Strangers in the Night: Nightlife Studies and New Urban Tourism

Eldridge, A.

Strangers in the Night: Nightlife Studies and New Urban Tourism.

Abstract

This paper draws together recent scholarship from the study of urban tourism and nightlife. Though studies of urban tourism do not always specifically address nightlife, and likewise studies of the night and nightlife do not always examine tourism, both bodies of research overlap in important ways. Concerns about commercialisation, gentrification, displacement, and urban change are to be found in both bodies of research. However, while the study of urban tourism typically recognises the erasure of the host / guest binary and seeks to destabilise the notion of who is a tourist or stranger, studies of nightlife often rest on a much clearer distinction between who belongs and who does not. An argument proposed here is that while the host / guest, tourist / non-tourist binary is perhaps breaking down, the night and nightlife spaces reinstate these binaries in various ways. This paper thinks through debates about tourists and residents in the night, focusing in particular on questions of belonging, place identification and gentrification through night-time uses.

Introduction

A point of departure for this paper concerns the closure of Fabric, a nightclub located in central London opposite the historic Smithfield meat market. Opened in 1999, the club was closed by licensing authorities in September 2016 due, in part, to the drug-related deaths of two patrons. A social media and crowdfunding campaign soon followed and the closure was commented upon by a number of spokespeople, including London's Mayor, Sadiq Khan (Baines, 2016). Though Fabric eventually re-opened, in light of wider concerns about the closure of a number of nightlife venues, especially local pubs, live music venues and LGBTQ+ spaces, news of the club's closure fed into the wider perception that London's nightlife was under threat (Campkin and Marshall, 2017; Furedi, 2015).

It was while attending a conference on nightlife in Berlin two months later that the fallout of Fabric's closure became clear to me. As well as being a frequent topic of discussion, a fundraising event had been organised for conference delegates to help cover Fabric's legal costs. As someone who lives very close to Fabric, it was both heartening but also unexpected to find people, almost 1,000km away, organising fundraising events and expressing concern about the closure of my 'local' club. Something I did not admit to at the time, however, was that despite my proximity and interest in nightlife I had actually never been to Fabric. Talking to my neighbours about the closure revealed similarly ambiguous feelings; one felt it was a shame for young people but was more concerned about the recent closure of one of our local parks popular with dog walkers. My neighbours downstairs, who regularly attended the club, were disappointed but took a pragmatic view that clubs opened and closed regularly.

Talking to my neighbours and people in Berlin about Fabric raised many of the issues explored in this paper. In particular, I am interested in the relationship 'hosts and guests' have to space, the role of tourists and residents in making cities, and, more broadly, place attachment and belonging (Cohen and Cohen, 2012). While the

discussion draws on recent scholarship from the field of new urban tourism (Novy, 2018) it does so through the lens of the night, drawing on a related but slightly different set of terms and debates. I am specifically interested in the night here as a contributing factor that shapes how tourists and locals alike might experience the urban landscape after dark and how the night contours our feelings of belonging or otherwise. That tourists might feel a different sense of attachment or belonging to a place than locals, and that we might experience these feelings differently in the night, points to a series of questions about how 'mobility and moorings' (Cresswell, 2010; Brenner, 2004) are as much temporal as spatial concepts. How, or to what extent, the night and nightlife more generally disrupts or reinstates the binary of tourist and non-tourist, belonging or strangeness, is of particular interest. After a brief discussion of debates about the night in the UK, and the dominance of the conflict model, the paper moves on to explore how tourism at night blurs or reinforces various distinctions through which nightlife is understood, lived and imagined. Guiding the discussion is the question of how and to what extent the night shapes different relations, entanglements and intensities of being and 'territorial belonging' (Gustafson, 2009) in the nocturnal city.

1. Conflict and nightlife.

A now well-established argument about nightlife is that it can lead to conflict between residents and nightlife consumers, with the latter often presumed to be 'not local'. Since at least the 1990s, the expansion of nightlife provision in British town and city centres, particularly bars, clubs and other alcohol-related establishments, has been marked by concerns about anti-social behaviour, binge drinking, the commercialisation of leisure, and over-development (Lovatt, 2017; Hadfield, 2006; Roberts and Turner, 2005; Chatterton and Hollands, 2002). Better management of what has become known as 'the night-time economy' has been a goal of various tiers of government from the late 1990s onwards (Roberts, 2004), with different policies seeking to both champion and restrain the growth of nightlife. While the liberalisation of licensing through the Licensing Act (2003) and the recent appointment of night tsars / mayors in London and Manchester can be understood more in terms of the former, other initiatives such as closing venues and other licensed public spaces, regulating hours, and allowing local residents to comment on and object to licensing decisions have sought to regulate, inhibit or at the very least better orientate its growth.

A second narrative characterising the literature on nightlife in British cities is its ambiguous relationship to regeneration and gentrification (Hobbs, et al, 2005; Author, 2009). In the 1980s and 1990s, nightlife was seen in some quarters as a tool for reversing de-industrial decline in urban centres (Lovatt and O'Connor, 1995; Stevenson, 2018). This could be achieved by encouraging workers to remain in town centres at the end of their work day, promoting bars, restaurants, and other 'quarters', encouraging housing development in urban centres – often alongside emerging nightlife precincts – and staging events after dark (Heath, 19997; Hughes, 1999). An active and vibrant nightlife was understood to act as a draw for further investment, recalling both Florida's (2005) work in articulating creativity and vibrancy with economic growth, and, more recently, Lloyd's (2011) work on urban neo-bohemia in promoting a 'grit as glamour' urban aesthetic.

The link between nightlife, regeneration and gentrification was always slightly ambiguous, however. On the one hand, nightlife, including aspirational bars, restaurants and clubs in new mixed-use developments, could be seen to encourage further growth by helping to market and 'brand' the nocturnal city. Night-time leisure venues and vibrant and diverse streetscapes would attract not just new homeowners, renters, investors, and students, but would also open up other supply chains, such as take-away venues, taxi companies, and various businesses supplying bars and clubs (Author, 2010). On the other hand, noise, binge drinking and the presence of some forms of nightlife deemed to be anti-social could negatively impact on property prices and detract from further development. As explored elsewhere (Author, 2010, see also Thurnell-Read, 2012), hen and stag parties were one such example where groups of presumably loud and drunken people were actively discouraged by local businesses and the media lest they alarm families or other nightlife consumers and investors. The promotion of British cities after dark has not been neutral, in other words, but instead has encouraged creative, aspirational, safe and well managed venues and streets (Haydock, 2014). This has not only led to accusations of nightlife being used to gentrify certain neighbourhoods and displace existing residents, but also highlights how some users, local or otherwise, have been privileged over others.

Central to much of the literature on British nightlife has thus been the theme of conflict, be that between residents and consumers, nightlife providers, local authorities and other stakeholders, new and established residents, promoters, and those resisting the over commercialisation of youth spaces and cultures. Much of the debate about nightlife has been framed in terms of alcohol and binge drinking, especially in regards to students and young working-class people, but wider debates have also been raised more generally about who then has access to urban centres at night and what that might mean for 'night citizenship' (Plyushteva, 2009; Gwiazdzinski, 2014). What we want our nocturnal cities to be, for whom, and how they might be more accessible and inclusive are chief, albeit not always clearly articulated, concerns.

Some of these arguments echo in studies of conflicts surrounding tourism and unsurprisingly there has been significant crossover between the two bodies of literature (Author, 2018; Nofre, et al, 2017; Nofre, et al, 2018). Commercialisation, rising land values, residential and commercial displacement (Cocola-Gant, 2018), and attempts to maintain local services run by and for local residents are concerns that have also informed research into sites where tourists and locals are more likely to cross over. These connect with debates about the nocturnal city in important ways. As extensively documented in cities such as Barcelona (Nofre, et al, 2018), Amsterdam (Pinkster, 2017) and Lisbon, (Nofre, et al, 2017), nightlife spaces play a central role in many of the conflicts that tourism is believed to cause; noise, gentrification, and challenges to local identity. Again, it is a question of who cities are for and who has the power to shape their present and future that drives many recent studies examining the entanglement of tourism and nightlife in European cities, especially areas which have only recently began to experience the expansion of tourism. These particular neighbourhoods, often in transition areas 'off the beaten track' (Maitland and Newman, 2009), echo the concerns explored thus far. Füller and Michel, in their study of Berlin's Kreuzberg, for example, note that 'the demand of the new urban tourism for '"authentic" experiences results in an interest in precisely the

amenities, the retail and entertainment infrastructure that city residents also prefer…
[however] the transformation of working-class pubs and mom-and-pop grocery
stores into high-priced coffee shops are only the most visible signs of such conflicts'
(2014;1314). Like other formerly working-class neighbourhoods such as Shoreditch,
London (Pappalepore, 2010), Brooklyn, New York, (Hae, 2011), or parts of Istanbul,
Turkey (Eder and Öz, 2015), Kreuzberg has been subject to a wave of galleries,
bars, and restaurants opening in quick succession, with students and urban tourists
drawn to the area as Berlin has become the new 'epicentre of cool' (Füller and
Michel, 2011). The effect of this on local residents, including commercial or
residential displacement through rising rents and neighbourhood change, has
dominated local discourse and media reports about nightlife in Kreuzberg (Füller and
Michel, 2011).

Numerous other studies have painted a similar picture (Author, 2018), one where
tourism at night is entangled with broader debates about gentrification, the
intensification of commercialism at night, displacement of local residents and the
leisure or retail spaces that serve them, as well as more quotidian concerns such as
the ability to sleep, feelings of safety and belonging, or simply having somewhere
familiar in which to socialise after dark.

There is important and considerable reach to this line of inquiry, especially in terms
of how it draws attention to the ways that urban tourism shapes cities, cities shape
urban tourism, and the extent to which nightlife potentially intensifies both. Indeed, a
contention here is that conflicts resulting from increased tourism might become
especially resonant at night. Local or neighbourhood bars and restaurants changing
their offer, revellers disturbing the sleep patterns of nearby residents, apartments
being taken over by investors or residents renting them through peer-to-peer
networks, guests hosting parties in such apartments and disturbing other residents,
and the transformation of local shops and services into new tourism-led bars and
clubs are all especially relevant.

More recently, however, tourist scholars have critically examined the terms upon
which such debates often rest (Novy, 2018). For some time now, it has been argued
that the host /guest binary is not necessarily stable or fixed, and 'the tourist' is not a
stable identity category or easy to define (Cohen and Cohen, 2012). While binaries
such as the resident /nightlife consumer or resident /tourist still informs much of the
critical work explaining conflict in the night, the following section examines how the
night might further complicate the ways we understand hosts, guests, tourists and
place attachment.

2. New Urban Tourism

As discussed above, conflict remains a dominant way of understanding nightlife,
especially between residents and nightlife consumers. In no way does this
discussion seek to minimise the debates raised by this body of work. Leisure is one
site through which our identities and connections to place are constituted and
experienced (Rojek, 2005), and something as simple as the closure of our local pub,
or finding it transformed for the pleasure of new or even non-residents can lead to a
sense of dislocation from our own leisure spaces. That said, the discussion now
turns to consider how an emphasis on conflict between residents, tourists and

nightlife consumers more generally might overly rely on an 'us and them' logic, a logic which has been challengedby urban tourism scholars.

Füller and Michel (2014) recite what is now a fairly well accepted argument in the study of urban tourism; a desire for more 'authentic' or more 'ordinary' experiences leads the new urban tourist 'off the beaten track' (Maitland and Newman, 2009) into typically transitioning areas. These areas are often working class, associated with ethnic minorities, and might be the setting for cultural, creative and experimental venues and atmospheres (Novy and Huning, 2009). In contrast to the traditional tourist bubbles, where tourists have desires, demands and interests distinct from residents (Lim and Bouchon, 2017), a desire for ordinary or more everyday 'creative' experiences sees today's urban tourists venture into such areas in the hope of having a less 'touristy' experience. For Pappalepore et al. these gentrified or gentrifying 'microgeographies…challenge traditional views of tourism consumption by blurring the boundaries between tourists, day visitors and residents' (2014, p. 228). An important consequence of this is an entanglement of resident and tourist practices and interests. As Lim and Bouchon (2017) characterise it, tourists engage in behaviours coded as both touristy, such as visiting galleries or shopping, while also engaging in practices coded as residential or local. This might include shopping in local grocery stores, especially if renting self-service apartments, eating in local cafes and restaurants, attending local farmers markets, using laundrettes, or participating in local events.

The breaking down of the host / guest binary is further enabled through the use of digital technologies and social media and how these allow us to enact a closer or at least *different* relationship to place (Hannam, Butler and Paris, 2014). For Brock, such technologies challenge the 'information divide' (2015:14, cited in Novy, 2018: 428), whereby being 'a local' no longer determines who has expertise about a local area. How this might be quantified or qualified is difficult to determine and depends greatly on how belonging and place attachment are understood (Lewika, 2011), as is discussed later, but the anecdote used in the beginning of this paper, my own ambiguous relationship to Fabric nightclub, is one such example where people not from my immediate neighbourhood were much more concerned than I was about the club's closure. My experience in Berlin some months later confirmed that I also knew far less about the case and what the club offered than nightlife consumers in a different country. This anecdote very much echoes Lewicka's (2011) extensive review of articles about people-place relations, where it was found that academic interest in people-place attachments was increasingly concerned with places that were not necessarily our permanent homes.

Garcia's (2016) study of techno-tourism in Berlin offers another clear example of this trend and starts with an opposing anecdote about British clubbers who visit Berlin's techno-clubs every third or fourth week of the month. This is a somewhat unique example, but it illustrates the extent to which nightlife tourists will work to belong, and, by extension, break down the resident-tourist binary. Garcia's interviewees plan their visits in advance, stay at friend's apartments, make use of existing networks, and draw on their considerable cultural knowledge of DJs, clubs and affordable places to eat. Their resulting sense of attachment to the clubs of Berlin, enabled through digital technologies and the ways knowledge circulates irrespective of

geography, is best encapsulated by one of Garcia's interviewees claiming: 'This is my local club, even if I have to get on a plane to come here' (Garcia, 2016:285).

With this in mind, defining who is or is not the local or guest, and indeed who is a tourist, becomes challenging. In a period of increased mobility, for some at least (Cresswell, 2010), and having access to considerable knowledge about a place before even venturing there, means our relationship or sense of attachment is not easily determined by or reducible to residency. The ERASMUS students referred to in Nofre's (2018) study, the repeat visitor (Freytag, 2010), the business person who regularly stays in the same hotel, or the techno-tourist (Garcia, 2016), share a sense of attachment and investment in a place where they do not permanently live. In large global cities such as Berlin, London or New York, marked as they are by tourism, residential churn, and diversity, it becomes even more challening to define exactly who belongs or who is a 'local'. As Dirksmeier and Helbrecht suggest, 'urban tourists are just strangers among strangers' (2015: 278).

3. Strangers at Night?

Thus far it has been argued that literature on the night overlaps with literature on tourism, especially in transitioning areas popular with those seeking a more authentic experience off the beaten track. Whether it is a concern with gentrification, commercialisation, locals versus newcomers, or anxieties about urban change and gentrification of night-time and other spaces, these are all entangled with wider processes linked to urban tourism and, more generally, post-industrial urban transformations (Novy, 2018). Moreover, in the study of urban tourism there is an established argument that the host /guest or tourist /non-tourist binaries are increasingly challenged by various mobilities and information technologies.

This attempt to rethink and challenge such binaries might function differently in regards to the study of the night, however. Indeed, in studies of nightlife debates about noise, morality, and who an area's leisure provision is actually for tend to rest on much more familiar understandings of the resident, the local, and the stranger. The question that motivates the second part of this paper is whether, in the modern global, cosmopolitan city, night studies similarly needs to rethink the host /guest, or resident /non-resident binary or whether the ways the night is lived, imagined and plays a role in constituting our identities renders those relations of proximity and sense of attachment more complex. While not discounting the argument that in contemporary cities we are strangers amongst strangers, is this useful in thinking through what happens at night and the ways we experience cities after dark?

Iveson explains that the city has long been a privileged site of analysis for cosmopolitanism, where traditional kinship or tribal ties give way to new and 'uncertain… identifications' (2006:70). In modern global cities, all urban dwellers are understood in terms of 'strangeness', effectively flattening any claims to space, territory or subjecthood. If we are all strangers, all mobile and all constantly arriving and departing (Iveson, 2006), then any claims to the host-guest binary further breaks down, taking with it any greater claim to the urban realm. That is, if modern urban life is indeed about strangers living amongst strangers all cobbled together, then the tourist becomes simply one further stranger negotiating their way through an intensely complex world of familiarity, difference, and greater or lesser intensities of

belonging. Attempts to enforce a local /non-local binary, be it through claims to public space, 'my' bar rather than 'theirs', gated suburbs, or restrictive policies determined by 'locals' is antithetical to this particular discourse of modern global cities.

This account represents a rather extreme understanding of the de-territorialized, mobile, urban citizen, however. As well as the need to be mindful of history, power, and privilege (Uteng and Cresswell, 2016), and the ways that mobilities might privilege masculinist models of home and travel (Morris, 1998), a problem with the idea that we all strangers thrown together is that it flattens out actual hierarchies of difference and how those differences are lived, managed and made meaningful in everyday or structural ways. As Iveson suggests, 'Any demand that all urban inhabitants adopt a cosmopolitan openness to others will have a fundamentally different meaning for weak groups than it will for those who have voluntarily fortified themselves in enclaves of privilege' (2006:81). We also need to be careful, as Hannam (2009) and others have stated, of romanticising or privileging the figure of the nomad, mindful of how this can represent a new form of power, prestige and cosmopolitan cultural capital (Rofe, 2003). Flying to Berlin every month to go clubbing, or knowing all the latest restaurants and bars to visit in any other modern, cosmopolitan city depends on forms of knowledge and financial power that are not universally shared.

The belief that we are all strangers, or that we are all swept up into a mobile and fluid world, also obscures different intensities of place attachment. The study of place attachment is broad and vexed (Low and Altman, 2002; Lewika, 2011) but has been defined as 'the emotional link formed by an individual to a physical site that has been given meaning through interaction' (Milligan 1998:2, cited in Harmon, et al, 2006). While it is beyond the scope of this discussion to enter into the myriad ways the concept is understood and deployed, the issue of how the night might contour our sense of attachment has been less examined in the literature. Temporality is a key theme in the study of place attachments, be that in the form of childhood homes, nostalgia for past landscapes, or the citation of annual rituals and events (Altman and Low, 1992). How attachment to place changes by time of the day remains somewhat obscure, however, but central to understanding how the night further contours our moorings and mobilities. Place attachments, and the sites that we wish to 'moor' (Debarbieux, 2014) ourselves to, change from day to night, effecting different relations of familiarity, connection or disconnection and in turn produce different understandings of who or who isn't a stranger.

To draw this out, it is important to explain how the night is understood here. The night is often figured as a transgressive space free of everyday rules and norms (Lovatt and O'Connor, 1995; Palmer, 2000; Williams, 2008). In many respects, the ways the night is commonly understood mirrors common sense understandings of tourism – a time when everyday constraints are suspended and we are free of domestic and work schedules or commitments (Edensor, 2007). Nightlife spaces can similarly 'undo' the day and also challenge common hierarchies of power while disrupting all that is articulated with the day; the quotidian, work, labour, oppressive norms, and the commercial realm of business (Williams, 2008). The night, more generally, is often further articulated with notions of creativity, cultural change, experimentation and resistance. Discourses of morality and crime continue to structure our understanding of the night, but it is equally understood as a space for

friendship, sociability, and leisure. It is perhaps for these reasons that the commercialisation of leisure spaces or punitive restraints on night-time leisure is so strongly revisited. Leisure "is the birthplace of the self, of the realization of one's own nature pursued purely for its own sake" (Cohen-Gewerc and Stebbins 2013:106). When a local pub personally associated with friendship and localism is closed or subject to change it challenges more than one's identity but all that the night is supposed to be; freedom, leisure, and escape from everyday structures, including the imperatives of commercialism.

This is, once again, a highly romanticised view of the night and just as tourism can reproduce existing forms of privilege, access and the choices available to us at night are highly gendered, raced, classed, and aged. To even have access to the night depends on forms of privilege, such that place attachments might not even be possible. Nonetheless, for those who actively engage in nightlife, the night is a key site for the production and reproduction of (sub)cultural capital (Thornton, 1996) and thus experiencing belonging and attachment. Nightlife spaces such as clubs, restaurants and bars rest on familiarity with rules, norms and expectations which we are expected to know (Thornton, 1996; May, 2014). Door policies are an obvious example of this but so too are the subtler web of powers and potential pleasures and embarrassments that shape our engagement with the venues, streets and public spaces we access after dark. Even in non-mainstream or alternative spaces which disrupt and resist quotidian hierarchies, knowledge and know-how in the form of embodied and symbolic capital plays an essential role in enjoying, let alone being able to access, these spaces. Failure to grasp how nightlife spaces constitute identities and operate to include and exclude means failing to recognise why they therefore become so important, so fiercely protected, and often generate precisely the same binaries new urban tourism scholars have challenged: us and them, local or stranger, fitting in or being an outsider. A local club or pub can thus be lived and imagined as integral to individual and community histories, desires, representations and indeed place attachments.

While nightlife spaces might therefore be reliant on familiarity and forms of symbolic and cultural capital which, by their nature, exclude others from participating, this does not necessarily mean geography is the key determinant of who has access. Returning to Garcia (2016) as an example, know-how and access is not predicated on being a local resident. In this case, any presumed link between geography and community is challenged by the evidence of people travelling vast distances to their 'local club', and the ways that information and knowledge about where to go and what to do and how to consume a city after dark circulate beyond locally specific networks. Garcia's interviewees demonstrate that it is not our physical proximity to a venue that counts, but rather a much more complicated sense of ownership, place attachment, and the desire to belong in ways that are not determined by our usual place of residence. In effect, the us and them binary often seen in accounts of tourism at night are not simply about where we call home, but how we fit in to the prevailing culture on offer.

Further to this, while accounts of tourism and mobilities might privilege that sense of the mobile stranger, the night is not simply about strangers meeting strangers. It is also about seeing and making friends, mixing with people we already know (whether they live here or there), and developing forms of kinship and identity. All sites are

heavily invested with specific cultural meanings and can be central to the constitution of our identities. The night, however, bound up as it is with pleasure, cultural capital, identity, friendship, for some their youth, for others alienation and fear, and a broad range of other emotions (Hubbard,2012) is strongly associated with a very complex set of desires and practices of belonging. This is not to privilege nightlife spaces as any more affective or crucial to our identity, but to suggest that, perhaps, the ways we experience, and are anchored within and consume cities is different in the night compared to the day.

In these terms, we might think of place attachment and identification at night beyond the broad descriptor of 'the neighbourhood' or 'city', and who has claim to them, but more in a micro sense of clubs, bars, and other leisure sites (Hernandez, et al, 2007) where belonging is less spatially determined and is enabled instead by complex 'conduits' of mobility, especially taste and capital (Cresswell, 2010: 24). Indeed, these might well be spaces where 'locals' feel no place attachment to such sites at all, despite living in the neighbourhoods in which they are located. As Hernandez et al (2007) explain:

> one person could be attached to a place but not be identified with it (i.e. someone who likes to live in a place and wants to remain there but does not feel that this place is part of their identity; at least not their main place identity) and vice versa; someone could have a high personal identity with a place and not a high place attachment (for example, to feel that one belongs to a place but prefers not to live there) (Hernandez, 2007:311).

The ways that place attachments, by locals or otherwise, intersect with mobilities and tourism is therefore complex, and further contoured by the ways that the night is such an important timespace through which identities and identifications are understood, imagined and lived. Understanding the night and nightlife spaces as crucial to constituting identity means we are not simply strangers rubbing up against other strangers, but are often trying precisely to not be strangers and find and perform instead a sense of commonality and shared cultural forms of belonging, meaning, identity and 'moorings'. If this results in or constitutes an us and them logic, or a sense of belonging and not belonging, then that is precisely because nightlife is one of many important spaces for the affirmation of identity and inclusion across local or multiple sites.

4. Concluding Thoughts

What we come to here is a complex picture. Because the night is so bound up with pleasure and identity for some people, change can be strongly resisted. When a local bar, restaurant or club becomes gentrified, whether that be through tourism or the more general processes of urban middle-classification, it can be strongly resisted in us and them terms. This and the ways that much of the conflict between nightlife is framed as tourists or strangers vs residents depends on and reproduces a logic which urban tourism scholars have rightfully sought to question. Us and them at night is not necessarily about geography, or how long we have lived in a place, however, but whether we fit into the dominant culture on offer, whether we know the music, wear the right clothes, understand the menu, or are confident in negotiating the familiar and the strange. Taste in music, food, or fashion and the confidence and

cultural capital to enter and enjoy nightlife venues play a greater role in our sense of attachment than where we reside in regards to how we emotionally attach ourselves to certain night-time spaces – be those place attachments fixed or fleeting.

The (dis)attachments we might have to our cities after dark, the clubs, bars or streets, are already highly contoured by gender, class, age, and our own symbolic and cultural capital. Participation and a sense of belonging or not belonging is therefore heightened at night. In rapidly gentrifying areas in particular, new shiny bars or restaurants might deliberately exclude some long-term residents in favour of a new, more mobile, more privileged clientele, instigating a further wave of tension between newer and older residents, the mobile or the constrained. A caveat to this, however, is the ways that local policies and laws do continue to allow local residents to shape their local night-time provision. Local residents with the skills or knowledge necessary to engage with local licensing decisions can participate in shaping licensing hours, the provision of outdoor seating, or even when a bar closes, and those decisions can impact on people living thousands of miles away who feel no less intimate or invested in nightlife provision of that area. This might not translate into actually using those spaces or indeed feeling welcome, however.

The study of urban tourism, especially in regards to transitioning areas off the beaten track, has been instrumental in opening up the binaries through which urban life is typically conceived and has sought to question such terms as the stranger, local, tourist, and resident. With it, questions about place attachment and identification have been similarly raised. But a contention here is that the night complicates feelings of belonging or disconnection. We might get angry about noise that wouldn't otherwise bother us during the day. We might be more sensitive to bars and clubs where there are strangers, unfamiliar codes of behaviour, or indeed where we find our own 'tribe' has moved on or been excluded. Leisure spaces are intensely social places, and therefore different to the laundrettes, public transport, street markets or local shops we might share with non-residents or tourists in the day. This is not to suggest all places aren't similarly affective or woven into and constitutive of our identities, but the night, because it is already entangled with wider concerns about exclusion or inclusion, identity and being with our tribe, complicates the ways we do and consume the urban realm.

A point that becomes clear here, following Gustafson, (2001, 2009) is that mobility does not necessarily erase being attached to specific places. The night-time reveller might well be a stranger on one scale but thoroughly embedded at the level of a club or bar. Likewise, the local resident, deeply rooted and dependent on local connections, might feel alienated and distanced from their nightscape, be that through traditional axes of exclusion such as gender or age, or through the social changes prompted by gentrification and urban change. Nightlife scholars, while increasingly sensitive to the ways the night excludes and includes, might benefit from scholars of urban tourism in considering the complex entanglements of place and identity that the night produces, while cognisant of breaking down the notion of us and them.

REFERENCES:

Baines, J. (2016). 'London Mayor Sadiq Khan Opens up About Fabric and London Nightlife in New Interview' *Thump* 2 September https://thump.vice.com/en_uk/article/pg8zxg/london-mayor-sadiq-khan-opens-up-about-fabric-and-london-nightlife-in-new-interview [Accessed July 3 2018]

Brenner, N. (2004). *New State Spaces: Urban Governance and the Rescaling of Statehood*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Campkin, B., and Marshall, L. (2017). *LGBTQ+ Cultural Infrastructure in London: Night Venues, 2006–present.* https://www.ucl.ac.uk/urbanlab/docs/LGBTQ_cultural_infrastructure_in_London_nightlife_venues_2006_to_the_present.pdf {accessed 20/8/2018]

Chatterton, P., and Hollands, R. (2002). 'Theorising urban playscapes: producing, regulating and consuming youthful nightlife city spaces' *Urban studies* 39:1, 95-116.

Cocola-Gant, A (2018). 'Tourism gentrification' in Lees, L and Phillips, M (eds.) *Handbook of Gentrification Studies*. Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar Publishing.

Cohen, E., and Cohen, S.A. (2012). 'Current sociological theories and issues in tourism'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39:4, 2177-2202.

Cohen-Gewerc, E., & Stebbins, R. A. (2013). *Serious leisure and individuality*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's Press.

Cresswell, T. (2010). 'Towards a politics of mobility' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space*, 28:1, 17-31.

Debarbieux, B. (2014) 'Rootedness – Anchoring – Mooring: Reviving Metaphors' L'Espace Geographique 1:43; 68-80.

Dirksmeier, P. and Helbrecht, I., 2015. 'Resident perceptions of new urban tourism: a neglected geography of prejudice'. *Geography Compass*, 9:5, pp.276-285.

Eder, M. and Öz, Ö., (2015). 'Neoliberalization of Istanbul's Nightlife: Beer or Champagne?'. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 39:2, pp.284-304.

Edensor, T. (2007). Mundane mobilities, performances and spaces of tourism. *Social & cultural geography*, 8:2, 199-215.

Florida, R. (2005). *Cities and the creative class*. Oxon: Routledge.

Füller, H., and Michel, B. (2014). 'Stop being a tourist!' New dynamics of urban tourism in Berlin Kreuzberg. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 38:4, 1304-1318.

Furedi, F. (2015). *Forward into the Night*. Night Time Industries Association http://www.ntia.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2015/06/Forward-into-the-Night-Report.pdf?567959 [Accessed 18.8.2018]

Gwiazdzinski, L. (2014). *Pleading for the right to the city's night. Night manifesto. Seeking Citizenship 24h*, Invisiveis Producoes, pp.204-219.

Giovanardi, M., Lucarelli, A., & Decosta, P. L. E. (2014). 'Co-performing tourism places: The "Pink Night" festival'. Annals of Tourism Research, 44, 102-115.

Gustafson, P. (2001). 'Roots and routes: Exploring the relationship between place attachment and mobility'. *Environment and Behavior*, 33:5, 667-686.

Gustafson, P. (2009). 'Mobility and Territorial Belonging' *Environment and Behaviour* 41:4, 490-508.

Gustafson, P. (2014). 'Place Attachment in an Age of Mobility', in Manzo, L. C., and P. Devine-Wright, P. [eds] *Place Attachment: Advances in Theory, Methods and Applications* Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge. 37-48.

Hadfield, P. (2006). *Bar wars: Contesting the night in contemporary British cities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hae, L. (2011). Dilemmas of the nightlife fix: Post-industrialisation and the gentrification of nightlife in New York City. *Urban Studies*, 48:16, 3449-3465.

Hannam, K. (2009). 'The end of tourism? Nomadology and the mobilities paradigm'. in J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical Issues in Tourism*. Channel View: Clevedon.

Hannam, K., Butler, G. and Paris, C.M., (2014). 'Developments and key issues in tourism mobilities'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 44, pp. 171-185.

Haydock, W. (2014). The 'civilising' effect of a 'balanced'night-time economy for 'better people': Class and the cosmopolitan limit in the consumption and regulation of alcohol in Bournemouth. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events* 6:2, 172-185.

Heath, T. (1997). 'The twenty four hour city concept—A review of initiatives in British cities'. *Journal of Urban Design*, 2:2, 193-204.

Hobbs, D., Winlow, S., Hadfield, P., & Lister, S. (2005). Violent hypocrisy: governance and the night-time economy. *European journal of criminology*, 2:2, 161-183.

Hubbard, P. (2016). 'The geographies of 'going out': Emotion and embodiment in the evening economy'. In *Emotional Geographies* Routledge. pp. 131-148.

Hughes, G. (1999). 'Urban revitalization: The use of festive time strategies'. *Leisure Studies*, 18:2, 119-135.

Iveson, K. (2006). 'Strangers in the Cosmopolis'. in Binnie, J., Holloway, J., Young, C., & Millington, S. (Eds.) *Cosmopolitan Urbanism*. Oxon: Routledge.

Lewicka, M. (2011). 'Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years?'. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 31:3, 207-230.

Lim, S.E.Y. and Bouchon, F., (2017). 'Blending in for a life less ordinary? Off the beaten track tourism experiences in the global city'. *Geoforum*, 86, pp. 13-15.

Lloyd, R. (2010). *Neo-bohemia: Art and commerce in the postindustrial city*. Routledge.

Lovatt, A. (2017). 'The ecstasy of urban regeneration: regulation of the night-time economy in the transition to a post-Fordist city'. In O'Connor, J., and D. Wynne [eds] *From the Margins to the Centre*. Oxon: Routledge. 141-168.

Lovatt, A., and O'Connor, J. (1995). 'Cities and the night-time economy'. *Planning Practice & Research*, 10:2, 127-134.

Maitland, R., and Newman, P. (2009) 'Developing world tourism cities' in Maitland, R. and p. Newman, [eds] *World tourism cities. Developing tourism off the beaten track*. London: Routledge pp. 1–21.

Morris, M. (1988). 'At Henry Parkes Motel'. *Cultural Studies*, 2:1, pp.1-47.

Nofre, J., SánchezFuarros, I., Martins, J. C., Pereira, P., Soares, I., MaletCalvo, D., Geraldes, M., and López Díaz, A., (2017). 'Exploring nightlife and urban change in Bairro Alto, Lisbon'. *City & Community* 16:3, 330-344.

Nofre, J., Giordano, E., Eldridge, A., Martins, J. C., & Sequera, J. (2018). 'Tourism, nightlife and planning: challenges and opportunities for community liveability in La Barceloneta'. *Tourism Geographies*, 20:3, 377-396.

Novy, J. and S. Huning (2009). 'New Tourism Areas in the "New" Berlin'. in: Maitland, R. and P. Newman (eds.): *World Tourism Cities*. London: Routledge.

Novy, J. (2018) '"Destination"' Berlin revisited. From (new) tourism towards a pentagon of mobility and place consumption, *Tourism Geographies*, 20:3, 418-442. Palmer, B. D. (2000). *Cultures of Darkness: Night travels in the Histories of Transgressio [From Medieval to Modern]*. New York: Monthly Review Press.

Pinkster, F. M., and Boterman, W. R. (2017). 'When the spell is broken: gentrification, urban tourism and privileged discontent in the Amsterdam canal district'. *Cultural Geographies*, 24:3, 457-472.

Pappalepore, I. (2010). *Tourism and the development of 'creative' urban areas: evidence from four non-central areas in London* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Westminster).

Pappalepore, I., Maitland, R. and Smith, A. (2014). 'Prosuming creative urban areas. Evidence from East London'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 44, pp.227-240.

Plyushteva, A. (2009). 'The right to the city and struggles over urban citizenship: Exploring the links'. *Amsterdam Social Science*, 1:3, pp.81-97.

Roberts, M. (2004). *Good practice in managing the evening and late night economy: A literature review from an environmental perspective*. London: Office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Roberts, M., and Turner, C. (2005). 'Conflicts of Liveability in the 24-hour City: Learning from 48 Hours in the Life of London's Soho'. *Journal of Urban Design* 10:2, 171-193.

Rofe, M. W. (2003). 'I want to be global': Theorising the gentrifying class as an emergent élite global community. *Urban Studies*, 40:12, 2511-2526.

Rojek, C., (2005) *Leisure theory: Principles and practice*. Springer.

Stevenson, D. (2018). *Feminism and Its Places: Women, Leisure and the Night-Time Economy.* In *The Palgrave Handbook of Feminism and Sport, Leisure and Physical Education*. Palgrave Macmillan, London. 557-569

Thornton, S. (1996). *Club cultures: Music, media, and subcultural capital*. Wesleyan University Press.

Thurnell-Read, T. (2012). 'Tourism place and space: British stag tourism in Poland'. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39:2, 801-819.

Uteng, T. P., and Cresswell, T. (2016). *Gendered Mobilities* Oxon: Routledge

Williams, R. (2008). 'Night spaces: darkness, deterritorialization, and social control'. *Space and Culture*, 11:4, 514-532.