UNIVERSITY OF
FORWARD
THINKING
WESTMINSTER[⌗]

Urban tourism as a source of contention and social mobilisations: a critical review

Novy, J. and Colomb, C.

Urban tourism as a source of contention and social mobilisations: a critical review

Dr Johannes Novy
Lecturer in Planning
Department of Planning and Transport
University of Westminster
UK
Email: J.Novy@westminster.ac.uk

Dr Claire Colomb
Reader in Planning and Urban Sociology
The Bartlett School of Planning
University College London
UK
Email: c.colomb@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract:
Across the globe, there has been a proliferation of manifestations of discontent and protest around tourism-related issues in cities. This points to an increasing "politicization from below" of the impacts of the visitor economy on people and places, which is the result of the quantitative and qualitative transformation of urban tourism, and of the ways in which tourism has been governed (or not) in contemporary cities. This critical review discusses the variety of tourism-related social mobilisations recently witnessed in cities. It distinguishes between multi-focal versus single-issue mobilisations; between those purposefully and primarily focused on tourism and those which have integrated tourism within broader urban struggles; between those with a radical, progressive agenda for urban change versus those primarily defending narrower interests or exhibiting reactionary or hostile characteristics. The paper ends by discussing how urban governance and public policies have responded so far to the conflicts and social mobilisations around tourism.

1. Introduction

Concerns and conflicts pertaining to tourism are not a new phenomenon. But they have gained significant traction in recent years and their current manifestations appear to involve more than "old wine in new bottles" (Dredge, 2017). One seemingly new aspect is that today's debates and controversies prominently feature *tourism in cities*. Discussions in the past revolved primarily around non-urban environments, especially in what Turner and Ash (1975) had termed "the pleasure periphery". The emphasis rested on the changes tourism was said to bring to "natural" habitats, "pristine" landscapes and "traditional" communities, including the way the latter were becoming progressively urbanized as a result of tourism-related development. Today, it is not so much "tourist urbanisation" (Mullins, 1991), but rather the "touristification" of the urban that dominates popular and academic debates. Previously confined to the domain of tourism studies, "touristification" has fast become an overused and ambiguous buzzword and the same applies to the two concepts of the title of this special issue: "overtourism" and "tourism-phobia".

This critical review aims to shed light on the recent proliferation of manifestations of discontent and protest around tourism-related issues in cities. Based on a review of the relevant theoretical and empirical literature, as well as on the editorial work done by the authors to bring to fruition a collective book which explores the diversity of struggles and social mobilisations around urban tourism in more than 16 cities in Europe, North America, South America and Asia (Colomb & Novy, 2016), we first explore the main reasons why tourism has become an increasingly visible object of contention in cities, and argue that cities need to be regarded not only as *sites* but also as *stakes* of many of the conflicts and contestations that have emerged. The paper then discusses the considerable range and variety of tourism-related social struggles and mobilisations which have recently been witnessed in urban settings. The terminology that is often used to describe them tends to distract researchers and policy-makers from the complexities of the disputes taking place, and of the people and claims involved. Taking issue with tourism and its impacts is not *per se* "tourism-phobic", and the often-alluded-to notion of "overtourism" distracts us from the fact that there is more to consider than the volume of visitation when making sense of (urban) tourism's current problematisation, politicisation, and contestation. The last section of the paper provides a brief overview of the main policy responses so far, and their underlying rationales. Like other policy areas (Wilson & Swyngedouw, 2014), tourism seems to have been, for a long time, *depoliticized* through its presentation as an uncontroversial, positive matter (Novy, 2016). Due to a proliferation of protests and mobilisations, tourism is increasingly recognised for what it is in cities' political arenas - increasingly consequential and inherently political (Burns & Novelli, 2007). A variety of responses are emerging - often characterized by a consensualising discourse on "sustainable tourism" that obscures inequalities of resources and power, and stifles alternative voices and approaches. But they also involve some developments that can be taken as evidence of changing political agendas in some localities, somewhat different from previously pursued approaches.

2. The rise of tourism as a source of contention in urban settings

In the early 2010s, the mood of the global travel industry was optimistic. The impact of the 2008–2009 global financial crisis had been less severe than feared. By the end of 2012, the sector

surpassed a symbolic milestone: more than one billion tourists were recorded crossing international borders that year, according to the United Nations World Tourism Organisation (UNWTO, 2012), providing a perfect occasion for industry representatives to boast about the importance of tourism as an indispensable driver of economic growth, "inclusive" development and environmental sustainability (UNWTO, 2013). A few years later, by contrast, tourism advocates often found themselves on the defensive, as media headlines increasingly revolved around the costs and conflicts associated with tourism, and "locals" in a growing number of contexts were depicted to be entering a "revolt against tourism" (Becker, 2015).

"Revolts", if we want to stick to this term, certainly have not been unheard of in the past. The emergence of seaside tourism in England in the mid-nineteenth century was for example marked by considerable conflicts, as working-class tourists faced hostility from residents and well-off vacationers sniffing in disdain at the thought of having to share "their" summer residencies alongside the lower classes (Smith, 2013, p. 363). The rise of mass tourism in Spain a hundred years later also prompted concerns: in an article from 1973, the *New York Times* reported that "Spaniards [had begun to] lose their enthusiasm for that rising deluge of tourists" (Giniger, 1973). Many of the issues the article listed – the dominance of "low quality" tourism, the industry's dependence on foreign tour operators, and negative environmental and socio-cultural impacts – correspond to the burgeoning academic critique of tourism that was developed around that time by members of what Jafari (2001) termed the "cautionary platform" of tourism research. Such issues are remarkably similar to the ones at stake in current disputes, so it is tempting to treat the latter as a mere continuation of a long history of tourism-related conflicts.

There are, however, significant differences that speak against doing so: not only the extent, intensity, and media exposure of what is currently unfolding, but also the degree of organised social mobilisations which, as discussed later, have developed in many locales around the impacts of tourism. And, crucially, whereas attention previously centred largely on developments outside major urban centres, the current "wave of anti-tourism protests" (Coldwell, 2017) makes itself particularly felt in cities. The focal points for much of the protests have been Southern European cities such as Rome, Venice, Lisbon, San Sebastian, Palma de Mallorca or Barcelona, but manifestations of protest and resistance have also been reported in other cities within and beyond Europe. Amsterdam, Budapest, Berlin, Cape Town, Seoul, New Orleans, or Hong-Kong are a few of the growing number of cities where reports of backlashes against tourism flows or developments have recently appeared in the news. These backlashes point towards what we have termed elsewhere a growing problematisation and politicisation "from below" of tourism in cities (Novy & Colomb, 2016). They are not uniform in nature, and cannot be explained by a single set of causes. But we argue that a number of factors have contributed to their spread. In a nutshell: tourism has become an object of mobilisation because there is more of it, in a wider range of urban destinations, spreading to previously "untouched" neighbourhoods, taking new forms, and because it is often not governed or regulated enough – or merely governed in the interest of a narrow range of actors (Novy, 2018).

Sharp *quantitative* and *qualitative* changes in urban tourism patterns and broader forms of individual mobility have made the negative impacts and externalities of visitor flows on cities more visible and more contested. Tourism in general has grown at a phenomenal rate since the Second World War, and urban tourism has grown at a faster rate than tourism overall (Bock, 2015;

IPK International, 2016). A steady rise in visitor numbers has been witnessed not just in traditional "tourist cities" such as Rome, Paris or Venice, but also in other cities which until the 1990s had hardly been exposed to (mass) tourism. Urban tourism has therefore become in many cities much more consequential and, thus, more prone to conflict. "Along with growth comes growing pain", as the popular saying goes: as popular areas, public spaces and transport services have become increasingly overcrowded in many places, it becomes understandable why the notion of "overtourism" has gained so much traction.

The changing spatialities of tourism flows in and across city space also warrant attention. Urban tourism has spread geographically and is no longer predominantly confined to "tourist bubbles" (Judd & Fainstein, 1999). Visitors increasingly seek to experience "ordinary" spaces off the beaten track, or to "live like a local", to use Airbnb's motto. Areas with few conventional tourist attractions have, in the 1990s and 2000s, become desirable sites of tourism, leisure and consumption by visitors and residents alike - for example Kreuzberg in Berlin (Novy, 2011), Shoreditch/Brick Lane in London (Shaw et al., 2004), or the "favelas" of Rio de Janeiro (Broudehoux, 2016). The expansion of visitor flows to these areas has significant consequences for their dwellers and users, which unsurprisingly exacerbates the potential for reactive protests – especially because such areas are often affected by broader forces of urban change, such as gentrification. Besides, considerable potential for conflict arises from several particular trends transforming contemporary tourism, such as the rise of "nightlife tourism", "party tourism" or "alcotourism" (Bell, 2008), of cruise ship tourism (UNWTO, 2010), and of short-term holiday rentals facilitated by digital platforms (Guttentag, 2015).

Moreover, two decades of tourism research have shown that tourist practices intersect with other patterns of place consumption, mobility, work and leisure, and that the notion of the "tourist" itself as a distinguishable entity should be called into question (see debates around the "de-differentiation" of tourism and everyday life in McCabe, 2005; Hannam, 2009; Larsen, 2008). The growing international mobility of university students, the increase in second home-ownership, as well as increasingly flexible working practices in the cultural and service industries, have led to new forms of temporary mobility and residence whereby a person can spend a few weeks in a city and simultaneously combine study, work and "leisure" tourism. This has visible impacts on urban spaces, housing markets and socio-economic relations in the city, which compound those of "traditional" tourist flows (Novy, 2018).

But tourism flows are only *one* driver of urban change, closely intertwined with other forces and processes of socio-spatial restructuring in cities, which may themselves be the object of contestation, as we will see. We consequently need to look at the social mobilisations around urban tourism in the broader context of the economic and physical transformation of cities, and of shifting forms of urban governance under conditions of globalization, economic restructuring, neoliberalisation and financialisation. Here it is important to highlight the ambiguous and contradictory role of public policies. The promotion of tourism as a driver of development by (urban) political and economic elites is not new. But it has remarkably intensified in recent decades due to the transformation of tourism into a major global industry, the turn towards entrepreneurial forms of urban governance (Harvey, 1989), as well as the shift from manufacturing-based capitalism to "post-Fordist" economies and the associated rise of urban industries based on consumption, culture, and leisure. City governments, regardless of their ideological orientation,

have thus multiplied their activities to support the tourism sector, for example through investments in tourist-oriented attractions, campaigns and events, or measures to redesign and sanitize urban spaces (Judd & Fainstein, 1999; Fainstein et al., 2003; Spirou, 2011).

Historically, however, the role of the local state has in most contexts been limited to providing a suitable environment for the tourism sector to thrive (Hall & Jenkins, 2004). "[E]xplicit tourism management policy that goes beyond promotion" (van der Borg et al., 1996, p. 316), although not unheard of, was extremely rare. Tourism was overwhelmingly treated as an automatically "good thing" generating growth and jobs, which does not require much regulation or oversight (Novy, 2016). This has been compounded by neoliberalisation processes affecting various aspects of urban governance and public policies in many cities, characterised by the "(partial) destruction of existing institutional arrangements and political compromises through market-oriented reform initiatives, and the creation of a new infrastructure for market-oriented economic growth, commodification, and the rule of capital" (Brenner & Theodore, 2002, p. 362). In relation to tourism, this has been manifested by the outsourcing of the governance of tourism to private bodies or commercial tourism marketing organisations; the favourable regulatory or tax conditions offered to major tourism industry actors (e.g. hotel chains) without consideration of the potential opportunity costs; the weak regulation of new practices such as short-term rentals; and the lack of mechanisms of "value capture" which would help better spread tourism's benefits or tackle its adverse side effects (e.g. the "tourist tax", which does not exist everywhere and is rarely used to fund social infrastructure). Additionally, over the past decade urban tourism has become increasingly intertwined with broader processes of financialisation of housing markets, which are often weakly regulated by national and local policy-makers. This is illustrated by the increasing tendency for investors to store their surplus capital in the residential market of tourist destinations, in particular in "peripheral economies" (Cócola Gant, 2018), as second homes and short-term rentals represent a highly profitable asset category.

One could debate whether these developments are more applicable to some geographical contexts than others. Existing analyses of the shift towards leisure, consumption and tourism industries in (Anglophone) urban political economy are overwhelmingly rooted in the experience of European and North American cities. In other parts of the world, urban dynamics may differ. Yet there are increasingly fewer (national and local) governments which do not aspire to develop tourism in some way: even the North Korean government has begun to market the country as a tourist destination (Coldwell, 2015). In Central and Latin America, local and national governments began as early as the late 1970s to pursue the redevelopment of historic city centres for tourism consumption, a process strengthened over the past two decades (Janoschka et al., 2014). Many of the above-mentioned trends observed in Western cities have thus been increasingly mirrored in other contexts. This is due to the increasing demand for travel of middle- and upper-income groups; international emulation processes and "policy mobilities" between urban elites (McCann, 2013); and the strategies of consumption-driven economic development adopted in a number of globalizing cities, such as Dubai (Pacione, 2005; Elsheshtawy, 2009), Singapore (Chang, 1997; Luger, 2016) or other large cities in South-East Asia.

3. Protest and resistance in the *tourist city*, or the rise to prominence of tourism in *contested cities*?

The broad transformation of cities and urban governance patterns outlined above has not gone uncontested. Activists with various backgrounds and objectives have, in cities throughout the world, mobilised to challenge prevailing politics, discourses, and agendas and defend or reclaim, explicitly or implicitly, what Henri Lefebvre referred to as a "right to the city" (1996[1968]). Understood as a right both to use urban space and to participate in its social and political production, it has over the past two decades become a popular rallying cry in what scholars have described as a considerable upsurge of struggles in and around urban space (Harvey, 2012; Swyngedouw, 2014). Paralleled by, and linked to a more general resurgence of protests and revolts around the world, from the rise of anti-austerity protests in Spain, Greece, and Israel to the global spread of the Occupy movement, many of these struggles are centred upon conflicting ideas about *who* and *what* the city is for. The notion of the "right to the city" essentially acts as a counterclaim to the privileging of exchange value over use value – or of profit over people – that has characterised dominant urban development practices in recent decades (Marcuse, 2009; Brenner et al., 2012; Mayer, 2009). Hence, it is not only urban tourism, but rather *the city itself* and its uneven socio-spatial transformation, which have become increasingly politicized in recent years (Miller & Nicholls, 2013). Consequently, scholars investigating the rise of tourism-related conflicts and contestations should embed their analysis within the context of the recent transformation of urban social movements (Mayer, 2009, 2013), and of a more general resurgence of practices of mobilisation and resistance in cities around economic and environmental injustice, the politics of neoliberal governance and austerity, as well as gentrification, displacement and corporate developments that (are perceived to) destroy the fabric of local communities (Brenner et al., 2012).

In previous work (Novy & Colomb, 2016), we undertook a first attempt at categorizing the main topics of contention characterising contemporary struggles around urban tourism, through a taxonomy of the most prominent *negative effects and externalities* associated with tourism in cities (Table 1). These tend to become more intense, visible and widely felt as tourism flows increase, often leading to social conflicts and manifestations of protest and resistance. But there are two other broad sources of social conflicts: tourism's *equity impacts*, i.e. the uneven distribution of the costs and benefits of urban tourism *among* various groups and spaces and the competition and conflicts that may arise; and the *contested politics* of urban tourism, i.e. the prioritization of tourism growth in urban policy agendas and its perceived lack of governance (or its governance in the interest of a narrow range of economic actors).

Table 1. The impacts of urban tourism on people and urban spaces: sources of conflicts. (*Source*: compiled by authors. Reproduced with permission from Novy & Colomb, 2016)

ECONOMIC	• Changing market demand for goods and services (from serving local needs to catering for t visitor economy e.g. bars, souvenir shops)
	• Loss of small independent shops and growth of chain and franchised establishments
	• Increasing commercial rents and consumer prices
	→ *Commercial / retail gentrification (loss or displacement of resident-serving businesses)*
	• Increase and spatial expansion of tourism accommodation industry (hotels, hostels, bed breakfast establishments, commercial vacation rental operators)
	• Increase in the number of second homes
	• Increase in the number of (short-term) rental housing units put on the market by individu (owner-occupiers, tenants or landlords renting part or all of a housing unit, e.g. through onl platforms)
	• Increasing property values and rents
	→ *Residential gentrification / displacement of low income residents and loss of housing units long-term residents*
	• Conflicts between social and economic agents around who benefits from the visitor econo (e.g. conflicts about wages in the hotel industry, street vending or the 'tourist tax')
PHYSICAL	• Overcrowding and resulting problems (e.g. traffic congestion)
	• Deterioration of public spaces (e.g. through tacky souvenir stores, vandalism etc.)
	• Privatization and/or commodification of public space (e.g. proliferation of café terraces enclosure of tourist sites) and community resources
	• Disruption of the aesthetic appearance of communities / spread of 'sameness'
	• Environmental pressures (production of waste, litter, increasing water demand…)
	• Land-use conflicts (e.g. the use of land for tourism-related activities vs. the use for housing, li manufacturing etc.)
	• Over-development, ¡land grabs', forced evictions, and creative-destructive spatial dynamics
	• Physical manifestations of commercial and residential gentrification (see above)
SOCIAL & SOCIO-CULTURAL	• Commercialisation, exploitation and distortion of culture (tangible/intangible), heritage a public space
	• 'Festivalization' and 'eventification'
	• Invasive behaviour of tourists (voyeurism and intrusion) / conflicts arising from different use and behaviour in public space (e.g. 'party tourism')
	• Problems of public order (crime, prostitution, 'uncivil' behaviour etc)
	• Repressive policies (e.g. anti-homeless laws)
	• Heightened community divisions (e.g. between tourism beneficiaries and those bearing t burden; between alternative visions of what is heritage)
	• Loss of diversity / cultural homogenisation (e.g. loss of alternative spaces for artists or s cultural scenes)
	• Changing demographic make-up and tense relations within host communities between lo term residents and "outsiders" (linked with gentrification dynamics)
PSYCHOLOGICAL	• Feelings of alienation, of physical and psychological displacement from familiar places (real perceived)
	• Feeling of loss of control over community future
	• Loss of a sense of belonging or attachment to the community
	• Feelings of frustration and resentment amongst local people towards visitors

We also argued (*Ibid.*) that recent social mobilisations surrounding urban tourism are very diverse in nature and focus. In what follows, we briefly identify several types, using some lines of distinction which we recognise can be simplistic, but nevertheless analytically helpful: between broad, multi-focal versus single-issue mobilisations; between those which are purposefully and primarily focused on tourism and those which have integrated tourism within broader, often pre-existing urban struggles; and between those with a more radical, progressive agenda for urban change versus those which primarily defend the relatively narrow interests of their participants or exhibit reactionary or hostile characteristics.

First, there is a small, but growing number of cases where new "purpose-built" social mobilisations or coalitions have emerged, in which tourism and "touristification" are the central object of protest. They may focus on a particularly "over-used" area or site of contention (as illustrated by the conflicts around the enclosure of the Park Güell in Barcelona analysed by Arias-Sans & Russo, 2016), or on a "single issue". Indeed, backlashes are often less directed against tourism in its entirety, than against particular kinds of tourism (or tourists). A case in point is the rise of protests against "party tourism" or "alcotourism" (Bell, 2008), which has been fuelled by the rapid expansion of low-cost air travel in recent years, in cities like Amsterdam (O'Leary, 2018) or Barcelona (Nofre et al., 2018). The same holds true for cruise tourism: with ever more – and ever larger – ships heading towards coastal destinations, the cruise industry has in many of these become the subject of mounting controversy, in particular in relation to its environmental impacts and lack of benefits for local communities. Towns around the shores of the Mediterranean and Adriatic are prime examples of such growing contestations (e.g. the *No Grandi Navi* campaign in Venice, see Vianello, 2016), but controversies also rage elsewhere. Charleston, South Carolina, has for instance been mired for years in a dispute over plans for a new cruise ship terminal, while residents in Key West, Florida, have recently fought off a proposed widening of the city's harbour for larger ships (Klein & Sitter, 2016).

Another major bone of contention in many cities has been the growth of short-term holiday rentals facilitated by online platforms such as Airbnb. Their impacts on the way people travel, and on neighbourhoods, have been profound. Critics of short-term rentals, who come from different backgrounds (from residents' associations, housing rights advocacy groups, to established economic interests like the hotel industry), argue that they represent unfair competition with hotels; pose safety issues for users; foster tax evasion; are a source of disturbance to neighbours; and, crucially, have become a driving force behind what is referred to as "tourism gentrification" (Gotham, 2005) or "touristification" (Gravari-Barbas & Guinand, 2017). The role of short-term rentals in fuelling changes in the residential structure and housing markets of many cities - and, ultimately, the social composition, retail offer, character and "sense of place" of communities - has in recent years emerged as a major concern among scholars and activists (Cócola Gant, 2016). In cities like Barcelona, Berlin or Amsterdam, demands for stricter controls over short-term rentals have been a central element of recent social mobilisations around tourism, while in others (e.g. San Francisco) they have been incorporated into existing campaigns for housing rights.

In rarer cases, social mobilisations or coalitions have emerged around tourism and "touristification" at the scale of the entire city, in a more encompassing manner than single-area or single-issue campaigns: the most salient example is Barcelona's *Assemblea de Barris per un Turisme Sostenible* (Assembly of Neighbourhoods for a Sustainable Tourism) (ABTS), a network

of residents' associations and grassroot initiatives created in 2015. Its activists have framed many of their tourism-related concerns (e.g. the proliferation of short-term rentals, congestion and commodification of public spaces, loss of traditional retail, impact of cruise ships) within a broader critique of Barcelona's urban development model, and they are often involved in other campaigns around housing or social rights. Similarly, the recently set up network of grassroots organisations *Morar em Lisboa* (Living in Lisbon) explicitly embeds its questioning of Lisbon's model of tourism development within a broader critique of the housing, land-use planning, and foreign investment policies of the national and local governments (Morar em Lisboa, 2017). The movement takes issue with the intricate interplay between processes of financialisation, touristification and gentrification in the transformation of Lisbon's neighbourhoods (Cócola Gant, 2018; Mendes, 2018).

Unsurprisingly, therefore, in some cases oppositional movements challenging tourism in cities consist of groups and individuals who target tourism because of the capitalist political economy that underlies it, for example in Spain. A case in point is the small, radical left-wing group Arran active in Catalonia and Mallorca, which in 2017 launched a "capitalismophobia" campaign, denouncing tourism for "capitali[sing] on collective assets, like the natural or social environment, for nothing in return" (cited in Dearden, 2018). The term "capitalismophobia" was coined in reference to the "tourism-phobia" accusation often levelled against tourism critics. However, by no means all mobilisations that have in recent years attacked the politics underlying tourism development in cities are necessarily explicitly "anti-capitalist", "anti-system" or "radical leftist" (Hughes, 2018). Many have their origins in, or are associated with, broader mobilisations that are simply critical of current, neoliberal forms and practices of urban development. In cities where mobilisations have formed around tourism, such as Barcelona or Berlin, there are noticeable differences and variations between their participants in terms of their degree of "critical positioning" vis-à-vis tourism and capitalist urban development processes. In the case of Berlin, it was for instance a diverse mix of groups and individuals that turned tourism into an increasingly controversial topic (Novy, 2016, p. 61): they have far less in common with one another than many of the media's generalizing portrayals of Berlin's alleged "tourist hate[rs]" (Huffington Post, 2012) would lead one to suspect.

In many other cities, tourism is not *per se* the focus of new social mobilisations formed on purpose, but instead, some of its impacts have gradually become problematised as part of *existing* contestations of broader processes of urban change. This comes from groups already collectively mobilised around particular urban issues such as heritage conservation and the management of public space (see Pixová & Sládek, 2016 on Prague), or tenants' rights and housing struggles (see Opillard, 2016 on San Francisco). Tourism-related issues can also be integrated into broader protests against the hegemonic urban development model adopted by urban elites, for example in cities where local governments have resorted to sports mega-events as a development strategy (Capanema Alvares et al., 2016; Lauermann, 2016). These examples support our earlier point that many social mobilisations surrounding urban tourism should be analysed as connected to wider struggles around contemporary urban restructuring.

At the same time, however, it is important to stress that not all tourism-related mobilisations readily slot into such a framework of analysis, nor can be systematically framed within the transformative or progressive tenets of the "right to the city" discourse (Uitermark et al., 2012). First, in various

contexts, conflicts arise between particular social groups not *against* tourism, but rather about who can - and should - reap the benefits generated by the visitor economy. The growth of urban tourism has equity impacts: its benefits and costs are unevenly spread between individuals, social groups, economic actors and geographical areas. This can lead to forms of collective action of one group against, or in competition with, others (see for example Arkaraprasertkul, 2016 on the conflicts generated by the visitor economy in a traditional *lilong* neighbourhood of Shanghai; and Lederman, 2016 on the conflicts and mobilisations between different categories of artisans, antique dealers and street vendors who compete for the material benefits of the visitor economy in San Telmo, Buenos Aires). Second, there are example of tourism-related social mobilisations which are not so much embedded within wider transformative, radical or critical agendas for urban change, as they are driven by relatively self-centred concerns. In Paris, for example, there is no "anti-tourism" movement embedded within a broader anti-gentrification or housing rights rhetoric, but instead, middle- and upper-class residents have incorporated tourism-related issues (e.g. noise nuisances) into claims for the defence of their "quality of life" (Gravari-Barbas and Jacquot, 2016) (see also Pinkster and Boterman, 2017, on the discontent of upper-middle-class residents in Amsterdam's tourist-saturated canal district).

This is not to say that *only* self-interest is at play in those collective mobilisations, and that group, class or interest-based opposition to tourism is not also inspired by a genuine concern for the identity and integrity of local communities and the everyday life that takes place in them. However, regardless of whatever legitimate concerns they may have, a small number of social mobilisations can also be motivated by "NIMBYist" tendencies, plain nativism, and sometimes hostile, xenophobic undercurrents. Concurrent with "progressive" mobilisations, recent years have also been characterised by an upsurge of support for all sorts of reactionary and populist movements, deploying tribalist, ethnocentric or even racist discourses. Not to recognise that backlashes against tourists or tourism may, in some instances, be motivated by intolerance, or form part of a broader backlash against unwanted "strangers" who are seen as threatening an existing order, would be naïve (Reisinger & Turner, 2012, p. 165). Recent developments in central Istanbul illustrate this. Several neighbourhoods of the Beyoğlu district had, in the 2000s, witnessed the opening of hostels, cafés and bars serving alcohol and playing music, run by socially liberal Turkish entrepreneurs who served the demand from both tourists and secular Turks. These establishments have recently been forced to close down under pressures from the current party in government (AKP), supported by a conservative, religiously-observant segment of the local population aligned with its ideology (Kızıldere & Günay, 2016). In Hong Kong, the city-state has experienced an acute surge in the number of mainland Chinese tourists, with visible consequences on Hongkongers' daily life. This has generated street protests and "anti-mainlander" sentiments among parts of the local population, a phenomenon which can only be understood in the context of the tense relationship between the People's Republic of China and the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, and of the rise of localist and nativist sentiments, and intensification of identity politics, in Hong Kong (Garrett, 2016).

Finally, criticisms have also come from an unlikely set of actors: tourism industry representatives or tourism growth advocates who have become increasingly concerned about the economic sustainability of their "destination" and/or the reputation of their trade (Novy, 2016). These actors would certainly reject the portrayal of tourism as inherently destructive and exploitative. But they too have become critical of the way tourism is dealt with in many cities' political arenas. A

prominent example is Taleb Rifai, the former Secretary-General of the UNWTO, who declared at the 2017 UNWTO Ministers' Summit that the proliferation of protests against tourism in cities should be taken as a "wake-up call", and is in part attributable to a lack of adequate planning and understanding of the needs of recipient populations (UNWTO, 2017).

4. Confronting protest and resistance in the tourist city: policy responses so far

We end this review by briefly discussing how policy-makers and the tourism industry have reacted and responded to the above-mentioned developments so far, and whether the governance of tourism in cities has changed as a result. An answer to this question can only be provisional at this stage. We tentatively suggest that four broad types of responses have been witnessed to date:

    (i)   The "ignore and do nothing" approach, i.e. a mere continuation of "business as usual" typically prioritizing tourism growth;

    (ii)   Often as a corollary to the former: attempts to delegitimize critiques and protests by casting them as "tourism-phobic", reactionary, dangerous for economic prosperity, and/or self-centred;

    (iii)   Smaller adjustments in policy and symbolic gestures that purport to mitigate selected impacts and/or make tourism more "sustainable";

    (iv)   More substantial political actions and policy responses aimed at changing the governance of tourism in its procedural and/or substantive aspects.

The four broad types of responses should not be viewed as separate or mutually exclusive: they often overlap to a degree, not least because different actors within a city's political, administrative and economic elite may hold different views on the matter and sustain different agendas which may be running in parallel – and often in tension – with one another.

The "ignore and do-nothing" approach (Type i) is widespread where no significant pressure exists to change the way tourism is approached, or where the local economic growth model is heavily dependent on tourism as a sector. The post-2008 economic and financial crisis and subsequent "austerity politics" have tended to reinforce the priority given to tourism as a key sector of the urban economy in many cities, particularly in Southern Europe and other "peripheral economies" (Cócola Gant, 2018). In that context, social mobilisations questioning the impacts and size of tourism may find it challenging to significantly change public opinion, as had been the case in Lisbon until recently (although the Barcelona and Mallorca examples are a recent proof of the contrary). In those contexts, the lack of policy responses is often accompanied by attempts from hegemonic actors to delegitimize voices critical of tourism, discredit protest movements, and stifle public debate about conflictual issues (type ii): (some of) the local media, key actors in the tourism industry and many policy-makers often accuse "tourism critics" of selfishness, hypocrisy, parochialism, intolerance or even xenophobia, and argue that their critiques threaten the economic prosperity of the city. This seems to occur especially when social mobilisations are considered a real threat by those who want to maintain "business as usual", or when there is a strong degree of collusion or proximity between major interests in the mass tourism industry and the local political elite.

This has been particularly manifest in Spain, where the neologism *turismofobia* ("tourism-phobia") has been increasingly used – mostly pejoratively – in the Spanish media (Milano, 2017)

to delegitimize the claims of concerned residents and social movements critical of the impacts of mass tourism. Tourism-phobia denotes an irrational fear, hatred or aversion towards tourists. It is a charge that most of the accused would dismiss as absurd: as shown in this paper, it is intellectually dishonest to subsume the variety of social mobilisations around tourism under such a label. Such mobilisations rarely target tourists as such (which does not prevent derogatory slogans, graffiti or statements or isolated occurrences of intimidation and vandalism), and they are, as shown, frequently part of struggles around broader urban issues. In response to such accusations, the majority of activists involved go to great lengths to clarify that they do not object to tourists or tourism as such, but to its increasing size, impacts on urban spaces and people, and to the lack of governance and regulation of its negative externalities. Moreover, it is worth noting that in some of the European and North-American cities where vocal coalitions of grassroots initiatives have emerged against the impacts of mass tourism flows – and been accused of intolerance –, many of the activists and organisations involved come from Left-wing social movements or political traditions which have, in parallel, been defending the welcoming of refugees or migrants in their city (e.g. in Berlin, Barcelona, or San Francisco) (Burgen, 2018).

Type iii corresponds to the responses recently articulated by some tourism industry players and tourism advocates who have taken notice of the challenges and conflicts which (too much) tourism creates. Concerns about excessive pressures in smaller heritage cities had been addressed for some time, but they are now acknowledged in relation to a wider range of urban destinations. The 2017 UNWTO Ministers' Summit was dedicated to the issue of "overtourism" and called for more coordinated action on this issue. Overtourism was the focus of specific sessions at the largest international trade fairs in the sector, the ITB Berlin and the World Travel and Tourism Council's Global Summit in early 2018. From the perspective of these actors, "overtourism" constitutes a misnomer for what they perceive as the failure of relevant stakeholders to properly plan and manage for tourism. Sticking to the old mantra that "growth is good and more of it is desirable", social conflicts are seen as resolvable through proper institutional competency, planning and management. Little emphasis is given to the inherently political nature of tourism development, as well as the fact that all destinations do have a carrying capacity in terms of infrastructure, resources and space, and that some of them may have reached - or exceeded – that capacity. In their narrative, growth is, as Taleb Rifai (cited in UNWTO, 2017) put it, "not the enemy; it's how we manage it that counts", while alternative voices critiquing growth or taking issue with the political-economic underpinnings of this growth (e.g. the uneven power relations or the dynamics of commodification and exploitation that underlie it), are marginalised or rendered invisible. In line with recent accounts of the "post-political", the issues at stake are portrayed as a "question of expert knowledge and not of political position" (Swyngedouw, 2010, p. 225), implying that most of the "problems" associated with (urban) tourism could be effectively tackled through more and better "destination management" alone.

The same could be said of many local strategies that purport to address particular impacts and/or make tourism more "sustainable". Berlin's recently overhauled tourism strategy is a case in point (SenWEB, 2018): it includes provisions to address adverse impacts, but these are mostly small-scale changes, and hardly amount to an overall shift in direction. Careful not to antagonize vested interests, it effectively depoliticizes many of the problems over tourism the city faces, by reframing them as challenges which can be met by moving tourists from congested to less congested locations, investing into the use of technology to measure and manage the impact of tourist flows,

and building awareness among locals of the benefits of tourism (Mattern, 2018). The same critiques have been addressed to the measures taken by Venice's municipal government to manage mass tourism, as illustrated by the recent controversies around access gates erected at key sites to channel pedestrian flows (Brunton, 2018).

Finally, in rare cases, some city governments have attempted to drive a more significant change in the governance of tourism. The Barcelona case is the most salient, where civic activism has recently successfully challenged pro-tourism urban regimes and influenced public policy (Russo & Scarnato, 2018). Since the mid-2000s, residents' associations had increasingly campaigned around the negative impacts of tourism. The issue became explosive in the summer of 2014, during which a prominent Barcelona housing activist, Ada Colau, wrote an opinion piece in the *Guardian* newspaper to explain why "mass tourism can kill a city" (Colau, 2014: np). A year later, following the May 2015 municipal elections, she became Barcelona's new mayor, as the figurehead of a newly created citizen platform strongly rooted in urban social movements, *Barcelona en Comú*, which obtained 11 out of 41 councillors' seats. Its manifesto promised to tackle inequality, guarantee access to housing, democratize local governance, and promote a change in the city's urban development model, in particular the governance of tourism. The implementation of this political agenda proved challenging, yet a number of measures were taken to signal an apparent change in tourism policy. In July 2015, a controversial one-year moratorium on new hotel construction and new licenses for short-term rentals was voted. In January 2017 the City Council produced a *Strategic Tourism Plan* - an attempt to develop a cross-sectorial approach to govern tourism to "guarantee the general interest of the city" and enable "the conciliation between visits and tourist practices with permanent living in the city" (Ajuntament de Barcelona, 2017, p. 5). In parallel, a *Special Plan for Tourist Accommodation* (PEUAT) was prepared, accompanied by a significant increase in inspection and enforcement resources to curb the growth of short-term rentals. The actual effects of those measures on the ground are, at the time of writing, not yet clear, and remain contested by multiple actors and vested interests. While the city government has been, since 2015, sympathetic to grassroots movements and has taken steps to seek to "govern" tourism for the greater good, the reality of increasing tourist flows seems unstoppable, and many of their adverse impacts seem difficult to regulate, control or tame.

5. Conclusion

Two narratives dominate media reporting about the rise of (urban) tourism-related conflicts and contestations. The first portrays them as a battle between David and Goliath in which brave communities stand up to the mighty juggernaut that is mass tourism to defend their identity, integrity, and quality of life. The second diagnoses a rise of "tourism-phobia" akin to xenophobia and portrays groups and individuals contesting tourism as selfish and intolerant. However, the growing body of research and evidence briefly reviewed here paints a more nuanced picture. It reveals a considerable range, diversity and heterogeneity of struggles and conflicts. Movements contesting tourism differ from city to city, as well as within cities, and are internally more heterogeneous and complex than often assumed. They do not only reveal a tension between "hosts" and "guests", but often reflect wider struggles, including, most notably, struggles over the socio-spatial restructuring of particular neighbourhoods and who has a "right" to live in, and enjoy, the city, its urban spaces and the socio-economic benefits of the visitor economy.

While we have outlined a number of key trends which create the preconditions for social mobilisations around tourism to occur, more detailed research is needed to explain *why* they take place in some cities and not others, paying attention to specific national and local political, economic, social and institutional factors. The scale of tourist flows in relation to a city's size (captured by the notion of "over-tourism") might be a key variable, but not the only one. The "politicization from below" of urban tourism is not systematic, and has not happened (yet) in many highly visited cities. In times of economic crisis and uncertainty, the perception of the positive impacts of tourism may actually increase (Garau-Vadell et al., 2018), even if local manifestations of contestation emerge among *some* segments of the local population. We cannot therefore speak of a global "revolt against tourism" (Becker, 2015).

In today's interconnected world, the consequences of increasing visitor flows on cities, their urban fabric, housing markets, public spaces, and social relations, are significant, for good and for bad. This underscores the need for more scholarly, activist and policy engagement with the complex, socially conflictual and political nature of tourism in cities. Cross-disciplinary research needs to be encouraged through more linkages between the largely discrete yet interconnected disciplines making up the broad fields of "urban studies" and "tourism studies" (sociology, politics, geography, anthropology, cultural studies, planning, tourism management), and through increasing dialogue between scholars working on neighbourhood change, gentrification, urban social movements, mobility, tourism, and urban politics.

In terms of policy- and action-oriented research, major questions to be addressed include: How do we envision new forms of (state, community and market-led) regulations of the visitor economy in both substantive and procedural terms? What kinds of alternative, more socially equitable and environmentally sustainable approaches can be proposed? What future changes in tourism are to be expected from recent and ongoing innovations in transport and digital technologies, and what kinds of opportunities and challenges do these changes present? In which contexts are tourism practices relatively well integrated into urban spaces and societies, and under which conditions? Is this related to a question of scale and nature of tourism flows and practices, or of public policy and regulation? How do we balance, in ethical terms, the necessary protection of the rights of "local" residents and businesses with the "right to mobility" of others, within a broader cosmopolitan and relational outlook on places? For critical scholars, progressive policy-makers and grassroots mobilisations, a significant challenge will be to "shift the question from "'how to protect the city from tourism' into 'how do we compose the city along with tourism', and thus eschewing a logic of dualism (tourists vs locals) in the production of tourist places" (Arias-Sans & Russo, 2016, p. 248).

References:

Ajuntament de Barcelona (2017). *Turisme 2020 Barcelona. Una estratègia col·lectiva per un turisme sostenible*. Barcelona: Direcció de Turisme.

Arias-Sans, A., & Russo, A. P. (2016). The right to Gaudí. What can we learn from the commoning of Park Güell, Barcelona? In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 247–263). London: Routledge.

Arkaraprasertkul, N. (2016). The abrupt rise (and fall) of creative entrepreneurs: socio-economic change, the visitor economy and social conflict in a traditional neighbourhood of Shanghai. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 282–301). London: Routledge.

Becker, E. (2015, July 19). The revolt against tourism. *New York Times.* Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/19/opinion/sunday/the-revolt-against-tourism.html

Bell, D. (2008). Destination drinking: toward a research agenda on alcotourism. *Drugs: Education, Prevention and Policy, 15*(3), 291–304.

Bock, K. (2015). The changing nature of city tourism and its possible implications for the future of cities. *European Journal of Futures Research, 3*(1), 1–8.

Brenner, N., & Theodore, N. (2002). Cities and the geographies of "actually existing of neoliberalism". *Antipode, 34*, 349–379.

Brenner N., Marcuse, P., & Mayer, M. (Eds.). (2012). *Cities for people, not for profit*. London: Routledge.

Broudehoux, A.-M. (2016). Favela tourism: negotiating visitors, socio-economic benefits, image and representation in pre-Olympics Rio de Janeiro. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and Resistance in the Tourist City* (pp. 191–209). London: Routledge.

Brunton, J. (2018, May 1). Venice poised to segregate tourists as city braces itself for May Day "invasion". *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/travel/2018/may/01/venice-to-segregate-tourists-in-may-day-overcrowding

Burgen, S. (2018, June 25). 'Tourists go home, refugees welcome': why Barcelona chose migrants over visitors. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2018/jun/25/tourists-go-home-refugees-welcome-why-barcelona-chose-migrants-over-visitors

Burns, P. M., & Novelli, M. (Eds.). (2007). *Tourism and politics*. Philadelphia: Elsevier.

Capanema Alvares, L., Mol Bessa, A. S., Pinto Barbosa, T., & Machado de Castro Simão, K. (2016). Attracting international tourism through mega-events and the birth of a conflict culture in Belo Horizonte. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 227–246). London: Routledge.

Chang, T. C. (1997). From "instant Asia" to "multi-faceted jewel": urban imaging strategies and tourism development in Singapore. *Urban Geography, 18*(6), 542–562.

Cócola Gant, A. (2016). Holiday rentals: The new gentrification battlefront. *Sociological Research Online, 21*(3). Retrieved from http://www.socresonline.org.uk/21/3/10.html

Cócola Gant, A. (2018). Tourism gentrification. In L. Lees & M. Phillips (Eds.), *Handbook of gentrification studies* (pp. 281–293). Cheltenham and Northampton: Edward Elgar.

Colau, A. (2014, September 2). Mass tourism can kill a city – just ask Barcelona's residents. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2014/sep/02/mass-tourism-kill-city-barcelona

Coldwell, W. (2015, October 8). Tourism or propaganda: how ethical is your North Korean holiday? *The Guardian.* Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/travel/2015/oct/08/north-korean-tourism-ethics

Coldwell, W. (2017, August 10). First Venice and Barcelona: now anti-tourism marches spread across Europe. *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/travel/2017/aug/10/anti-tourism-marches-spread-across-europe-venice-barcelona

Colomb, C., & Novy, J. (Eds.). (2016). *Protest and resistance in the tourist city*. London: Routledge.

Dearden, L. (2018, August 5). Anarchist group threatens new attacks on tourists in Spain after targeting Barcelona and Mallorca. *The Independent*. Retrieved from https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/tourist-attacked-spain-anarchists-british-bus-barcelona-palma-de-mallorca-arran-restaurants-a7878226.html

Dredge, D. (2017). "Overtourism". Old wine in new bottles? Retrieved from https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/overtourism-old-wine-new-bottles-dianne-dredge

Elsheshtawy, Y. (2009). *Dubai: Behind an urban spectacle*. London: Routledge.

Fainstein, S., Hoffman, L., & Judd, D. (2003). Introduction. In L. Hoffman, S. Fainstein, & D. Judd (Eds.), *Cities and visitors: Regulating people, markets, and city space* (pp. 1–19). Oxford: Blackwell.

Garau-Vadell, J. B., Gutierrez-Taño, D., & Diaz-Armas, R. (2018). Economic crisis and residents' perception of the impacts of tourism in mass tourism destinations. *Journal of Destination Marketing & Management*, *7* (March), 68–75.

Garrett, D. (2016). Contesting China's tourism wave. Identity politics, protest, and the rise of the Hongkong city state movement. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 107–129). London: Routledge.

Giniger, H. (1973, August 25). Spaniards begin to lose their enthusiasm for that rising deluge of tourists. *New York Times*, p. 25.

Gotham, K. F. (2005). Tourism gentrification: The case of New Orleans' Vieux Carré (French Quarter). *Urban Studies, 42*(7), 1099–1121.

Gravari-Barbas, M., & Guinand, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Tourism and gentrification in contemporary metropolises. International perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Gravari-Barbas, M., & Jacquot, S. (2016). No conflict? Discourses and management of tourism-related tensions in Paris. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 31–51). London: Routledge.

Guttentag, D. (2015). Airbnb: disruptive innovation and the rise of an informal tourism accommodation sector. *Current issues in Tourism, 18*(12), 1192–1217.

Hall, C. M., & Jenkins J. M. (2004). Tourism and public policy. In A. A. Lew, C. M. Hall & A. M. Williams (Eds.), *Companion to tourism* (pp. 525–540). Oxford: Blackwell.
Hannam, K. (2009). The end of tourism? Nomadology and the mobilities paradigm. In J. Tribe (Ed.), *Philosophical issues in tourism* (pp. 101–113). Clevedon: Channel View.

Harvey, D. (1989). From managerialism to entrepreneurialism: the transformation in urban governance in late capitalism, *Geografiska Annaler*, *71*B, 3–17.

Harvey, D. (2012). *Rebel cities*. London: Verso Books.

Huffington Post Canada (2012, May 12). Berlin tourist hate: gentrification fuels battle between locals and travelers. Retrieved from http:// www.huffingtonpost.ca/2012/12/05/berlin-tourist-hate_n_2240869.html

Hughes, N. (2018). "Tourists go home": anti-tourism industry protest in Barcelona, *Social Movement Studies*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1080/14742837.2018.1468244

IPK International (2016). *ITB World Travel Trends Report 2015-6*. Berlin: Messe Berlin GmbH.

Jafari, J. (2001). The scientification of tourism. In V. L. Smith & M. Brent (Eds.), *Hosts and guests revisited: Tourism issues of the 21st century* (pp. 28–41). New York: Cognizant Communication Corporation.

Janoschka, M., Sequera, J., & Salinas, L. (2014). Gentrification in Spain and Latin America - a critical dialogue. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research, 38*(4), 1234–1265.

Judd, D. & Fainstein, S. (Eds.). (1999) *The tourist city*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Kızıldere, D., & Günay, Z. (2016, July). *Hate gentrification, love the gentrifier: conservative resistance in Tophane*. Paper presented at the RC21 Annual Conference, Mexico City, Mexico. Retrieved from http://rc21-mexico16.colmex.mx/images/abstracts/stream19/stream19-panel1-kizildere.pdf

Klein, R. A., & Sitter, K. C. (2016). Troubled seas: The politics of activism related to the cruise industry. *Tourism in Marine Environments*, *11*(2-3), 146–158.

Larsen, J. (2008). De- exoticizing tourist travel: everyday life and sociality on the move. *Leisure Studies*, *27*(1), 21–34.

Lauermann, J. (2016). Politics as early as possible: democratising Olympics by contesting Olympic bids. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 210–226). London: Routledge.

Lederman, J. (2016). Of artisans, antique dealers, and ambulant vendors: culturally stratified conflicts. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 264–281). London: Routledge.

Lefebvre, H. (1996[1968]). The right to the city. In E. Kofman & E. Lebas (Eds. and Trans.), *Writing on cities* (pp. 63-181). Oxford: Blackwell. Originally published as *Le droit à la ville*. Paris: Anthropos.

Luger, J. D. (2016). The living vs. the dead in Singapore: contesting the authoritarian tourist city. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 302–319). London: Routledge.

Marcuse, P. (2009). From critical urban theory to the right to the city. *City*, *13*(2-3), 185–197.

Mattern, P. (2018). Die Touristifizierung Berlins. *MieterEcho*, 395, 4–5.

Mayer, M. (2009). The "Right to the City" in the context of shifting mottos of urban social movements. *City, 13*(2-3), 362–374.

Mayer, M. (2013). First world urban activism. Beyond austerity urbanism and creative city politics. *City, 17*(1), 5–19.

McCabe, S. (2005). "Who is a tourist?" A critical review. *Tourist Studies, 5*(1), 85–106.

McCann, E. J. (2013). Policy boosterism, policy mobilities, and the extrospective city. *Urban Geography, 34*(1), 5–29.

Mendes, L. (2018). Tourism gentrification in Lisbon: The panacea of touristification as a scenario of a post-capitalist crisis. In I. David (Ed.), *Crisis, austerity and transformation: How disciplinary neoliberalism is changing Portugal* (pp. 25–46). London: Lexington.

Milano, C. (2017). *Overtourism y Turismofobia: Tendencias globales y contextos locales / Overtourism and Tourismphobia: Global trends and local contexts.* Barcelona: Ostelea School of Tourism & Hospitality.

Miller, B., & Nicholls, W. (2013). Social movements in urban society: The city as a space of politicization. *Urban Geography, 34*(4), 452–473.

Morar em Lisboa (2017). *To build a Lisbon for all! Open Letter to the Government, Deputies, the Lisbon City Hall and Citizens*. Retrieved from http://moraremlisboa.org/open-letter-living-in-lisbon/

Mullins, P. (1991). Tourism urbanization. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *15*(3), 326–342.

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. (2011). Kreuzberg's multi- and intercultural realities. Are they assets? In V. Aytar & J. Rath (Eds.), *Gateways to the urban economy: Ethnic neighborhoods as places of leisure and consumption* (pp. 68–85). London: Routledge.

Novy, J. (2016). The selling (out) of Berlin and the de- and re-politicization of urban tourism in Europe's "Capital of Cool". In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 52–72). London: Routledge.

Novy, J. (2018). Urban tourism as a bone of contention: four explanatory hypotheses and a caveat, *International Journal of Tourism Cities.* Advance online publication. doi: https://www.emeraldinsight.com/doi/abs/10.1108/IJTC-01-2018-0011

Novy, J., & Colomb, C. (2016). Urban tourism and its discontents: an introduction. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 1–30). London: Routledge.

O'Leary, N. (2018, August 4). Sex, drugs and puke: partygoers turn Amsterdam into an "urban jungle". *The Guardian*. Retrieved from https://www.theguardian.com/world/2018/aug/04/amsterdam-british-tourists-overwhelmed-bad-behaviour

Opillard, F. (2016). From San Francisco's "Tech Boom 2.0" to Valparaíso's UNESCO World Heritage Site: resistance to tourism gentrification in a comparative political perspective. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 129–151). London: Routledge.

Pacione, M. (2005). Dubai. *Cities*, *22*(3), 255–265.

Pinkster, F. M., & 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.

Pixová, M., & Sládek, J. (2016). Touristification and awakening civil society in post-socialist Prague. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp. 73–89). London: Routledge.

Reisinger, Y., & Turner, L. (2012). *Cross-cultural behaviour in tourism*. London: Routledge.

Russo, A. P., & Scarnato, A. (2018). "Barcelona in common": A new urban regime for the 21st-century tourist city? *Journal of Urban Affairs, 40*(4), 455–474.
SenWEB Senatsverwaltung für Wirtschaft, Energie, und Betriebe (2018). *Tourismuskonzept 2018+*. Retrieved from https://www.berlin.de/sen/wirtschaft/wirtschaft/branchen/tourismus/

Shaw, S., Bagwell, S., & Karmowska, J. (2004). Ethnoscapes as spectacle: reimaging multicultural districts as new destinations for leisure and tourism consumption. *Urban Studies, 41*(10), 1983–2000.

Smith, P. (2013). In defence of tourism: A reassessment. *Tourism Recreation Research, 38*(3), 362–369.

Spirou, C. (2011). *Urban tourism and urban change: Cities in a global economy*. London: Routledge.

Swyngedouw, E. (2010). Apocalypse forever? Post-political populism and the spectre of climate change. *Theory, Culture & Society, 27*(2-3), 213–232.

Swyngedouw, E. (2014). Insurgent architects, radical cities and the promise of the political. In E. Swyngedouw & J. Wilson (Eds.), *The post-political and its discontents: Spaces of depoliticization, spectres of radical politics* (pp. 169–188). Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Turner, L., & Ash, J. (1975). *The golden hordes*. London: Constable.

Uitermark J., Nicholls, W., & Loopmans, M. (2012). Cities and social movements: theorizing beyond the right to the city. *Environment and Planning A*, *44*(11), 2546–2554.

UNWTO UN World Tourism Organization (2010). *Cruise tourism. Current situation and trends*. Retrieved from https://www.e-unwto.org/doi/abs/10.18111/9789284413645

UNWTO UN World Tourism Organization (2012). *Global report on city tourism*. Retrieved from http://affiliatemembers.unwto.org/publication/global-report-city-tourism

UNWTO UN World Tourism Organization (2013). *Annual report*. Retrieved from http://cf.cdn.unwto.org/sites/all/files/pdf/unwto_annual_report_2013_0.pdf

UNWTO UN World Tourism Organization (2017). *Communities' protests over tourism, a wake-up call to the sector. Press Release 17120*. Retrieved from www.media.unwto.org/press-release/2017-11-08/communities-protests-over-tourism-wake-call-sector

Van der Borg J., Costa, P., & Gotti, G. (1996). Tourism in European heritage cities. *Annals of Tourism Research, 23*(2), 306–321.

Vianello, M. (2016). The "No Grandi Navi" campaign. Protests against cruise tourism in Venice. In C. Colomb & J. Novy (Eds.), *Protest and resistance in the tourist city* (pp.171–190). London: Routledge.

Wilson, J., & Swyngedouw, E. (Eds.). (2014). *The post-political and its discontents: Spaces of depoliticization, spectres of radical politics*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.