

EGOS Conference 2007
Sub-theme 43:
Creativity and enterprise in unusual places

Creative industries, governmentalities, and heterotopias:
The case of a local government in France¹

Thomas Froehlicher
Professor, ICN Graduate Business School
Artem

Arnaud Guillemin*
Assistant Professor, ICN Graduate Business School
Doctoral Candidate, University Nancy 2

Patricia Apangu
Assistant Professor, ICN Graduate Business School

Abstract

Creative industries, since 1997, have become assets for economic and cultural development. Nations around the world, at different political levels, are now focusing on the development of a creative industries policy. The success of this concept can be linked to the fact that this meta-sector has one of the highest levels of economic growth in these last years. Despite the growing number of studies on creative industries, the rationale behind the implementation of this type of policy remains unclear. We seek to further understand how and why local governments are participating in creative industries and how it is spatially acted, by using the concepts of governmentality and heterotopias, as defined by Foucault (1991a, 1997), to explore the rationality and the dynamics behind this policy.

Our study focuses on the case of the “Grand Lyon” and its economic development agency. In early 2006, Lyon decided to launch a creative industries policy focused on its two existing creative clusters linked to fashion and video games, Lyon Vision Mode and Lyon Game respectively. A transversal approach was taken to include various and often unconnected sectors. Lyon is the third largest French city with a strong industrial economy. The city has the ambition to be in the top fifteen of the creative regions in Europe.

Our results demonstrate that, first of all, the practices of creative industries highlight the different types of technologies that were expressing the rationality and mentality of the ‘governors’. We also found that the policy deployed by the local government created two types of heterotopias (Foucault, 1997). These separate and different spaces appeared as places for creativity in the development and implementation of the creative industries strategy. These heterotopias help to build a sense of community among the participants, and create a tribe, clan, or as defined by Florida (2002), a class.

¹ This research has been financially supported by the ‘Communauté du Grand Lyon’ and we would to thank them for this great support.

Introduction

Creative industries, since 1997, have become assets for economic and cultural development. Nations around the world, at different political levels, are now focusing on the development of creative industries policy. The success of this concept can be linked to the fact that this meta-sector has one of the highest levels of economic growth in these last years. We define creative industries using the definition of Leadbeater (1999: 49): “*Creative industries, such as music, entertainment and fashion, are driven ... not by trained professionals but cultural entrepreneurs who make the most of other people’s talent and creativity. In creative industries, large organisations provide access to the market, through retailing and distribution, but the creativity comes from a pool of independent content producers*”. Despite the growing number of studies on creative industries, the rationale behind the implementation of this type of policy remains unclear. Creative industries, as a policy, are a strategic and tactical move, in de Certeau view (1984). Creative industries are then a way to govern economic development in the knowledge economy. The notion of government brings us to the concept developed by Foucault and further developed by Dean (2006), that of governmentality. Governmentality stresses a way to think about government which is analysed as the area where power is located (Lemke, 2001). We advance that governmentality is situated; place and space matter. Using the definitions and analysis of de Certeau (1984) and Lefebvre (2000) regarding place and space, and Foucault’s concept of heterotopia (1968), we have attempted to understand the rationale behind the creative industry policy by asking the question: what can we learn from practices within creative industries about the rationality of governing ? And, how does space, and what type of space matters in the dynamics of the creative industries ?

To answer these questions, we will first go back to the concepts of governmentality, space and heterotopias (Part I). Then we will present the case on which our analysis has been based on (Part II) and will discuss the findings highlighted by the case and the confrontation with these concepts (Part III). We will finish with the conclusion in which our main findings will be emphasized and some limits highlighted.

I. Literature Review

1. *Governing in space*

Creative industries are driven by government policies, either at a national or regional level. In this restrictive sense of government, the state “*apparatus*,” appears as a new economic logic of governing. The term “creative industries” are often used to replace “cultural industries” (Bilton, 2007), in doing so, placing emphasis on the productive or innovative function of creativity. This distinction is situated within a context of the “new economy”, an economy of knowledge, where growth is supposed to come from creative sectors. The term “creative industries” helps to focus on the need to be economically profitable, which has not always been in the case of the cultural industries, and as such expresses “essentializing dualisms” (Jeffcut and Pratt, 2002:227). The importance of creativity, of the economy, of knowledge seems to bring light to a new type of governmentality.

2. *Governmentality as an analytical tool*

Governmentality, the concept developed by Michel Foucault in his lectures at the *Collège de France* on the “genealogy of the state,” is an elongation of his work that has focused on the power and discipline, but never explicitly on the State. For Foucault, the notion of governmentality views the State as a logical actor governing itself and others. His question was “to discover which kind of rationality being used” (Foucault, 1981:226). Rationality is relative term, referring to social relations, to historical practices (Lemke, 2001) with the aim to examine “how forms of rationality inscribe themselves in practices or systems of practices, and what role they play within them, because it is true that ‘practices’ do not exist without a certain regime of rationality” (Foucault, 1991b: 79). The first implication is that rationality is not viewed as an absolute concept to be analysed as its own independent object. Rationality is embedded in practices of government. We can then discover the rationality by analysing the *regime of practices*, or the ways of going about doing things (Dean, 2006). In addition to rationality, Dean (2006) dissects the word into its roots, government and mentality, to express the mental disposition of governing, in doing so, highlighting the way of thinking about how we govern (Dean, 2006). Thinking is a collective activity (Dean, 2006) based on knowledge, shared ideas. Governmentality is then a way to understand the system of thoughts embedded in the ways in which things are done. Mentalities and rationalities produce technical and

practical means to conduct, either the other, either oneself. Technologies of power, for example, cannot be analysed without the analysis of the political rationality underpinning them (Lemke, 2001).

In Foucault's analysis, government is not limited to the State. Government, defined as the conduct of conduct, is viewed in any power-based relationship. Governing involves thinking of how to govern oneself and others, or how to activate the action of others and of oneself. It involves technologies, for example, the technologies of power. Different types of technologies have been highlighted in the literature (Dean, 2006). The two main types that have been differentiated are the technologies of the self and the technologies of domination. Technologies of the self include all techniques (procedures, methods) that individuals apply to themselves to reach a goal and that come from their rational and mental system. Technologies of domination those "technologies imbued with aspirations for the shaping of conduct in the hope of producing certain desired effects and averting certain undesired one" (Rose, 1999:52). These technologies express the system of thought of the governors. These two technologies must be analysed not as separated entities but as interactive ones. As Foucault states, *"He has to take into account the points where the technologies of domination of individuals over one another have recourse to processes by which the individual acts upon himself. And conversely, he has to take into account the points where the techniques of the self are integrated into structures of coercion and domination. [...] Governing people, in the broad meaning of the word, is not a way to force people to do what the governor wants, it is always a versatile equilibrium, with complementarities and conflicts between techniques which assure coercion and processes through which the self is constructed or modified by himself"* (Foucault, 1993:203-4). The consequence is that governing involves reflexivity. The techniques used to govern reveal mentality but are also actualised through the analysis of the thought supporting actions. The techniques can then be viewed as mobile and evolving expressions of how one thinks at a particular moment.

Technologies of the self are techniques that allow individuals to affect, by their own means, a certain number of operations on their own bodies, minds, souls and lifestyles, so as to transform themselves in order to attain a certain state of happiness, and quality of life. There are relations between technologies of the self and technologies of domination. Thus, governmentality is *"at once internal and external to the state, since it is the tactics of government which make possible the continual definition and redefinition of what is within*

the competence of the state and what is not, the public versus the private, and so on; thus the state can only be understood in its survival and its limits on the basis of the general tactics of governmentality” (1991a: 103).

3. Spaces and other spaces for creativity

When dealing with creativity, the notion of space is important (Kristensen, 2004). Space is a concept that has been widely used, especially in economic geography, to understand phenomena such as that those of industrial districts or clusters. It is, however, an ambiguous term that needs to be defined, especially to stress the difference between space and place. We will use de Certeau (1984) to understand the meaning of space. De Certeau (1984:117) states that *“A place is the order (of whatever kind) in accord with which elements are distributed in relationship of coexistence. It thus excludes the possibility of two things to be at the same location. The law of the ‘proper’ rules in the place: the elements taken into consideration are beside one another, each situated in its own ‘proper’ and distinct location, a location it defines. A place is thus an instantaneous configuration of positions. It implies an indication of stability. A space exists when one takes into consideration vectors of direction, velocities, and time variables. Thus space is composed of intersections of mobile elements. It is in a sense actuated by the ensemble of movements deployed within it. Space occurs as the effect produced by the operations that orient it, situate it, temporalize it.”* Space involves mobility and is produced by action. In this conceptualisation, space is created by the movement and the possibilities of movement of the ones that are moving. This is in line with Lefebvre (2000) and his concept of living space. Space is not defined without the one that must define it. It is submitted to *subjectification*. Space is then the appropriation of opportunities of mobility. This means that living space is constrained by representation of space, and space of representation (Lefebvre, 2000). This adds the technical or architectural part of space, where mobile elements are constrained by non-mobile elements, and also the cognitive part, where perception and knowledge play an important role. Then, space can be constrained by mental models that can restrain the number of vectors of direction and of velocity.

Space is created through play (Steyaert, 2006; Hjorth, 2004). Creative spaces emerge *“from a specific relationality, namely how these spaces alter our way of thinking and living ourselves in the usual spaces of everyday life”* (Steyaert, 2006). These spaces can be qualified as thirdspaces or other spaces. These spaces can be linked to governmentality in that they can

have an influence on, or change, the mentality. They can impact how we think of ourselves doing things, and then governing. Why can these spaces do this ? Because they involve spaces in which mobility is different and where temporality is different. That is what Foucault (1986) calls *heterotopias* and *heterochrony*. Heterotopias are sites “*that have the curious property of being in relation with all the other sites, but in such a way as to suspect, neutralise, or invert the set of relations that they happen to designate, mirror, or reflect*” (Defert, 1997:265). In heterotopias, it is much more the mobility of mind that is emphasised than physical mobility. Heterotopias produce mental velocities, as locations full of layers of meanings, and are also produced by mental velocity. Heterotopias have the property to juxtapose “*in a single real space several spaces, several sites that are in themselves incompatible*” (Foucault, 1986). It is in fact this incompatibility that opens the door for mobility. The space is then defined as intersections between mobile incompatibilities. Heterotopias involve heterochrony. In heterotopias, time is different, different from the usual time. This time can go faster or slower. This is due to the historical part that is present in heterotopias, a kind of path where incompatibilities are making people wonder. In heterotopias, we are experiencing, living, and so, appropriating unusual spaces. Unusual, not because they are unknown, but because they dismantle our way of thinking to reconstruct another way. Unusual because their access is neither easy nor neutral. There are some rituals to enter a heterotopia. Some people can be excluded even if they think that they entered. Heterotopia is then a located utopia. Then creativity, as a utopia, can become real in heterotopia.

II. The case study

To respond to our questions, we have used the case study method to allow us to deeply understand facts (Eisenhardt, 1989). Our study was conducted within the territory of the ‘Communauté du Grand Lyon’, in close partnership, with the economic development agency within the Grand Lyon. Our research can be viewed as abductive and interpretative. The questions and the theoretical background are the result of the interaction between the case and theories. We conducted eight interviews with different actors (three from Grand Lyon, three with industrials, two with designers). These interviews were recorded and transcribed before being analysed using a thematic analysis. Triangulation was used as a way to strengthen our analysis (Yin, 2003).

1. *The history of creative industry within the Grand Lyon*

In 2005, the economic development agency of the “*Grand Lyon*” (Greater Lyon Area) began reflecting on the creative industries and the economy of the city-region, launching its own creative industries policy in early 2006. We have had the opportunity to work with the agglomeration, in the creation and implementation of this policy. This case study seeks to illustrate the use of *governmentalities* and the creation of heterotopias as a manner to understand the creative industries policy. “*Grand Lyon*” will be used to refer to the economic development agency. Precisions will be made in the case of references to other agencies or departments within the city of Lyon or the agglomeration of Lyon.

Catching wind of the growing interest in the creative industries, from the work of Florida, to the implementation of policies in cities such as London, the “*Grand Lyon*,” in 2005, embarked on a benchmarking of creative industries policies in similarly sized, structured and positioned cities. Lyon is the third largest city in France with a strong industrial economy linked to the chemicals and textiles industries. It is its ambition to be recognized in the top fifteen of creative regions in Europe, if not globally.

In early 2006, using the clusters, Lyon Vision Mode, established in 2003, and Lyon Game, established in 2005, as the foundation for its strategy, the Grand Lyon began to deploy its new policy. These existing clusters, representing the fashion and new media respectively, had not previously been referred to as either a creative industry or a creative cluster.

Unlike many of its contemporaries, the “*Grand Lyon*” interpreted the term “creative industries” in a distinctive manner. Apart from Lyon Vision Mode and Lyon Game, which fell within the widely used definitions of creative industries², the Grand Lyon sought to include the industrial, manufacturing-based firms that have traditionally been at the core of the regional economy in addition to designers and artists. For the economic development agency, the primary objective of its creative industry was to foster creation through collaboration among entrepreneurs and industrialists from differing industries. Historically,

² Creative Industries according to the United Kingdom’s Department of Culture, Media and Sport are “those industries that are based on individual creativity, skill and talent. They are also those that have the potential to create wealth and jobs through developing intellectual property.”

the firms and individuals in Lyon have operated within a closed-world, which limited the opportunities for interaction and collaboration outside of their own space.

After extensive study and analysis of the economic structure of the greater Lyon territory, the creative industries strategy was put in place. The goal of the Grand Lyon was to identify and involve the industries or activities within the city-region that were economically and/or creatively well-positioned. Various sectors and industries were identified including textiles, small household appliances, design (fashion, industrial), film and television, video games and toys. The economic development agency then encountered these differing firms and individuals to better understand their needs and goals in more effectively structure the involvement of all actors (the Grand Lyon and firms alike). The individuals identified as creative catalysts within these firms were invited to participate to the launch meeting, during which the Grand Lyon presented the strategy and the goals of its creative industries policy. As noted by a key actor of Grand Lyon, *“the goal is to build more links between actors so they can share ideas. We would like them to find interest in exchanging and developing common ideas. This should take the form of projects.”* A benchmark of creative industries policies in other cities was used to explain the importance of this strategic direction to both the territory of the greater Lyon area, and also the entrepreneurs and enterprises located within it. The Grand Lyon highlighted the role of creativity at the core of new developments, and that among the firms interviewed, there was recognition of the need to be more creative, and to find new ideas to differentiate their firm and its products on the market. As stated by an actor, *“we feel the need to look outside of our own world and have the opportunity to take a little distance from our day-to-day job”*.

During this meeting, a consultant to the Grand Lyon proposed a variety of projects that could be launched. Immediately, some participants seized the topic, and counter-proposed differing orientations. Their approach, contrary to that of the consultant, focused on transverse themes that were broad enough to involve actors from the different sectors, industries and professions implicated in the working group.

Reactions to this meeting were in some cases rather direct. A participant from the fashion industry remarked discreetly afterwards, *“I do not understand why the people from the Grand Lyon are involving themselves. They are from the public sector and do not know how to do it. Most of the time, when they try to involve themselves in the private sector, they create a*

mess.” Another actor, a designer, said to everyone: *“we are designers in Lyon and we have been here for three years. We are working with firms in Paris but none in Lyon or the greater region but we are not desperate to work with firms in this region.”*

At the end of the meeting, it was agreed that working groups open to those pre-selected would be launched to reflect on the themes proposed. It was planned that the working group would meet regularly at a “creative quarter” within this city, due to the neutral nature of this location.

2. Putting creative industries into action and place

As the actors of the Grand Lyon began to plan the way they wanted to work, one of their objectives was to create noise and to break rules. As one said: *“we would like to bring them into an atmosphere and a world where they are not comfortable. If we want this to work, we have to plan it well and to make them satisfied because we know that we have no legitimacy in their eyes. In fact, we do not want to appear so much; we want them to feel that they are appropriating this reasoning. We want them to discover that there exist other ways to look at their business, to look at other businesses”*. The Grand Lyon organized many meetings with us to work on ideas about planning events, inviting experts and selecting themes of intervention. Communication was a key element to the strategy. A newsletter was established so that all interested parties would be informed of what was happening and was sent to not only the actors involved in the project but also to other targeted actors. At the request of participants, visits were arranged by the Grand Lyon to the firms implicated in an attempt to build partnerships and to understand the activities of various sectors and to bring light to possible areas for collaboration.

One of the goals was to reunite all participants once every second month as a way to reinforce and extend the network. Given the closed-world tradition of the city, the goal was to open new channels of communication among disparate actors. The first meeting brought together over 50 actors from differing sectors of activities, excluding those representatives of the Grand Lyon. This meeting focused on the interplay and interdependency of art, science and business, with a talk given by a subject matter expert. Feedback was mixed, in some cases extremely positive, and in others, a sense of impatience was conveyed by those in search of concrete information and projects.

According to one industry participant, *“during the working groups, you have the feeling to be disconnected from your own reality.”* Another one stated: *“being in this type of place helps you to reflect on your own view of things. I realized that we were perceiving creativity in a narrow way. What is interesting is that, through exchanges, the others are acting as a kind of mirror”*. In the words of a third industrial, *“you had sometimes the feeling to be in an unreal place because some artists, designers were expressing their view on creativity and were bringing us to paths we were not used to”*.

There was an active attempt of the actors of the Grand Lyon to maintain contact with the participants. Telephone calls, email exchanges, and face-to-face encounters were used to continue the dialogue in order to better understand the perceptions of this meeting, the expectations of the participants, and areas for improvement or addition. Existing networks of the Grand Lyon were used to communicate this strategy and to encourage participation in this initiative. During this meeting, in a pre-planned intervention, a highly regarded industry-based firm CEO, considered legitimate in the eyes of many industrials, presented a positive testimony on the creative industries policy and its benefits for his firm, other firms and the territory itself. His participation in this meeting was not by chance. This individual is known to be quite active in the territory, known not only in name, but by face, if not personally, by many of the participants and viewed by the Grand Lyon as someone representing the openness they aimed to foster within the territory.

In its discourse, the Grand Lyon explicitly sought to use the lexicon used within the private sector, and in so, familiar to firms. The creative industries, as defined by the Grand Lyon, were used in order to build a consensus among creative and industrial actors. As stated by a representative of the Grand Lyon, *“we wanted to show that we view things in an economical way. We want to prove that this can create future economic profits for participants. We benchmarked, first of all, to see how other cities were doing. But we also used this [information] to demonstrate that all the big cities we are in competition with are moving towards creative industries. And as we like to be viewed as leaders in the region, we were expecting people to develop an interest in this initiative.”*

The term transversality was used often and at play in the discourse of the Grand Lyon. It was used to demonstrate the awareness of the preoccupation of firms and also that the Grand Lyon itself could be viewed as transverse.

III. Analysis and Discussion

1. “Creative industries” as an artefact for new spaces of government

In this section, we seek to analyse the case and to emphasise the mentalities and the technologies of the Grand Lyon that were used to implement the change. This change can be viewed as a change in the mentality (of those being governed) and the techniques (used to govern) of the ones governed. This required particular spaces (of action and of interaction) to emerge.

1. Mentalities and Practices

The Grand Lyon can be viewed as an organized system, not in a state of domination. Power is at the heart of the analysis but not in the usual sense given. Power, according to Foucault, is not domination but is viewed as a strategic game (Lemke, 2001). Government is a kind of mediation between strategic games and domination. Governing is seen as a source of power where people are supposed to have a degree of freedom. “Power is about guidance, governing the forms of self-government, structuring and shaping the field of possible action of subjects” (Lemke, 2001). Government is the singular mode of action where power is situated.

The actors of the Grand Lyon were aware of this situation, knowing that they could not obligate or constrain the economic actors of their territory to participate in their strategy of “creative industries”. As a governor, the Grand Lyon was viewed in the eyes of the private sectors primarily as a public service, or bureaucracy, lacking performance in its ways of thinking, working, and acting. The mentalities of the ones governed, we can say, were based on the shared view that the boundaries between private and public world were strong and without porosity. The “public people” were continuously launching new ideas that were counterproductive and for their own ‘electoral’ interests not the economic interests of the territory. In this perspective, the role of the Grand Lyon was to provide means and allocate resources in an effective way, but not to initiate new strategies and new ways of thinking.

Different technologies have been used by the Grand Lyon to appear as more legitimate and to initiate the ‘creative industries’ strategy. First of all, they restructured the economic development agency and created a service entitled the “service to enterprises.” The goal here

was to listen to the local market and to its actors and then to propose new services to help them reach their goals. They recruited younger employees to manage the different activities, i.e. a project leader for Lyon Vision Mode, and also, Lyon Game. Benchmarking was widely used, as evident with the creative industries. They also put in place different indicators to follow activities and to communicate about them. Through these practices represent a use of technologies of performance (Dean, 2006). These technologies were used to make accountable individuals within the Grand Lyon, to make them ‘calculative individuals’ within ‘calculable spaces’ (Miller, 1992). In fact, the technologies, and then the rationality of the Grand Lyon must then be analysed in link with not only the importance of the ‘economy’ but the importance of ‘the knowledge economy’. The duality between creativity and industry (Jeffcutt and Pratt, 2001) made it important, if not essential, for the Grand Lyon to adopt a way of thinking that was in line with that which the ‘new economy’ signifies. These approaches, and the technologies above, explain why the Grand Lyon avoided using the words ‘*culture, cultural or cultural industries*’. First of all, for them, cultural was not viewed as an economic term. In the French collective mind, culture is a kind of exception that must be defended, without any economical constraint (Bilton, 2007). Second, the cultural development service was viewed in this way within the Grand Lyon and the actors of the economic development did not want culture to be involved in the creative industries policy because “it would have been a disaster”. Thirdly, the cultural development department was situated at the level of city government, whereas the economic development agency of the Grand Lyon was situated at the level of the agglomeration of Lyon and the greater region. Technologies of performance, however, were not the only technologies that could explain these views.

Apart from these technologies, that represent technologies of the self, they also use technologies of domination, or the technologies of others. Here we advance the notion of the technology of mobility. As used by the Grand Lyon, this technology was both a technology of the self and a technology of the others. The means or techniques of these technologies were based upon empowerment, interaction (dialogue), movement (of encounters throughout the Grand Lyon), and lastly, “*ouverture*” or openness (of the system, the city, through the participation of people outside of the territory as either actors or as experts. While similar in some regards to what Cruikshank (1994) called the ‘technologies of citizenship,’ this technology goes further by integrating the notion of mobility. We prefer to use mobility as in contrast to the “*responsibilisation*” of a citizen or the creation of citizenship, the mentality of mobility serves to make economic actors move (mentally and physically), to open their minds

to others, and to break their paths and patterns. This technology has been employed within the Grand Lyon, as a technology of the self, but also as a technology of domination. It is through the combination of the technologies of performance, of citizenship and of mobility, the Grand Lyon succeeded to change its own mentality and to also facilitate the change in the mentalities of some actors. The domination was hidden, representing a sort of discursive and rhetorical strategy or tactic, in the sense of de Certeau (1994). It is through the discourse around 'creative industries' that the Grand Lyon succeeded to involve people, and to influence them to think differently. This did not happen immediately but through exchanges. Actors discovered other actors, and were exposed to different view points and ways of thinking within the Grand Lyon thanks to the working groups but also specific conferences animated by experts from various, and often non-business related streams. The actors from the Grand Lyon were, in some ways, "manipulative." They had a precise goal in mind: they wanted to change the image of Lyon with the goal to emerge as an important creative territory at the European and even global levels. Historically, the economic actors, and by extension, the entire society of Lyon, was perceived as being 'bourgeois', not particularly open, and not particularly interested in creation, although Lyon has a tradition of within the arts and fashion industries. The industrial myth of the city was firmly rooted, embedding a mentality of pure vertically divided nature, forming a sort of ethnocentrism. The economy of the greater Lyon area was strong and the territory was attractive. Success resulted in the development of strong routines and paths that created in a form of lock-in (Grabher, 1993), where paths guide much automatic behaviour (Bargh and Barndollar, 1996). The Grand Lyon unlocked itself through changes at the head of both the City Hall and at the Grand Lyon. The vice-president of the Grand Lyon, for example, possessed solid links to the fashion industry and through this interest, led the formal development of the cluster 'Lyon Vision Mode'. The mentality shift within the Grand Lyon resulted from a changing of the guard, bringing with them a differing view of the role of the agglomeration viewing the role differently and also a different repertory of knowledge. These elements along with the creative industries policy began to slowly influence the evolution of the image of the territory in the eyes of both public and private sector actors and the governing mentalities. One participant, stated in during the first conference, that when he accepted the invitation to be involved in the initiative he had doubts, but he participated nevertheless in order to be open and in the hope of finding new sources of improvement and inspiration. The working groups, he continued, presented him with not only the opportunity to meet potential collaborators, but also to learn different approaches and perspectives to the problems faced by his firm and his industry, and already, new projects

were beginning to emerge. Another participant also admitted that it was the first time that creativity in Lyon was a collective activity. This led a representative of the Grand Lyon to say: *“I am really amazed by the excitement among everyone. They did not know each other even though they are living and working in our territory. They understood that they have many things to share and now, they are also organizing firm visits.”*

Here, we see the role of the technology of mobility advanced, and within this, the importance of the technique of transversality. The dualism of creative industries helped to create a common problematic for the participants to begin to address. The use of the term “creative industry” by the Grand Lyon to promote creativity in a transversal and collective way can be viewed as a kind of technology, a technology of the self in others. Creative industries, as a term, as a discursive strategy, acted as a kind of ‘obligatory passage point’ (Callon, 1986) through which individuals have agreed to some behaviours, norms and so on.

2. *Situating governmentality in new spaces of action*

The main actions and confrontations, in the form of meetings, conferences and working groups, took place in two specific places: the formal offices of the Grand Lyon located in the centre of Lyon, and a creative hub, called “Villa Creatis” outside of the city. One can describe these two locations as heterotopias. The first, the Grand Lyon, and particularly the offices of the economic development agency consisted of an open space structure. Within this area, differing spaces of interaction were accumulated, composed of *the physical space*, or locality, which is an open working space; *the space of the public system*, represented by the status and the spirit of serving the territory; and *the space of the private sector*, represented by the will to be efficient and to bring the spirit of firms inside the Grand Lyon. The spaces of the public and spaces of the private were quite often, viewed as incompatible. It is through this incompatibility, however, that vectors of direction and velocity took place. Moving only within the space of the public system would have excluded the Grand Lyon from the private ‘outside.’ Likewise, moving only to the private space would have excluded the actors from the public ‘inside.’ This particularly uncomfortable situation forced the Grand Lyon to reflect upon its manner of acting, and about method of governing. This ambiguous space incited them to be creative. It has also been reinforced by the particular ‘time’ that exists within the Grand Lyon. It is always a kind of mix between the time related to economic action that is experienced by many actors in the city, and the time required for reflection. Time passes

differently because space is perceived and enacted differently. Mobility, then, or being mobile involves the compression or decompression of time. This reflects a sort of heterochrony due to the presence of the spirit of economy and the spirit of citizenship.

Concerning the Villa Creatis, many different spaces existed in this locale: the space of industry and the space of art; the space of efficiency and the space of authenticity; the space of competition and the space of cooperation. The immobility of individuals in this location did not restrain mental mobility. In this heterotopia, time differed. Actors experienced a pause in comparison to their normal activity and time. It was possible to breathe, and then, to reflect. This took on the form of the mirror as described by Foucault in his discussion of heterotopias. People at the Villa Creatis, were there in mental movement, and had the feeling to be somewhere that could be unreal. They were able to move from different spaces, and to exist between spaces without constraints. They could view themselves in the eyes of the others and could then, actualise, in the sense of de Certeau (1994), their own mental space by putting it in practice. Creative industries, then, created a space for play and invention (Hjorth, 2004). “Space emerges here as deterritorialized³” (Steyaert, 2006), a space of connections that are creating by practice. “Practice, the movement of actors and the flux of relations, tends to deterritorialize (in that possibilities not marked by codes and forms are actualised); but it also reterritorializes because these formations themselves are actualised” (Macgregor Wise, 1997:125). The creative industry policy of the Grand Lyon, through places and spaces gave the possibility to connect spaces of places and spaces of flows (Castells, 1997). But we extend flow in a sense that, contrary to Castells, it can be localised. The space of flow is not only at distance, it can be proximate and embedded in a set of places. It is the interplay between flows at distance and proximate flows that helped to create a stronger social contract. The flows are not only about information, or knowledge, they are also about informal signals, looks, mental mobility, and so, movement of mentalities. A place does not mean relationship, does not mean any kind of socialization. It is through acting space, or spacing, that a social contract is at play. The creative industry policy helped, through spacing and especially spacing mentalities, to build social relations.

Finally, one remaining, equally important aspect of spaces and heterotopias is that they created the conditions of transversality. Although, transversality is a word that suffers from

³ Deterritorializing (Deleuze and Guattari, 1987:423) means bringing « connections to bear against conjunction of the apparatuses of capture and domination ».

over utilization, we saw that, for all the actors within the economic development agency and the participants, transversality was important. In the '*Communauté*' du Grand Lyon, the government of the Greater Lyon area, boundaries existed between services. Among the participants, boundaries existed between sectors. These boundaries often vertical division, linked to functions or industries, and in other cases, horizontal divisions. But horizontal does not mean transversal. One can look at its competitor, but it does not mean that the individual is transverse. Transversality refers to the ability to look outside of one's own place and space. It involves moving outside of oneself and outside of one's sector or organisation. Heterotopias, through the different spaces of which they are composed, and through their actualisation process are platforms to create transversality. Transversality, as governmentality, cannot be understood outside of practices. This word was often used by different actors in Lyon, in a purely conceptual nature. Creative industries, through technologies and space, helped them to better understand what it meant through practice.

Conclusion

In this paper, we have attempted to understand the rationality of the creative industry policy of the Grand Lyon and to see how this policy was built and structured through practices. We also attempted to understand the role of space in the development of creativity. The creative space is not uncommon (Steyaert, 2006), but some types of space are less common than others, namely, heterotopias. Based on the concept of governmentality and heterotopias, we highlighted that, through different practices, the 'governors' from the Grand Lyon developed different types of technologies of power (particularly, technologies of performance, of mobility) that were based on shifting mentalities for both themselves and for others. The mentality shift was facilitated by spaces, specifically, by the two heterotopias highlighted. In these spaces, the freedom required to exercise power was present. It involved the possibility to move between different spaces within a time that was unusual to the actors. Governmentality and space/heterotopias are necessary tools were essential tools to understand the rationality and the dynamics of government of the Grand Lyon. Based on our approach, we can say that governmentality cannot be truly understood without situating it through places and spaces. In this thinking, the actors of the Grand Lyon took on the role of boundary shakers (Balogun et al., 2005). They shook the organizational, and mental or cognitive boundaries through the use of different technologies and practices. The actors, in doing so, involved themselves in the majority of the behind the scenes activities such as planning. They

were constrained by the ambiguity of the space they occupied as well as the constraints of the network system they were in. This revealed the importance of knowing how to play with, and within, these networks. We also found that creative industries were used to build consensus among actors to make them move, act and react, as desired by those governing. It is then clear that governing involves power through technologies. Power does not mean violence or consensus but rather strategic games and government. Creative industries were used as a tool and can be viewed, in fact, as an artefact, as a technology expressing a rationality or a mentality, with the intent to build relations among different actors as a means to diffuse creativity and then, in turn, to create economic growth. The policy put in place within the territory of the Grand Lyon, is quite different that the ones found in other cities in various countries, and is an explicit choice with the objective to create a shift in thinking, in the governing mentalities within the territory.

These different findings must, of course, be taken with caution. First of all, the concept of governmentality and heterotopias are quite complex, and as such, can be subject to oversimplification. Secondly, this study is based on a single case, and as such, requires further work using other cases. We think, however, that this case study has shown that the concepts are interesting in the study of economic development policy, particularly within the creative industries and should, then, be pursued in more detail.

References

- Bagolun J., Gleadle P., Hope Hailey V. and H. Willmott (2005); Managing Change Across Boundaries: Boundary-Shaking Practices, *British Journal of Management*, vol.16.
- Bargh J. and Barndollar K (1996); Automacity in Action: the Unconscious as repository of chronic goals and motives, in P.M. Gollwitzer and J.A. Bargh (eds), *The psychology of Action*, the Guilford press, New York.
- Bilton C. (2007); *Management and Creativity, from creative industries to creative management*, Blackwell Publishing.
- Callon M. (1986); Some elements of a sociology of translation: domestication of the scallops and the fishermen of the St Brieuc Bay, in J. Law (ed.), *Power, Action and Belief: A New Sociology of Knowledge*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Cruishank B. (1994); the will to empower: technologies of citizenship and the war on poverty, *Socialist Review*, vol. 23, 4.
- Dean M. (2006); *Governmentality, Power and Rule in Modern Society*, Sage Publications.
- de Certeau M. (1984); *The practice of everyday life*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Defert D. (1997); Foucault, Space, and the Architects, *Documenta X – The book*, Berlin: Cantz Verlag.
- Lefebvre H. (2000); *La production de l'espace*, 4^{ème} édition, Anthropos.
- Florida R. (2002) ; *The rise of the Creative Class*, New York: Basic Books.
- Foucault M. (1981) ; Omnes et singulatim : towards a criticism of « political reason », in S. McMurrin (ed.), *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, vol.2, Salt Lake City University of Utah Press.
- Foucault (1986); Of Other Spaces, *Diacritics*, vol. 16, 1.
- Foucault M. (1991a); Governmentality in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault M. (1991 b); Questions of method in G. Burchell, C. Gordon and P. Miller (eds), *The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality*, London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.
- Foucault M. (1993); About the beginnings of the hermeneutics of the self, *Political Theory*, vol 21, 2.
- Hjorth D. (2004); Creating space for play/invention-concepts of space and organizational entrepreneurship, *Entrepreneurship and Regional Development*, vol. 16, September.

- Jeffcut P. and Pratt A.C. (2002); Managing creativity in the cultural industries, *Creativity and Innovation Management*, vol. 11, 4.
- Kristensen T (2004); The Physical context of creativity, *Creativity and Innovation Management*, Vol. 13, 2.
- Lemke T. (2001); the birth of bio-politics: Michel Foucault's lectures at the College de France on neo-liberal governmentality, *Economy and Society*, vol. 30, 2.
- Macgregor Wise J. (1997); *Exploring technology and social space*, Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Miller P. (1992); Accounting and objectivity: the invention of calculating selves and calculable spaces, *Annals of Scholarship*, vol. 9.
- Rose N. (1999); *Power of Freedom: Reframing political thought*, Cambridge University Press.
- Steyaert C. (2006); Cities as Heterotopias and Third Spaces: the Example of ImagiNation, the Swiss Expo02 in Stewart R Clegg and Martin Kromberger (eds), *Space, Organizations and Management Theory*, Liber and Copenhagen Business School press.