0. Introduction

The aim of this book is to reframe debates about creative hubs. Thus farther focus of interest have been dominated by generic solutions (a creative hubs model), the promotion of creative aspirations (branding, or naming buildings), or operational 'how to' guides. Whilst we can appreciate the pragmatic need for such solutions, as researchers who have been following the creative hubs phenomenon for the last twenty years, we are frustrated. This frustration relates to the presence of an absence, that absence is the day-to-day experience of working in a hub. The rich diversity of hubs either has been suppressed, or squeezed into a narrow set of ideal types; our concern is that the desire to simplify and communicate the potential contribution or role of hubs can end up 'throwing out the baby with the bathwater'.

From our perspective on of the most important 'hidden' aspects of hubs that find little expression in the writings about hubs is the voice of those that work in hubs. This oversight is all the more critical given the transformation of all work, and in particular work in the cultural economy, in recent years which has highlighted the overall growth in the cultural economy, the structural and organisation changes (evidenced by micro-enterprises and freelance work), and the particular affective conditions of cultural labour. The first two factors in part explain a demand for hubs, but the latter concerns the ways that hubs operate, and the conditions within then, in both senses these are particular to the cultural economy.

Cultural labour requires the engagement of aesthetics and values, and the unique balance between the economy and art. Often, cultural workers choose to, or are forced to do things in unique ways. In part because the risk of failure is great, but also because normal economic and bureaucratic systems assume a reality that is different from that of the cultural economy. These conditions, and the experiences of cultural workers, have generated a substantial debate in academic fields, that has slowly found its way into the political sphere through concern with 'precarious work'. However, our concern goes further to address the experiences and aspirations that cultural workers bring to this question: how do they use, and share, knowledges, skills, practices and aspirations and what sort of situated 'solutions' do they achieve, and furthermore do creative hubs help or hinder these actions.

As our contributors argue, creative hubs are seldom amenable to binary divisions between competition and cooperation, the formal and informal, and the for-profit and its alternative. To accept such a binary thinking endangers the creative economy being imprisoned not only in the physical structures of the industrial revolution, but also the thinking of mass manufacture. Debates are not reducible to 'flexible workspaces' that are assumed to accommodate new, or rapidly changing, organisational forms that are associated with project work, collective and individual work. The concerns of cultural workers with balancing material and cognitive (or immaterial) labour, and the moral economy of work, materials and organisation; as well as questions about how they can connect with they audiences and markets for both inspiration, and social validation. We hope that this collection causes readers to question how, and why, hubs operate as they do, as well as attending to the communities that they are part of, as well as the workers and their aspirations and motivations.

1. Creative Hubs in Question: Space, Place and Work in the Creative Economy

Hubs in general, and creative hubs in particular, have become since the early 2000's a contemporary meme in the policy fields of culture/ creativity; urban, regional and national development; industrial and innovation. A google search on the term 'creative hub' shows peaks in search occurrences in 2005, and 2017; the latest high point being dominated by searches in Asia[1]. As further evidence of hubs being 'on trend' we can note that companies such as Facebook and Ikea are promoting versions of a hub as part of their business activities. Like many ideas before them, hubs have become a 'go to' solution that rests on an apparent common-sense understanding of concentration and intensity of activities (more must be better), and the implicit facility to connect firms and creatives (due to proximity), and to distribute those benefits locally.

The generic notion of the hub relies on a number of assumptions which are invalid. The popularity and general understanding of hubs has led to a political popularity. The translation of this general idea into practice has usually taken the form of a designated building or space that is branded a hub. Their promoters and supporters assume that by

[1] see https://trends.google.com/trends/explore?date=all&q=creative%20hub (August 20 2018)

facilitating co-location (by provision of space that was not previously available, and/or via subsidy) that the economies of aggregation, and knowledge transfer will follow. Whilst the idea of hubs (or clusters, of districts) has been a popular topic for industrial strategy and economics, those empirical analyses have been been carried out are limited to macro-scale studies using secondary data[2]. Little empirical work has focused on particular industrial sectors, or explored detailed analysis of product or information exchange: that is, what goes on inside hubs. The research deficit is most acute in the field of the creative economy.

The lack of detailed research and understanding of creative hubs is surprising. The term creative hub appears in urban regeneration policies, and in creative economy strategies; it also has occurred in a number of public research funding calls. The relatively small body of research that has been carried out on them can be broken down into three types: first, perhaps the most popular are pragmatic accounts of 'how to set up a hub', inevitably they tend to stress the positive or aspirational agenda of the agency promoting the hub. Implicitly, they highlight that the process is not quite as easily achieved as 'build and and they will come'. Second, the main body of academic research on creative hubs is of a policy descriptive variety, whilst much of it is critical, offers little in the way of evaluation or understanding of either the actual practices, or the gap between the observed and expected outcomes (Evans 2001; Pratt 2004a; Bagwell 2008; Evans 2009). Finally, a strand of work that attempts to offer a robust evaluation of hubs is closely bound by economic assumptions and use of secondary data to explore regional effects (Chapain et al. 2010).

There are number of weaknesses in this field of research. First, the gap between what was expected or proposed in hubs, and what actually happened. Second, most of the insight is gained from secondary, and collective data (such that it is unclear which firms or creatives are included in a spatial unit). Third, there are a lack of explicit objectives for hubs; where there are, they tend to relate to property management. Fourth, where data is collected on firms and creatives it focuses on employment. Overall, there exists a blind spot in relation to what actually goes on inside hubs. This question relates to the management and organisation of the hub, how they are governed, what the character of

[2] The notion of hubs and clusters of economic activities has been promoted by Michael Porter and his consultancy activities. Porter's (1998) work builds on a wide range of work on industrial co-location in economics and geography. It is relevant that Porter's work comes from a business and management studies perspective, and hubs and clusters are viewed as part of the (internal) 'value chain' of the production company: the bottom line is efficiency and cost.

the relationships are between the various users of hubs are (internal and external): are they material, or immaterial; and formal, or informal, relationships? Moreover, in the field of culture and creativity the question of values is an important one; this may be apparent in the set of questions above, or expressed as a moral or ethical position. Aesthetic and political judgements may, for some participants, be more important than profit generation per se.

Arguably, the forerunner of the idea of a creative hub was that which was developed at St Katherine's Dock in London by SPACE in 1968 (see Harding 2018). The acronym SPACE stands for Space Provision (Artistic Cultural and Educational) and reflected an ambitions attempt to provide space for artists run by artists[3], and a new way of working across boundaries: professional, social, political, cultural and philosophically, between artist and audiences, and artist and materials going beyond sites of individualistic expression (Wilson 2018). This innovative initiative was clearly driven by a deep concern for the quality and nature of art that was produced, not simply the economic bottom line, although this had to be satisfied too. We present this manifestation of SPACE as a counterpoint to the mechanistic and bland initiatives that commonly carry the label 'hub'; let alone 'creative hub'.

The example of SPACE alerts us to the live questions of ethics and values that underpin all work, but particularly cultural work. It highlights that there is an alternative to the 'cubicle working environment' that makes up much hub provision. Of critical importance to the day to day experience of hubs is the social and organisational environment, their governance and representation, individual and collective spaces and services, as well as the opportunities to learn from, and interact with, others. Our collection of essays seeks to open up the scope of enquiry to embrace this position, in so doing we have sought to create a platform for authors to start with what actually happens, rather than what should, or might, occur. We hope that this will strategy will bring us to a better point of departure from which we may develop a richer understanding of the phenomenon of creative hubs, including what goes on inside them both in spite of, and because of, their organisations.

[3] The St Katherine's Dock development ran between 1968 and 1970. However, SPACE as an organisation that is run by artists, for artists, is still going strong providing studio spaces in London: it celebrated 50 years in 2018

In summary, creative hubs have become a cornerstone of economic and cultural policy with only the barest amount of critical discussion or scrutiny. It is as if we have all unwittingly become caught up in the hyperbole about creative hubs as a 'Good Thing'. Yet, do they fulfil the promises that are claimed? Our contributors explore a range of questions, including, but not limited to:

* What makes a hub 'a hub': is it a co-working space, district or cluster by a different name?
* What is it like to work in a creative hub? Do/can hubs address questions of austerity and inequality?
* How are creative hubs materialised differently in various parts of the world and in contrasting environments?
* What does the notion of 'creative hub' achieve performatively or ideologically for its sponsors, users, and communities?
* Do creative hubs contribute to a variety of social 'goods' – good working environments, successful businesses, more equal and socially just communities?

Contributors to this book use to tools of qualitative research and take an interdisciplinary perspective to engage with the phenomenon of creative hubs including: Sociology, Geography, Economics, Media and Communications, Culture and Creative Industries, Critical Policy studies, and Urban Studies. We also asked our contributors to provide a combination of empirical studies of actual hubs, as well as theoretical reflections on the concept of creative hubs; moreover, we have sought to provide a wide range of international examples so as to broaden and deepen the debate.

The remainder of this introduction is divided into two parts. The major part sketches out the overlapping discursive realm of creative hubs. Here we discuss how two discourses have, in different but generally complementary ways, framed the creative hubs debate: the economic and the political. We offer a third discourse that has been neglected, and which we offer as a way into the concerns of our contributors to this collection. The aim is not to offer a discrete mapping of various conceptions and related functionalities. Instead we use this division to illustrate what might be considered as three different lenses on the creative hub phenomenon; each lens frames a type of action and problem, sometimes covering the

same issues from a different perspective. On the basis of this meta-framing of the debate in the second section we pose the question of 'what are creative hubs are the answer to?'. Our answer is conditional, and related to the particular situated circumstances of the hub, its creatives and the communities that it is embedded in.

2. Three discourses of creative hubs

We have argued in the previous section that the common, and even specialist, usage of the term has become unclear: a cloud of meanings and interpretations wrapped around a signifier. The various perspectives that have been deployed to justify or support hubs create specific in/visibilities, invite/dissuade actions, and open up or close off possibilities. Classically, political rhetoric and policy choice have such a character; less obvious is the power that economics, or social or cultural analyses provide. Normative economics is articulated based upon a number of assumptions which do not hold in empiric circumstances; moreover, they are founded upon the operation of the market and the production economic values. Social accounts favour accounts of people and social structures that enable or constrain them. All three discourses are partial, and none in part, nor combination, completely describe the world. Framing and discourses of the world are calls to action, the identify resources and potential modes of action.

In this section we view creative hubs debates in this way, our objective it to highlight the research gap of the social aspects of hubs. However, we argue that it is not simply prioritising one perspective above another: that is simply the exercise of power and authority. We want to point to the different visibilities of each discourse, thereby demonstrating what the 'social/cultural' discourse offers.

a. Political discourse

The political discourse of hubs concerns the object that is 'hubbed': the creative. Of course, the term 'creative' and 'creative industries' has a particular history that has been mobilised to support political programmes. The usage of creative and and creativity have relatively recent usage, Pope (2005: 19) points out that the abstract noun 'creativity' first appeared in the Oxford English Dictionary as late as 1933, and did not achieve common usage until the 1950s. Arguably, the turning point for creativity's specific recent usage came in 1997

in the UK with the naming of the 'Creative Industries'. Previously, those economic activities that had as their 'product' culture were referred to as the Cultural Industries, a term that emerged from an economic analysis; a novel taxonomy of the economy (Garnham 2005). The Cultural Industries were themselves a politically chosen contrary term to the 'Culture Industry' the ideologically damming term used by Adorno (Horkheimer and Adorno 2002 (original 1947)). The term Cultural Industries sought to pluralise and remove a determinate moral censure, and to challenge the binary between culture and economics.

The choice of the term 'creative industries' had no roots, simply that it was different to the 'cultural industries' that had been promoted in the Britain by 'Old Labour' municipal authorities; New Labour sought to distance itself from this legacy, and coining a new term was a way to do it (Hesmondhalgh and Pratt 2005). Moreover, that abstract noun freights youth, expectation and modernisation precisely the themes that the New Labour government sought to promote post-1997, and was much copied internationally.

In Britain, the cultural industries had seldom been discussed as a collective, but were commonly referred to as 'cultural clusters', referring to the co-location of (old industrial) buildings that local authorities sought to reuse to promote the new industries; it was a relatively short step to rebranding them creative clusters and traducing what had often been happenstance co-location into a cause of the 'cluster'; and, then elevating it to a 'model' that might be copied. Despite the British national government's loud promotion of the creative industries, the policies were in fact those that had pre-dated this national concern with creativity, previously put in place at a municipal level by cities who had sought to establish 'cultural clusters' (Pratt 2004b) or 'cultural quarters' (Bell and Jayne 2004) to support and promote local 'cultural industries'.

The 'creative' label received a fillip in 2004 when Richard Florida (2004) named insurgent urban entrepreneurs 'the creative class'. Definitions are not critical here, it is the rhetoric of a 'creative class' that conveys the notion of a future, and those will play a dominant in it. Florida's argument is - to really simplify it - to create cities and neighbourhoods that the creative class want to live and work in, and you will generate economic growth: these were called 'creative cities'. Unusually for an academic, Florida's (2008) message hit the 'sweet spot' for City Mayor's: who would not support making their city 'the most creative city in the nation/world'?

In the early 2000's the attachment of the label 'creative' to anything suddenly made it attractive, innovative and successful: from Apple products, to management textbooks, to baristas. The creative city message although a little more subtle, was a powerful add=on to existing practices of 'place marketing' or branding. Where as making cars or mining coal, or even producing bio-tech can be come outdated, creativity (appears to) remain fresh and 'future proof'! Despite the fact that the creative industries had no part in Florida's argument, the buzz word of creativity, the similarity of the creative industries term, and the eagerness to brand places made the 'creative hub' a somewhat overdetermined outcome, and thus politically very successful[4]. Simply, it was a term that was open to multiple interpretations, and not fixed in one only, and it sounded like a good thing.

The political discourse of the creative hub (and the flexibility of its terminology) demonstrates that politicians and policy makers sought to address contemporary concerns, and those of the future. Their policy aspirations (of more, of better) are represented by the building which stands for that concern. However, this framing leaves little space for, or recognition of, either the operation of, or work within, a particular hub; economic and social discourses provide a partial repair to this incomplete picture.

b. Economic discourse

Perhaps the most surprising shift in the last 20 years has been the rise of an economic discourse about culture, and the creative industries. This involved a challenge in cultural policy which viewed economics at least inimical to, if not destructive of, cultural values. For their part mainstream economists have long discounted, or diminished, the role of culture in the economy: from their perspective it was consumption, and hence not productive; moreover, it had little, or dubious, economic value. It is only since the 1970s that economic discourse has sought to embrace culture[5]. Even then, sympathetic economists sought not to attribute an economic value to it (as this would succumb to Adorno's objection) (Throsby

[4] Before the obligatory 'hub' label was applied creative hubs laboured under variants of the 'art factory' (with an obvious reference to Andy Wahol). The early trend was to name the cluster after the previous industrial use of a particular building, examples included: the cable factory, the chocolate factory, the custard factory….

[5] Baumol and Bowen (1966) is usually regarded as the founding text of modern cultural economics.

2001); accordingly much effort was spent on the calculation of 'economic multipliers' for culture (Myerscough 1988): which was a way of valuing culture without directly putting a price on it: so called, 'shadow pricing'. The ascent of Neo-liberalism and its castigation of the legitimacy of the state seemed to be the death knell for culture. However, recuperation was achieved for the 'creative industries' (or the 'intellectual property based industries') by emphasising their economic value to national economies. The creation of measures of the employment, exports, and value added by the sector enabled it to be represented as a net contributor to national well-being and not a drain on it (UNCTAD 2008). However, the effect was that only the parts of the creative economy that 'looked like' economics were valued, their other characteristics (arguably the ones that made them distinctive) were either play down, or ignored, rendering them invisible to analyses.

Normative economic discourse views a good location as a result of monopolistic behaviour, and one that firms will seek to gain. As such, it is a distortion of the market, and a monopoly confers unfair advantage. Initially such natural monopolies were measured as proximity to consumers. Such a location is described as one that minimises 'transactions costs', that is all the costs of doing business, like transport, but including local laws and customs. From such a thin perspective of human action the most efficient solution will be co-location, everybody will seek to be as close to the most efficient spot as possible. This was the origin of discussion of 'industrial districts' by Marshall (1920), but as he was classical, not neo-classical economist, he was able to talk about social and cultural factors of location, beyond the simply profitable. Such talk was 'cleansed from economic discourse with the advent of the neo-classical tradition. However, it did reappear in the 1980s when Italian scholars discussed 'new industrial districts' (Becattini 2004; Santagata 2010), and although it seldom found its way into economic text books, as it stressed a co-dependences of politics, social forms and economic accounts. As noted above, Porter's (1996) influential ideas of the value chain gave a new twist to the benefits of co-location. Many countries employed his company to produce maps of their countries that identified clusters, or nascent cluster that could be nurtured by state investment (DTI 2001).

Economic discourse is very constrained by its adherence to neo-classical theories and assumptions. Generally, economic accounts of co-location or clustering are rational accounts of cost minimisation, and the 'potential' of interaction. The actual interaction, the 'what goes on in a cluster' is not something that economic discourse can address beyond

the assumption that interaction, and innovation, and creativity 'will happen'. In fact, most of what we might want to call the 'factors' of clustering are formally not factors at all, but 'externalities' (that is, out-with the formal model of economic action). Accordingly, economic ears are also deaf to questions of organisation as well. Importantly, major contributions to understanding the creative economy by those outside of economies have referenced its 'peculiar' (compared to the 'industrial' norm) organisational and market structures, as well as non-market roles (Caves 2000): hence, the need for a further perspective.

c. Social/cultural discourse

As indicated above, the main focus of this book arises from the lack of research that frames creative hubs in a social or cultural discourse. Creative hubs can be considered as a solution to the problem of outsourcing work and the workplace that has occurred in across all parts of the economy, but led by cultural work. Generally, the shift from large factories to smaller workshops has occurred; but, in the case of cultural work this involves the development of 'the studio': a self-organised creative workplace. As noted above, SPACE was an early exemplar of an artist-led organisation to respond to the need for a new type of studio space that was open and multi-disciplinary.

As the cultural industries have expanded and developed the nature of cultural production has also changed, as has cultural work (Hesmondhalgh and Baker 2011). Cultural work is neither characterised by the isolated creator or the creator working in quasi-factory conditions. Cultural work has increasingly been organised around temporary project work and freelancers moving from one project team to another. This has created a precarious work pattern, in contrast to the model of the career, or the profession. The uncertainly about future work brings risk, and often low pay and no social protection, but it also regarded as an opportunity, which the autonomy to chose future work potentially offers. Cultural workers commonly have to invest in their own training.

These organisational shifts are articulated with the passion for the labour that is carried out by the worker. Debates drawing on the Italian Operaist tradition have referred to this as immaterial labour (Banks, Gill, and Taylor 2013). Immaterial labour is less to do with making things, and more with creating ideas (although cultural work is a position on a continuum

between the two) (Gill and Pratt 2008; Ross 2009). The seduction of such work is satisfaction, and the potential negation of the alienation of labour. Although, it may be fairly said that immaterial labour involves both the selling of the body AND the mind.

From the perspective of the conditions of labour, the Operaist argument is that immaterial labourers share similar conditions to other outsourced and marginalised labour such as cleaners, or delivery operatives (Neilson and Rossiter 2008). Whilst immaterial labourers are seldom governed by an algorithm, they are subject to their internalised discipline. For many this leads to self-exploitation of over-work or 'sacrificial labour' (where extra labour is carried on for low or no return in the hope, or expectation, of a future opportunity) (McRobbie 2016). Sadly, the opportunity that is available to many, is simply to carry on until the next temporary contract. Cultural workers are in a complex position balancing autonomy and risk, fulfilment and self-exploitation. Clearly, such a social condition of work is maintained through the structure and organisation of the cultural industries more generally, where those in power and control are able to shift the risks to the most vulnerable workers.

These then are the conditions that bring cultural workers to seek out work space, some manage with using their homes (again taking on more risk and responsibility), but many seek a workspace that offers some 'value added'. What constitutes value added varies by worker, but commonly involves a sense of community, an opportunity to share and learn from others, as well as having security of a private space. Many workers bring with them a sense of the moral economies of work, seeking 'good' work, that is that aligns with a personal sense of politics (Banks 2007). Mobilising a moral politics of work in conditions of potential super-exploitation is problematic (Hesmondhalgh and Baker 2010). However, it is because cultural workers have a degree of autonomy (and believe that it is critical to their practice) that they seek to mobilise around their work conditions and the organisation of workplaces, and their communities.

As our contributors demonstrate, cultural workers bring a wide range of expectations and aspirations to creative hubs. Accordingly, much more than other types of hubs, creative hubs can act as a stage upon which the contradictions of creative work are played out. What have been traditional industrial era divisions between crafts and disciplines are broken down, as are those between profit-making activities, and informal or experimental

ones. The opportunity of working together can be a means of pushing back against individual isolation and competition. In fact the condition of cultural labour is that this week one is likely to be working alongside those that were previously competitors last week. It is not surprising that cultural workers commonly value 'affective communities', and 'communities of practice'; at the same time this lays them vulnerable to the compulsory sociality that may be necessary to maintain contacts, or stay 'in the loop' for jobs, or professional knowledge (Gregg 2011).

3. If creative hubs are the answer, what is the question?

As we have already argued, it is useful to explore the 'problem' of creative hubs from what might conventionally be see as 'back to front'. Rather than reducing diversity to a one best way, we should seek to understand the reasons for, and benefits of diversity. Rather than seeing creative hubs as farmed by economic, political or social discourses we could follow the internal logics to see where they lead beyond these discursive limitations. Simply, we should develop and understanding of 'what goes on in hubs'. As the previous section highlighted, the social/cultural discourse has more purchase on this question. Reflecting on the range of empirical examples, presented both in this collection and elsewhere, we can discern a tension between the notion of providing a 'home', or community, for micro-enterprises and sole operators; and, simple provision of a sustainable (price, and security of tenure) work place. This might be presented as both for funding reasons, and based on common understanding of hubs (as co-location), these options (community and cheap accommodation) are often presented as polar opposites rather than balance on a continuum.

Historically, the development of hubs emerged from a context of economic change (manufacturing decline) and urban dereliction, and the lack of appreciation of the creative economy, which was commonly interpreted as it had been for manufacturing, as a matter of workspace provision; but, there has been a belated recognition, especially in innovative and creative activities, that work without an institutional framework of a stable market or audience, as well as a complex network of diverse production and creative skills are also important. Research on innovation, technology and creativity has indicated the value of the social environment that supports experimentation and innovation (Pratt and Jeffcutt 2009). In the past 'institutional umbrellas' were provided by large corporations (such as the BBC

in broadcasting). This organisational form enabled a cross-subsidisation, and long lead-time of product development to be buffered. By contrast, small of micro-sized organisations seldom can afford research and development, and concentrate on the risky strategy of getting their 'one big idea' to market or an audience It is not chance that networks, clusters and hubs found favour in the period of economic organisation changes where many large companies were replaced by a host of small and project enterprises (Pratt and Gornostaeva 2009). The everyday realities of cultural labour involve maintaining access to a large number of contacts, and being within ideas networks.

The soft-skills of management and governance that such a balancing act requires has been under-reported. The social and organisational setting of the creative economy has evolved in order to cope with on-going risk and uncertainty, along with the rapid 'fashion'/'taste' cycle. These insights find little immediate correspondence with the field of research that has explored this strand of work concerns 'knowledge transfer': the implicit assumption that co-location generates interaction, and learning is weak; just as is the existence of an innovation 'pipeline' unhelpful (Simmie 1997). However, alternative views have pointed to more common 'cultural practices': an understanding of 'flow' and 'interaction', and 'learning and reflection'. This has been the focus of recent work on leaning and innovation, in particular the focus on intermediaries to curate, facilitate and articulate knowledge (O'Connor 1998; Nixon and Gay 2002; Virani and Pratt 2016). The importance of intermediaries has been long recognised in the creative economy, and the notion of a community of practice has been recognised as important in innovative situations. There is the potential that a creative hub can internalise these important social relations of work.

For the creative economy communication with other producers is important, as it is also with audiences and consumers. In this sense, we can see the value of a two-way flow across the boundaries of hubs where audiences' knowledge and understanding can be brought to bear on the understandings of producers. In principle, this is exactly the institutionalised process used in art and creative training: the 'crit.', where criticism is constitutive of the product and practice. The potential is for creative hubs to provide such support; something that can buttress the inherent structural weakness of the creative economy (such as the lack of mediation, and high-risk projects).

3. Introducing the collection

We have divided our collection into three parts, as noted above all are concerned with exploring a 'social discourse' of creative hubs: the concerns that each perspective covers can be summed up as Labour, Community and Autonomy. In the first section the papers range over a number of issues including labour and identity, the organisation of work, and collaboration and competition. Our contributors problematise the reductive notions of 'co-working' and 'shared space' as contested notions that cultural works have to negotiate their relationship with.

The second group of chapters turns our gaze 'outward' beyond the creative hub, or to put it another way how the hub is also constituted by the 'outside' as well as the 'inside'. Here we explore the questions of working at and between different scales and relating back to the hub, contributors also examine how various boundary assumptions challenge their actions, and finally how this enables some to challenge what is often seen as instrumental governance of hubs.

The third section is has a common theme of a cross-cutting concern with governance and the degree of autonomy that cultural production has. Here contributors discuss the wider eco-system of social , cultural and political activities that constitute their identities as well as the potential of hubs to be a place of mobilisation of 'bottom up' approaches that better represent the desires of cultural workers.

Bibliography

Bagwell, Susan. 2008. 'Creative clusters and city growth', *Creative Industries Journal*, 1: 31-46.
Banks, Mark. 2007. *The politics of cultural work* (Palgrave Macmillian: London).
Banks, Mark, Rosalind Gill, and Stephanie Taylor. 2013. Theorizing cultural work : labour, continuity and change in the cultural and creative industries (Routledge: London).
Baumol, William J., and William G. Bowen. 1966. Performing arts - the economic dilemma : a study of problems common to theater, opera, music and dance (Twentieth Century Fund: New York).

Becattini, Giacomo. 2004. Industrial districts : a new approach to industrial change (Edward Elgar: Cheltenham ; Northampton, MA).
Bell, David, and Mark Jayne. 2004. City of quarters : urban villages in the contemporary city (Ashgate: Aldershot).
Caves, R.E. 2000. Creative industries: contracts between art and commerce (Harvard University Press: Harvard).
Chapain, Caroline, Phil Cooke, Lisa De Propris, Stewart MacNeill, and Juan Mateos-Garcia. 2010. 'Creative clusters and innovation', *Putting creativity on the map. NESTA London*.
DTI. 2001. "Business clusters in the U.K.: a first assessment. Report by Trends Business Research." In. London: Deparment of Trade and Industry.
Evans, G. 2001. Cultural planning: an urban renaissance? (Routledge: London).
Evans, Graeme. 2009. 'Creative cities, creative spaces and urban policy', *Urban Studies*, 46: 1003-40.
Florida, Richard L. 2004. Cities and the creative class (Routledge: London).
———. 2008. Who's your city? : how the creative economy is making where to live the most important decision of your life (Basic Books: New York).
Garnham, N. 2005. 'From cultural to creative industries: An analysis of the implications of the 'creative industries' approach to arts and media policy making in the United Kingdom', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11: 15-30.
Gill, R.C., and A.C. Pratt. 2008. 'In the social factory? Immaterial labour, precariousness and cultural work', *Theory, Culture & Society*, 25: 1-30.
Gregg, Melissa. 2011. *Work's intimacy* (Polity).
Harding, A (ed.)^(eds.). 2018. Artists in the city: SPACE in ’68 and beyond (SPACE: London).
Hesmondhalgh, D., and A. C. Pratt. 2005. 'Cultural industries and cultural policy', *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, 11: 1-14.
Hesmondhalgh, David, and Sarah Baker. 2010. "A very complicated version of freedom': Conditions and experiences of creative labour in three cultural industries', *Poetics*, 38: 4-20.
———. 2011. 'Toward a political economy of labor in the media industries', *The handbook of political economy of communications*: 381-400.
Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. 2002 (original 1947). 'The culture industry: enlightenment as mass deception.' in, *Dialectic of enlightenment : philosophical fragments* (Stanford University Press: Stanford, Calif.).
Marshall, Alfred. 1920. Principles of economics : an introductory volume (Macmillan: London).
McRobbie, Angela. 2016. Be creative: Making a living in the new culture industries (John Wiley & Sons).
Myerscough, J. 1988. The economic importance of the arts in Britain (Policy Studies Institute: London).
Neilson, Brett, and Ned Rossiter. 2008. 'Precarity as a Political Concept, or, Fordism as Exception', *Theory Culture Society*, 25: 51-72.
Nixon, Sean, and Paul Du Gay. 2002. 'WHO NEEDS CULTURAL INTERMEDIARIES?', *Cultural Studies*, 16: 495-500.
O'Connor, J. 1998. 'New Cultural Intermediaries and the Entrepreneurial City.' in Tim Hall and Phil Hubbard (eds.), *The Entrepreneurial City: Geographies of Politics, Regime and Represention* (John Wiley: Chichester).
Pope, Rob. 2005. Creativity: Theory, history, practice (Psychology Press).
Porter, M. 1996. 'Competitive advantage, agglomeration economies and regional policy', *International Regional Science Review*, 19: 85-94.
Porter, Michael E. 1998. The competitive advantage of nations (Collier Macmillan: London).
Pratt, A. C. 2004a. 'The cultural economy: a call for spatialized 'production of culture' perspectives', *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 7: 117-28.

Pratt, A. C., and P. Jeffcutt. 2009. 'Creativity, Innovation and the Cultural Economy: Snake oil for the 21st Century?' in A.C. Pratt and P. Jeffcutt (eds.), *Creativity, innovation in the cultural economy* (Routledge: London).
Pratt, A.C., and G Gornostaeva. 2009. 'The governance of innovation in the Film and Television industry: a case study of London, UK.' in A.C. Pratt and P. Jeffcutt (eds.), *Creativity, innovation and the cultural economy* (Routledge: London).
Pratt, Andy C. 2004b. 'Creative Clusters: Towards the governance of the creative industries production system?', *Media International Australia*: 50-66.
Ross, Andrew. 2009. Nice work if you can get it : life and labor in precarious times (New York University Press: New York ; London).
Santagata, Walter. 2010. The culture factory: Creativity and the production of culture (Springer Science & Business Media).
Simmie, J. M. 1997. *Innovation, networks and learning regions?* (Jessica Kingsley publishers and the Regional Studies Association: London).
Throsby, David. 2001. *Economics and culture* (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge).
UNCTAD. 2008. "The creative economy report. The challenge of assessing the creative economy: towards informed policy-making." In. Geneva/New York: UNCTAD/ UNDP.
Virani, T., and A. C. Pratt. 2016. 'Intermediaries and the knowledge exchange process: the case of the creative industries and Higher Education.' in R. Communian and A. Gilmore (eds.), *Beyond the campus: Higher Education & the Creative Economy* (Routledge: London).
Wilson, A. 2018. 'May ’68 in London and the emergence of AIR and SPACE.' in A Harding (ed.), *Artists in the city: SPACE in ’68 and beyond* (SPACE: London).