

Performing the City

PAUL MAKEHAM

Lewis Mumford, writing in the 1930s, understood the city as a ‘theater of social action’. Mumford’s ideas remain important in the context of the contemporary post-industrial city, in which theatricality and performativity are key drivers of so-called ‘experience economies’. Increasingly, urban planners are attuned to such theatrical notions as the ‘urban scene’ and ‘urban drama’ in framing policy. Adopting interpretive strategies enabled by Performance Studies, this paper gives an account of some of the ways in which theatre and performance are made manifest in cities. It considers some of the implications of urban performativity, arguing that good city planning demands an ethics of performance, whereby citizens become spectators and co-performers in the urban drama.

Lewis Mumford, one of the champions of progressive urban planning in the twentieth century, understood the city as ‘a theater of social action’:

The city fosters art and is art; the city creates the theater and is the theater. It is in the city, the city as theater, that man’s more purposive activities are focused . . . The physical organization of the city may . . . through the deliberate efforts of art, politics, and education, make the drama more richly significant, as a stage-set, well-designed, intensifies and underlines the gestures of the actors and the action of the play.

Writing in 1937, Mumford concluded that:

To embody these new possibilities in city life, which come to us not merely through better technical organization but through acuter sociological understanding, and to dramatize the activities themselves in appropriate individual and urban structures, forms the task of the coming generation.¹

This paper outlines some of the ways in which cities and city life might be apprehended through reference to theatre and performance. Since 1937, of course, our understandings of what theatre and performance are have changed considerably, so Mumford’s exhortations resonate differently in the contemporary context. In particular, the perspectives enabled by Performance Studies provide an interpretive frame for analyzing the urban drama, encompassing not only formally designated artworks, but an almost infinite range of other phenomena as well. A key consideration now, for instance, is the role of so-called ‘cultural economies’ and ‘experience economies’ in urban life.

Commentators such as Charles Landry, Richard Florida and Alan Blum have made valuable insights recently into how such economies function in contemporary cities.² While much of their commentary is interdisciplinary, crossing discursive borders between urban planning and architecture, economics, sociology and cultural studies, underpinning all of it is a recognition that cities around the world are in various stages of social, spatial and economic transformation. Where it was once dependent upon its capacity for economic production and distribution, the post-war, post-industrial city is being radically re-structured towards residential accommodation and cultural consumption. Working against the modernist, instrumentalist legacies of their predecessors, contemporary urban planners increasingly are attuned to culture and creativity as drivers of urban design and redevelopment.

Central components of such cultural activity are theatre and performance. As Charles Landry argues:

the so-called 'experience economy' cannot be ignored – a rapprochement between everyday living, consumption and spectacle shaping what cities look and feel like . . . This process is turning retailing into a part of the entertainment industry, often blurring the boundaries between shopping, learning and the experience of culture. In this process design, multimedia applications, theatrics and soundscapes move centre stage.³

Of course, the theatrical and performative dimensions of cities are, in one sense at least, most easily recognizable in plays and other designated performance events, including street theatre; the agit-prop enactments associated with rallies and demonstrations; festivals; site-specific works; installations; multimedia events; and so on.⁴ Increasingly, city planners and administrators recognize the value of, and demand for, such overtly theatrical activities. In other accounts though, the theatrical is abstracted, such that the city itself is figured metaphorically through terms such as 'stage', 'scene', 'set', and 'drama'.⁵

As instructive as these tropes can be, the role of theatre and performance in urban life is more than merely metaphoric, and the manifestation of them in cities is complex and varied. For the urban stage – in all its material and social dimensions – is shot through with performative elements. While many of these are recognizable in the designated, intentional or 'aesthetic' performances such as those outlined above, 'the performative' is not reducible to those qualities associated with designated performance such as mimesis, intentionality and rehearsal. Sporting events, for instance, figure prominently in a city's performed life, but occupy an ambiguous space between 'the performative' and performance proper, depending upon definition and point of view. 'Cultural performance' as well (variously defined) denotes a kind of 'hyper-theatricality and self performance'⁶ discernible in a variety of public events such as marches, parades, commemorations and celebrations, occasions in which 'culture complexly enunciates itself'.⁷ In a broader sense the physical spaces, architecture and design of cities comprise myriad performative qualities including tension, irony, intertextuality and self-reflexivity; as Edmund Bacon observes, one of the 'prime purposes of architecture is to heighten the drama of living'.⁸ Indeed, cities as a whole can be understood as sites upon

which an urban(e) citizenry, in the ‘practice of everyday life’,⁹ performs its collective memory, imagination and aspiration, performing its sense of self both to itself and beyond.

Good city planning, then, promotes the full participation of citizens, both as performers in the urban drama and as spectators of it, and the most innovative planners embrace this principle willingly. However, certain assumptions inherent in the adoption of theatre discourse by urban planners warrant scrutiny. In particular, metaphors of performance and spectatorship may be explored through reference to contemporary performance theory, which tells us that performers and spectators exist always in a complex power relation, not only to one another but to the place of performance, and indeed to the entire production apparatus (in this case, the city administration). Whilst performers might appear to be ‘in control’, in many cases they are substantially disempowered. So if urban planners are to function ethically, in democratic partnership with the populace, it is incumbent upon them not simply to proffer an extended metaphor of ‘urban drama’, but to consider fully its socio-political implications: Who owns and controls the performance space? What is the dominant discourse of performance? And whose interests are furthered by the performance? As Alison Richards observes:

The culturally complex city requires a farsighted set of cultural strategies which can support diversity, while working to ensure that the boundaries which mark difference remain ‘in play’, rather than solidifying as defended borders. A good cultural plan becomes an expression of the way which the city conceives of itself, the way it remembers its past, lives its present, and wants to greet its future.¹⁰

Performance and performativity are intrinsic to urban life and design. A mobile billboard; an illuminated building at night; a park fountain; an episode of road rage; a store window display; a queue – all of these comprise performative elements. ‘In the modern world of the city, theatricality and performance are what people turn to to create the appearance of a meaningful life’.¹¹ So if it is true that we always find something to give us the impression we exist, then one of the places we find that something is on the urban stage. In *Soft City* (1974), Jonathan Raban describes the ‘intrinsic theatricality of city life’, arguing that public spaces in the city ‘often resemble lit stages awaiting a scenario’.¹² Raban goes on to characterize clothing, buildings, thoroughfares and skylines all in theatrical/semiotic terms, suggesting that ‘this kind of signification, communication, meaning-making, identity-forming, city-making is the “grammar of the city”, and “the art of urban living”’. David Nentwick, paraphrasing Raban, says:

The city is soft, shapeable, moldable, like clay. It ‘awaits the imprint of an identity’. It invites the individual to remake it, and the ‘self’ too; this process, of the formation of identity and the shaping/remaking of the city, is a *dialogic* process [. . .] in which the formation of identity is simultaneously the shaping of the city.¹³

This question of identity-formation is a key ethical consideration here, since one of the abiding challenges for urban planners is to facilitate the public good – access, security, civic services – whilst also allowing for the assertion (the performance, in other words) of individual identity, transgression and difference. The interaction of the citizenry

with public space and infrastructure is a process of self-identification, of performing the self. Richard Sennett, however, also writing in the early 1970s, cautions against the authoritarian or doctrinaire planning regime which may impede the formation of individual identity and the performance of difference. In *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity in City Life*, Sennett argues that ‘disorder threatens personal identity by exposing a person to experiences and information which may call the beliefs and assumptions of that identity into question. Planning is an attempt to control this exposure to disorder, and in so doing create a “purified” identity’.¹⁴ So in order to avoid a bland aesthetics of authoritarian uniformity, urban planners must be alert to, and willing to accommodate, civic dramas of difference and transgression. Citizens must have opportunities to devise the narrative.

One of the principal metaphors upon which discursive constructions of the city often rely is that of ‘the scene’. In *The Imaginative Structure of the City*, Alan Blum examines this notion of the ‘urban scene’, suggesting that ‘if a scene is being played there must be both actors and audience’.¹⁵ Blum’s study draws upon his ‘Culture of Cities’ project, a five-year examination of urban culture commencing in 2000, led by Blum at York University in Canada. (The project takes its name, incidentally, from Lewis Mumford’s book of 1938). Culture of Cities is an interdisciplinary research project focussing on four cities: Berlin, Montréal, Dublin and Toronto. Over a five-year period, it is planned that the project will produce a series of comparative studies on a range of topics, including ‘building and rebuilding, the circulation of artefacts, the arts, the organization of streets, public sites and localities, and citizenship’.¹⁶ One of the outcomes of the Culture of Cities project thus far has been a special issue of *Public* magazine (titled ‘Cities | Scene’) which is:

devoted to the study of scenes; treating these as phenomenal elements in the cultural life of cities. Both memorable and ephemeral, scenes conjugate a history of urban places by enacting a dramatic visibility. They are a measure of the decline, vitality and distinctness of a city.¹⁷

As Ray Conlogue observes: ‘Scenes are essential to creating the local identity of a city . . . It is the alchemy of people, not architecture, which keeps a scene alive. Scenes do need to be transgressive . . . Eventually clever elites recognize the value of scenes and surreptitiously support them’.¹⁸ Conlogue’s point here about the appropriation of resistance is useful. However, his claim that it is the alchemy of people rather than architecture which keeps scenes alive is questionable, for as Raban points out, it is ‘the peculiar relationship between man and material that exists in the continual creative play of urban living’.¹⁹

Scenes are part of what has otherwise been characterized as the *soft infrastructure* of the city, namely ‘the system of associative structures and social networks, connections and human interactions that underpins and encourages the flow of ideas between individuals and institutions’.²⁰ These forms of social exchange can be encouraged through performative activities and milieux. The idea of ‘soft infrastructure’ echoes Raban’s image of the ‘soft city’:

The city as we imagine it, the soft city of illusion, myth, aspiration, nightmare, is as real, maybe more real, than the hard city one can locate on maps, in statistics, in monographs on urban sociology and demography and architecture.²¹

There is a great lineage here. The theatrical city extends back in time to the historical traditions of classical architecture and civic participation. For the ancient Greeks, the idea of the city (the 'polis') was cognate with that of the citizen (or 'polites'), the polis being the institution in which people normally lived their lives. To be 'political', then, meant be 'of the city', to be a human living in complex social structure with others. Aristotle argued that the individual was 'born to live in complex organization with his or her fellow creatures, in community and harmony, through compromise, but united through a common purpose, which is to live a shared life'.²² The Athenian *Agora* epitomizes in physical form these social ideals. In reference to classical art and design, Michael Greenhalgh describes the 'theatricality of Hellenistic art, architecture and town planning', observing that 'theatricality is indeed a hallmark of Hellenistic architecture and urbanism':

It is to be seen in all 'levels' . . . of architectural design, from the first calculating placement of a building or group of buildings to attain the greatest effect . . . to a predilection for abundant sculptural decoration.²³

A particular point of interest here is Greenhalgh's observation that:

The Gymnasium at Sardis has a splendidly festive façade – but it would not have escaped the attention of the ancient visitor that the large columns (some 15 meters in height) are actually monoliths. Not to appreciate the sheer effort involved in turning such monsters on a horizontal lathe is to fail to understand part of the effect the architects were intent on creating.²⁴

What Greenhalgh is describing here in effect is self-reflexivity: the columns theatricalize themselves by drawing the visitor's attention not only to themselves, but also to the process by which they came into being.²⁵

Urban designers and architects have traditionally had the almost exclusive mandate to fashion public spaces. In the main, their craft has been conducted with an acute awareness of the need and potential for theatricality of built form, perhaps most notably the ancients, and those associated with the renaissance and beaux arts periods. More recently, key urban designers and design schools have advocated a re-energized approach to urbanism, a conscious making and re-making of the city according to the pre-industrial conventions of civicness, civic form and space, pedestrianism (walking), and habitation. Notable amongst such planners are the between-war modernist utopianists emanating from the Bauhaus; and the post-modernist polemicists who emerged so forcefully in the 1980s, including the Krier brothers, Aldo Rossi and Robert Venturi. Their influence has been profound in countering the statutory planning systems that have been so destructive to American and post-war reconstructed European cities.

More recently, many practitioners have sought new ways to address contemporary urban design challenges through reference to theatre and performance. Two projects

worth mentioning in particular are Bauhaus' *EVENTCITY* and Alan Read's *CIVICCentre*. *EVENTCITY* was the key theme in 2001 at the Bauhaus Kolleg in Dessau, and it animated a number of Bauhaus projects that year. The contemporary Bauhaus is involved in design, teaching and research, focusing on the city and on 'urbanity' in the broadest sense of the word. It incorporates an ongoing theatre project, and in 2001, the Bauhaus Theatre examined 'the relationships between people and space; the relationship between space provided for theatre and urban space; and the concept of the theatricality of the city':

People have changed the way they live and work. Hence there is a need to think about whether the stage is still adequate as a venue for theatrical work in modern society. What roles do new and different venues play? The concept of the theatricality of the city incorporates the effect of the media and advertising. The question arises of a new role for theatre. An earnest search in this respect will be accompanied by the conscious interlinking of the performing arts with the new media.²⁶

The second project is worth mentioning in this context partly because it foregrounds some of the socio-political dimensions of performing the city. *CIVICCentre: Reclaiming the Right to Performance*, a research symposium held in London in 2003, sought to explore 'the relationship between contemporary performance, civic dialogue and political involvement':

It is timely to consider the relationship between civic intervention and contemporary performance . . . An impulse to reclaim gestures shorn of their democratic resonance, stripped of their political impact and evacuated from their everyday contexts would invite us to consider how we might identify such gestures, how we might recognize them anew, how we might wish to reclaim our right to them, and to the performance they stand for . . . Making a gesture might then not appear such a hollow refrain nor one wholly disassociated from the realm of theatre.²⁷

In recent years, then, the broad set of concepts associated with performing the city has spawned a diverse research and training agenda. Applied performance theory, particularly in relation to notions of urban performativity, informs Urban Studies curricula at a variety of institutions. An example is the Urban Studies programme at Vassar College, which is a multidisciplinary concentration in the study of cities and urbanization. In recent years, it has included a unit on Aesthetics and Urban Social Movements, exploring 'the political practices of social movements as forms of theatricality that display, dramatize, elaborate, and symbolically resolve the social tensions that have brought them into being'.²⁸ There are many other examples of research and teaching based on concepts of urban performance and performativity.

For most of the twentieth century, however, training programmes in architecture, engineering, urban design and built environment were dominated by a modernist and utilitarian approach to urban planning: 'The dominant intellectual traditions which have shaped urban policies have been profoundly rooted in a belief in the virtues of instrumental, rational and analytic thinking'.²⁹ Twentieth-century planners typically adopted functional strategies, attending primarily to the physical dimension: zoning, corridors, traffic grids, height restrictions, and so on. David Harvey describes the

post-war European and American embrace of utilitarianism in which, he says: ‘the modernists [saw] space as something to be shaped for social purposes and therefore always subservient to the construction of a social project’. But modernist architecture – though often daring – was also constrained by this functionalism:

Under the watchful eye and sometimes strong hand of the state, procedures were devised to eliminate slums, build modular housing, schools, hospitals, factories etc. through the adoption of the industrialized construction systems and rational planning procedures that modernist architects had long proposed.³⁰

Increasingly, urban planners have understood the importance of creativity, performativity and spectacle in cities and city-making. Drawing on the legacy of figures such as Lewis Mumford and Jane Jacobs, planners recognize that social processes of interaction are critical considerations for city-making. Mumford, for example, always emphasized the social imperative in urban planning. He viewed the city as the ‘prime location of human intercourse, and its siting, plan and architecture, and its institutions, were the framework of civilization’.³¹ Mumford insisted on the importance not only of buildings, but equally, of the spaces in between buildings, which have their own functions, both aesthetically and socially. Similarly, Jane Jacobs emphasizes social process in urban design. Bemoaning the ‘great blight of dullness’ afflicting American cities, Jacobs argues that processes are of the essence, and that it is upon the social processes of interaction that urban planners need to focus. Like Mumford’s, Jacobs’ work is essentially interdisciplinary. She has no formal training either in architecture or city planning, but her ideas cross such diverse frameworks as urban design and history, economics, and ethics. Her key text, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961) is one of the most influential books in the history of city planning. Opposing the post-war urban renewal and garden-city movements, Jacobs was ‘critical of a planning style that destroyed communities, separated land uses, and rebuilt sterile areas. She argued and fought for an alternative view in which planners aimed to protect neighbourhoods, mixed land uses, and paid attention to design details that matter to people’.³²

Contemporary urban planning encompasses not only physical design, but ‘cultural animation’ as well, and one way for urban planners to achieve this is through reference to performance and performativity. The kinds of insight enabled by Performance Studies confirm, as Marvin Carlson argues, that ‘human culture is in large measure performative, that is, activity consciously carried out and presented to others in order to have some effect on them’.³³ At the same time, cities face new kinds of problems and opportunities, and many city administrations have adopted lateral, dynamic, creative solutions to contemporary urban challenges. Population density in cities is increasing, and while on the one hand we are global and networked,³⁴ there is also a human need – a bio-social and economic need – for individuals physically to interact, to create and inhabit ‘scenes’, as Blum and others have recognized. In other words, people are making fundamentally different demands upon the city, many of which occur as embodied cultural practices taking place in real time and space. Intrinsic to that physical exchange are elements of theatre, drama and performance.

An understanding of these elements is evident in the work of a number of architects, urban planners and designers who have turned to performance to inform their practice:

The exceptional body of work of [architects] Elin and Carmen Corneil . . . resonates with the theatrical and dynamic. They have experimented with scripted design games in real-time and choreographed construction processes . . . Their imperative towards the theatrical has led them to orchestrate the inclusion of a variety of podia, stages and arenas within their works which serve to enhance the activities of day-to-day life and imbue the ordinary life of buildings and people with the theatrical . . . [Their] large-scale urban works also seek to dramatize the urban experience by bringing one through the mediation of reassuring objects, into memorable juxtapositions and immediacies with extraordinary places.³⁵

In one sense, cities have a materiality and permanence which performance does not. To cite Mumford once more: 'Cities are a product of time. They are the molds in which men's lifetimes have cooled and congealed . . . In the city, time becomes visible: buildings and monuments and public ways . . . leave an imprint upon the minds even of the ignorant or the indifferent'.³⁶ In another sense, though, the city is as imaginary and ephemeral as performance, because it is a performance – of individual and collective values, desires, memories and aspirations. In *Memories of Las Vegas*, Michael Peterson argues that an imagined history of Vegas is enacted by its architecture, which invokes historical fantasies with its colonial kitsch, its simulated skylines of Paris and New York, and its stereotypical cultural experiences such as Venetian gondola rides. More than that, Vegas conjures a 'nostalgia for histories that never were':

Tourists use these cultural-historic references to make their own memories. More than spectatorship at formal performances – more even, perhaps, than gambling – visitors follow in the footsteps of earlier Vegas visitors to plan memories, document them, and move on. Not just to see, but to *have seen*; not just to gamble, but to *have gambled*. These goals shape spectators' performance itineraries – the routes that connect street, casino, restaurant and theatre – and thus 'sights', games meals and formal performances.

And of formal performances, Peterson makes the point that Vegas shows 'strive to construct themselves as memories-to-be', producing memories 'even in the performance of cultural memory'.³⁷

Urban performativity, then, enables citizens to invent – through memory, imagination and desire – new ideas about themselves and their relationships with the urban landscape. Landry and Bianchini argue that the most creative approaches to city planning recognize and value the subjective and the unquantifiable: 'memory, emotions, passions, senses, desires, all of which engender motivations and loyalties'.³⁸ Creative cities now are careful to create positive, high quality images of themselves, and have sought architectural forms that reflect this sense of self. This often involves the concerted organization of spectacle and theatricality, a kind of urban planning which endorses not realism, but façade; which models itself not on utilitarian ideas of traffic flow and pedestrian efficiency, but the stage set, the carnival, and the forum – spaces which engage the real and transform it.

Instances of such transformation, as Scott McQuire has discussed,³⁹ include large-scale electronic projection onto city buildings and other public surfaces; large screen TVs in public squares; ‘smart’ buildings skinned with interactive surfaces; as well as new forms of public art involving complex systems of projection and light. McQuire discusses these contemporary developments in electrification, spectacle and urban space, and considers the theatrical impact of electric light on the appearances of the modern city.

Other kinds of performative engagement with the urban fabric, however, occur when individuals perform their own meanings and experiences within the larger urban context. Pedestrianism is an example of this. In ‘Semiology and the Urban’, Roland Barthes argues that all participants in the urban drama write landscape poetry as they wend their own particular paths through the city streets’.⁴⁰ Experienced from below, the city becomes a negotiable and *scriptible* text, rather than a dominating system of power structures. Similarly, in his influential essay ‘Walking in the City’, Michel de Certeau contends that pedestrianism is empowering for the individual, since the ‘rhetoric’ of walking offers a means – a postmodern means – of resisting the large metropolitan power structures, the towers and skyscrapers so characteristic of modernism’s erectile fantasy. Beginning with an assertion of an inherent ‘texturology’ in cities, de Certeau suggests that seeing the city from above has the effect of totalizing it; such a view satisfies the scopic drive to make ‘the complexity of the city readable’. This seeing the whole produces a ‘voluptuous pleasure’. Walkers (Wandersmänner), however, can resist the city’s spatial power structures by writing as they walk, choosing pathways in a text they cannot read all at once.⁴¹

Performing the city, therefore, demands an ethics of performance, a measure by which to foster and value partnerships between the polis and its people. In order for the performative to be embedded and activated beyond the formal theatre building, the citizenry needs access to shared civic space. Performing the city becomes an assertion then of the political values of access, participation and cultural democracy. In claiming this right to public space, of course, it is important to avoid a naïve kind of populism. Rowe and Koetter point out that by surrendering to ‘an abstract entity called “the people” [the populists] cannot recognize how manifold “the people” happens to be, and consequently, whatever “its” will, how much in need of protection from each other its components happen to stand’.⁴²

Nonetheless, the theatre of the city is animated through the collective actions of individuals, exchanging signs and meanings, in dialogue and conflict with one another, seeing and being seen, telling stories, enacting the core rituals of performance. In so doing citizens become fully engaged as co-performers and spectators in a theatre of social action. For this theatre to function in practice rather than as a fanciful metaphor, the city administration must accommodate not only set and props but the performance in its entirety, including the dramas of transgression and disharmony which impel social narratives, and lend substance to shared existence. As Mumford consistently argued, physical organization should always be subservient to social need; accordingly the city becomes a ‘special framework directed toward the creation of differentiated opportunities for a common life and a significant collective drama’.⁴³

NOTES

- 1 Lewis Mumford, 'What is a City?', *Architectural Record*, 82 (November 1937), n.p.
- 2 See for example Richard Caves, *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce* (Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press, 2000); Richard Florida, *The Rise of the Creative Class: and How it is Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life* (New York: Basic Books, 2000); and Alan Blum, *The Imaginative Structure of the City* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003).
- 3 Charles Landry, 'Tapping the Potential of Neighbourhoods: The Power of Culture and Creativity', paper presented at the International Conference on Revitalizing Urban Neighbourhoods, Copenhagen, 5–7 September 2001 at http://www.byforny.dk/conference/charles_landry.htm. Accessed 20 November 2003.
- 4 See Schechner's distinction between 'is performance' and 'as performance', in Richard Schechner, *Performance Studies: An Introduction* (New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 30–4.
- 5 See for example the 'city as a stage' conference, Adelaide, Australia, 2–3 March 2001, featuring Charles Landry *et al.*, at http://www.planning.sa.gov.au/citystage/about_frame.html. Accessed 20 November 2003.
- 6 Elinor Fuchs, *The Death of Character: Perspectives on Theater after Modernism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996), p. 15.
- 7 Elin Diamond, 'Introduction', *Performance and Cultural Politics* (New York: Routledge, 1996), p. 6.
- 8 Edmund Bacon, *Design of Cities* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1974), p. 19.
- 9 Michel de Certeau, *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984).
- 10 Alison Richards, unpublished correspondence, 'The Living City: A Response to the Melbourne Metropolitan Strategy Technical Report 9, *Culture and the Metropolis 2002*'.
- 11 Stephen Railton, 'Third Dreiser Lecture', at <http://etext.lib.virginia.edu/railton/enam312/lects/mari.html>. Accessed 23 June 2003. Railton makes this observation in reference to the novel *Sister Carrie* written by Theodore Dreiser in 1900.
- 12 Jonathan Raban, *Soft City* (London: Hamish Hamilton, 1974), p. 27.
- 13 David Nentwick, 'Notes on Soft City', at <http://www.albany.edu/faculty/dn4377/aeng105z/Notes%20on%20Soft%20City.htm>. Accessed 12 January 2004.
- 14 Richard Sennet, *The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity in City Life* (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1971). The quotation is from David Engwicht, 'Placemaking as a Form of Fundamentalism: Kicking the Certainty Habit', *Network News*, 3 (1999) (Brisbane: Queensland Community Arts Network), p. 20.
- 15 Ray Conlogue, 'Society's Need to See and be Scene', *The Globe and Mail* (Canada, 7 August 2002), p. R2. See Blum, *The Imaginative Structure of the City*.
- 16 Alan Blum, 'Culture of Cities: About the Project', at <http://www.yorku.ca/cities/about.htm>. Accessed 13 January 2004.
- 17 Janine Marchessault and Will Straw, 'Introduction', *Public* (22/23: Cities | Scene), http://www.yorku.ca/culture_of_cities/pucl.htm. Accessed 13 January 2004.
- 18 Conlogue, 'Society's need to See'.
- 19 Raban, *Soft City*, p. 2.
- 20 Charles Landry, *The Creative City: a Toolkit for Urban Innovators* (Stroud, Glos.: Comedia and Earthscan Publications, 2000), p. 133.
- 21 Raban, *Soft City*, p. 2.
- 22 Graham Maddox, *Australian Democracy in Theory and Practice* (2nd ed.) (Melbourne: Longman Cheshire, 1991), p. ii.
- 23 Michael Greenhalgh, 'Hellenistic Splendour', in *The Greek and Roman Cities of Western Turkey*, at <http://rubens.anu.edu.au/raider4/turkey/turkeybook/splendid5.html#romans>. Accessed 13 January 2004.
- 24 Ibid.
- 25 A final point to make in this historical context is the capacity of the stage proper – the designated place of performance – to interact with and to influence the broader processes and manifestations of urban performance. In her critique of a book by David L. Smith about seventeenth-century London, Emma

- Smith introduces the idea of 'metropolitan self-fashioning', referring to 'the reality of the early modern stage, and its capacity to shape as well as reflect social categories as part of the discursive production of a theatricalized London'. So a braided relationship is being suggested here, between the stage proper and the overtly, self-consciously theatrical elements of city life. See Emma Smith, 'Review of *The Theatrical City: Culture, Theatre and Politics in London 1576 – 1649* and *Literature and Culture in Early Modern London*', *Early Modern Literary Studies*, 1, 3 (1995) at http://www.shu.ac.uk/emls/01-3/rev_smi.html. Accessed 13 January 2004.
- 26 Bauhaus (2002) 'Bauhaus Stage', at <http://www.lab-au.com/files/doc/bauhaus.htm>. Accessed 13 January 2004.
- 27 Alan Read, 'Introduction', *CIVICCentre*, at <http://www.civiccentre.org/CIVICintropage.html>. Accessed 13 January 2004.
- 28 Vassar College, *2000/2001 Catalogue Index: Urban Studies*, at http://registrar.vassar.edu/oldcatalogue00_01/urbanstud.html. Accessed 13 January 2004.
- 29 Charles Landry and Franco Bianchini, *The creative city* (London: Demos and Comedia, 1995), p. 17.
- 30 David Harvey, *The condition of postmodernity: an enquiry into the origins of cultural change* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1989), p. 69.
- 31 Daniel Wiltshire, 'Review: *The Culture of Cities*', at <http://students.bath.ac.uk/abodw/bookreview.htm>. Accessed 13 January 2004.
- 32 Pamuk (no initial given) 'Pamuk's notes on Jane Jacobs' contributions', at <http://www.people.virginia.edu/~plan303/pamuk.html>. Accessed 14 January 2004.
- 33 Marvin Carlson, 'Theatre and Performance at a Time of Shifting Disciplines', *Theatre Research International*, 26, 2 (2001), p. 141.
- 34 See Manuel Castells, *The Rise of the Network Society, The Information Age: Economy, Society and Culture*, vol. 1 (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996).
- 35 Michael Milojevic, 'Theatricality in the Work of Elin and Carmen Corneil', 26th Annual Conference of the Society for the Study of Architecture in Canada, Quebec City, 6–10 June 2001 (Conference Abstracts), at <http://216.239.33.100/search?q=cache:NpHF4TmKRQcC:www.architecturecanada.org>. Accessed 17 October 2002.
- 36 Lewis Mumford, *The Culture of Cities* (London: Secker & Warburg, 1938), p. 4.
- 37 Michael Peterson, 'Memories of Las Vegas', in Peter Eversmann, ed., *Theatre and Cultural Memory: XIV World Congress Book of Abstracts* (Amsterdam: International Federation for Theatre Research, 2002), p. 167.
- 38 Charles Landry and Franco Bianchini, *The Creative City*, p. 21.
- 39 Scott McQuire, 'The City as Surface (LA and Shanghai)', *Creative Cities – Cinema and The Built Environment Seminar*, 28 October 2003, Queensland University of Technology, at <http://creativeindustries.qut.edu.au/research/cirac/documents/CreativeCities.doc>. Accessed 1 December 2003.
- 40 Roland Barthes, 'Semiology and the Urban', in Neil Leach, ed., *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1997), pp. 163–72.
- 41 Michel de Certeau, 'Walking in the City', *The Practice of Everyday Life* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984), pp. 91–110.
- 42 Colin Rowe and Fred Koetter, *Collage City* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1978), p. 97.
- 43 Lewis Mumford, 'What is a City?', n.p.

PAUL MAKEHAM is Coordinator of the Bachelor of Creative Industries degree at Queensland University of Technology, Australia. He is President of ADSA, the Australasian Association for Theater, Drama and Performance Studies. He teaches and publishes across a range of theatre and cultural studies, including theatre history, performance theory and practice, and community cultural development.