to Company, in Cultural Studies: Special Issue on 'Who Needs Cultural Intermediaries'? 16 (4) pp516-531.
Negus Keith, (1996). Producing Pop, Edward Arnold, London,UK.
Nixon Sean, (2003). Advertising Cultures, Sage, London, UK.

Patterson Richard, (2001). Work Histories in Television, in Media, Culture and Society vol 23 pp 495-520.
Rose Nikolas, (1999). Powers of Freedom, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge UK.
Ross Andrew, (2003). No Collar, Basic Books, New York, US.
Sassen Saskia, (1991). The Global City, Princeton University Press, New Jersey, US.
Sassen Saskia, (2000). 'New Frontiers Facing Urban Sociology at the Milennium' in British Journal of Sociology vol 51 no 1 pp143-159.
Sassen Saskia, (2002). Extract from 'Globalisation and its Discontents' in The City Reader as above pp 161-171.
Sennett Richard, (1998). The Corrosion of Character, Norton, New York, US.
Scott Allen J, (2000). The Cultural Economy of Cities, Sage, London, UK.
Soja Edward, (2002). 'Six Discourses on the Postmetropolis' in The City Reader as above pp 188-197.
Terranova Tiziana, (2000). 'Free Labor: Producing Culture for the Digital Economy' in Social Text 63, vol 18, no 2, pp 33-57.
Thornton Sarah, (1996). Club Culture, Polity Press, Cambridge, UK.
Wittel Andreas, (2001). 'Toward a Network Sociality', in Theory, Culture and Society, vol 18, no 6 pp 51-77 Sage, London, UK.
Zukin Sharon, (1988). Loft Living, Hutchinson, London UK.