Part I

Regulating Visitors

1

Visitors and the Spatial Ecology of the City

Dennis R. Judd

In the post-structuralist urban literature,[1] enclaves represent local nodes of international circuits of capital and culture, though each of them may masquerade as a local space: gated communities, through the magic of marketing, become neighborhoods; malls are said to be the new marketplaces; and tourist bubbles offer simulacra of the cities they are replacing. As Michael Sorkin describes it, the "new city replaces the anomaly and delight of [local] places with a universal particular, a generic urbanism inflected only by appliqué" (1992: xiii). In his account, this new city is characterized by "rising levels of manipulation and surveillance" and "new modes of segregation," all put in the service of a "city of simulations, television city, the city as theme park" (Sorkin 1992: xiii–xiv). David Harvey echoes the frequently expressed concern that cities are being turned into sanitized, monotonous copies of one another, "almost identical from city to city" (1989: 295). Similarly, Chris Rojek describes a "universal cultural space" that "provides the same aesthetic and spatial references wherever one is in the world" (1995: 146).

By now an overwhelming consensus has emerged around the assertion that these enclaves are different from the public spaces of the past. Enclosure, it is said, facilitates new forms of domination. Tim Edensor proposes that the tourist enclave is a "total institution" of regulation that "materializes an ideology of consumption and regulates the performances of tourists" (1998: 52). Edensor echoes Lefebvre's observation that tourist

spaces "are planned with the greatest care: centralized, organized, hierarchized, symbolized and programmed to the nth degree" (1991: 384). Tilling the same ground, John Hannigan asserts that the uniformity of the spaces they inhabit subjects tourists to "a measured, controlled and organized kind of urban experience" (1998: 6) that eliminates the unpredictable quality of everyday street life. Such views seem to inexorably confirm Daniel Boorstin's complaint, expressed as early as 1961, that tourists have become passive consumers of pleasure "isolated within tourist facilities" whose promoters specialize in sponsoring pseudo-events and performances (1961: 94, 97, 109).

In this chapter I contest the vision that foresees the future city as little more than an assemblage of fortified spaces colonized by global capital and affluent residents and visitors. Predictions of such a dismal urban dystopia seem warranted only if one's focus is restricted to a few cities. Some older manufacturing and port cities in the United States and England have shared a trajectory that seems to confirm the direst predictions: a steep decline during the deindustrialization of the 1970s and 1980s, followed by a style of revitalization that sharply segmented urban space, to the benefit of the affluent middle class and the detriment of the poor (Judd and Parkinson 1990). Baltimore may be taken as emblematic of this type of redevelopment; its famed Harborplace is a virtual reservation for visitors who rarely experience the rest of a troubled city (Hula 1990; Harvey 2001: 128–57). It makes sense that Los Angeles should inspire the "LA School" of urban geographers to theorize a fragmented and centerless city, because it is one (Dear 2002). Las Vegas has also become an object of fascinated scrutiny because it seems to provide a voyeuristic glimpse into a city that has been constructed as a façade of carnival and spectacle (Rothman and Davis 2002).

But it is hazardous to treat these and cities like them as harbingers of what all cities are destined to become. The fractured character of Baltimore, Los Angeles, and Las Vegas may be exceptional rather than archetypal. Despite the effects of globalization, cities vary significantly from one another, and they are not necessarily converging. Boston, for example, is a walking city for residents and visitors alike, notwithstanding the presence of the world's first Rouse mall at Faneuil Hall and an interconnected mall and hotel complex at Copley Plaza (Ehrlich and Dreier 1999). The streets outside these enclosures are crowded with local residents and visitors, and visitors spill over into business and residential areas far more freely than a decade ago. Likewise, tourists are not confined within barricaded spaces in New York, San Francisco, or Chicago, despite the presence of tourist bubbles such as South Street Seaport, Ghirardelli Square, and the Magnificent Mile.

Tourist enclaves have become ubiquitous features within cities, but they

do not inexorably overwhelm them. In assessing the spatial character of urban tourism, the scale of analysis is fundamental. Within tourist enclaves, a non-democratic, directive, and authoritarian regulation is attempted and generally achieved. But when urban tourism is considered at the scale of the city, enclaves generally capture only some of the visitors some of the time. Urban tourism does not operate, in most cities, as a "total institution" of regulation, and it is not likely that it will do so in the future. I pursue this line of argument in the remainder of this chapter.

The Construction of Tourist Enclaves

Until the rise of mass tourism in the latter half of the nineteenth century, cities held a special status as travel destinations. The cities of the Grand Tour of the fifteenth through the eighteenth centuries – mainly Paris, Geneva, Rome, Florence, Venice, Naples – were visited as a rite of passage by young men of the British upper class, who were expected to come of age by seeing "the ruins of classical Rome as well as the churches and palaces and art collections of the great Continental capitals" (Withey 1997: 7). The Grand Tour cities offered a veneer of high culture as well as abundant worldly diversions, but they were also often reviled. As the historian Lynne Withey has observed, the signs of poverty, social disorder, and physical decay were everywhere apparent in Rome, Naples, and Venice, and Paris was a warren of overcrowded streets filled with careening horses and wagons, strewn with garbage and running with sewage (Withey 1997).

Whatever the drawbacks of the Grand Tour cities, travelers were willing to brave weeks of discomfort to negotiate rutted roads and nearly impassable mountains, if necessary, to get to them. The hazards and inconvenience of travel sharpened a widely shared disdain for nature and the natural. Mountains were considered ugly and forbidding, seacoasts generally inaccessible and dangerous. By the mid-eighteenth century, however, such attitudes began to change. Nature was discovered as a vast repository of sublime views and vistas. The Romantic poets reinterpreted nature as a tamed backdrop of leafy bowers, stately trees, and placid lakes. With the rise of the industrial cities of the nineteenth century, the worship of nature reached full bloom, now interpreted through Thoreau, Wordsworth, and their contemporaries as the repository of the human spirit, as opposed to the meanness and gloom of the cities.

The "American Grand Tour" of the post-Civil War years provided a sharp contrast with its earlier European counterpart, with trips up the Hudson and Connecticut river valleys as "prime examples of the picturesque," and the Catskill Mountains and Niagara Falls as iconic exam-

ples of the "sublime" (Withey 1997: 117). But Europeans also visited such places as St Louis, Cincinnati, and Chicago to see the dramatic evidence of bustling progress and industry. They noted the grand hotels and mansions, riverboats, and steamships; recently arrived immigrants and even sometimes the occasional Indian, all combined into "a curious mixture of the civilized and the primitive" (Withey 1997: 131). Urban elites were convinced that visitors' perceptions might determine a city's economic prospects, and so they assiduously promoted (real and imagined) cultural, educational, and artistic accomplishments (Wade 1959).

European cities were reborn as tourist destinations by becoming stops on a democratized version of the Grand Tour. Beginning in the 1850s, Thomas Cook began the age of mass tourism by leading package tours to the continent. Cities promoted themselves as well, but as centers of industry more than of culture. The glorification of technology and progress supplied the common thread running through the fairs and exhibitions of the nineteenth and first decades of the twentieth centuries: London's Crystal Palace exposition of 1851 and the Paris Exhibition of 1867; across the ocean, the World's Fairs of Chicago in 1893, St Louis in 1904, and New York in 1938.

But such promotional activities were not sufficient by themselves to transform cities into tourist destinations. The cities of the industrial age were as often noted for their squalid slums and social problems as for their architectural and cultural treasures (Hall 1996: ch. 2). A visitor who chose to travel a city's streets randomly might well have many adventures, but not all would likely be welcomed. Urban tourism grew in tandem with the signposting of the sites and sights that visitors should seek out. When Thomas Cook began offering package tours to European cities, he took his charges to significant historical sites and to cultural attractions, arranged lodging, and provided essential information and assistance (Urry 1990: 24). By 1869 he was leading the first tourists to Jerusalem and the Holy Land, a business that mushroomed (through Thomas Cook and Son) to 5,000 visitors a year within a decade (Brendon 1991: 120–3).

Package tours demystified the place being visited by breaking it into manageable parts, each of which carried significance and meaning. By the turn of the century most major European cities had been thus interpreted through guidebooks, and guiding services had sprung up to compete with Cook. In the United States, a parallel process evolved, but local tourism entrepreneurs took the lead. Guidebooks, sketches, drawings, and photographs "coached" visitors about what to see and do. The representations and the physical spaces "played a key role in both making cities appealing to tourists and conveying a sense of social unity" (Cocks 2001: 144). Local tour operators translated the descriptions and representations found in guide books into physical reality by providing tourists with fixed itineraries,

which reduced the cities they saw to a mélange of monuments, historical sites, and cultural facilities. The tourist experience on mass transportation and guided tours reduced the city to a panorama of a "passing city" seen in a "spectatorial, fascinated manner" (ibid.: 164). World's Fairs and exhibitions embellished the habit of seeing cities as a collage of stylized urban images and set scenes. As one visitor observed about the World's Columbian Exposition at the Chicago World's Fair of 1893, "The Fair is a world . . . in which ugliness and useless[ness] have been extirpated, and the beautiful and useful alone admitted" (ibid.: 128). The City Beautiful movement derived much of its inspiration from the Chicago World's Fair, with its focus on monumental architecture, parks, and public spaces.

Half a century later, a similar process of image-making and spatial reconstruction unfolded. By the 1960s in the United States the older industrial cities were faced with the physical dilapidation of downtowns and the spread of blight through miles of neighborhoods surrounding the core. The massive clearance projects financed by urban renewal failed to bring a renaissance, and any improvements from the federal grant programs of the 1960s and 1970s were overshadowed by crime, riots, and social unrest. Republican candidates and the media portrayed cities as outposts of violence and racial problems, so that terms like *ghetto*, *welfare*, *the underclass*, *crime*, and *the inner city* became conflated into interchangeable images (Edsall and Edsall 1991). As a result, a narrative of urban decline entered the national consciousness that mostly erased the positive images that cities might have inherited from the past (Beauregard 1993).

A generation of "Messiah mayors" burst onto the American scene in the 1980s, proclaiming a gospel of self-help and renewal (Teaford 1990). By using tax breaks and subsidies and new public/private partnerships, they stimulated a remarkable period of regeneration. Especially in older cities, a tourist bubble took form around a cluster of facilities and amenities (new waterfronts, atrium hotels, festival malls, convention centers, sports stadiums, entertainment districts), a space or series of spaces segregated from the remainder of the city. By building fortress spaces, even the most crime-ridden cities were able to carve out islands and reservations that could comfortably be inhabited by tourists and middle-class city residents.

In the ensuing years, enclavic tourist spaces have multiplied throughout the world. Stephen Graham and Simon Marvin predict the global proliferation of fantasy cities that bundle together retailing, restaurants and bars, performance halls, cinemas and IMAX theatres, hotels, video and virtual reality centers, and other diversions into an all-consuming environment of consumption and entertainment (2001: 265). Even now, a world traveler can find versions of these entertainment complexes scattered all over the globe (Iyer 2000).

Plate 1.1   Times Square, New York, entertainment complex. *Source*: Corbis

Tourist Enclaves as "Total Regulation" Regimes

Baudrillard's analysis of sites of consumption as cultural fields composed of "a sign-consuming totality" is helpful in understanding how the managers of tourist enclaves may attempt to regulate their users. Baudrillard writes that shopping centers are places in which "art and leisure mingle with everyday life" and constitute, in effect, subcultures of their own that establish a perfect context for consumption through "the total conditioning of action and time" (Baudrillard 1998: 28, 29). They allow desire and satiation to be blended into a super-heated mixture in which all sensations become overwhelmed by a pandemonium composed of a "sweeping vista of perpetual shopping" (ibid.: 30). Enclavic tourist spaces may operate similarly, by enveloping visitors within an environment that floods their senses with the signs and symbols of consumption and play.

Such experiences may be conceived as comprising a totalizing environment that filters the tourists' perceptions, experiences, and desires. This is akin to Bourdieu's *habitus*, a constellation of the dispositions and attitudes, practices, and representations that organize everyday life (Bourdieu 1990a), or (in Aboulafia's excellent summary) "the home of our non-reflexive engagement with the world" (Aboulafia 1999: 166). As a constellation of behaviors, *habitus* can, in effect, act as an agent protecting itself from

change and disruptions, but "it" can also make choices to deflect challenges to its continued existence:

> Early experiences have particular weight because the *habitus* tends to ensure its own constancy and its defence against change through the selection it makes within new information . . . Through the systematic "choices" it makes among the places, events and people that might be frequented, the *habitus* tends to protect itself from crises and critical challenges by providing itself with a milieu to which it is as pre-adapted as possible. (Bourdieu 1990b: 60–1)

The tourists who inhabit enclavic spaces are encouraged to act, essentially, like factory workers subjected to "the time-sheet, the timekeeper, the informers, and the fines" (Thompson 1967). Because they are bounded by physical barriers and are designed for specialized activities, venues such as sports stadiums, convention centers, and malls may accomplish an almost total regulation of the body. Sports stadiums and convention centers, for example, are designed for the sole purpose of performance, and users who have other activities in mind are apt to be thrown out. Likewise, shopping malls are built as palaces of consumption; aimless loitering is discouraged or forbidden. Though they sometimes masquerade as public spaces, such confining environments project a "finite, or finished, aspect" that directs everything inward (Lefebvre 1991: 147). As Edensor has noted, these spaces may become as subject to the "remorseless surveillance through panopticon visual monitoring" as the carceral networks described by Foucault (Foucault 1977; Edensor 1998).

Enclavic tourist spaces are designed to regulate their inhabitants through the control of four principal aspects of agency: desire, consumption, movement, and time. Desire and consumption are regulated by promotion and marketing. Time and movement are strictly confined (by corridors, turnstiles, escalators, tunnels and tubes) and monitored (by security cameras and security guards). The use of time is also constrained by the scheduling of staged spectacles and performances and by physical features such as the availability or absence of seating and gathering places. The experiences and products on offer combine homogeneity and heterogeneity – enough of the former to give a sense of comfort and familiarity, enough of the latter to induce a sense of novelty and surprise.

Activities except those encouraged by corporate sponsors are often intercepted or forbidden. Malls routinely prohibit political activities of any kind, and security forces are quick to escort conspicuous non-consumers off the premises. The way that this works can be discerned in the opening of the World Financial Center in New York City in October 1988. The advertising agents for the developer, Olympia & York, staged five days of

celebrations, all intended to convey (in the advertising firm's language) "a progressive understanding of the uses of public space." As it transpired, the celebrations were tied closely to the marketing needs of the businesses located in the Center. The sponsored activities defined and strictly limited the activities of the participants, who were reduced to the status of passive observers (Boyer 1994: 468).

If cities were composed mainly of archipelagos of enclaves, visitors and local inhabitants would scarcely be able to escape the close surveillance and control that enclavic space facilitates. However, enclaves constitute only one component of an increasingly complex spatiality of urban tourism. The environments inhabited by city visitors run the gamut from spaces built specifically for the production of spectacle and consumption, to public spaces such as waterfronts, parks, and plazas, to business and residential streets. This complex geography provides plenty of opportunity for visitors to escape the confines of enclosure.

The Complex Spatiality of Urban Tourism

Visitors to some cities find it difficult to move freely about. Most visitors to Detroit quickly exhaust the attractions of the Renaissance Center and Greektown, but they walk into the surrounding city at their own peril. Visitors to Baltimore are generally advised to avoid the "other Baltimore" that lies outside the Harborplace development, with its broad marble and stone plazas, Rouse mall, aquarium, restaurants and bars, and luxury hotels (Hula 1990; Harvey 2001: 128–57). In Las Vegas virtually all visitors are confined within casinos, hotels, and malls. But these cities lie at the extreme of a continuum. Typically, enclaves inhabited by visitors co-exist with downtown business districts, streets populated with local small businesses and shops, neighborhoods, and public buildings, and public spaces.

Enclaves are generally incorporated into an urban texture which has itself become an object of fascination and consumption. As Sassen and Roost have observed, "the large city has assumed the status of exotica. Modern tourism is no longer centered on the historic monument, concert hall, or museum but on the urban scene or, more precisely, on some version of the urban scene fit for tourism" (1999: 143). The "scene" that visitors consume is composed of a kaleidoscope of experiences and spaces devoted to work, consumption, leisure, and entertainment (Featherstone 1994: 394–7).

The areas in cities inviting tourists to wander about may not be places normally inhabited by tourists at all; they may be "edgy" – transitional neighborhoods or zones where people are on the margins of urban society

– places where ethnic minorities, non-whites, immigrants, and poor people may live and work. Such areas may be attractive precisely because they have not been constructed for and do not provide for tourists. Outside of the usual comfort zone, the tourist can stroll into an interesting and unpredictable intellectual and physical space. As expressed by an artist living in such a neighborhood, "Along with the danger there's a vitality . . . when you're sure of personal safety there's a certain edge goes away. And there's something exciting having that edge" (Lloyd 2002: 528).

In European cities that do not have the extremes of segregation, crime, racial tensions, and social problems of some older cities in the United States and of cities in developing countries, visitors tend to be absorbed into the urban fabric. Leo van den Berg and his collaborators have proposed that there is a "European Model" that emphasizes the "harmonious development of the city" rather than the construction of segregated tourist spaces (van den Berg et al. 2003). Their studies of Rotterdam, Amsterdam, Lisbon, and Birmingham show that planners and policy-makers in those cities weigh the costs of tourism by taking into account "displacement of resident-oriented activities, gentrification, and cultural friction" (van den Berg 2003).

Such a balancing of local needs and economic development projects requires an over-arching political vision that is rarely possible in cities where leaders feel desperate for development at almost any cost. In European cities, the unique architectural and cultural heritage of urban cores has been understood to be the main attraction for visitors; as a consequence, tourism development has been aimed at enhancing the character of each city. Similarly, planners in Vancouver, Canada, have regarded tourism as a natural by-product of policies that emphasize neighborhoods, urban amenities, and the environment (Artibise 2003). Even in Montreal, a city that has emphasized mega-projects such as Expo 67 (the 1967 World's Fair) and the 1976 Summer Olympics, as well as other large projects, no tourist bubble has developed; visitors to the city often wander through the downtown and the neighborhoods (Levine 2003). Mexico City is an especially interesting case because it has focused its energies on the development of an enclave in the historic center – a strategy virtually forced on the city by its high crime rates. But despite these conditions, planners are trying to make the enclave a place desirable for local residents as much as for visitors (Hiernaux-Nicolas 2003).

The changing geography of urban spatial structure reflects the rise of an urban culture that revolves around "quality of life" concerns (Clark et al. 2002; Lloyd 2002). It is increasingly difficult to distinguish visitor from "local" spaces because leisure, entertainment, and cultural sectors are sustained as crucially by local residents as by out-of-town visitors. When not traveling elsewhere, local residents frequently engage in activities that are

indistinguishable from what tourists do: dine out, go to the mall, walk along the waterfront, attend a concert. The rise of a new urban culture devoted to aesthetic pursuits has remade cities into places that provide the consumption opportunities of travel right at home: "Consumers no longer travel vast distances to experience a magnificent diversity of consumption opportunities. For their convenience, flourishing districts of urban entertainment concentrate objects, or at least their facsimiles, [gathered] from the world over . . . Residents increasingly act like tourists in their own cities" (Lloyd 2000: 7).[2] The resulting "localization of leisure" has stimulated, as much as has tourism, the conversion of cities or parts of cities into specialized venues for entertainment (Hannigan 1998: 61).

A globalized consumer culture has spread to embrace the middle classes in developing and developed countries, and the bundles of consumer goods they desire have become remarkably similar. Sassen has documented the concentration of a class of highly paid workers in the services sector in global cities; however, in actuality the new global class of privileged "symbolic analysts" has spread to nearly all corners of the globe (Reich 1991; Sassen 1994; Lury 1997: 90). The rise of a global cosmopolitan class can be discerned in the proliferation of urban lifestyle magazines (Greenberg 2000: 5). In the 1960s, lifestyle magazines were launched in 60 US metropolitan areas, a number that grew to more than 100 by the end of the century (Greenberg 2000). These magazines are similar from city to city because the target audience is unvarying: an affluent new middle class made up disproportionately of empty-nest baby boomers and their highly educated and well-paid progeny. In her study of *New York*, *Atlanta*, and *Los Angeles* magazines, Miriam Greenberg found that since the early 1990s, people in this strata share a preoccupation with "narrowly-defined, consumer-oriented, and politically conservative urban lifestyles" (ibid.: 25). The new middle-class consumer can acquire instant sophistication by eating the cuisine, drinking the wine, smoking the cigars, and buying the cars and art recommended by a new breed of writers and critics who specialize in giving lifestyle advice. Though Greenberg's study only examines magazines published in the United States, similar magazines can be found on the newsstands of major cities throughout the world.

Tourism overlaps with – indeed, is a product of – a globalized culture of consumption sustained by highly mobile workers and consumers. It makes sense to assume that the members of this class will tend to demand and therefore to reproduce similar urban environments wherever they go. This tendency is not difficult to observe. New York's Soho, like warehouse districts elsewhere, has been invaded by a predictable mix of themed stores. Likewise, ethnic cuisine has not only been internationalized but also fetishized, so that the same varieties of ethnic nouvelle cuisine can be found in almost any city. These developments suggest a provocative question: Will

a globalized culture of affluent consumption eventually reduce all cities to a monotonous monoculture?

In fact, it is far from clear that cosmopolitans want the same thing everywhere they go. Because many residents and visitors seek out the unique, and numerous visitors come for other purposes than sightseeing, a tendency towards homogeneity is not inevitable, and it may even be unlikely. Richard Lloyd discerns the rise of a new culture of "neo-bohemia" led by urban residents who associate "gritty spaces with creative energy" (2000: 1). This new class, he argues, is responsible for the reclaiming of "apparently anachronistic spaces" in inner cities such as old warehouse and industrial districts (ibid.: 5), a development much like the gentrification of London's city fringe, where designers and artists have colonized old market halls, storefronts, and workshops (Fainstein 2001).

Richard Florida has shown that the group he calls "the creative class" – highly educated professionals with rarified intellectual, analytic, artistic, and creative skills – frequently regard lifestyle as more important than a particular job in choosing a place to live (2002: 224). The members of this class demand social interaction, culture, nightlife, diversity, and authenticity, the latter defined as "historic buildings, established neighborhoods, a unique music scene or specific cultural attributes. It comes from the mix – from urban grit alongside renovated buildings, from the commingling of young and old, long-time neighborhood characters and yuppies, fashion models and 'bag ladies'" (ibid.: 228). Florida indicates that the creative class tends to reject "canned experiences": "A chain theme restaurant, a multimedia-circus sports stadium or a prepackaged entertainment-and-tourist district is like a packaged tour: You do not get to create your experience or modulate the intensity: it is thrust upon you." What the members of the creative class demand is "to have a hand in creating the experience [of the city] rather than merely consuming it" (ibid.: 232). These preferences have spawned a globalized movement demanding a higher level of urban amenities, both public and private (Clark et al. 2002).

Modes of Resistance

It is difficult to anticipate the kinds of places and experiences to which tourists will be drawn. Harlem, for example, has become a popular destination for German tourists fascinated by African-American religious services and by other tourists attracted by "ethnic" New York (Hoffman 2000). Some proportion of tourists and local residents seek out such places as an alternative to the contrived atmosphere of enclavic tourist spaces. Feifer has proposed that these people be called post-tourists (after "post-

modern"). Unlike ordinary tourists, post-tourists do not wish to gaze upon officially sanctioned tourist sites, partly because they have already weathered a continuing barrage of tourist objects and images projected by television, film, magazines, and other media. They are jaded by travel before they even leave home. Having ceased to regard any particular "gaze" as privileged, the post-tourist seeks out a multitude of experiences, as an antidote to boredom (Feifer 1985: 269).

City visitors possess a significant capacity to resist the totalizing regulation intended by the managers of enclavic tourist spaces. Post-tourists, jaded by a lifetime of exposure to marketing and theming, are apt to adopt an *ironic stance* within the confines of Disneyfied environments. What post-tourists seek in festival malls and entertainment multiplexes is pure fun and escapism; they are likely to find criticisms that these spaces are inauthentic to be ill-tempered, meaningless, or beside the point (Fainstein 2001: 210). Their ironic stance allows them to seek their own experiences even within a confining environment.

A second mode of resistance is *a refusal to conform* to expected uses of tourist spaces. As de Certeau has observed, "space is a practiced place"; as, for example, when "the street geometrically defined by urban planning is transformed into a space by walkers" (1984: 117). Because the developers of enclavic spaces must respond to changing tastes and preferences, the practices within them may be less static and unchanging than is sometimes supposed. Even in cities splintered into enclaves and fragments, Stephen Graham and Simon Marvin identify several modes of resistance: Residents of gated communities regularly ignore or defy their common-interest associations; young people find ways to evade the strict regulations within malls; and the rules imposed by the owners and managers of enclaves are sometimes met by well-organized protests (2001: 389, 394–5). The refusal to conform may even be asserted in extremely confining circumstances. In his study of tourism in India, Edensor found that despite the best efforts of the guides on package tours to shield their charges from unanticipated encounters, the intermingling of spaces often promoted casual wandering and walking and lounging about on streets, in markets, and at outdoor cafés. The members of packaged tours sometimes freely wandered about, occupying the liminal zone of anonymity of the *flâneur* (Urry 1990: 138).

This suggests a third mode of resistance: *escape* from closely regulated tourist enclaves. Escape is easy in all but the most specialized resort cities or crime-ridden urban cores. In fact, escape is often encouraged; cities that offer a wide range of amenities and interesting urban experiences advertise their enclaves as only one option in a range of experiences. The franchised brand-name outlets associated with festival malls (such as Banana Republic, the Gap, Victoria's Secret, etc.) have spilled out from the malls

and into shopping districts such as the Magnificent Mile on Michigan Avenue, Chicago, and in London's Chelsea precisely because their customers have refused to stay confined. The institutions of "high culture" – museums, performing arts centers, playhouses, and art galleries – may be found not only in their traditional settings, but, increasingly, within entertainment enclaves (presumably the plays staged at the Shakespeare theatre on Chicago's Navy Pier are no less authentic because of its location). It is also evident that cities on both sides of the Atlantic have been investing heavily in such public amenities as parks, fountains, formal gardens, and public art, which contradicts dire predictions that the public realm is disappearing (Clark et al. 2002).

The disorder of urban life, the unpredictable mélange of the local and vernacular with the global, is expressed in the variety of experiences available to a typical city's residents and visitors. All in the same day a visitor may sample Disneyfied entertainments, go to a Monet exhibit, walk through a historic neighborhood, and end up at Mexican restaurant (which may be a cheap local *taqueria* or a restaurant serving a globalized, nouvelle Mexican cuisine). The city is a crucible melding circuits of globalized capital and culture with the local and the eccentric, the cosmopolitan with the parochial. Walter Benjamin's delight in the exuberant anarchy of city life can still be experienced, even by the casual visitor:

> Not to find one's way in a city may well be uninteresting and banal. It requires ignorance – nothing more. But to lose oneself in a city – as one loses oneself in a forest – that calls for quite a different schooling. Then, signboards and street names, passers-by, roofs, kiosks, or bars must speak to the wanderer like a cracking twig under his feet in the forest, like the startling call of a bittern in the distance . . . in the midst of asphalt streets of the city I felt exposed to the powers of nature. (Benjamin 1978: 8–9)

It should be noted that even when they leave enclaves and indulge in the unpredictable adventures of the *flâneur*, visitors are subjected to a variety of regulations in the form of official surveillance, legal strictures, spatial configurations, and the limited range of options and choices available to them. Complete escape from regulation is not an option, but the visitors encounter many different modes of regulation in contemporary cities. The spatial ecology of cities is becoming more, not less, complex and varied. As Graham and Marvin have observed, "urban life is more diverse, varied and unpredictable than the common reliance on US-inspired urban dystopias suggests" (2001: 392). The obituaries pronouncing the imminent demise of the public city may be greatly exaggerated.

NOTES

1   I follow Susan Fainstein's example (*The City Builders* 2001: 204–13) in employing this term to denote a body of scholarship that emphasizes what is often labeled the "post-modern geography" of the city, which is described as a landscape fractured by walls, barriers, and a geography of difference and separation, a form of development brought about by the economic and political influences of globalization. This view constitutes a sharp departure from a "modernist" twentieth-century geography of comprehensive planning, large-scale development, and the goal of achieving order and harmony in the urban environment The post-structuralist interpretation of urban development is rather self-consciously represented in the self-styled LA School (cf. Michael J. Dear (ed.), *From Chicago to LA*).
2   Richard Lloyd's concept of the "as if" tourist is brilliant, and if there is any justice, this felicitous term will become a mainstay in the literature on tourism and urban tourism.

REFERENCES

Aboulafia, M. 1999: A (neo) American in Paris: Bourdieu, Mead, and pragmatism. In R. Shusterman (ed.), *Bourdieu: A Critical Reader*. London: Blackwell, 153–74.

Artibise, A. 2003: Tourism infrastructure of a post-industrial city: a case study of Vancouver, British Columbia. In D. R. Judd (ed.), *The Infrastructure of Play: Building the Tourist City*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Baudrillard, J. 1998: *The Consumer Society: Myths and Structures*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Beauregard, R. A. 1993: *Voices of Decline: The Postwar Fate of American Cities*. New York: Blackwell.

Benjamin, W. 1978: *Essays, Aphorisms, Autobiographical Writings*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Boorstin, D. J. 1961: *The Image: A Guide to Pseudo-Events in America*. New York: Vintage.

Bourdieu, P. 1990a: Structures, habitus and practices. In *The Polity Reader in Social Theory*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 95–110.

——1990b: *The Logic of Practice*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Boyer, C. 1994: *The City of Collective Memory: Its Historical Imagery and Architectural Entertainments*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Brendon, P. 1991: *Thomas Cook: 150 Years of Popular Tourism*. London: Secker and Warburg.

Clark, T. N., Lloyd, R., Wong, K. K., and Jain. 2002: Amenities drive urban growth. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24 (5): 493–516.

Cocks, C. 2001: *Doing the Town: The Rise of Urban Tourism in the United States, 1859–1915*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Dear, M. J. (ed.) 2002: *From Chicago to LA: Making Sense of Urban Theory*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

De Certeau, M. 1984: *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Edensor, T. 1998: *Tourists at the Taj: Performance and Meaning at a Symbolic Site*. New York: Routledge.

Edsall, T. B. and Edsall, M. D. 1991: *Chain Reaction: The Impact of Race, Rights, and Taxes on American Politics*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Ehrlich, B. and Dreier, P. 1999: The new Boston discovers the old: tourism and the struggle for a livable city. In D. R. Judd and S. S. Fainstein (eds.), *The Tourist City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 155–78.

Fainstein, S. S. 2001: *The City Builders*, 2nd ed. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas.

Featherstone, M. 1994: City cultures and post-modern lifestyles. In A. Amin (ed.), *Post-Fordism: A Reader*. Oxford: Blackwell, 387–408.

Feifer, M. 1985: *Going Places*. London: Macmillan.

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

Foucault, M. 1977: *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Allen Lane.

Graham, S. and Marvin, S. 2001: *Splintering Urbanism: Networked Infrastructure, Technological Mobilities and the Urban Condition*. London: Routledge.

Greenberg, M. 2000: Branding cities: a social history of the urban lifestyle magazine. *Urban Affairs Review* 36 (2): 228–63.

Hall, P. 1996: *Cities of Tomorrow*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Hannigan, J. 1998: *Fantasy City: Pleasure and Profit in the Postmodern Metropolis*. New York: Routledge.

Harvey, D. 1989: *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

—— 2001: *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. New York: Routledge.

Hiernaux-Nicolas, D. 2003: Tourism and strategic competitiveness: infrastructure development in Mexico City. In D. R. Judd (ed.), *The Infrastructure of Play: Building the Tourist City*. Armonk, New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Hoffman, L. M. 2000: Tourism and the revitalization of Harlem. In *Research in Urban Sociology*, vol. 5. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 207–23.

Hula, R. C. 1990: The two Baltimores. In D. R. Judd and M. Parkinson (eds.), *Leadership and Urban Regeneration: Cities in North America and Europe*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, 191–215.

Iyer, P. 2000: *The Global Soul: Jet-Lag, Shopping Malls and the Search for Home*. London: Bloomsbury.

Judd, D. and Parkinson, M. (eds.) 1990: *Leadership and Urban Regeneration: Cities in North America and Europe*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lefebvre, H. 1991: *The Production of Space*. London: Blackwell.

Levine, M. V. 2003: Tourism infrastructure and urban redevelopment in Montreal. In D. R. Judd (ed.), *The Infrastructure of Play: Building the Tourist City*. Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Lloyd, R. 2000: Grit as glamour: neo-Bohemia and urban change. Unpublished manuscript, University of Chicago.

—— 2002: Art and neighborhood redevelopment in Chicago. *Journal of Urban Affairs* 24 (5): 517–32.

Lury, C. 1997: The objects of travel. In C. Rojek and J. Urry (eds.), *Touring Cultures: Transformations of Travel and Theory*. London: Routledge, 75–95.

Reich, R. B. 1991: *The Work of Nations: Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism*. New York: Knopf.

Rojek, C. 1995: *Decentering Leisure*. London: Sage.

Rothman, H. K. and Davis, M. (eds.) 2002: *The Grit beneath the Glitter*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Sassen, S. 1994: *Cities in a World Economy*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.

—— and Roost, F. 1999: The city: strategic site for the global entertainment industry. In D. R. Judd and S. S. Fainstein (eds.), *The Tourist City*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 143–54.

Sorkin, M. (ed.) 1992: *Variations on a Theme Park*. New York: Hill and Wang.

Teaford, J. 1990: *The Rough Road to Renaissance: Urban Revitalization in America, 1940–1985*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Thompson, E. P. 1967: Time, discipline, and industrial capitalism. *Past and Present* 38, as quoted in S. Zukin [1991], *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 17.

Urry, J. 1990: *The Tourist Gaze: Leisure and Travel in Contemporary Societies*. London: Sage Publications.

van den Berg, L., van den Borg, J., and Russo, A. P. 2003: The infrastructure of urban tourism: a European model? In D. R. Judd (ed.), *The Infrastructure of Play: Building the Tourist City*. New York: M. E. Sharpe.

Wade, R. C. 1959: *The Urban Frontier: Pioneer Life in Early Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, Lexington, Louisville, and St Louis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Withey, L. 1997: *Grand Tours and Cook's Tours: A History of Leisure Travel 1750 to 1915*. New York: William Morrow and Company.