

Mobilities and Hospitable Cities

Mobilities and Hospitable Cities

Edited by

Ezio Marra and Marxiano Melotti

Cambridge
Scholars
Publishing



Mobilities and Hospitable Cities

Edited by Ezio Marra and Marxiano Melotti

This book first published 2018

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

Lady Stephenson Library, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2PA, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2018 by Ezio Marra, Marxiano Melotti and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-5275-0533-2

ISBN (13): 978-1-5275-0533-9

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
--------------------	---

Part One: Guido Martinotti's Legacy

Chapter One.....	4
The Metropolis and Beyond	
Ezio Marra	

Chapter Two.....	20
City-Users and Hospitable Cities	
Nicolò Costa	

Chapter Three.....	38
Early International Research Activities	
Armando Montanari	

Part Two: Around the World

Chapter Four.....	58
International Mobilities and Security in European and American Cities	
Sophie Body-Gendrot	

Chapter Five.....	66
Hospitable and Healthy Destination: A Collaborative Approach	
Alan Fyall, Heather Hartwell and Ann Hemingway	

Chapter Six.....	79
Making Places, Selling Places: City Marketing and Commodification	
Giandomenico Amendola	

Chapter Seven.....	86
Night-Time Economy, Tourism and Conflicts: Barcelona and Lisbon	
Emanuele Giordano, Jordi Nofre and Emanuele Tataranni	

Chapter Eight.....	101
Beyond Venice: Heritage and Tourism in the New Global World Marxiano Melotti	
Part Three: Some Italian Cases	
Chapter Nine.....	142
Urban Regime and Policy Performance: The Case of Turin Silvano Belligni and Stefania Ravazzi	
Chapter Ten	158
Problem Areas and Opportunities in a Complex City: The Case of Rome Fiammetta Mignella Calvosa and Fiammetta Pilozi	
Chapter Eleven	170
The Variable Geometry of Urban Governance: A Comparative Research Fortunata Piselli	
Chapter Twelve	185
Gentlemen, Professionals and Profiteers: The Case of Naples Guido Borelli	
Appendix	210
Destination Competitiveness and Education System: Old Resources for New Policies Antonio Minguzzi, Angelo Presenza and Maria Concetta Perfetto	
Contributors.....	239

INTRODUCTION

This collection presents a number of selected papers presented at the international conference on “Mobilities and Hospitable Cities” (Rome, January 2014), which was held to honour the memory of Guido Martinotti, a leading figure in urban studies. The volume is focused on the huge changes that have occurred in many cities owing to the processes of globalization and postmodernization. Special attention is paid to the phenomenon of city-users and to the increasing social, economic and cultural importance of tourism. Many authors, therefore, deal with tourism, particularly its international dimensions, in a variety of different but complementary approaches.

The chapters by Ezio Marra, Nicolò Costa, and Armando Montanari, who worked with Guido Martinotti on a number of projects and in several circumstances, illustrate his intellectual biography, the breadth of his research interests and the significance of his contributions to urban sociology, particularly his main work entitled *Metropoli*, analysing Martinotti’s theories of urban mobility and their impact on tourism studies.

In providing an overall framework for urban themes, Giandomenico Amendola deals with the commodification of cities and of urban marketing, with particular reference to tourism.

After September 11, 2001 and the attacks which followed (Madrid, 2004; London, 2005), and the explosion of *banlieues* in Paris (2005) and elsewhere, as well as the terrorist attacks in different European cities between 2015 and 2017, the problem of urban safety has grown paramount. In this book the theme is aptly and realistically discussed by a prominent specialist, Sophie Body-Gendrot.

Safety, with specific reference to its social health dimension, is discussed in the interesting chapter by Alan Fyall, Heather Hartwell, and Ann Hemingway.

Emanuele Giordano, Jordi Nofre, and Emanuele Tataranni dwell upon the “touristization” of the urban night in post-industrial cities in Western Europe, particularly in some historical neighbourhoods in Barcelona and Lisbon.

Venice, one of the icons of international tourism, is the protagonist in the paper by Marxiano Melotti, who extends his gaze to include the States and China for their commercial replicas of parts of the city. While the

best-known instance of this process is the Venetian Hotel in Las Vegas, the mimics and reproductions in China also include outlets and malls recalling the Italian Renaissance, with echoes of Rome and Florence.

The controversial problem of urban governance is another major theme. The research by Silvano Belligni and Stefania Ravazzi investigates local administrations in Turin in a period of complex urban change and the citizens' perception of their performance. Fortunata Piselli highlights the variable geometry of urban governance synthesizing the results of an in-depth comparative survey on some large cities in Northern, Central and Southern Italy.

The problems of Italian cities constitute the main focus in other remarkable contributions. Fiammetta Mignella Calvosa and Fiammetta Pilozzi foreground "green" dynamics in dealing with Rome, at the same time capital of the Italian Republic and the Vatican State, the main seat of the Catholic Church, entirely embedded in the city's intensely crowded metropolitan area. Guido Borelli, dealing with the building industry, real estate and illicit gain in Naples, compares the current situation with the 1950s and the 1960s of the twentieth century, already depicted in Francesco Rosi's famous film, *Le mani sulla città* [Hands over the City] (1963).

The appendix is devoted to a presentation of tourism degree programmes in European universities. Antonio Minguzzi, Angelo Presenza and Maria Concetta Perfetto analyse the relationships between the higher education system and tourism competitiveness in some countries, proving a positive correlation between the success of a tourist destination and the quality of its university system.

The contributions in this volume usefully focus on a number of relevant themes and salient dimensions of the new urban issues, in Europe and beyond.

PART ONE:
GUIDO MARTINOTTI'S LEGACY

CHAPTER ONE

THE METROPOLIS AND BEYOND

EZIO MARRA

1. A modern polymath

A leading Italian sociologist, Professor Emeritus Guido Martinotti (Milan 1938–Paris 2012), was one of the scholars who carried urban sociology into the twenty-first century through his outstanding research on the interaction of technologies with the spatial organization of society.¹ He was well-known worldwide, notably in the United States and France, which he regarded as his “second homes.”

He graduated in Law from the State University of Milan with a dissertation on the sociology of law under the supervision of Renato Treves. As a young graduate, he was a Harkness fellow at Columbia University in New York (1962–1964), and one of the promising scholars who would soon develop a comparative perspective in Italian social and political studies—among them Giuliano Amato, Paolo Farneti, Franco Ferraresi, Alberto Martinelli, Gianfranco Poggi and Marino Regini.

He first taught in Milan (Faculty of Architecture, 1966–1969; Faculties of Law and Political Sciences, 1969–1975) and in Turin (Faculty of Political Sciences, 1975–1981), of which he was dean (1978–1981) after Norberto Bobbio. He was at the University of Pavia for a few years, and then joined again the Faculty of Political Sciences at the State University of Milan (1989–1998). In 1998 he moved to the University of Milano-Bicocca, of which he was one of the founders, and vice-rector until 2007.

At Milano-Bicocca he was coordinator of the degree course in Tourism Sciences. He started this programme in close collaboration with Nicolò Costa, who in this volume dwells upon Martinotti’s commitment to and key role in promoting this new degree course in Italian universities. There he also launched two doctoral programmes, the interdisciplinary QUA_SI

¹ See M. Castells’ 2010 Preface to the second edition of his *Rise of the Network Society*.

(Quality of Life in the Information Society) and URBEUR (European Urban Studies), which in 2013 conflated into URBEUR Studi Urbani, an international doctoral network joined by Paris Sciences Po, London School of Economics, King's College London, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Universitat de Barcelona, and Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

In 2007 he moved to the Italian Institute of Human Sciences (SUM) in Florence, where he taught until retirement. Throughout his career, he was a Visiting Professor at distinguished academic institutions in Europe, notably Paris Sciences Po, and in the United States, most frequently working with Harvey Molotch at UCSB (University of California Santa Barbara) and NYU (New York University).

Although he was mainly perceived as an urban sociologist, Martinotti was a social scientist in the broadest sense and a polymath: a scholar in an overarching, most complete sense.

Since his early days as a student at the Cesare Beccaria, the *liceo classico* (high school) in Milan, where he met his life partner Eva Cantarella, he delved into the humanities. At the same time, however, as Eva recalled in a conversation with the authors of this book, he was also very fond of physics and biology (and later in life also astronomy, since he was an experienced skipper). This interest in the “hard sciences”, as we shall see, was a distinguishing trait in his entire career, the hallmark of his scholarly life being an unceasing dialogue between *esprit de finesse*, given his intense background in the classics, and *esprit de géométrie*, given his accomplished interest in mathematics and computer science.

2. The story of the *metropolis*

In 1981 the results of the 12th Italian census, compared with the figures from the previous ones, showed that the population of the largest Italian cities was decreasing, similar to all major European core cities.

Though in the urban belts the population was still increasing, for the first time in about two hundred years the major urban centres showed a decline. Some scholars began to speak of counter-urbanization (Berry 1976) or de-urbanization (Van den Berg, Drewett and Klaassen 1982). Since then the decrease in the population of many European cities has continued and is still remarkable today.

The process has been interpreted in different ways. Some regarded it as a temporary event linked to suburbanization (Hall and Hay 1980); others considered it an epochal phenomenon marking a real decline of the city (Van den Berg, Drewett and Klaassen 1982). Still others believed that the ending growth of cities did not entail the vanishing of urbanism as a way

of life; on the contrary, in most developed countries the inhabitants of rural areas had already assumed or were assuming patterns of typically urban behaviour (Bell 1980, 539). The diffusion of individual means of transport and of mass communications had urbanized the people living outside the big cities, at least psychologically (Bell 1980). Finally, others have claimed that the city “no longer has a specificity distinguishing it from the surrounding territory” (Ceri and Rossi 1987, 580).

The finding, in 1981, that seven out of the ten largest Italian cities were losing large numbers of their population was somewhat astonishing. To those who took an optimistic viewpoint it was just a passing event, whereas others regarded it as an irreversible process.

The trend was emphasized by ISTAT’s (the Italian National Institute of Statistics) grouping of municipalities according to their demographic size. From the data thus presented and their naïve reading, it seemed that municipalities with under 20,000 inhabitants continued to grow at a fast pace, those with between 20,000 and 100,000 inhabitants continued to grow, though more slowly, while larger municipalities were undergoing a demographic decline (Martinotti 1993, 100).

The trend continued in the following years. So much so that Corrado Barberis, who had directed a research project for the Ministry of Agriculture, came to argue that “people are returning to live in the countryside” and therefore “the majority of Italians now live in rural municipalities” (INSOR 1988). These statements could well be used to update Durrell Huff’s examples in *How to Lie with Statistics* (1954). In fact, Barberis used a definition of “rural municipality” dating back to 1951 and regarded many municipalities located next to the major metropolises as rural, but which had already become part of large suburban areas. The logic was *olim ruralis semper ruralis*, “once rural, always rural.”

An incorrect use of statistics is not uncommon, but it can produce totally unfounded alarm. Barberis’ statements were taken as read by various newspapers and by a number of national and local media. Martinotti criticized Barberis’ statements in many lectures and in his book *Metropoli. La nuova morfologia sociale della città* [Metropolis. The New Social Morphology of the City] (1993), showing that they were false and misleading. Indeed, if we introduce the distinction between metropolitan and non-metropolitan municipalities, we see that metropolitan municipalities below 100,000 inhabitants grew much faster than municipalities of the same demographic magnitude that were not under metropolitan influence (Martinotti 1993, 108).

In brief, the belts of large metropolitan areas grew very rapidly, while the population of their respective city centres was in decline. Thus, the

demographic balance of the metropolitan areas was always positive. The “metropolitanization” (an ugly but useful term) of the towns adjacent to the largest cities was so intense that many authors even began talking of the advent of an “urban sprawl” to the detriment of a countryside which was rapidly disappearing owing to the pervasive and sometimes invasive spread of urban lifestyles (Dal Pozzolo 2002).

The city is changing. Following Martinotti, this means that we are to revise and redefine the scientific tools—above all, the theoretical framework—we use to analyse it.

3. *Metropoli*: The master work

Martinotti’s main work, *Metropoli. La nuova morfologia sociale della città*, published in 1993, was followed in 1999 by his edited collection *La dimensione metropolitana: sviluppo e governo della nuova città* [The Metropolitan Dimension: Development and Governance of the New City].

In *Metropoli* Martinotti singled out three useful analytical criteria for defining the metropolitan areas: 1) morphology, in terms of spatial contiguity, distance and/or belonging to a specific orographical or geographical system etc.; 2) interdependence, due to exchanges of people, goods or information (commuting, communication, telephone calls etc.); 3) homogeneity, due to similarity in terms of density and socio-economic characteristics.

New urban spaces connect the three different layers or different social formations. The first layer is the traditional town that coincides with a sociological unit defined by interactions between individuals, groups, organizations, and other social actors. This layer survives, but in Martinotti’s framework it is embedded in the “first-generation metropolis,” a second layer in which the metropolitan area constitutes a FUR (functional urban region) whose uncertain borders are still marked by centre-periphery relations. This second layer, in its extreme version of “megalopolis,” (Gottmann 1990, 1994), still remains linked to the centre-periphery relations. The third layer is a recent development, where central areas are replaced by internationally connected “global” nodes. Its definition is still underway, as the various labels naming it show (“world city”, “global city”, “exopolis” etc.).

The progress of these three coexisting layers in terms of sustainable growth, social equity and good quality of life depends on their intersections (Martinotti 2008, 7). However, these three layers of polymorphous urban agglomeration interact with the internet and with digital technologies (Martinotti 2008, 52–4). It is precisely this close

interaction of technologies and social configurations that makes the future less predictable.

Martinotti identified four urban populations that characterize social change in the urban context and its structure: residents, commuters, city users and metropolitan businessmen (Martinotti 1993, 1999, 2010; Martinotti and Diamantini 2009). He believed that the central object of urban sociology was the so-called traditional city, where inhabitants and workers coincided spatially and socially (Martinotti 1993, 143). In this old configuration, the night-time population (the inhabitants living in the city) and the daytime population (those who only work there) largely overlapped. But the city's productive capacity and its transport network expanded, increasing its attractiveness due to job and income opportunities. This marked the rise of a new figure, the commuter, who belonged to the daytime but not to the night-time population. This was an important trait of the first-generation metropolis (Martinotti 1993, 145).

As the first-generation metropolis evolves, the transport system develops, while the population's working time decreases and the income and leisure time increase. This entails the transition from a strongly production-oriented society to an increasingly market-oriented and consumer-oriented society.

Large cities and metropolises offer increasing opportunities for recreational and cultural activities, such as museums exhibits, sports events, concerts, etc., not to mention the pleasure of shopping or strolling in the historic centre. At this stage city consumers and city users share the metropolitan scene (Martinotti 1993). Obviously, the three metropolitan populations mentioned above partially coincide, as the same individual can live, work, shop and have fun in the city. But in the second-generation metropolis there is an ever-increasing number of external individuals (consumers and commuters) who, though not living in the city, use it during the day (Martinotti 1993).

The city user is on the move, all year round, with no set timetables (Urry 1990, Martinotti 2004a). Workers, no longer tied to Fordist production, also move more freely and flexibly, and this makes it more difficult to estimate the urban population at any given time.

Finally, according to Martinotti, there is a fourth, smaller but highly qualified metropolitan population, which performs high-level economic functions and benefits from middle or upper-middle class kinds of consumption. This population is made up of so-called metropolitan businessmen, who usually move long distances and are particularly attracted by the financial centre and the business opportunities offered by the metropolis.

The metropolitan businessmen are strongly international and are socially and economically relevant for their high consumption standards and for their ability to take decisions affecting the territory by choosing where to locate new companies or to make economic investments. Obviously, this type of population is particularly demanding in terms of cultural consumption and requires top class exclusive hotels and lodgings.

The presence of these four populations, according to Martinotti, characterizes the third-generation metropolis, which is still emerging; therefore, its morphology is still to be fully defined (Martinotti 1993, 152).

The study of metropolitan populations requires adequate statistical data, which in Italy at least did not exist before 1981: the censuses concerned almost exclusively resident and non-resident inhabitants. The 1991 and 2001 censuses also concerned people moving for work or study, but they did not take into consideration the much more numerous individuals who go to town for other reasons, including business and leisure.

This paradigm applies well to the study of the metropolitan phenomenon and, with some changes, to the study of tourism and migration. More generally, Martinotti's analyses show that official statistics are largely inadequate to study the growing territorial mobility of the population and its profound transformations. In his own words, "the new metropolitan reality overlaps with the ancient urban or municipal reality without eliminating it: the two entities coexist both in the territory and in the minds of men" (Martinotti 1999).

4. Beyond *Metropoli*

His unrelenting attention to social change led him to publish, in 1997, the Italian version of Saskia Sassen's 1992 study, *The Global City* (La città globale), contributing his own introduction to the volume. With the explosion of the Internet and of web communications, he started reconsidering his theory of the metropolis.

His later works include two edited volumes: *Urban Civilization from Yesterday to the Next Day* (2009), with Davide Diamantini, and *La metropoli contemporanea* [The Contemporary Metropolis] (2012), with Stefano Forbici.

In the 2009 volume he analysed the transition from *Gemeinschaft* (community) to *Gesellschaft* (society) and from *Gesellschaft* to *Vernetzenschaft*, as he tentatively defined the interactive network society (Martinotti and Diamantini 2009, 48).

In updating and adjusting his paradigm, he increasingly focused on the interaction of technologies, places, and spaces, characterizing advanced urban studies at the inception of the twenty-first century and thus became a prominent voice among the international scholars facing this theme from different disciplinary angles.

Martinotti also added historic and cultural identity to the three criteria defining the metropolitan areas mentioned earlier (spatial contiguity, interdependence, and social composition). Maintaining that the metropolis is by its very nature boundless, though of course not infinite, he criticized demographic density as a defining parameter (Martinotti and Forbici 2012). In undermining this criterion, which correlates the number of inhabitants with a specific territory, we are obliged to abandon the time-hallowed view of the city by Louis Wirth (1938), almost unchallenged until the 1990s, which claimed that it was possible to capture its essence by means of three variables: size, density, and heterogeneity.

In response to the question posed by Sharon Zukin “Is There an Urban Sociology?” (2011), Martinotti (2011a) produced a relevant study identifying ten central themes to which a renewed urban sociology should pay attention. He criticized the indiscriminate use of technical tools which is likely to generate “theoretical poverty”—notably themed cartography and GIS (Geographic Information Systems), neither of which is able by itself to explain a social reality which is much more complex than the one they purport to present.

His judgement in this respect is worth quoting: “The relation between the richness of systematic (more or less) and cartographic—one is tempted to say calligraphic—data on cities and theoretical poverty, despite some good hunches, is in my mind the crux of the crisis of Urban Sociology” (Martinotti 2011a).

5. A wide research horizon

Martinotti’s predominant interest in urban sociology was already evident at the inception of his academic career. His anthology, *Città e analisi sociologica. I classici della sociologia urbana* [City and Sociological Analysis. The Classics of Urban Sociology], published as early as 1968 has constituted the basic reference for many generations of Italian scholars.

As a social scientist, however, Martinotti cultivated other all-encompassing research fields, often intersecting with his main interest in urban studies. If he had not been such an accomplished, well-rounded

scholar, he would probably not have produced his best-known work, *Metropoli*, nor updated it constantly.

He was naturally keen on the methodology of social research, and reinforced this strong interest at Columbia University, as a pupil of Paul Lazarsfeld. He also edited the Italian translation of Herbert H. Hyman's *Survey Design and Analysis* (Disegno della ricerca e analisi sociologica, 1967). These competences provided the backbone for his questionnaires and quantitative methods, though he always avoided the extremes defined by Sorokin as quantophrenia. At least two of his surveys using questionnaires must be recalled here, the first one concerning Turin and the second one Milan: *La città difficile* [The difficult city], carried out in 1982, and *Milano ore sette: come vivono i milanesi* (Milan at seven o'clock: how the Milan people live), carried out in 1988. Without his advanced methodological skills, he would not have been able to analyse the dynamics of the Italian metropolitan areas with sophisticated quantitative instruments, as he did in the second chapter of *Metropoli*.

Next, and again closely linked to his predominant research field, was his keen interest in information technology, both as a research tool and as an instrument capable of deeply affecting social relationships. In this regard we must mention his book *Informazione e sapere* [Information and Knowledge], published in 1992. His interest in the use of IT in the social sciences was also linked to the international network of Data Archives; one of the founders of IFDO (International Federation of Data Organizations), he was its President for six years (1977–1983). This striking interdisciplinary experience led to the 1993 volume and to the subsequent *opus*.

His further major field of research (and also civic concern) was the rigorous study of politics: governance processes, electoral behaviour and public policies, especially local municipal expenditure. Among his many contributions on this subject, which he continued to study throughout his life, we shall recall here the highly significant special issue of “Quaderni di Sociologia” devoted to classes, voting, and politics in Italian cities (Martinotti 1982). Here again, his attention to institutional dynamics and the governance of metropolitan processes (see Rotelli 1999 and Ercole 1999) occupied a crucial role in his theoretical system.

6. Civic involvement

Martinotti intensely cultivated the sentiment for civil society and the institutions regulating it, which is traditionally known in socio-political

studies as “civicness.”² In particular, the school system and university education were at the forefront of his mind.

It was not an academic interest in a strict sense, but rather civicness infused with scientific rigor. Here we must remember *Gli studenti universitari: profilo sociologico* [University Students: A Sociological Profile] (1967), *Education in a Changing Society* (1977), edited together with Antonina Kloskowska, and *È possibile una università che funzioni davvero?* [Is a university that really works at all possible?] (2006), updated by his speech *È possibile un'università diversa?* [Is a different university possible?], given at the University of Camerino in 2011 and now available online.

As Nicolò Costa recalls in this volume, Martinotti presided over the government-appointed commission, producing the preliminary plan for international agreements which brought the Italian education system in line with those of other European countries. The report of the so-called “Martinotti Commission”, with fifteen members representing different academic disciplines, led to Italy’s participation in the 1998 Sorbonne meeting which initiated the harmonization of European higher education systems. Yet, given the developments of the university reform policy, he was not satisfied with its implementation, which was affected by the intricacies of the “idiotic bureaucracy,” a label he borrowed from the mathematician Bruno De Finetti.

In an open forum on the Encyclopaedia Treccani website, Guido Martinotti expressed his concerns about the possible end of sociology as a science. In his view, sociology was (and indeed in part it still is) at risk of becoming mere opinion, losing its research-based status. Even in the most heated debates and critical confrontations, however, he listened patiently and looked upon his interlocutors benevolently.

Martinotti was a truly exemplary professor. He loved teaching and liked to stay young. Those who had the privilege to know him³ will

² See E. Cantarella and G. Martinotti, *Cittadini si diventa*. Torino: Einaudi Scuola, 1996.

³ I first met Guido Martinotti in 1973, as a student of the Social Science Methodology course he was teaching, with Joseph la Palombara and Herbert Hyman among others, for Co.S.Pos (Comitato delle Scienze Politiche e Sociali). The course was jointly sponsored by the Olivetti Foundation and the Ford Foundation to promote the social sciences in Italian universities and was attended by young scholars specializing in political science (Turin) and sociology (Milan). Martinotti’s lectures, focused on survey and cross-tabulation techniques involving the use of computer software, were extremely innovative, therefore successfully inspiring for us all.

remember his constant, genuine effort to understand the new. And they will remember the attention with which he used to listen, the puzzled look while he stroked his beard, and clever smile when he was thinking intensely: traits familiar to all those who were close to him and were familiar with the depth of his vision as well as his undeniable sense of humour. The generosity, loyalty and frankness of the man surround his memory with a special aura.

Guido Martinotti leaves us with an extraordinary human and intellectual legacy, hence the great responsibility of keeping it alive.

References

- Bell, D. 1980. "The Social Framework of the Information Society," in *The Microelectronics Revolution*, edited by T. Forester, 500–49. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Berry, B.J.L. ed. 1976. *Urbanization and Counter-Urbanization*. New York: Sage.
- Blalock, H. 1961. *Casual Inferences in Nonexperimental Research*. Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press (Italian transl. 1967: *L'analisi causale in sociologia*. Padova: Marsilio. Book Series in Sociology directed by L. Balbo and G. Martinotti).
- . 2004. *The Network Society. A Cross-Cultural Perspective*. Cheltenham: Edward Edgar.
- Cafiero, S. and Busca, A. 1970. *Lo sviluppo metropolitano italiano*. Milano: Giuffrè.
- Cantarella, E. and Martinotti, G. 1996. *Cittadini si diventa*. Torino: Einaudi.
- Cantarella E. 2014. "Ho scelto tra diritto e miti greci, ora so che Antigone aveva torto" (interview with Antonio Gnoli), *la Repubblica*, August 11.
- Castells, M. 1976. "Is there an urban sociology?" in *Urban Sociology*, edited by C.G. Pickavance, 33–59. New York: Routledge.
- . 2010. *The Rise of the Network Society. The Information Age: Economy, Society, and Culture*, vol. 1, 2nd ed. with a new preface. London: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Ceri P. and Rossi P. 1987. "Uno sguardo d'insieme", in *Modelli di città*, edited by P. Rossi, 539–81. Torino: Einaudi.
- CNR [Italian National Research Council]. 1973. *Il mercato edilizio delle abitazioni nelle aree di sviluppo urbano in Italia: situazione attuale e previsioni. Programma di ricerca sull'industrializzazione nell'edilizia*. Vol. 1.1. *Le aree di sviluppo*. Milano: Adelphi.

- Costa, N. and Martinotti, G. 2001. "Il turismo nell'autonomia didattica degli atenei" [Riforma universitaria], in *Decimo Rapporto sul Turismo in Italia*, edited by E. Becheri. Firenze: Mercury, 613–26.
- Costa, N., and Martinotti, G. 2002. "Un manuale per studenti e operatori dei sistemi turistici locali. Introduzione," in K. Godfrey and J. Clarke, *Manuale di marketing territoriale per il turismo*, 15–26. Firenze: Le Monnier.
- Costa, N., and Martinotti, G. 2003. "Sociological theories of tourism and regulation theory," in *Cities and Visitors*, edited by L.M. Hoffman, S.S. Fainstein and D.R. Judd, 53–73. London: Blackwell.
- Dal Pozzolo L. ed. 2002. *Fuori città, senza campagna*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Davis, K. 1959. *The World's Metropolitan Areas*, International Urban Research Institute of International Studies, University of California. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Fichera M. 2008. *La Fondazione Adriano Olivetti dal 1962 al 1975: il contesto, le contraddizioni, i temi*. Roma: Fondazione Olivetti.
- Ercole, E. and Scrivanti, P. 1984. "Le variazioni territoriali in Italia 1950–1979," in *Ricerca sociologia, informatica e società italiana*, edited by A. Ardigò and G.D. Amendola. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Ercole, E. 1986. *Database delle variazioni comunali in Italia*. Milano: ADPSS [Archivio dati e Programmi per le Scienze Sociali] (mimeo).
- Ercole, E. 1999. "La crescita metropolitana," in *La dimensione metropolitana*, edited by Guido Martinotti, 191–230, Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Gottman, J. and Harper, R.A., eds. 1990. *Since Megalopolis: the Urban Writings of Jean Gottmann*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Gottman, J. 1994. *Beyond Megalopolis*, Tokyo: Community Study Foundation.
- Hall, P. and Hay, D. 1980. *Growth Centres in the European Urban System*. London: Heinemann.
- Huff, D. 1954. *How to Lie with Statistics*. New York: Norton.
- INSOR [Istituto Nazionale di Sociologia Rurale]. 1988. *L'Italia rurale*, edited by C. Barberis. Bari: Laterza.
- Hyman, H. 1955. *Survey design and analysis: principles, cases and procedures*. Illinois: The Free Press (Italian transl. 1967: *Disegno della ricerca e analisi sociologica*, edited by G. Martinotti. Padova: Marsilio).
- MacCannel, D. 1992. *Empty Meeting Grounds: The Tourist Papers*. New York: Routledge.

- Marra, E. 1980. "ADRL [Data Archive of Region Liguria] and Project Turin: using census data and public register of population for computer cartography," in *Development of Joint Data Bases for Regional Analysis and Computer Cartography*, IFDO [International Federation of Data Organizations], Turin: March, 17–22. Torino: Csi [Consorzio per il Sistema Informativo] Piemonte.
- . 1985. *Per un atlante sociale delle città: basi di dati anagrafici e Decision Support System*. "Progetto Torino" vol. 3. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- . 1989. "Effetti di contesto e consumi culturali", in *Componenti culturali della qualità urbana*, edited by E. Marra. Milano: Etas Libri, 31–130.
- . Mela, A. and Zajczyk, F. 2004. "Tempi difficili per la città," in *Anni in salita. Tempi difficili per gli italiani*, edited by G.D. Amendola, 275–310. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- . and Gilli, M. 2012. "Il triangolo postindustriale: dal fordismo al turismo," in *La metropoli contemporanea*, edited by G. Martinotti e S. Forbici. Milano: Guerini.
- . 2013. "Dal *fully fledged* al *serious tourism*: considerazioni sulle quattro popolazioni turistiche", in *Cultura, territorio, turismo: un'indagine in Lombardia*, edited by E. Marra and M. De Carlo, 19–41. Milano: Guerini.
- Martinotti, G. 1963. "Alcune teorie sullo sviluppo metropolitano con applicazione all'area milanese," *Ricerca ILSSES* [Istituto Lombardo di Studi Economici e Sociali]. In *Studi e Ricerche I, 2*, Milano: PIM [Piano intercomunale milanese] (mimeo).
- Martinotti, G., and Balbo, L. eds. 1966. *Metropoli e sottocomunità*. Padova: Marsilio.
- Martinotti, G. 1966. "Sociologia e pianificazione urbana," in *Metropoli e sottocomunità*, edited by G. Martinotti e L. Balbo, 185–212. Padova: Marsilio.
- . 1967. *Gli studenti universitari. Profilo sociologico*. Padova, Marsilio.
- . ed. 1968. *Città e analisi sociologica*. Padova: Marsilio.
- . 1968. "Presentazione," in H. Zeisel, *Ditelo con i numeri*. Padova: Marsilio, 1–13.
- Martinotti, G., and Kloskowska A. eds. 1977. *Education in a Changing Society*. London: Sage.
- Martinotti, G. 1978. "Data processing, government and the public: reflections on the Italian case," *International Social Science Journal*, 1, 146–63.

- 1979a “Filosofia e schema del Bilancio Sociale di Area,” *Città Classe*, 18 (special issue), 5–18 (reprinted in *I servizi sociali*, edited by M. Bianchi, 145–55. Bari: De Donato, 1981).
- 1979b “Introduzione,” in *I servizi sociali in Liguria. Elementi di un sistema informativo, analisi e programmazione*, vol.1 *Movimento e struttura della popolazione. Raffronto 1951–1961–1971 e 1962–1976*, edited by E. Marra, v-xiv. Genova: Regione Liguria and Istituto di Scienze Politiche “Gioele Solari,” Università di Torino.
- Martinotti, G. and F. Zajczyk, eds. 1979, *L’informatica nelle regioni italiane e straniere*, Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier.
- Martinotti, G. 1981. “The illusive autonomy. Central control and decentralization in the Italian system of local government,” in *The Local Fiscal Crisis in Western Europe. Myths and Realities*, edited by J.L. Sharpe, 63–124. London: Sage.
- Martinotti, G. and Moscati, R. 1982. *Lavorare nell’università oggi*. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Martinotti, G. ed.1982a, *La città difficile. Equilibri e disuguaglianze nel mercato urbano*. “Progetto Torino” vol. 5. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Martinotti, G. ed. 1982b. “Classi, voto e politica nelle città italiane,” *Quaderni di Sociologia*, 2, 3, 4 (special issue).
- Martinotti, G. and Aiken, M. 1982c. “Sistema urbano, governo della città e giunte di sinistra nei grandi comuni italiani,” *Quaderni di Sociologia*, 2, 3, 4 (special issue), 172–248.
- Martinotti, G. and Aiken, M. 1984. “The turn to the left among Italian cities and urban public policy,” in *Cities in Recession*, edited by I. Szeleny, 238–77. London: Sage.
- Martinotti, G. ed. 1988. *Milano ore sette: come vivono i milanesi*. Bologna: Maggioli.
- Martinotti, G. 1985. “La sociologia della città: problemi e prospettive,” *Quaderni di Sociologia*, 4–5, 335–47.
- 1986 “La politica del dato,” *Ricerca sociologica, informatica e società italiana*, edited by A. Ardigò and G.D. Amendola. Milano: Franco Angeli, 277–309.
- Martinotti, G. and Aiken, M., Newton, K., Fried Land, R. 1987. “Urban Systems Theory and Urban Policy: A Four-Nation Comparison,” *British Journal of Political Science*, 17, 3, 341–58.
- Martinotti, G. and Ercole, E. 1987. “Le aree metropolitane,” *Amministrare*, 17, 1, 111–57.
- Martinotti, G. 1988. “Problemi di metodo per un’analisi della qualità della vita urbana nelle grandi città italiane,” in *Gli indicatori ambientali*:

- valori, metri e strumenti nello studio dell'impatto ambientale*, edited by P. Schmidt di Friedberg, 575–615. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- Martinotti, G. and Ercole, E. 1988. "Le aree metropolitane e la regione metropolitana lombarda," *Amministrare*, 18, 1, 141–95.
- Martinotti, G. and Micheli, G., Vicari, S., Natale, P. 1988c. *Milano ore 7: come vivono i milanesi*. Rimini: Maggioli.
- Martinotti, G. and Ercole, E. 1990. "La definizione delle aree metropolitane: problemi metodologici," in ISAP [Istituto per la Scienza dell'AmministrazionePubblica], *Verso il governo dell'area metropolitana*, 69–144. Milano: Giuffrè.
- Martinotti, G. 1990. "La población de la nueva morfología social metropolitana. Reflexiones a partir del caso italiano," in *Las grandes ciudades en la decada de los noventa*, edited by J. Borja, M. Castells, R. Dorado and I. Quintana, 64–139. Madrid: Editorial Sistema.
- . 1992a, *Informazione e sapere*. Milano: Anabasi.
- . 1992b. "Städtischer Wandel in Italien: Grosstädte und Agglomerationsräume," in *Ökonomie und Politik in alten Industrie-regionen Europas. Probleme der Stadt- und Regionalentwicklung in Deutschland, Frankreich, Grossbritannien und Italien*, edited by H. Hauessermann, 298–315. Berlin: Birkhäuser.
- . 1993. *Metropoli. La nuova morfologia sociale della città*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- . 1994. *The New Social Morphology of Cities*. Discussion Paper Series n. 10. UNESCO/MOST, Wien, February 10–12 (available on line: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/images/0010/001056/105620e.pdf>).
- . 1995. "City-users a Milano," *Annali Italiani del Turismo Internaionale*, 1, 1, 181–97.
- . 1997a. *Perceiving, Conceiving, Achieving the Sustainable City. A Synthesis*. Report of the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. Loughlingstown, Dublin.
- . 1997b. "Introduzione" to Saskia Sassen, *Città globali*. New York, Londra, Tokyo (Italian transl. of *The Global Cities: New York, London, Tokyo*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1992), ix–xxiv. Torino: UTET.
- . 1997c. "Un'idea di Università," in *Il piacere della sociologia*, edited by R. Siebert. Soveria Mannelli: Rubbettino.
- . 1998. "Information et connaissance," *Revue Europeenne des Sciences Sociales*, 111, 131–50.
- . 1999a. "A city for whom? Transients and public space in the second-generation metropolis," in *The Urban Moment. Cosmopolitan Assays in*

- the Late-20th Century City*, edited by R. A. Beaurgard and S. Body-Gendrot, 155–83. London: Sage.
- ed. 1999. *La dimensione metropolitana*. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- 2000. “Il gene dell’innovazione,” *Sociologia Urbana e Rurale*, 62, 11–14.
- 2003. “I luoghi (veri) della modernità radicale,” in *Lo sguardo del turista e il racconto dei luoghi*, edited by R. Bonadei and U. Volli, 91–119. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- 2004a. “*Urbs Hospitalis*. Visitors in the city,” in *Città, turismo e comunicazione globale*, edited by A. Savelli, 75–84. Milano: Franco Angeli.
- 2004b. “The Social Morphology Dimension,” in UN-HABITAT, *The State of the World’s 2004/2005*, 52–54. London: Earthscan.
- 2004c. *Come cambia e come ci cambia la vita* (interview with F. Erbani), *la Repubblica*, October 22.
- 2007. “Gone with the wind: physical spaces in the third generation metropolis,” *Advances in Complex Systems (ACS)*, 10: 233–53.
- 2008. *H²O – Accadueo. L’acqua, la terra e gli uomini*. Milano: Skira.
- Martinotti, G. and Diamantini, D. 2009. *Urban Civilization: from Yesterday to the Next Day*. Napoli: Scripta Web.
- Martinotti, G. 2011a. “There Is, There Is!” [Reading Sharon Zukin’s “Is There an Urban Sociology?”]. *Sociologica*, 3, 1–15.
- 2011b. “Robert E. Park: l’ecologia umana”, in *Lezioni di sociologia urbana*, edited by G. Nuvolati. Bologna: il Mulino, 105–24.
- 2011c. “Area metropolitana. Scienza e politica.”, *Arcipelago Milano*, III, 37.
- Martinotti, G. and Forbici, S. eds. 2012. *La metropoli contemporanea*. Milano: Guerini.
- Martinotti, G. 2012a. “Parole parole parole ... di un attento osservatore”, *Arcipelago Milano*, IV, 31.
- 2012b. “Prolegomeni a ogni futura definizione di area metropolitana/ 1”, *Arcipelago Milano*, IV, 32.
- 2012c. “Prolegomeni a ogni futura definizione di area metropolitana/ 2”, *Arcipelago Milano*, IV, 33.
- 2013. *Guido Martinotti: un giornalista di eccezione. Gli articoli scritti per Arcipelago Milano dal 2009 al 2012* (Martinotti’s articles for the online journal *Arcipelago Milano*, collected after his death). Milan: Arcipelago Milano.
-

- Melis, A. 1999. "Città e metropoli: un confronto statistico," in *La dimensione metropolitana*, edited by G. Martinotti, 275–95. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Pizzetti, F. 2015. "Le città metropolitane per lo sviluppo strategico del territorio: tra livello locale e livello sovranazionale," *Federalismi.it, rivista di diritto pubblico italiano, comparato, europeo*, 12, 2–36.
- RGR [Rapporto Giorgio Rota]. 2015. *La sfida metropolitana*. Torino: Centro Luigi Einaudi.
- Rotelli, E. 1999. "Le aree metropolitane in Italia: una questione istituzionale insoluta," in *La dimensione metropolitana*, edited by G. Martinotti, 299–327. Bologna: Il Mulino.
- Urry, J. 1990. *The Tourist Gaze* (2nd rev. ed. 2002). London: Sage.
- Van den Berg, L., Drewett, R. and Klaassen, H. 1982. *Urban Europe: a Study of Growth and Decline*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Wirth, L. 1938. "Urbanism as a Way of Life," *American Journal of Sociology*, 44, 1–24.
- Zukin, S. 2011. "Is There an Urban Sociology? Questions on a Field and a Vision," *Sociologica*, 3, 1–18.
-

CHAPTER TWO

CITY-USERS AND THE HOSPITABLE CITY

NICOLÒ COSTA

1. Introduction

This chapter dwells upon the activity of Guido Martinotti in urban sociology and sociology of tourism.

The aims of this chapter are:

- to reconstruct the origins and developments of his ideas on the links between urban transformations, tourism, hospitality, and human mobilities;
- to examine the applications of his ideas and his research to university education through the establishment of degree courses in tourism.

The methods used are:

- for his scientific activity, a synchronic interpretation of Martinotti's writings and their diachronic or historical-biographical contextualization, also by citing some publications that I had the honour of writing with him or I wrote with his encouragement;
- for his teaching activity, an analysis of his video-lectures for his distance course on Sociology of Tourism and Land Use at the International University Consortium "Nettuno" and his lectures for the degree course in Tourism and Local Community Sciences that he established in Milano Bicocca University.

The contents are:

- subjects directly or indirectly connected with urban transformations, city-users and tourism;
- subjects explicitly concerning tourism education at the university level and the related teaching issues.

The conclusion will underline the appropriateness of orienting studies and research on tourism towards post-Fordist production centred on hospitality/mobility.

2. Main topics of Martinotti's research related to tourism

2.1 Theory of city-users and the sociological "discovery" of tourists

Martinotti's interest in tourism began between 1989 and 1992, when, reworking incessantly, he was writing the third chapter of his book *Metropoli* (1993), entitled "The four metropolitan populations." Martinotti used an original method to outline the new social morphology of the city with an advanced economy. He found the analysis of urban ecology and the Marxist theory of conflict too limited because they focused exclusively on the inhabitants, i.e. those permanently resident in the city, whereas, according to him, it was necessary to focus on human mobilities.

Martinotti argued that cities are dynamic organisms, increasingly characterized by information flows and spatial mobilities. This makes the city limits porous and outdates the models of governance inherited from the past and the tools of economic, social, demographic, and urban diagnosis. To understand how the city is changing, it is necessary to know how and why the residents and the "transient populations" move within and between cities, experiencing them and connecting them in a continuously different way over time.

Starting in 1989, Martinotti distributed drafts of the third chapter of *Metropoli* to friends who could help clarify specific topics or examine them more deeply. The city populations also included tourists, to whom up to then Martinotti had given only indirect attention. Until 1989, he shared the dominant idea in Italian sociology, influenced by French sociology, that tourism was a sector of "free time," which was supposed to have been "freed" to provide a better quality of life for workers. In 1989 he was missing the connection with the new orientations of sociology of tourism dominated by Anglo-Saxon researchers (MacCannell, Cohen, Graburn, etc.). They were concentrated around the journal "Annals of Tourism Research" and within the Sociology of Tourism working group (not a structured section) of the International Sociological Association, as well as around the nascent Mediterranean Association of Sociology of Tourism managed by Asterio Savelli. Moreover, in previous years, Martinotti had studied free time in advanced-economy cities in relation to working times according to a French model that considered these activities residual with respect to work issues, the alpha and omega of industrial citizenship.

As a result, in 1989 he read my book and Savelli's book, both entitled *Sociologia del turismo* (Sociology of Tourism), which sought to summarize the national and international debate on this subject (Costa 1989; Savelli

1989). While appreciating and supporting our work, Martinotti politely declared that he was dissatisfied with the results produced by the new discipline at the beginning of the 1990s. According to him, research by the “territorialists,” i.e. the sociologists who studied tourism processes in organized space (e.g., the many contributions on the economic, environmental and socio-cultural impacts of tourism), underestimated the fact that tourists were a segment of a larger population, which he called “city-users.” It was a population so important that it shaped the new social morphology of advanced-economy cities. This population was not to be restricted to the free time and shopping of residents and tourists; it also concerned the students, the elderly, the sportsmen, etc. City-users were the result of a new protagonism of advanced-economy cities, competing with each other to attract metropolitan business persons, talented immigrants, researchers and students, sportsmen, and people in entertainment, financial investments, goods, etc.

Martinotti requested Italian and foreign sociologists of tourism to take a step forward: to update their approach and include their contributions within a macro-sociology of the cosmopolitan city on the move, the “second-generation metropolis” and the nascent “third-generation metropolis” characterized by mobility induced by *metropolitan business persons*. He reaffirmed this idea to an international audience in his essay “A city for whom? Transients and public life in the second-generation metropolis” (1999). He asked researchers to investigate motivations and behaviour of tourists within the city-users, identified as a “new class, relatively free of location” (Martinotti 1999, 168).

Empirical analyses of how city-users model urban spaces were the starting point for a later attempt to provide a broader generalization on the economic-social dynamics of contemporary capitalism and to consider the hospitality/mobility binomial a production system of the new metropolis. This suggestion was difficult to follow. It was difficult to establish a link with studies based on the international literature dealing with the sociology of tourism, which at that time was much more interested in cultural issues. The working group of sociologists of tourism was closely attached to the sociology of culture, as clearly showed, for instance, the conference entitled “Tourism between Tradition and Modernity,” Nice, 1993, in which I and Savelli took part. It was sufficient to consider the paper on the authenticity of tourism experience, by Dean MacCannell, or that on the phenomenology of the tourist experience, by Erik Cohen, or the anthropological view of the culture shock of intercultural communication, proposed by Nelson Graburn, or the centre-periphery idea, expressed by Marie Lanfant, or the subject of tourism mythologies, treated by Tom

Selwyn. Thus, when in 2005 I wrote the introduction to the Italian translation of a classic of sociology of tourism (Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist. A New Theory of the Leisure Class*, 1976; new ed. 1999), I mentioned that its roots were in Simmel's, Durkheim's and Goffman's thought, but not in urban sociology in the narrow sense. In fact, I recalled Martinotti's observations much earlier. Indeed, the work of grafting sociology of tourism on urban sociology was in an early phase at the end of the 1980s.

The English-speaking and French-speaking geographers of tourism had already developed models of tourism space since the 1970s (Miossec 1977, Butler 1980, etc.). They had discussed the concepts of tourism region and urban tourism, linking them to local production systems, going beyond the idea that the tourism act was exclusively a variant of tourist consumption during leisure time. They were close to the issues raised by Martinotti. Nevertheless, the interdisciplinary approach was also slow in this sector of tourism studies. In Italy in 2009 a geographer, Armando Montanari, wrote a book on "urban tourism" integrating the national and international literature in an interdisciplinary way (it was published by Bruno Mondadori in a series edited by Martinotti, Montanari, and me). Therefore, the interdisciplinary connection between the city-users theory and the geography of tourism in the early 1990s was easier but still complex. It required (and requires) further theoretical elaboration, the ability to work in a team and crossed citations overcoming corporate barriers and hierarchical affinities, especially deep-rooted in Italy.

It was precisely in those years that Martinotti felt the need to create a team of experts. A few years later, he supported my idea to start a journal that would link the national debate on tourism to the international one and to the interdisciplinary approach, favouring issues related to space and mobilities. With the help of the Lombardy Region, we founded a journal, "Annali Italiani del Turismo Internazionale," which lived two years (1996 and 1997, for a total of eight issues), but unfortunately with limited distribution. It was based in the Department of Sociology, University of Milan, and had an interdisciplinary nature. Its scientific committee included a psychologist, Marcello Cesa Bianchi, a geographer, Giacomo Corna Pellegrini, an American anthropologist, Nelson Graburn, a French economic sociologist, Marie Françoise Lanfant, two Italian sociologists, Vincenzo Cesario and Antonio de Lillo, and other well-known sociologists, such as Erik Cohen, Dean MacCannell, Krzysztof Przeclawski, and John Urry.

Martinotti wrote an article for the first volume. It was entitled "City-users a Milano." Its final section reprised the third chapter of *Metropoli*

(1993), defining Milan, the Lombard capital, as a second-generation metropolis. Unlike many scholars who then associated the decline of the Fordist industrial city with the general decline of cities, Martinotti analysed the factors of the resurgence of Milan. In parallel, he argued that Milan would have been included in the new trend if the city council had planned mobilities and thus the constructed city, stressing the specific traits of European mobility as “very different from those of the other geopolitical blocs: Eastern Europe, the USA, and Japan” (id., 193). Martinotti maintained that the absence of a monitor of city-users explained why Milan was “indecipherable” in the new spatial and demographic configurations. Later, in an explicit manner, he concluded:

“It is therefore necessary to describe the mobility of business people, cultural and recreational tourists, students, the elderly and all transient people who use the services offered by this active city. With this new information, public administrators will be able to intervene to improve hospitality with greater managerial efficacy. In this sense, tourist mobility is an important indicator of the more general transformations under way in second-generation metropolises. And we will devote particular attention to tourist mobility in future issues” (Martinotti 1995, 195).

Unfortunately, his hope was in vain, partly because the municipal administration and the Lombard and Italian governments did not set up a monitor of city-users.

Martinotti was not the only one in those years to desire a new interdisciplinary approach to the study of tourism, included in the broader context of advanced-economy cities, of the city of information flows, of intense exchanges and accelerated mobilities.

It was necessary to turn to the sociology of tourism developed in Britain (on the basis of the influential thinking of Anthony Giddens) to contextualize Martinotti’s innovative city-users theory. The book by John Urry, *The Tourist Gaze*, was released in 1990. In its subtitle and in various passages, it considered tourism as a variant of a more comprehensive theory of “travel” in contemporary society. The effect of Urry’s book in Italy was mainly the initiation of many reflections on cultural or visual sociology, focused on the “social construction” of the tourist gaze. Above all, it stimulated aesthetic ideas or those focused on cultural diversities in shaping urban landscapes (“collective gaze,” “romantic gaze,” “ordinary/extraordinary dynamics,” etc.). In 2003, however, there was a meeting between Urry and Martinotti, when Rossana Bonadei and Ugo Volli invited them to a conference on Lake Garda. Its organizers published the proceedings under the title *The Tourist Gaze and the Narrative of*