# Moving to Meet and Make:

Rethinking Creativity in Making Things Take Place

Bærenholdt, Jørgen Ole

*Published in:*
The SAGE Handbook of New Urban Studies

*Publication date:*
2017

*Document Version*
Early version, also known as pre-print

*Citation for published version (APA):*
Bærenholdt, J. O. (2017). Moving to Meet and Make: Rethinking Creativity in Making Things Take Place. In J. Hannigan, & G. Richards (Eds.), *The SAGE Handbook of New Urban Studies* (pp. 330-342). SAGE Publications.

27.01.2015

Revised chapter for Greg Richards and John Hannigan (eds) *The Handbook of New Urban Studies*, Sage.

# Moving to Meet and Make:
# Rethinking Creativity in Making Things Take Place

Jørgen Ole Bærenholdt

## Abstract

Several new issues merge in Mobility and Urban Studies alongside contemporary debates on the role of creativity, tourism, mobility and the material in urban development. First of all there is an increasing focus on the role of the urban atmosphere and how it facilitates creativity while it is also mobilised through cultural events and heritage. Consequently, traditional distinctions between what is cultural and what is economic are and should be bridged, though the discipline of disciplines is hard to break. Finally, to break through and mobilise such intersections, multiple understandings of the role of the material and human commitment to the material are helpful. Meetings, networks and mobilities are not just abstract formations; they are always about some-thing, some-where making people do things. In line with these observations, this chapter investigates what makes things take place, through emergent design processes involving multiple human and non-human actors, reaching far beyond conventional understandings of who and what can be conceived as producers, creators or designers. Starting with a few key points derived from many years of observation of the making of the Viking Ship Museum in Roskilde and the Roskilde Festival, both in Denmark, the chapter reviews and challenges key contributions to research, which have come from economic geography, cultural economy and creativity approaches. The challenge concerns how well these contributions can describe, analyse and explain the observed design processes. The conclusion suggests what the findings in this chapter imply for the understanding of the urban.

## Introduction: Setting the scene of exploration

What makes things happen is always a crucial question. There is a need to investigate how people and things are drawn together in processes of moving, meeting and making that make much of the things, events, products, services, experiences and businesses essential in human life on earth. In investigating what makes what and how things take place, there is an implicit question about spatiality and temporality in the processes of making, designing or creating.

For example, in a town like Roskilde, one can wonder, how crucial practices surrounding the annual Roskilde Rock festival and the experimental Viking Ship Museum – both appearing to

be of international significance attracting people to Roskilde – have taken place and made the festival and Museum become what they are today. This question is about exploring the messy design processes, creativity, entrepreneurship and politics that make things happen in society. The exploration in this chapter takes off by briefly describing the history and geography of the making of the Roskilde Festival and the Viking Ship Museum. This forms the background for investigating the practices involved that really made and make a difference in stabilising and taking care of such designed places, so that they last or are repeated continuously. Here, the interest is not so much with the performance or the experience itself. Nor is it about some distant or generalised production of ideas and goods involved. It is about the specific, situated, ways in which committed human-and-material efforts combine to make things take place again and again. The following establishes and describes the cases that the paper will use as the exemplars we will learn from.

The Viking Ship Museum first opened in the form of the Viking Ship Hall in 1969. The modernist, brutal, concrete museum hall had been built in Roskilde in the southern end of the narrow Roskilde Fjord. The museum became the place of the assembling and exhibition of the remains of five Viking ship wrecks, excavated 1962 from the bottom of the fjord at Skuldelev which is in fact nearer to the next town to the north than to Roskilde. Through local politics, Roskilde municipal leaders managed to get the museum to Roskilde, and during the first years visitors could see how staff worked slowly to mount the precarious, conserved, remains into a modernist steel skeleton. Having completed these 'sacred' structures, curators also developed an interest in experimental archaeology, making a museum shipyard behind the nearby local marina. Here grew an interest in building replicas of the ships exhibited, using the techniques and tools that remains indicated had been used by the Vikings. Massive tree trunks were split with hand axes along the grains of the wood to produce the kind of very strong wood. This was used by Vikings to make strong, light and flexible ships. Replica ships became crucial tools for experimental sailing that aimed to help us learn more about how ships could sail, thereby improving the missing bits of - and knowledge about - the sunken ships. During the 1980s, the museum gained more and more public and research attention, because of its reconstruction work. Ship reconstruction was moved from its former hidden location to the open lawns around the museum hall. As a part of an ambitious local, municipal/mayor led reconstruction of the harbour areas, a new Museum Island was constructed in 1997 to house the shipyard and other, now, staged activities of the museum.

In the early 2000s, the museum reconstructed what is still its largest replica from the 'Skuldelev 2' wreck, it was launched in 2004 with Queen Margrethe of Denmark on board, after having named the ship the *Sea Stallion from Glendalough*, referring to the location in Ireland, where the original ship's wood came from (see Bærenholdt and Haldrup, 2004, 2006 and Bærenholdt et al., 2008). With several, changing, groups of voluntary sailors on board, the ship managed to sail around Scotland to Dublin in 2007, exhibited in the court of the Irish National Museum over the winter, and returned along Southern England in 2008 (Haldrup and Bærenholdt, 2010). Meanwhile, the 1997 construction of the Museum Island, digging channels around the island, revealed a new collection of wrecks at this exact location, including 'The Roskilde 6' the world's largest ever Viking Ship. Conserved and mounted to a another, new type of skeleton in mobile sections, the remains of this ship was named *Ægir* and exhibited at the Danish National Museum, The British Museum and the Museum of Prehistory and Early History in Berlin in 2013-2015. It also made the *Sea Stallion* visit and sail around

Berlin's waterways in 2013, after having been moved there on a lorry. And we still have not seen and heard of the replica of *Ægir*. The museum's latest initiative was the story festival 'The story of the Sea' held September 2014. As stated by the artistic leader of the festival in the local newspaper (Pedersen, 2014), the festival came into being upon her coincidental meeting of a friend employed at the museum, a little more than a year before. Meeting other people on the move can thus make new things happen.

The Roskilde Festival – or just 'Roskilde' - is even more emblematic of Roskilde since this annual music festival is much better known internationally than the town itself. The festival originated from a small-scale event in 1971, inspired by the Woodstock festival in the US. It has become one of the major rock festivals in Europe, alongside Glastonbury in the UK. It reached its peak in the mid-1990s when there were more than 100,000 guests. However, following the tragic deaths of nine young people in the crowds in front of a Pearl Jam concert in 2000, the Festival reduced visitor numbers to around 80,000. It employs around 65 employees and 850 volunteers year around (Rasmussen, 2014), and mobilizes a further 30,000 voluntary workers in preparing and making the festival run every year. Roskilde Festival is famous for its mobilization of the large number of volunteers, who are seen as crucial drivers in the making of the event, but who also need careful leadership (Jensen, 2014).

The Festival presents itself as a cultural-political manifestation organised around environmental and humanitarian values, often expressed from the festival's stages. It manages to make the diversity of alternative movements, some of the World's most famous and expensive bands, such as the Rolling Stones in 2014, and the Tuborg brewery work in concert. And it has also produced a number of important spin-offs such as businesses managing other kinds of events. The Festival takes place in an area controlled by the municipal authorities, which is also used for other events, and uses fields around the site for camping, south of the town, opposite of the Viking Ship Museum. When the festival is alive, once a year, it works as a temporary city with the highest population density in the world (this has also been described in detail in architectural research (Marling and Kiib, 2011)). A nearby former industrial area (Unicon concrete producers) between the festival place and the town, Musicon, is now developed as new quarter for cultural industries and housing. This was originally conceived of as the Musicon Valley project, a cluster project, which remained on paper for years (see Bærenholdt and Haldrup, 2006). Things only began to move when the projects was changed from a cluster project to an urban planning project. With an emphasis on temporality and planning processes handled by a semi-autonomous secretariat, Musicon became an area planned as a neighbourhood and creative place where sports, culture, artists and the like can use the ruin-like enormous buildings of the concrete industry. The political, national decision, to locate the Danish Rock Museum here has been especially instrumental to the development of the area and to the stabilization of the whole project. The museum is under construction, built on the basis of former industrial buildings, and is planned to open in 2015.

The Roskilde Festival is of course different from the Viking Ship Museum, the festival is the major annual event in the town, engaging much of the town's population and producing a large portion of the annual turnover in shopping and tourism. But it is similar to the Viking Ship Museum in being part of the cultural (or experience) economy, in being highly value

driven, following its own ideas, having inspired a museum location and above all by engaging very many volunteers, also making it a kind of (social) movement.

Earlier analysis of the Viking Ship Museum and spin-offs of the Roskilde Festival, conducted together with Michael Haldrup, pointed to a number of key characteristics (Bærenholdt and Haldrup, 2006: 220-222): First of all weak ties and commitments based on mutual trust, involving local politicians, friendships and a stimulating social atmosphere among those working together are crucial. Second, these weak ties do *not* qualify as a cultural industry cluster or any other kind of Marshallian industrial atmosphere. Third, these networks are not always stable and may well erode, as was the case in the Musicon Valley project. Finally, extensive networked mobilities including visitors play a fundamental role in making things happen together with the shared material constructions in the places visited. Even voluntary workers travel to the city to play their part in creating the festival place or sailing a replica ships across the seas. Further research into the design of the Viking Ship Museum stressed how active co-making of tourist sites by involving visitors must be in making experiences happen. Therefore professional museum employees, architects and designers need to experiment with how well the tourist site *affords* experiences. Furthermore, this way of working with experiences reflects the museum's approach to *experimental* archaeology in their research, and this analogy suggests that also research into the making of tourist - and more generally – urban places can, or must, be *design-based* (Haldrup and Bærenholdt, 2010: 199). Research into the making of another Viking attraction, the Destination Viking Sagaland project in Thingeyri in Iceland, pointed out that traditional analyses of networks between a few actors cannot explain the more complex and fluid spatial orders involved in making things happen. In order to succeed projects must be open to changing their ideas, objects and aims. Secondly, the spatial order is not one than can be understood only within a simple tension between place and mobility. Though all practices are always somehow localized, this exactly includes the relations at-a-distance crucial to make things happen (Jóhannesson and Bærenholdt, 2008: 164).

The setting of the scene above - from case studies and earlier research – is the departure point from which the following exploration of approaches to creativity takes off.


**From clusters to creativity and actor-networks in economic geography**

In the field of economic geography and business studies, there is a long tradition of studies of the optimal conditions for innovation, creativity and/or development. However, such studies rarely go into any detail about *how* the conditions and networks valued as important actually emerge and work. It is therefore not surprising that one of the key thinkers of the tradition, Michael Storper, in his *Keys to the City* ended by addressing policymakers, saying 'We know relatively little about how to create such networks…' (Storper, 2013: 227). Still it has been a highly influential tradition, setting the concept of *clusters* and later *buzz* centre stage not only in the academic literature but also in EU and urban and regional development policies in many countries. The central idea is that face-to-face interactions help to develop and cope with highly complex, tacit and non-coded knowledge. And this compelling idea is combined or translated into the other idea of *Buzz*, namely that 'colocation…provides a low-cost way for new ideas and talent to make their way into existing activities by facilitating access for new

comers as well as lowering the costs of evaluation...' (Storper, 2013: 181). The primary way of securing conditions for this to happen is the colocation of firms together with 'spatially concentrated demand for skilled labour' (Storper, 2013: 182) thus producing interaction, deal making and learning. A second way is the more generalised form of spatial concentration and buzz available in cities (see Amin and Thrift, 2002).

Much recent literature has questioned or revised cluster theory, as put forward in the mainstream formulation by Michael Porter (see Jagtfelt, 2012). This critical discussion addresses the two principal propositions: (1) The centrality of face-to-face interaction in the context of expanding mobile and virtual social networks, and (2) Whether or not colocation – of firms or generalised in the city – is a condition for producing face-to-face interaction. Furthermore, there are sector specific discussions: To what extent is the idea that co-location produces the face-to-face interactions that produce creativity valid in the creative or cultural economy? The two cases of the Viking Ship Museum and the Roskilde Festival both contribute to this questioning. Face-to-face interaction in these cases appears in at least three forms: First, there is the face-to-face dimension of experiencing the site or the event. This is about the experience of consuming/visiting/taking part in the event. For some, the fascination, enchantment and engagement involved in the experience itself also informs other forms of face-to-face interaction, namely, second, the mobility of very many volunteers to meet and make Viking Ship replicas sail or make the Festival work. And third the mobility of very many experts and professionals to meet and make the museum and festival work. But in contrast to the economic geographies in the work of Storper and others, the energy and stimulation emerging in face-to-face interaction has nothing to do with the colocation of firms, labour markets or other structures. Colocation occurs in particular moments when people have moved in order to meet each other and make things together.

Along a parallel path, since Richard Florida's work (2002, 2005) creativity has been associated with a specific class of people and the circumstances under which the creative side of people can prosper. His ideas have caused critiques (Richards and Wilson, 2007; Pratt, 2008), but on both sides of these debates, there is less attention to more in-depth studies of how creativity works in practice. Much of the discussion has centred around the more or less general conditions measurable in statistics. But even under the most obvious 'creative conditions' some projects succeed, while others never came out of the garage. More qualitative studies have suggested examining the weaker ties among business and their contribution to an 'Ecology of Creativity' (Grabher, 2001), and, also, looking into the productive role of consumer's (such as tourist's) performance (Ek et al., 2008). While Florida also points to the central role of cross-cutting action and of diversity for creativity, there is a need for a closer look into the *relations* that are decisive for creativity. Additionally, creative relations include consumer practices; since experience - or cultural - economies imply transformations transcending the traditional distinctions between producers and consumers. We need to research deeper into the forms of collaboration and politics involved in creativity (Hallam and Ingold, 2007).

Most analyses of creativity, in keeping with Florida's work, have addressed general *conditions* that seem to facilitate creative practices, but it is seldom that they dig deeper into *how* productive relations are performed and which practices of mobility are involved. Contributions have come from much research on how cities emerge as vibrant meeting places

where consumption and creativity come together (such as Amin & Thrift, 2002; Florida, 2005; Landry & Bianchini, 1995; Scott, 2000). Policy initiatives to a large extent have had the objective of stimulating such attractive environments, since they are considered to be central conditions for the development of experience economies.

In a study concerning the manufacturing of design and furniture in the Scandinavian periphery, Power and Jansson (2008) pointed to the immense importance of trade fairs in this industry. These are events crucial for connecting and marketing in making furniture for distant markets. In their conclusion, they argue for 'some sort of relation approach emphasizing connections through networks (be these networks of actors or commodities or production chains)' with 'networks of agents (such as individuals, institutions and objects) acting across various distances and through diverse intermediaries' (Power and Jansson, 2008: 175). They place this insight in the global commodity chain literature, with a specific reference Dicken et al.'s (2001) important article. These are literatures, around the so-called Manchester School and Global Commodity Chains that acknowledge the importance of actions across distance, but with a specific focus on manufacturing industries producing goods transportable to a market far away. And when the global commodity chain (GCC) tradition intersects with the World City Network (WCN) tradition (Derudder and Witlox, 2010), it continues to do so with a clear focus on firms from a production system perspective that does not really apply to the cultural economy.

Focusing on cultural economies, like the cases discussed in this chapter, in recent years more critical and analytical approaches have emerged, and they question some of the enthusiastic and prescriptive ways of describing economies found in contributions such as those from Florida and from Pine and Gilmore. Tim Edensor et al. (2010) suggest that we critically investigate what seems a too instrumental use of arts and creative practices in urban regeneration. And they suggest a deeper look at the role of generosity, conviviality and activism in the cultural economy. This approach questions cultural cluster policies, and this is supported by a brilliant analysis of creativity among musicians in Toronto showing the 'increasing important creative outputs emerging from everyday spaces outside the core' (Hracs, 2010: 76). Rantisi and Leslie (2010) arrive at a similar conclusion in their critical discussion of design policies in Montreal, Quebec. Here polices tend to overlook the importance of informal spaces and thus there is a risk of marginalizing crosscutting designers, which are not apt for incorporation in more hierarchical policies.

In a parallel analysis of the experimental music scene in Santiago de Chile, Manuel Tironi(2010) critically investigates the validity of Marshallian cluster theory. Based on ethnographic research, he finds that the music scene somehow works as a Marshallian district but it does not fit its spatiality, since the music scene is not based on specific quarters, districts or neighbourhoods but distributed and *mobile*. 'Indeed, the scene is deployed by and actualized in a network of sites, places and venues that are in constant movement' (Tironi, 2010: 40). And 'The scenes doesn't have, in other words, a spatial "obligatory point of passage"…(…)…The geography of Santiago's EMS (experimental music scene, ed.) is decentred, mobile, contingent and transient; it is, in brief spatially multiple.' (Tironi, 2010: 42). It is a project driven economy, where much of the buzz is computer-mediated in ways that supersede earlier divisions of labour. Santiago's music scene of is multiple and thus works as described with categories of gels and publics (Sheller, 2004).

Tironi thus shows how spatial topologies along ANT ways of thinking are helpful in better describing *how* the creative process takes place. On this understanding, the urban is not identical to what we associate with the city, since new forms of urban assemblage emerge. Sheller's analysis helps us understand new forms of spatial practices in '..."mobile publics" that exceed current understandings of the public domain as a set of spaces or institutions that can easily be distinguished from the private sphere' (Sheller, 2004: 40). The mobile public are only momentarily stable as a festival event or a museum exhibition. They involve private engagements made momentarily public in the form of voluntary work at the festival or on the replica Viking ship at sea, but broadcasted.

In working with ANTs contribution to urban studies, Farías (2010) returns to the classic book *Cities: Reimagining the Urban* by Amin and Thrift (2002). In Farías' interview with Nigel Thrift, Thrift suggests an approach which is more constructive and experimental than normal social science. Along the same line of reasoning, Pineda in his study of urban transport in Bogota suggest that our approach needs to consider that 'there is an overemphasis in denoting what things are rather than accounting for the process that produced them: too many subjects, too few verbs' (Pineda, 2010: 126).

Having discussed cluster theory, creativity and Actor-Network Theory (ANT), this section has argued for moving the economic geographies of cultural production towards approaches engaged with the actual processes of making things happen and taking place. This implies a hint in the direction of the methodological approaches suggested in Actor-Network Theory opening the more or less black box in which design processes take place.

**The creative economy of cultural production from an Actor-Network approach**

Follow the actors making things happen is the central methodological device suggested by ANT in order to investigate how things are produced and can be produced. The introduction briefly referred to research on the making of the Viking attraction, the Destination Viking Sagaland project in Thingeyri in Iceland, and this is an example of the contribution from Actor-Network Theory to entrepreneurship and cultural economy, worth referring to in more detail. Gunnar Thór Jóhannesson in his PhD thesis (Jóhannesson, 2007; and see Jóhannesson, 2012) followed the entrepreneurial processes involved in designing Viking attractions around the small village Thingeyri in the Westfjords of Iceland, which was involved in the international EU Destination Sagaland's project. He concluded that traditional network approaches would not have been able to account for the messy spatial orders at work in making the attraction. Networks tend to be too focused on reciprocal relations or on transport lines of input and output. Also a too territorial approach to the 'inside' of a place would not have sufficed. Other spatial orders, such as fluids and fires, as suggested by Law and Mol (2001), play a significant role in the making of things. Furthermore, specific material elements played an important role for how the whole project was accomplished and stabilised and this contributed to understand the kinds of 'relational entrepreneurship' involved. Studying the material elements in the making of the project led to an understanding that entrepreneurship is not always about economic motives and that firm distinctions between economy and culture needs to be overcome. The 'methods' (in the ethnomethodology sense) enacted by

project participants did not only refer to economic development, but also to 'fellowship', and what Jóhannesson called 'sparks' as well as the learning processes of 'finding one's sea legs' to use a sailing metaphor. 'Fellowship' refers to the materially supported engagement and joy of working as part of a collective party. 'Sparks' – or fire from Mol and Law (1994) - is about flickering practices opening new and alternative connections. Finally, 'finding one's sea legs' is about gaining confidence in how things can be settled in processes that take time (Jóhannesson, 2007: 224-229).

Gunnar Thór Johannisson concludes that

> the strongest feature of the ANT approach is that it can be used to trace the relational practices through which the economy, culture and political power are established. ... It stresses the fact that "more-than-humans" enact culture and the economy through their everyday practices in multiple ways. (2007: 235)

The strong contribution of this approach is not in abstract theory but in the ways it opens for detailed empirical description sensitive to materiality and multiplicity.

Another example of this is Kristine Munkgård Pedersen's (2010) PhD on the making of the Roskilde Festival. Inspired by ANT and other perspectives, she concludes that the festival's vulnerability is crucial, since it opens for constant negotiations where responsibilities are broadly distributed and non-human actants have become crucial in the security efforts to regulate the crowd in order to control the risks tragically experienced in the 2000 Festival. She highlights the importance of the 'performative alliance with the audience', where the Roskilde Festival becomes an event, a movement or an event that is a movement. She sees the festival as a place where different things are 'translated' (ANT) into being equal (Pedersen, 2010: 180-183).

ANT approaches to cultural production may look like a version of network theory. Mobility research (Urry, 2007; Larsen et al. 2006) points to the social obligations performed through people's practices of moving in order to meet. Larsen and Urry explain that 'network capital is the capacity to engender and sustain social relations with individuals who are not necessarily proximate, which generates emotional, financial and practical benefit' (Larsen and Urry, 2008: 93). These are social relations, which are afforded by mobility. This is a concept stressing how access to technologies of mobility and skills of using these technologies implies a certain capacity, namely a form of capital. Compared to this approach, ANT supersedes concepts of capital or capacity and moves directly to the actual enactments and processes of making themselves. ANT finds no reason to operate with a capacity – or a Floridan creativity index – outside of the processes, but focus on the workings of network*ing* in processes of making. ANT's topology of networks is thus different from other network theories, since networks are seen as fluid and mutable, and actors are networks too. Networks work (see Jóhannesson and Bærenholdt, 2009).

ANT provides an approach that fits well to the entanglement of economy, culture and materiality in cultural production. It helps understand the messy hybrid and relational practices that make a difference in making things like the Roskilde Festival and the Viking Ship Museum become real and alive. However it may be necessary to move further, beyond

ANT approaches, to account for 'the virtual planes', which are so central in for example tourist experience (Farías, 2012). However, I have suggested that so-called second generation ANT (Law and Mol, 2001; Mol and Law, 2002) provides a perspective on multiple realities and absence-presence, where virtual planes can also be analysed as vivid realities at play. At least this provides a perspective on tourism in which 'the enactment of destinations depends on the meeting of multiple actors and their performance. Yet, this practice is only possible through reference to and playing with absent, fantastic realities' (Bærenholdt, 2012: 124). This way of approaching cultural production as enactments in multiple realities where absence-presence (the presence of the absent) is carefully managed, provides a way to understand the complexity of moving, meeting and making in several planes.

The complex, intense and unforeseeable events taking place in cultural productions like the Roskilde Festival and the Viking Ship Museum involve different creative practices, which can be described well through ANT notions of enactment, multiple realities and layers of absence and presence. Here 'mobile publics' (Sheller, 2004; Tironi, 2010) are at work. Movements criss-crossing traditional distinctions of what are private and public. Not only loads of people and objects moving in physical space, but being emotionally moved and engaged. This is not to make the fiery souls at play romantic, but they are imposing relational achievements.

**Making people move, meet and make**

The cultural economy or experience economy is not necessary well defined, but it is obvious that these kinds of economies involve processes, network types and forms of creativity that cannot be understood in the same way as, for example, manufacturing. Here are other forms of agglomeration (Sørensen, 2008) and even passion (Darmer, 2008). The two examples of the Viking Ship Museum and the Roskilde Festival have shown cultural production and creativity driven by values and strictly following certain conceptual ideas. This enables all the people and things assembled, brought together and on the move to build stable museum sites, annual events and travelling objects, as well as virtual planes of 'Vikings' and 'Roskilde' floating around. To make this movement, volunteers are crucial, but they are also carefully managed and combined with professional skills, carefully setting the scenes of performance, even at distance and in absence.

The material objects involved in making ships sail and the music scene play are pivotal actors in engaging all this networking including the virtual planes. As Ingold (2013: 71) explains processes of designing and making always involve uncertainty, since one tries to follow designs for something, one does not know what will become yet, and which often turn out differently than expected. He concludes one of his essays as follows:

> In this tension, between the pull of hopes and dreams and the drag of material constraint, and not in the opposition between cognitive intellection and mechanical execution, lies the relation between design and making. It is precisely where the reach of the imagination meets the friction of materials, or where the forces of ambition rub up against the rough edges of the world, that human life is lived (Ingold, 2013: 73)

Ingold explains the role and energy of hope and how this involves in-fights with the material in order to make objects into sense making things. As in the cases of the Viking Ship Museum and the Roskilde Festival, there is 'imagination' and 'ambition'. This is about human lives and human ensembles (the collectives of fellowship, see above) invested, where the issue is more than material things made – but also about the *Ting* - the Nordic assemblies of people meeting to make things – in thing-places (*Tingsteder* in Danish; *Thingvéllir* in Icelandic). The author collective A. Telier (2011) suggests *Design Things* to be such assemblies of both humans and non-humans, experimenting which are also aligned with one another in taking part in projects (see also Tironi, 2010: 43) in which people take possession of things (Hetherington, 1997, and see Bærenholdt, forthcoming).

One such project, thing and whole organizing idea is the ship building methods used for Viking ships historically and re-enacted at the Viking Ship Museum. In order to secure the making of light, strong and flexible ships, the wood cannot be cut with a saw. As mentioned, massive tree trunks must be split with hand axes along the grains of the wood, to produce the kind of very strong wood used by Vikings, and this can also be a metaphor for the way of making things happens in the cultural economy. Both materials and imaginations need to be taken seriously, easy to lose as they are. This also holds in relation to the alliance with the audience who also mostly move, meet and make, becoming part of the movement; material, social and imaginative. Networks but especially networking, connections but more connecting, authenticity but in the sense of 'connective authenticity' need to involve things (material and people) in experiences and imaginations spanning across time and space (Bærenholdt et al., 2008: 199). Connecting through traces, in Walter Benjamin's sense, enacting closeness across distances (Bærenholdt, 2013), and taking possession of things (Hetherington, 1997; Bærenholdt, forthcoming).

**Conclusion: The urban as moving assemblages**

This chapter is based on the experiences of the kinds of cultural production taking place at the Viking Ship Museum in Roskilde and at the Roskilde Festival. It tried to investigate the use of various approaches to understand what and how are the processes making things happen in such attractions. Much economic geography tradition seems to have problems in understanding how cultural economies emerge and move. Creativity approaches from Florida and others add further perspectives alongside network studies, but they did little to help us understand in detail the processes of designing and making involved. Compared to this, the approaches and methodologies surrounding Actor-Network Theory (ANT), especially second generation ANT perspectives on multiplicity and absence-presence, opened up new ways to understand how people and things move, meet and make such places and events take place. Inspiration gained from Ingold's phenomenology of making added further insights. Together these approaches are promising for providing a deeper understandings of the messy time-space of productive practices with material and personal engagements across private, public and professional roles in making things happen.

Furthermore, tracing creativity in cultural production will need studies of designing and making with foci on enthusiasm, morality, ethos and performance inside processes of making

and designing. The main inspiration for this can come from Edensor et al.'s (2010) *Spaces of Vernacular Creativity* and from Farías and Bender's (2010) *Urban Assemblages*. The key point is to understand how people and things are being moved in several ways and how this enlightens forms of moral engagement with the fantastic. People move to make things together with others, in intersection with key sites that materially afford these processes. In the messy and multiple spatialities and temporalities of creativity.

The cases presented are not urban in the normal sense. But they described assemblages on the move, where people meet to make things take place, suggest other forms of the urban than we are used to think about. Hannigan (2007) described the development from the culture led city to the creative city, focusing on the people creating new things. In continuation of this, this chapter has suggested we look at the city or the urban as a moving assemblage coming and going, developing into the mobile city. As suggested by Hracs (2010) and Tironi (2010), creative actors and networks are mobile, what Sheller (2004) called 'mobile publics'. The Roskilde Festival, supported by a small all year organisation, once a year mobilizes thousands of people and lots of equipment to create a temporary city, where professionals, volunteers and visitors meet. The Viking Ship Museum in addition to the museum site, mobilizes not only professionals and volunteers but also moving exhibitions and replica ships sailing across seas. These are moving assemblages with the urban characteristics of light institutions of sociability and undisciplined creation, described by Amin and Thrift (2002). In cities with possibilities of mobile politics and free associations (Amin and Thrift, 2002: 156), the urban is about the subversive, the vulnerable and the uncertain, all of which play significant roles in the creativity of making things happen. This point is supported by the growing literature on the mobile, moving and material city, beyond territorial containers and full of resistance (Graham, 2002; Latham and McCormack, 2004; Cronin, 2008; Pinder, 2010). Working at a distance, technologies and material designs support and connect such urban assemblages.

This way, urban conditions can appear outside larger cities. But in fact, rather than suggesting any overall transitions from the cultural to the creative to the mobile city, it would be more accurate to describe these urban assemblages as simultaneously cultural, creative and mobile. The examples of Rock music and Viking ships from this chapter are about people and things coming together in public associations and assemblages, which are inherently cultural, creative and mobile. It is by moving to meet in this kind of unstable, vulnerable and multiple circumstances that things happen.

## References

Amin, A. and Thrift, N. (2002) *Cities: Reimagining the Urban*. Cambridge: Polity.

Bærenholdt, J.O. (2012) 'Enacting destinations: The politics of absence and presence', in R. van der Duim, C. Ren and G.T. Jóhannesson (eds), *Actor-Network Theory and Tourism: Ordering, Materiality and Multiplicity*. Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 111-127.

Bærenholdt, J.O. (2013) 'Experiencing mobility – mobilizing experience', in S: Witgall, G. Vogl, and S. Kesselring (eds) *New Mobility Regimes in Art and Social Science*. Farnham: Ashgate. pp. 287-298.

Bærenholdt, J.O (forthcoming) 'Experiencing the enchantment of place and mobility', paper under review.

Bærenholdt, J.O and Haldrup, M. (2004) 'On the Track of the Vikings', in M. Sheller and J. Urry (eds), *Tourism Mobilities: Places to Play, Places in Play*. London: Routledge. pp. 78-89.

Bærenholdt, J.O. and Haldrup, M. (2006) 'Mobile networks and place making in cultural tourism', *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 13(3): 209-224.

Bærenholdt, J.O., Haldrup, M. and Larsen, J. (2008) 'Performing cultural attractions', in J. Sundbo and P. Darmer (eds), *Creating Experiences in the Experience Economy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 176-202.

Bærenholdt, J.O. and Sundbo, J. (eds)(2007) *Oplevelsesøkonomi: Produktion, forbrug, kultur [Experience Economy: Production, Consumption, Culture]*. Copenhagen: Samfundslitteratur

Cronin, A.M. (2008) 'Urban space and entrepreneurial property relations: Resistance and the vernacular of outdoor advertising and graffiti', in A.M. Cronin and K. Hetherington (eds) *Consuming the Entrepreneurial City: Image, Memory, Spectacle*. New York: Routledge. pp. 65-84.

Darmer, P. (2008) 'Entrepreneurs in music: The passion of experience creation', in J. Sundbo and P. Darmer (eds), *Creating Experiences in the Experience Economy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 111-133.

Derudder, B. and Witlox, F. (eds)(2010) *Commodity Chains and World Cities*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Dicken, P., Kelly, P.F., Olds, K. and Yeung, H.WC. (2001) 'Chains and networks, territories and scales: Towards a relational framework for analysing the global economy', *Global Networks*, 1(2): 89-112.

Edensor, T., Leslie, D., Millington, S. and Rantisi, N. (eds) (2010) *Spaces of vernacular creativity: Rethinking the cultural economy*. London: Routledge.

Ek, R., Larsen, J., Hornskov, S.B. and Mansfeldt, O.K. (2008) 'A dynamic framework of tourist experiences: Space-time and performances in the experience economy', *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 8(2): 122-140.

Farías, I. (2010) 'Interview with Nigel Thrift', in I. Farías and T. Bender (eds), *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies*. London: Routledge. pp. 109-119.

Farías, I. (2012) 'Destinations as virtual objects of tourist consumption', in R. van der Duim, C. Ren and G.T. Jóhannesson (eds), *Actor-Network Theory and Tourism: Ordering, Materiality and Multiplicity*. Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 128-145.

Farías, I. and Bender, T. (eds) (2010) *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies*. London: Routledge

Florida, R. (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books.

Florida, R. (2005) *Cities and the Creative Class*. New York: Basic Books.

Gilmore, J.H. and Pine, B.J. (2007) *Authenticity: What consumers really want*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Grabher, G. (2001) 'Ecologies of creativity: the village, the group and the heterarchic organisation of the British advertising industry', *Environment and Planning A*, 33(2): 351-374.

Graham, S. (2002) 'Communication grids: Cities and infrastructure', in S. Sassen (ed.) *Global Networks, Linked Cities*. New York: Routledge. pp. 71-91.

Haldrup, M. and Bærenholdt, J.O. (2010) 'Tourist experience design', in J. Simonsen, J.O. Bærenholdr, M. Büscher and J.D. Scheuer (eds), *Design Research: Synergies from Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. Abingdon: Routledge. pp. 187-200.

Hallam, E. and Ingold, T. (2007) *Creativity and Cultural Improvisation*. Oxford: Berg (ASA Monographs).

Hannigan, J. (2007) 'From fantasy city to the creative city', in. G: Richards and J. Wilson (eds), *Tourism, Creativity and Development*. London: Routledge, pp. 48-56.

Hetherington, K. (2007) *Capitalism's Eye: Cultural Spaces of the Commodity*. New York: Routledge.

Hracs, B.J. (2010) 'Beyond Bohemia: geographies of everyday creativity for musicians in Toronto', in Edensor, T., Leslie, D., Millington, S. and Rantisi, N (eds), *Spaces of vernacular creativity: Rethinking the cultural economy*. London: Routledge. pp. 75-88.

Ingold, T. (2013) *Making: Anthropology, Archaeology, Art and Architecture.* Abingdon: Routledge.

Jagtfelt, T. (2012) 'Disentangling Porterian clusters, or Philosophies of similarity', PhD Dissertation, Department of Environmental, Social and Spatial Change, Roskilde University.

Jensen, I.K. (2014) *Roskilde Festival: Ledelse af frivillige [Roskilde Festival: Leading Volunteers].* Den danske ledelseskanon. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

Jóhannesson, G.T. (2007) 'Emergent tourism: An actor-network approach to tourism economies', PhD Dissertation, Department of Environmental, Social and Spatial Change, Roskilde University.

Jóhannesson, G.T. (2012) '"To get things done": A relational approach to entrepreneurship', *Scandinavian Journal of Hospitality and Tourism*, 12(2): 181-196.

Jóhannesson, G.T. and Bærenholdt, J.O. (2008) 'Enacting places through the connections of tourism', in Bærenholdt, J.O. and Granås, B (eds), *Mobility and Place: Enacting Northern European Peripheries*. Aldershot: Ashgate. pp. 155-166.

Jóhannesson, G.T. and Bærenholdt, J.O. (2009) 'Actor-Network Theory/Network Geographies', in Kitchin, R. and Thrift, N. (eds), *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography*. Oxford: Elsevier. Volume 1, pp. 15-19.

Landry, C. and Bianchini, F. (1995) *Creative City*. London: Demos.

Larsen, J. and Urry, J. (2008) 'Networking in mobile societies', in Bærenholdt, J.O. and Granås, B.(eds) *Mobility and Place: Enacting Northern European Peripheries*. Aldershot: Ashgate. pp. 89-101.

Larsen, J., Urry, J. and Axhausen, K. (2006) *Mobilities, Networks, Geographies.* Aldershot: Ashgate.

Latham, A. and McCormack, D.P. (2004) 'Moving cities: Rethinking the materialities of urban geographies', *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(6): 701-724.

Law, J. and Mol, A.M. (2001) 'Situated technoscience: an inquiry into spatialities', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 19(5): 609-621.

Marling, G. and Kiib, H. (2011) *Instant City@Roskilde Festival.* Aalborg: Aalborg University Press.

Mol, A.M. and Law, J. (1994 ) 'Regions, networks and fluids: Anaemia and social topology', *Social Studies of Science*, 24: 641-671.

Mol, A.M. and Law, J. (2002) 'Complexities: An introduction', in J. Law and A.M. Mol (eds), *Complexities: Social Studies of Knowledge Practices*. Durham: Duke University Press. pp. 1-22.

Pedersen, K.M. (2010) 'Flygtige forbindelser og midlertidige mobiliseringer [Fluid connections and temporary mobilization: On cultural production at the Roskilde Festival]', PhD Dissertation, Department of Intercultural Communication and Management, Copenhagen Business School.

Pedersen, L.A. (2014) 'Tilfældigt møde blev til festival [Coincidental meeting became a festival]', *Dagbladet Roskilde* (Roskilde edition of Regional Newspaper), 27 September 2014, Section 1, p. 4.

Pinder, D. (2010) 'Cities: Moving, Plugging in, Floating, Dissolving', in T. Cresswell and P. Merriman (eds) *Geographies of Mobilities*. Aldershot: Ashgate. pp. 167-186.

Pine, B.J. and Gilmore, J.H. (1999) *The Experience Economy*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Pineda, A.V. (2010) 'How do we co-produce urban transport systems and the city? The case of Transmilenio and Bogotá', in I. Farías and T. Bender (eds), *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 123-138.

Power, D. and Jansson, J. (2008) 'Outside in: Peripheral cultural industries and global markets', in J.O. Bærenholdt and B. Granås (eds), *Mobility and Place: Enacting Northern European Peripheries*. Aldershot: Ashgate. pp. 167-177.

Pratt, A. 2008: 'Creative Cities: The cultural industries and the creative class', *Geografiska Annaler*, 90B(2): 107-118.

Rantisi, N.H. and Leslie, D. (2010) 'Creativity by design? The role of informal spaces in creative production', in T. Edensor, D. Leslie, S. Millington and N. Rantisi (eds), *Spaces of vernacular creativity: Rethinking the cultural economy*. London: Routledge, pp. 33-45.

Rasmussen, J. (2014) 'Der er festival året rundt [It's festival all year round]', *Dagbladet Roskilde* (Roskilde edition of Regional Newspaper), 26 November 2014, Section 1, p. 4.

Richards, G. and Wilson, J. (2007) 'Tourism: from culture to creativity?', in. G: Richards and J. Wilson (eds), *Tourism, Creativity and Development*. London: Routledge, pp. 1-33.

Scott, A.J. (2000) *The Cultural Economy of Cities*, London: Sage.

Sheller, M. (2004) 'Mobile publics: Beyond the network perspective', *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 22: 39-52.

Sørensen, F. (2008) 'The urban innovation network geography of leisure experiences', in J. Sundbo and P. Darmer (eds), *Creating Experiences in the Experience Economy*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. pp. 134-156.

Storper, M. (2013) *Keys to the City: How Economics, Institutions, Social Interactions and Politics Shape Development*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Telier. A. (T. Binder, G.d. Mechelis, P. Ehn, G. Jacucci, P. Linde and I. Wagner) (2011) *Design Things*. Cambrigde (Mass.): MIT Press.

Tironi, M. (2010) 'Gelleable space, eventfull geographies: The case of Santiago's experimental music scene', in I. Farías and T. Bender (eds), *Urban Assemblages: How Actor-Network Theory Changes Urban Studies*. London: Routledge, pp. 27-52.

Urry, J. (2007) *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity.

van der Duim, R., Ren, C. and Jóhannesson, G.T. (eds)(2012) *Actor-Network Theory and Tourism: Ordering, Materiality and Multiplicity*. Abingdon: Routledge.