Urban Studies, Vol. 43, No. 10, 1687–1714, September 2006

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Living with Difference? The 'Cosmopolitan City' and Urban Reimaging in Manchester, UK

Craig Young, Martina Diep and Stephanie Drabble

[Paper first received, November 2004; in final form, November 2005]

Summary. This paper explores notions of cosmopolitanism and the 'cosmopolitan city' to interrogate how difference is constructed and treated in the contemporary entrepreneurial city. This is achieved through a grounded case study of the operationalising of notions of cosmopolitanism in Manchester, UK. This is examined in two ways. First, the construction of notions of the cosmopolitan city in the private-sector place marketing of a new 'cosmopolitan city-centre lifestyle' are analysed to reveal how urban reimaging creates a geography of difference in which certain forms of difference are valued or pathologised and fixed in space. Secondly, the analysis explores the contested ways in which the new city-centre 'cosmopolitan' residents understand and reproduce notions of cosmopolitanism and how this links to the treatment of difference in the city. The paper concludes by evaluating how interrogating notions of cosmopolitanism through a grounded urban case study, linking the textual analysis of urban imagery produced by the private sector to the political economy of the city, and investigating what actually happens in these new cosmopolitan city spaces contribute to the understanding of difference in the contemporary city.

Introduction

Cities today frequently mobilise notions of cosmopolitanism or the 'cosmopolitan city' as a part of their efforts to market themselves and to define particular development paths. This paper explores notions of cosmopolitanism and the 'cosmopolitan city' and how they relate to the way that difference is constructed and treated in the contemporary entrepreneurial city. Here, cosmopolitanism is understood as implying a particular stance towards difference in the world, one that involves an openness to, and tolerance of, diversity. However, while there is much debate around abstract notions of cosmopolitanism, few studies attempt to ground it in particular contexts. The focus of this paper is thus how notions of cosmopolitanism are operationalised in the regeneration of Manchester, UK, especially through the private-sector place marketing of new city-centre 'cosmopolitan' lifestyles and the mundane gentrification practices of the new city-centre residents. Thus the paper explores how notions of cosmopolitanism and the cosmopolitan city may offer a critical lens through which to interrogate the treatment of difference in the entrepreneurial city.

Craig Young and Stephanie Drabble are in the Department of Environmental and Geographical Sciences, Manchester Metropolitan University, John Dalton Building, Chester Street, Manchester, M1 5GD, UK. Fax: 0161 247 6318. E-mails: c.young@mmu.ac.uk and s.drabble@mmu.ac.uk. Martina Diep is in the Department of Geography, University of Cambridge, Downing Place, Cambridge, CB2 3EN, UK. Fax: 01223 333392. E-mail: md394@cam.ac.uk. *The authors would like to thank the three referees for helpful comments which further developed this paper and also everyone who took part in the surveys. They also owe a great debt to their colleagues at Manchester Metropolitan University for their collaboration and guidance in developing notions of cosmopolitan urbanism—Jon Binnie, Julian Holloway, Steve Millington, David Bell and Tim Edensor. Thanks are also due to Rod Allman for his help. Any errors in this paper are the responsibility of the authors alone.*

0042-0980 Print/1360-063X Online/06/101687–28
DOI: 10.1080/00420980600888486

The next section of the paper articulates the link between cosmopolitanism, the 'cosmopolitan city', the political economy of urban reimaging and the treatment of difference in the city. The following section explores how, in the case of Manchester, such processes are linked to a 'normalising' of hegemonic discourses of urban regeneration, central to which are notions of the cosmopolitan city and the definition of 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' forms of difference as a part of those discourses. The main section then first analyses how private-sector place marketing articulates particular discourses in producing the 'cosmopolitan' city-centre lifestyle which also contribute to the construction of a 'geography of difference' in which definitions of the 'cosmopolitan city' value or pathologise and spatialise certain forms of difference. Secondly, the analysis considers how the complex relationships of city-centre residents to the marketed image reproduce or contest that marketed image and further contribute to definitions of acceptable and unacceptable difference in the cosmopolitan city.

The 'Cosmopolitan City', Place Marketing and the Normalisation of 'Acceptable Difference'

'Cosmopolitanism' can be conceived of in a number of ways which cannot be fully explored here (for discussions across a range of disciplines, see Beck, 2002; Binnie and Holloway, 2003; Millington and Young, 2003; Cheah and Robbins, 1998; Ley, 2004; Vertovec and Cohen, 2002; Binnie *et al.*, 2006b). Binnie *et al.* (2006a) identify two key ways of conceptualising cosmopolitanism which have particular resonance for exploring the 'cosmopolitan city'. First, it can be understood as a

> political geography and philosophy of global citizenship ... underpinned by a rejection of citizenship and loyalties based upon the nation (Binnie *et al.*, 2006a, p. 5).

Secondly, it can be conceived of as the possession of a specific attitude and set of skills which permit the understanding and negotiation of cultural diversity. This attitude towards otherness and difference includes a desire for, and openness to, cultural diversity. Hannerz, for example, describes cosmopolitanism as

> an orientation, a willingness to engage with the Other ... [entailing] an intellectual and aesthetic stance towards divergent cultural experiences, a search for contrasts rather than uniformity (Hannerz, 1996, p. 103).

Thus this attitude is also linked to the possession of a set of competences or skills based on an ability to engage with otherness. In this sense, cosmopolitanism demands the ability to be able to perform a certain 'cultural capital' (Bourdieu, 1984) through which people gain social status through cultural practices (forms of consumption or lifestyles) enabling them to demonstrate taste and judgement. Thus one way that cosmopolitanism can be thought of is as "a genuine or authentic engagement with difference, and a practice and a consciousness with a global outlook" or "a practice of consumption involving a particular open stance to otherness and difference" (Binnie and Holloway, 2003, pp. 4, 7; Binnie and Skeggs, 2004; Binnie *et al.*, 2006b).

However, it is difficult to define what a 'cosmopolitan city' should be. This paper therefore follows recent calls within the geographical literature to 'ground' cosmopolitanism to explore how it is understood and deployed in specific, particularly urban, contexts (see Ley, 2004; Binnie *et al.*, 2006b). 'Cosmopolitanism' is concerned with approaches to encountering difference and neo-liberal or entrepreneurial urbanisms commonly ground notions of cosmopolitanism in the planning, remodelling and reimaging of the 'post-industrial' city which have implications for dealing with difference in the city. Thus some authors go so far as to suggest what the cosmopolitan city *should* be. For example, Sandercock suggests that 'Cosmopolis' (as an 'ideal type') can be thought of as

> a city ... in which there is genuine acceptance of, connection with, and respect and space for the cultural other, and ... the possibility of a togetherness in difference (Sandercock, 2003, p. 2).

From this perspective, the implication is that the 'cosmopolitan city' should offer exciting encounters with difference and that those who live cosmopolitan lifestyles will be able and willing to negotiate and perform these encounters. Placing emphasis on this particular interpretation of cosmopolitanism could be contested, but this paper takes the stance that it offers an important starting-point for exploring the phenomenon of the 'cosmopolitan city'. This paper thus seeks to contribute to recent literature which has also explored this conceptualisation of cosmopolitanism in a range of urban contexts—in Australia and New Zealand (Latham, 2003; Ley, 2004; Rofe, 2003), in the UK and Europe (Binnie *et al.*, 2006b; Binnie and Skeggs, 2004; Sandercock, 2003; Szerzsynski and Urry, 2002; Pécoud, 2004), in Asia (Law, 2002; Yeoh, 2004; Tan and Yeoh, 2006) and in North America (Sandercock, 2003; Germain and Radice, 2006).

Taking this view of cosmopolitanism allows the development of a critical perspective towards the cosmopolitan city. Cosmopolitanism as a concept is now much more widely embedded in academic, policy, business, media or 'popular' discourses about the contemporary city (for a discussion, see Binnie *et al.*, 2006a). However, recent writing on the urban (Binnie *et al.*, 2006a; Ley, 2004) has suggested that this construction of cosmopolitanism is paradoxical as it implies that there must be some form of 'other' who is different from the 'cosmopolite' and who may not possess the correct attitude towards difference or the skills to negotiate encounters with it. Thus such conceptions and deployment of cosmopolitanism (in this sense) imply that "while difference is sought, this requires a certain subjectivity to be denied or made illegitimate" (Binnie and Holloway, 2003, p. 7; Ley, 2004). Within notions of cosmopolitanism, difference may be simultaneously valued *and* pathologised, particularly where it cannot be easily commodified or consumed (Binnie *et al.*, 2006a). When such notions of cosmopolitanism are grounded in the development of the city, the question is whether the production of cosmopolitan space is linked to a paradoxical displacement of other forms of 'disruptive' difference which need to be excluded from certain spaces. As Keohane suggests

> Instead of the antagonistic encounter with alterity and the dialectical return from (Otherness), new city spaces show the erasure of particularity and the homogenisation of urban environments ... city centres have been reproduced as safe zones for tourism and downtown lifestyles ... they are homogenized spaces, sanitized gilded cages ... from which possibility of encounter with other forms of life has been all but eliminated (Keohane, 2002, p. 42).

Such a conclusion may overemphasise the exclusion of certain forms of difference in the contemporary city, but it does raise the question of whether the production and reproduction of the 'cosmopolitan city' involves a symbolic and material territorialisation of difference, involving a 'normalised' fixing in place of 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' difference. Rofe's (2003) work on Australian cities, for example, shows how inner-city cosmopolitan urban identities are constructed in opposition to an 'other' comprised of suburban 'mainstream' Australian culture (see also Ley, 2004). The questions of what is 'acceptable' difference, who decides this and what impacts this has on diversity in cities highlight the inherently political nature of so-called cosmopolitan strategies. In this sense, cosmopolitanism "points ... to a domain of contested politics" (Robbins, 1998, p. 12; see also Beck, 2002) and is shot through with the multiply contested politics of class, race, gender and sexuality grounded in (urban) space (Binnie and Skeggs, 2004).

Thus critical appraisals of the 'cosmopolitan city' need to explore this differential valuing and fixing of difference in urban space and its potential for excluding

'unacceptable' difference. Notions of 'cosmopolitanism' and the 'cosmopolitan city' are frequently deployed within neo-liberal and entrepreneurial forms of urban governance which link the consideration of cosmopolitan urbanism to how difference is treated within those urbanisms. The issue of what constitutes 'acceptable' difference is thus central to the regeneration and social development of the post-industrial, cosmopolitan city.

There is, of course, a large body of literature which links the development of neoliberal and entrepreneurial urban policy to the exclusion of certain forms of difference. Social exclusion consists of complex processes of marginalisation from social networks, employment and income, decision-making and quality of life which form "mechanisms that act to detach people from the social mainstream" (Giddens, 1998, p. 104). Individuals or groups become marginalised from, or unable to participate in, 'normal' society, and feelings of cultural exclusion form a part of the processes which produce and reinforce this situation (Smith, S., 2001, p. 346). Thus 'entrepreneurial' urban governance and development, the gentrification and reimaging of the inner city, the development of new lifestyles in the city centre (such as 'loft living') and a remodelling of the city centre towards consumption practices are often linked to exclusion, including a lack of political inclusiveness and accountability, the exclusion of those with those with low or no incomes and the socio-cultural exclusion of those deemed not to 'fit' the dominant vision or style of urban development, a process reinforced by the increasing use of systems of surveillance which monitor and control urban space (see, for example, Zukin, 1988; Harvey, 1989a; Smith, N., 2002). All these developments have been linked to

> a sharpening of socioeconomic inequalities alongside the institutional displacement and "social exclusion" of certain marginalized groups (MacLeod, 2002, p. 602).

Thus the "divisive sociospatial effects of neoliberal urban policies" have consistently been linked to the inscription of "new forms of social exclusion, injustice and disempowerment . . . upon the urban landscape" (Brenner and Theodore, 2002, pp. 344, 345).

Many analyses link the increasing disciplining and purification of new inner-city 'public' spaces to the exclusion of individuals and groups (MacLeod, 2002). Programmatic attempts to exclude 'undesirable' elements of society are frequently linked to the entrepreneurial city, initially particularly in the US (Smith, N., 1996), but increasingly in the UK and other European cities (Ward, 2003; MacLeod, 2002; Atkinson, 2003; Belina and Helms, 2003). The rise of the 'revanchist city', with its repressive state apparatuses focused on the poor and dispossessed as part of a disciplinary and authoritarian stance towards the city, has been accompanied by an increase in the 'policing of the streets' with new technologies deployed by a privatised security system which increasingly defines 'who 'belongs' where and what is 'appropriate' behaviour' (Smith, N., 1996; Smith, S., 2001). This can result in the 'cleansing' of public spaces to rid them of 'undesirable' elements to achieve an aesthetic upgrading of city centres for economic ends (in the US, see Mitchell, 1995; in the UK and Europe, see Belina and Helms, 2003, and MacLeod, 2002). Social exclusion also arises as a result of the mundane activities of regeneration organisations which seek to maintain space as 'safe' for the 'public' or inner-city dwellers' lifestyles. Clarke and Bradford (1998) link visions of an urbanism based on private consumption and provision to the systematic exclusion of some groups, particularly those excluded from consumption or failed by the market. This 'domestication by cappuccino', in which public space is improved and 'cleansed' through a combination of expanding its consumption uses and better maintenance and surveillance, can lead to the unintended exclusion of certain groups (particularly non-consumers) (Atkinson, 2003; Zukin, 1995; Miles, 1998). Butler (2003, p. 2484) further emphasises this 'mundane' exclusion when he discusses middle-class gentrified lifestyles as existing

'in a bubble' in which others are 'valued as a kind of social wallpaper', suggesting that the working class has not so much been displaced as blanked out by those who consider them 'not like themselves'. Thus organisations responsible for regenerating the city and individual residents in regenerated areas play complex roles in the mundane exclusion of 'unacceptable' difference.

The consequences of these mundane actions link to Latham's (2003, p. 1702) suggestion that "the diversity celebrated within contemporary cities is mediated, engineered and packaged". The cleansing of public spaces so that only 'acceptable' forms of difference are permitted to use them is associated with the construction of what Flusty (2001) terms 'interdictory spaces'—i.e. spaces which are apparently public but which are regulated and subject to surveillance (such as gated communities, shopping malls and surveyed streetscapes). Interdictory space is

> designed, built and administered by those affluent enough to do so, and with the ... sensibilities of the similarly affluent consumer in mind [but also] functions to systematically exclude those adjudged unsuitable and even threatening ... in maintaining itself through the exclusion of others, interdicted spaces ... redefine the remainder [of the] diverse community landscape as 'Other' and work to exclude that otherness. Interdictory space ... is selectively exclusionary space ... the 'Others' making up the bulk of the city are ... often welcomed in. But only as long as they behave appropriately. And what constitutes acceptable behaviour in interdicted spaces is rigidly defined and strenuously enforced by management. In short, difference is fine, so long as it is surrendered at the gate (Flusty, 2001, p. 659).

The exclusion of difference in the entrepreneurial city is thus the product of a complex set of economic, social and political processes. However, as the literature reviewed here suggests, a further important process contributing to exclusion relates to the way that the regenerated city is conceived of, designed and promoted to certain groups who are deemed to be appropriate to the particular style of development and urban form which is favoured by élites. Thus an important part of entrepreneurial city strategies has been efforts to reimage cities, particularly to counter negative stereotypes and make them more appealing to investors, businesses, tourists, consumers and residents (Gold and Ward, 1994; Kearns and Philo, 1993; Ashworth and Voogd, 1990). This is central to many entrepreneurial regeneration strategies, involving new forms of governance, the remodelling of the city to provide 'post-industrial' functions such as consumption, leisure and tourism, and the reimaging of the city to counter negative perceptions.

This reimaging has grown in importance as cities have been increasingly drawn into inter-urban competition within globalisation and increasing international capital mobility. While initially city authorities undertook simple selling of what they had to offer, they have increasingly engaged with place marketing—i.e. focusing on the needs of the buyer and "adapting, reshaping and manipulating ... images of place to be desirable to the targeted consumer" (Gotham, 2002, p. 1743; on the distinction between place selling and place marketing, see Holcomb, 1993, 1994, 1999). More recently, some cities have developed their strategies into a form of 'branding' (Gibson, 2005; Hannigan, 2003; Evans, 2003), involving attempts to develop the 'cultural city' by enhancing the city with globally branded entertainment and arts destinations and commercial entertainment complexes built around major retail and media companies. The marketing of cities as 'cosmopolitan' is a common strategy in this reimaging and place marketing is an important process in defining 'acceptable' or 'unacceptable' forms of difference within the cosmopolitan city.

It would be wrong to overemphasise the part that marketed place images play in social exclusion. However, while there is a great deal of literature on the divisive socio-spatial impacts of the entrepreneurial city

and gentrification, and on public-sector place imaging strategies, there have been relatively few attempts to tease out the connections between them. As already discussed, urban reimaging is closely interlinked with the political economy of cities and thus its social impact, in combination with other factors, requires further consideration, particularly its role in processes of cultural exclusion. Place marketing produces an oversimplification and stereotyping of places (Waitt, 1999) and such marketed images form "an arrested, fixated form of representation which denies the play of difference" (Sibley, 1995, p. 18). Indeed, place marketing strategies commonly reproduce 'sameness' by using the same stereotypical place images as other localities (Griffiths, 1998). These stereotypical place images represent what powerful groups imagine as the 'right' or 'acceptable' image of the city. Their existence involves the erasure of what are considered 'unacceptable' forms of difference so that they do not disrupt the city's regeneration and reimaging. 'Purified' and 'cleansed' images of city-centre living can thus shape a homogenisation of the city's diversity and marginalise people from the lifestyles that are defined and promoted as 'normal' or 'natural'. In this way, marketed place images act as further banal or naturalised 'interdictory spaces' (Flusty, 2001). Reimaging practices play a role in 'naturalising' visions of city-centre regeneration along 'correct' or 'accepted' lines. As they define, legitimate, naturalise and promote what is 'normal' in the city, they also define 'unacceptable' difference.

The link between globalisation, urban governance, public-sector reimaging strategies and their uneven treatment of forms of difference has been well articulated in the literature. A focus on property-led and particularly 'flagship' developments is held to neglect the welfare needs of the city's citizens in favour of the needs of capital producing socio-spatial differentiation, through creating 'islands' of redevelopment or dual labour markets in the city centre (Madsen, 1992; Hubbard, 1996; Paddison, 1993). Such strategies are accompanied by the disciplining and regulation of the spaces that they sell so that they fit a certain vision of the city and its residents designed to appeal to potential users or investors who form the desired 'target markets' (Ward, 2003; MacLeod, 2002; Raco, 2003; MacLeod and Ward, 2002; Bell and Binnie, 2004). Thus a limited amount of literature highlights how some residents have contested the reimaging of their city because they felt culturally excluded from the new (narrowly middle-class) image portrayed (Boyle and Hughes, 1991; Waitt, 1999; Burgess and Wood, 1988; MacLeod, 2002; Sandercock, 2003; Gibson, 2005). This small body of literature demonstrates that the reimaging of place can contribute to and reinforce social exclusion. However, very little of this research has directly studied how residents consume or relate to this imagery and the literature that does exist tends to focus on social groups beyond the intended target market and their alienation from the marketed image (although see Burgess and Wood, 1988, and Young and Lever, 1997, who study the consumption of place imagery by target businesses). Even less is known about how the private sector engages in place marketing rather than just selling (Eyles, 1987; Marvell, 2004; Gold and Gold, 1994; Ward, 2000; Gotham, 2002) and that limited literature does not address its relationship to public-sector marketing or social exclusion. However, it is important to consider the role of private-sector reimaging in the social impacts of urban development as "privatised and residential images drive a visualisation of the kinds of 'public' that should be allowed to use [urban] spaces" (Atkinson, 2003, p. 1841).

However, other authors have explored alternative interpretations of the neo-liberal and cosmopolitan city and urban reimaging. Studies of cosmopolitan spaces within a range of cities, particularly new consumption spaces, have identified such spaces as sites in which wider forms of difference are encountered and accepted (see Law, 2002, on Hong Kong; Binnie and Skeggs, 2004, on Manchester, UK; Brown, 2006, on London; Latham, 2003, on Auckland, New Zealand;

Germain and Radice, 2006, on Montréal, Canada; and Sandercock, 2003, on a range of European and US cities). Similarly, city-centre gentrifiers are not automatically members of a 'new urban middle class' in the sense of a new distinctive class fraction which excludes others (as Wynne *et al.*, 1998, conclude about Manchester). These studies thus suggest that some cities do incorporate more inclusive spaces in which difference is tolerated, although there are limits to which forms of difference are allowable. Binnie and Skeggs (2004), for example, suggest that Manchester's Gay Village is a space in which there is more tolerance for encountering various queer identities, but that certain forms of gay lifestyle may still be marginalised in this commodified space. Similarly, Latham (2003) argues that new cosmopolitan consumption spaces in Auckland, New Zealand, allow encounters with difference which did not previously exist within the dominant New Zealand culture, although again certain forms of difference, such as Maori culture, still seem absent from these spaces. Several authors (such as Smith, M. P., 2001; Hannigan, 2003; Fainstein, 2001) are also critical of key accounts of the entrepreneurial city which focus disproportionately on a reified globalisation which

> not only fully explains the development of cities but even determines the subjectivity of their inhabitants, without ever interrogating them about what they are up to (Smith, M.P., 2001, p. 6).

The need to avoid an overreductionist approach to the cosmopolitan city is taken further by Latham (2003) with his call to investigate what is actually happening in such new reimaged 'cosmopolitan' spaces rather than simply relating their creation to the formation of a 'new urban middle class' or the exclusion of difference.

In order to do so, following Gibson, research should pursue a

> detailed analysis of textual discourses ... which ... situates these discourses within the material context of both their production and reception (Gibson, 2005, p. 262).

This paper therefore contributes further to recent calls in the literature (Gibson, 2005; Gotham, 2002) for analyses of urban reimagining that link textual analysis with the political economy of cities. As Gotham stresses when calling for such an approach, "outside every 'text' there continues to be an objective yet contested world of exploitative production relations" and thus it is important to investigate the "specific economic, political and social forces that are entangled with cultural images and discursive practices" (Gotham, 2004, p. 1753). In particular, it is important to conduct "studies of media consumption that might reveal spaces of complexity and contradiction" (Gibson, 2005, p. 277) rather than just reading off a simplistic picture of the straightforward reception and reproduction of a dominant transmitted image and resulting social relations. The following section outlines the rise of reimaging strategies in Manchester and discusses the role of the private sector in this process.

Regenerating Manchester as the 'Cosmopolitan City'

Like many other cities in Europe and North America, Manchester has undergone a shift in governance and since the 1980s has developed a series of selling, marketing and branding strategies to reimage the city. These factors, combined with the strong role played by the private sector in regeneration and reimaging, make it an important case study through which to explore the 'cosmopolitan city' and private-sector place marketing. Formerly a major industrial city, by the 1970s Manchester suffered from deindustrialisation, unemployment and city-centre depopulation. From the 1980s, Manchester underwent an 'entrepreneurial turn' (Peck and Ward, 2002a; Cochrane *et al.*, 2002), an approach strengthened through the strategies adopted to reconstruct the city centre following an Irish Republican Army (IRA) bomb attack in 1996 (see Peck and Ward, 2002b;

Williams, 2003). Strategies focus on making Manchester competitive at the European scale, with property-led regeneration and place marketing. Governance has been reoriented towards the political centre and the middle classes. Development focuses on a cultural agenda of 'city living' emphasising service and consumption activities, bolstered by flagship projects, bids for public-sector regeneration funding and the Olympic and Commonwealth Games, and city-centre housing projects for the professional classes. Public–private partnership and the private sector play a central role in regeneration through investment in housing and consumption and by influencing the 'vision' of development and reimaging strategies. Manchester has 'levered in' private-sector investment, particularly in housing, to recapitalise the city centre. Central to this is a diversification of housing tenure and the repopulation of the city centre with residents with high disposable incomes to support consumer-based land uses (Quilley, 2002, pp. 86–87). The city-centre population has grown from just a few hundred in 1989 to *c*.10 000, with projections of nearer 20 000.

Thus the development of Manchester is strongly influenced by the private sector and

> as the agenda was set by the need to regenerate markets in property it inevitably marginalized those whose access to markets was restricted (Mellor, 2002, pp. 218–219).

Property-led regeneration has had little effect on the 'economic dislocation' of the poor (Peck and Ward, 2002a) and has marginalised those with restricted economic capital. An average one-bed apartment starts at *c*.£120 000, while penthouse properties can command over £1 million. Despite this recapitalisation of the city centre, Manchester has considerable socioeconomic problems (Herd and Patterson, 2002; Mellor, 2002) and in 1998 and 2004 was ranked as the third most deprived local authority district in England (ODPM, 2004). Despite initiatives to tackle unemployment and exclusion and increase provision of 'low-cost' housing, there is a highly fragmented pattern of wealth and poverty with pockets of severe deprivation next to the gentrified city centre. Property and consumption-led regeneration plays a large role in social exclusion in Manchester. In turn, regeneration is accompanied by 'revanchist' policing strategies in which

> there are clear links between the pursuit of a particular model of economic development and the regulation of individuals . . . whose activities pose a potential threat to its realisation (Ward, 2003, p. 125).

Thus there is an important role for "non-material strategies associated with the process of narrating change [which] can themselves affect the form taken by that change" (Ward, 2003, p. 125).

This suggests that social and cultural exclusion are shaped by powerful economic processes but that these are intertwined with the socio-cultural processes of reimaging Manchester. Regeneration strategies fused supply-side, market-based initiatives with a concern for "the celebratory and experiential-identity dimensions of the 'soft city'" (Quilley, 2002, p. 77). As a result

> Dominating public perception is the idea of the 24-hour city . . . A philosophy of urbanity, in which the city district . . . should offer everything needed for daily existence, was to frame the policy guidelines. Work and leisure, private and public life, day and night, were to be synthesized; all the accepted . . . boundaries cast away. Cumulatively this pointed to a civilised lifestyle and presentation of Manchester as 'Glamchester' (Mellor, 2002, pp. 219–220).

This new lifestyle image is explicitly based on differences of (economic and cultural) capital and class as "every stratagem is being deployed to tie the city centre into a cosmopolitan circuit of work and play intended to maximise its appeal to investors" (Mellor, 2002, p. 230) while the "emerging preoccupation with culture, leisure and the upbeat presentation of a cosmopolitan, post-industrial city appeal to the city's middle classes" (Quilley, 2002, p. 85). Such visions of the inner city imply a blurring of the boundaries

between private and public space, in which the public space of the city centre, supposedly open to all, is folded into and becomes a resource for a privatised, exclusive city-centre lifestyle.

The need to attract a new city-centre population has led to a focus on gentrification and the marketing of a new city-centre lifestyle, processes in which various 'non-material strategies' play a key role. Initially kick-started by the publicly subsidised Central Manchester Development Corporation (CMDC—an Urban Development Corporation charged with developing an area of the inner city, especially the refurbishment of old warehouses into quality office space) in the 1980s, this process acquired a market momentum of its own (Robson, 2002), reflecting the centrality of the private sector in regeneration. The development of private-sector city-centre housing projects, mainly flats in converted warehouses and factories, has been accompanied by public-sector place marketing initiatives which seek to dispel Manchester's ex-industrial, northern city image and to replace it with a new 'cosmopolitan' city-centre lifestyle. Thus collaboration between the public sector and different parts of the private sector is a characteristic of the marketing of Manchester. Analysis of CMDC marketing material, for example, shows that the top three categories promoted (after quality office space) were quality of housing, aesthetic urban qualities and tourism/visitor appeal and leisure (Young and Lever, 1997), a set of images matched in private-sector reimaging. Public- and private-sector organisations involved in tourism also promote the new 'cosmopolitan city' image (Bramwell and Rawding, 1996). Manchester City Council has collaborated with the private sector to establish specialist marketing agencies, such as 'Marketing Manchester', and thus Manchester's reimaging is influenced by entrepreneurs engaged in shaping the representation of the city (see Ward, 2000). The redeveloped retail core of the city exhibits a degree of 'place branding' through attempts to develop the 'cultural city' (for example, Manchester's lively arts scene), globally branded entertainment and arts destinations (such as flagship developments like the Bridgewater Hall concert venue) and commercial entertainment complexes (such as The Printworks) built around major retail (Marks and Spencers, Harvey Nichols) and media companies (the Universal Studios store).

Thus there has been a convergence of public- and private-sector interests in marketing Manchester. Quilley identifies a 'Manchester script', a common language and conceptual vocabulary shared by regeneration actors

> According to the *Manchester script*, the city has been reborn as a post-modern, post-industrial and cosmopolitan city, standing in Europe's 'premier league'. New Manchester is a vibrant and culturally diverse place to live (Quilley, 2002, p. 91).

Holden (2002, pp. 148–149) goes so far as to suggest that this script has cohered into a "hegemonic project [or 'representational regime'] to restructure and reimagine Manchester's political economy" linking regeneration to "an ideologically invested vision of Manchester as a vibrant, futuristic, and European city". It has been suggested that, in Manchester, image building

> was oriented internally as much as externally. Local politics was redefined in terms which made opposition difficult [and] stressed the overarching notion of 'Manchester' as a place with an uncontested identity and shared goals (Cochrane *et al.*, 2002, pp. 108–109).

and that this approach has been 'normalised' as the 'correct' way to achieve regeneration (Cochrane, Peck and Tickell, 2002, p. 115). Within this process, it has been suggested

> A vocabulary and policy prescription for the city's regeneration has percolated public opinion and become accepted as the commonsense appraisal of the way forward (Mellor, 2002, p. 219).

How entrepreneurialism is performed and narrated may influence the definition of 'appropriate' forms of growth and citizenship (Ward,

2003; Jonas and Wilson, 1999; Rose, 2000) and thus the treatment of difference in the city.

However, while the identification of a 'script' or 'hegemonic representational regime' may do much to capture the strong convergence of public- and private-sector interests in Manchester, it may also overemphasise the pervasiveness of this model of urban development and the 'cosmopolitan city' image. Such views of the development of Manchester are not totalising or adhered to throughout the city. Unlike cities which have experienced organised contestation of new city images, particularly on the basis of class distinction (see Boyle and Hughes, 1991, on Glasgow; Waitt, 1999, on Sydney; Burgess and Wood, 1988, on London Docklands), there has been little systematic criticism of the reimaging of Manchester. *Graffiti* advocating a politics of 'class war' on advertising hoardings for new housing developments, or occasional art exhibits or workshops considering alternative ways to image and develop the city, hint at the tensions between reimaging and socioeconomic differentiation. Further, suggestions that entrepreneurial regimes of city governance define particular forms of citizenship or behaviour are potentially too deterministic and fail to acknowledge how residents might construct their own sets of meanings and images of the gentrified city centre and contest the dominant representations created by powerful political-economic interests. It is thus necessary to explore what actually happens in these new 'cosmopolitan' spaces and how marketed images are received and reproduced or contested. Thus this paper first analyses the role of private-sector place imaging of central Manchester in shaping and spatialising forms of acceptable and unacceptable difference. Given the emphasis on property-led regeneration, this paper focuses on the key private-sector actors involved, such as property developers, estate agents and specialist media companies which market new city-centre properties. The efforts of these private-sector actors to sell properties are embedded in broader strategies of *marketing* the city centre as a place associated with a particular lifestyle. There is a recognition that longer-term gains (maintaining property values and demand) can be achieved through masterminding marketing shifts—manipulating market tastes, opinions and needs and promoting their convergence with urban design and form (Gospodini, 2002). Place marketing involves stimulating want through the commodification of the city (Holcomb, 1994). Secondly, the paper explores the diverse role of the new city-centre residents in reproducing and contesting these marketed forms.

Method

As previously noted, the private sector plays an important role in the reimaging of Manchester and one set of key actors in this sector which is engaged in place marketing are the property developers, estate agents and specialist media companies who market the new city-centre properties. From surveys of development in Manchester, the specialist media and other sources, 48 property developers and estate agents were identified as the key private-sector actors in marketing city-centre living, and 67 multipage promotional brochures were collected from them. Marketing also takes place through newspapers, the Internet, show flats and the performance of estate agents, but brochures are the key marketing product and there is remarkable consistency within them. Content and semiotic analysis of brochures deconstructed the 'cosmopolitan' reimaging of city-centre living. Analysis was also undertaken of the specialist property magazines *Property and Design* (*PaD*) and *Square*^{foot}.

Semi-structured qualitative interviews were held with three key developers and three estate agents. Interviews with 46 residents of city-centre properties were further developed through follow up reinterviewing around specific topics, resident diaries and a focus group. Residents were recruited by a process of 'snowball sampling' starting with residents known to the researchers or the developers and estate agents. Samples of socially linked and thus likeminded people were avoided by using multiple initial contacts in multiple

properties. The sample was predominantly White, aged 20–39 years, dominated by singles or 'living with partner', and those in professional occupations, including self-employed, legal and financial professions, journalism and public relations. This suggests that the sample is representative of those chosing to live in the exclusive city-centre properties which other surveys have shown are predominantly young (or were when they bought the property), single/child-free, professionals or middle-ranking public-sector employees and those making a lifestyle choice (Robson, 2002; Mellor, 2002). The interviewees were questioned about their lifestyles and a randomly chosen sample of brochures to ascertain their views on the 'cosmopolitan' marketing of city-centre Manchester.

Private-sector Place Imaging and the Construction of a Geography of Difference

Property developers, estate agents and marketers are key actors in Manchester's private-sector place imaging. It could be argued that these actors are simply seeking to sell properties in order to maximise returns on investing in the inner city and thus are only being pragmatic in tailoring their marketing to people they think can afford and will want to live in the gentrified inner city—i.e. mainly young, single, professional people. However, the analysis below explores how these mundane actions are complexly interlinked with the spatialising of difference in the city. Gibson (2005, p. 266) notes that efforts to reimage Washington, DC (USA) to attract affluent suburbanites into downtown areas market a consistent set of images about the 'urban good life' and that within these images can be seen "the implicit boundaries of class and income coded within campaign texts". In turning to the analysis of campaign texts, therefore, Gibson (2005, p. 267) stresses the need to understand how the creation of "discursive viewing positions" embedded in texts helps to shape "who, in terms of social class ... these ads think 'we' are" and "how the texts attempt to position readers [of images] in terms of the location they occupy within a social field profoundly structured by class relations". Turning first to how estate agents and others embed certain meanings in marketing texts is thus important in terms of understanding how private-sector marketing shapes the treatment of identity. These actors play an important role in reimaging and marketing the city because, as they seek to maximise property values, they also function as "key intermediaries in the encounter between housing taste and price"—they mobilise lifestyle images to commodify inner-city living as a niche market for the affluent through a process of "luxury inscription" (Rofe, 2003, p. 2522). In doing so, they reinterpret and represent the 'class aesthetics' of this process, tapping into the subtleties of taste differences and the deployment of cultural capital by potential purchasers, a process which can exclude other tastes. Thus their practices may contribute to the maintenance of class distinction and incorporate a 'symbolic violence' over 'others', especially the working class. (This argument follows Bridge, 2001, pp. 87–92).

Developers and estate agents clearly understand their target markets and that, as they attempt to sell property, they are also marketing a specific lifestyle associated with the regenerated city centre. As one property developer stated

> We are trying to tell people that you can live like this, we are selling a lifestyle not just plain and conventional flats ... It's a totally different concept of living. People go for style and are willing to sacrifice practicality, the fact they can tell or show someone they live in a city loft just says it all (property developer interview no. 1).

In doing this, estate agents and developers actively encode their vision of who belongs in the cosmopolitan city centre in a way that reveals their implicit boundaries of class and income

> I know about these types of people [who want to live in the city centre] ... They want to try out city living as they have

> these preconceptions based on a 'Friends' or 'Sex and the City' syndrome. They want to live in a loft apartment and go and drink coffee during the day, then to hang out and to be seen in trendy bars in the evenings. That's what attracts people to city living, we sell it to them ... and people love it! (property developer interview no. 3)

Developers and estate agents see their target market as people who are prepared to buy into that marketed lifestyle. In doing so, they market a 'narrow cosmopolitanism', the ability to conform to certain narrowly defined characteristics which the marketing suggests are 'cosmopolitan'. The target market is thus consumers who can mobilise a certain style of cultural capital. It is assumed that people will aspire to this lifestyle and perform it to reproduce the 'cosmopolitan' city centre. People desire this form of 'loft living' and 'cosmopolitan' lifestyle, it is argued, especially as it is imagined in transnational cultural products such as popular American television programmes. Thus this reimaging shapes urban actors' institutionalising of the idea of 'cosmopolitan' space as marketable and attractive, particularly by creating what Schein (1999) terms 'imagined cosmopolitanism', a narrow cosmopolitanism of a certain kind which can be produced through an engagement with promotional media. This point was further emphasised by some of the estate agents interviewed who appreciated the distinction between cosmopolitanism in its wider sense and how the target markets understand it

> To me [cosmopolitanism is] experiencing other cultures. Being able to accept and enjoy the way other cultures live their lives. Manchester is a city that has welcomed communities from all corners of the world and has become so cosmopolitan in this way.
>
> *Q*: So do you sell city centre apartments based on that idea?
>
> Not to that extent, because people don't want to hear it. They don't mind the western European way, you know, the French lifestyle in particular, because that is seen as classy and trendy at the moment (estate agent interview no. 2).

The 'cosmopolitan' city centre is marked out as different, but this is a form of difference which is planned, legitimated, regulated and commodified as a part of the marketing of the city. What is more, it is expected that people buying such properties will 'live the lifestyle'. In this way, the marketing of 'cosmopolitan' spaces and lifestyle helps to shape the definition of 'unacceptable' forms of difference in the city. Their erasure from the marketed image is a part of the processes in which, as Flusty (2001, p. 661) puts it, there is an "application of a cutely human face to the spaces ... of selective exclusion". This is evidenced in the dominant place marketing images and the meanings encoded within them that have been produced for Manchester city-centre properties, an analysis of which is presented below.

Private-sector marketing of city-centre Manchester is dominated by images of a sophisticated 'cosmopolitan' lifestyle and the reproduction of the 'Manchester script'. Advertising for the Greenquarter development, for example, notes

> the location's propinquity to the theatres, cinemas, galleries, restaurants and bars that have transformed Manchester into the European centre it has become.

At the South development

> buying a home is about more than just bricks and mortar—it's about buying into a way of life ... one of The North's most cosmopolitan lifestyle experiences is awaiting the next purchaser (*PaD*, September 2004, pp. 44, 43).

The marketing material is dominated by a consistent set of images which can be summarised under four codes (see Table 1).

First, the construction of Manchester as a sophisticated, European city is central to the production of a chic 'cosmopolitan' lifestyle of which apartment dwellers with the 'right'

Table 1. The dominant elements of private-sector marketing of city-centre Manchester as 'cosmopolitan' place

Examples of marketed image	Summary	Code
"Professional people can establish a home base within walking distance of their office" "Chic, comfortable living space for the new generation of city dweller" "The young, professional element" "Whether you're young, single or a couple" "For those who value choice in their life"	Professional Middle class Young and mobile Singles and childless couples Predominantly White	The new (young, White, professional, middle-class) urban élite
"Sophisticated, continental style pavement cafés give a European feel to the city" "A city of diversity, Manchester offers a unique cosmopolitan living experience" "Eating out is a truly international affair, with cuisine from around the world" "For the very best in retail therapy and latest designer fashions—with shops to die for" "At the cutting edge of a vibrant music culture and club scene" "A thriving economy which is buzzing with vitality seven days a week" "City of culture, capital of cool … carnivals, street markets and special events" "A wealth of outstanding theatres, galleries and museums" "Loft style living is the lifestyle choice of the moment"	European and '24-hour' city Bars, restaurants and cafés 'Cosmopolitan' culture Night-time economy/night life Shopping/designer boutiques Arts, theatre and music Sports, recreation, relaxation	Cosmopolitan city-centre lifestyle
"Excellent public transport and easily accessible" "Right at the heart of Manchester" "Immense feeling of heritage" "… from the Edwardian and Victorian periods" "The birth place of the industrial revolution—once a proud industrial city" "Historic mill buildings now taking on a new and exciting lease of life" "Combination of urban vitality and waterside tranquillity" "Complete with leafy city park and stylish public squares"	Location, centrality Heritage and history Local landmarks Waterfronts, canals and quays Trees and urban parks	Centrality, connectedness and quality of life
"Experience spacious urban living" "Spacious, airy and light" "Duplex apartments with en-suite and generous open plan living areas" "Striking architecture combined with high-quality craftmanship" "Latest in smart home technology—intelligent lighting, heating and audio" "Traditional design with modern aspiration" "Contemporary design" "Exposed original brickwork, existing timber beams and original industrial features" "24 hour security"	Floor plans Spacious living areas Exterior and interior features Modern appliances Contemporary/minimalist Exposed brick/wooden beams	'Trendy' city-centre 'loft living'

Source: analysis of property developers' and estate agents' promotional brochures.

taste and style can become a part. Images of café bars, coffee houses, nightlife, boutiques, delicatessens and arts and sports signify a predefined and homogeneous 'cosmopolitan' lifestyle. Marginalised groups and lifestyles, however, are excluded from such imagery which makes this 'cosmopolitan' image appear banal and neutral, obscuring economic and power relations within the city. (Although given the commodification of 'gay space' in Manchester, certain aspects of gay identity are acceptable—see Binnie and Skeggs, 2004.) This reinforces the ideology of new urban middle-class 'cosmopolitan' lifestyles as the essence of city-centre living and thus plays a role in the ability of such groups to control and order certain spaces. Engagement with such spaces, the imagery suggests, requires not only economic capital, but cultural capital and the ability to perform the 'cosmopolitan' lifestyle. As the marketing material for one current development proclaims

> Quadrangle is a blank canvas for modern city living. Its style and space is a contrasting palette of vivid colour and calm. Its location is central against the vibrant backdrop of city life. It is the *art* of living in the city (marketing material for Quadrangle development; emphasis added).

The Gallery development claims to be "Making an art form out of luxury living", while in Angel Meadows the estate agent claims to have "created the ultimate style for city living". City-centre living is frequently represented as having been reinvented, providing an environment in which the new urban middle classes can reinvent themselves by performing new lifestyles, forms of consumption and taste, almost on a blank canvas. Social groups which will not, or cannot, perform such a role are excluded from the marketed imagery in case they blemish the canvas of the reinvented city centre.

Thus the marketing material portrays the kinds of people who can live this cosmopolitan lifestyle as predominantly young, professional, middle-class, able-bodied, single or child-free couples, heterosexual and (despite some ethnic diversity) predominantly White. There is an imaging of a 'new urban elite' which marketers wish to associate with city-centre living (see Table 1). Young people dominate the imagery which emphasizes their supposed freedom, mobility and choice. The implication is that such city-centre dwellers have the resources and the cultural capital with which to make the 'correct' choices which cosmopolitan living demands and can perform the 'art' of city-centre living. These 'cosmopolites' are placed centrally in imagery, suggesting control and dominance over the spaces they inhabit, while the stereotypes of 'professional executive' and 'glamorous beauty' (of both genders) also suggest the glamour and seductiveness of city-centre living. The Castlegate development, for example, is for those who are "*lusting after* the last word in urban chic, lifestyle-orientated apartments" (Castlegate development; emphasis added). The 8th Day development markets this lifestyle as about "living *for* the city" (emphasis added) which is "stimulating, exciting, challenging, relaxing". This development is

> Located for living. Designed for life ... offers you apartments to transform your lifestyle, inspire your imagination, revitalise your life. For now. For good. Walk to work. Walk to work out. Walk to watch, to revel, to eat, to indulge. It's all at your fingertips. On your doorstep. Up your street. After all, in the twenty first century, thousands of *discerning people* are asking themselves ... Why rush home in the evening and leave it all behind? Why not live at the heart of things? Why not live life to the full? City-centre living offers so much more (emphasis added).

These images seek to ascribe certain qualities of 'cosmopolitan' sophisticatedness to potential buyers and to the city centre. This is further emphasised by the growth in 'off plan' sales with personalisation packages which allow purchasers to make the space

> very much your own ... by changing the layout ... adding or subtracting rooms ... putting in more light with glass or curved internal walls and ... fitting buyers' personal choice of radiators, lights etc. (promotional article in *Square*^{foot}, July/August 2004, p. 9).

The Edge development is described as "the perfect canvas to define who you are" (*Square*^{foot}, July/August 2004, p. 14), while new apartments at *QUAD* are double-heighted allowing for the purchaser's "artistic flair" (*Square*^{foot}, 4, September/October, 2004, p. 63). City-centre living is thus implied to require a new attitude, taste, discernment and commitment to a lifestyle. Such is the consistency and pervasiveness of the marketed images that such qualities may become taken for granted or 'naturalised' attributes of the city.

The theme of 'centrality and connectedness' stresses the integration of 'loft living' with the city centre and work (see Table 1). Such imagining strategies are used to suggest the ease with which city-centre residents can access, enjoy and perform the 'cosmopolitan' lifestyle within the city centre, reflecting the idea of the '24-hour' city in which work and leisure, day and night, public and private become interwoven. They also stress the connectedness of Manchester nationally and internationally, especially through the airport, but also link to other aspects of this lifestyle incorporating ideas of international business travel and sophisticated, exotic foreign holidays. The 8th Day development proclaims itself as at "the heart of the city ... You're also at the hub of the national transport network ... Manchester International Airport, minutes away, offers direct routes around the globe". This is further emphasised through the use of transnational designers and styles, such as at The Edge development in the former Manchester Docks (now Salford Quays) where "Brooklyn-born fashion designer" Ben de Lisi has designed show flats which "could be Palm Beach or Long Island ... A space that is well travelled and relaxed without conforming to convention" (*Square*^{foot}, July/August 2004, p. 14). This echoes certain highly problematic academic conceptualisations of the 'cosmopolite' as mobile and transnational in contrast to locally grounded, immobile working-class 'others'. (See in particular the argument of Hannerz, 1996, that to be local is to be non-cosmopolitan, and critiques by Featherstone, 2002, and Smith, M. P., 2001.). It is also seen in other gentrified areas where gentrifiers seek to distinguish themselves "by imaginatively disembedding their identity from the local to that of the global" and where estate agents are marketing a "commodified form of globally oriented residential identity" (Rofe, 2003, pp. 2523–2524). Imagery also draws on certain aspects of Manchester city centre, especially canals or waterfront locations, which are locally specific but are a part of very generalised reimaging strategies employed in many ex-industrial cities. Conversely, there is only limited use of Manchester's specific heritage as a major manufacturing and trading centre, even though the majority of these properties are in gentrified warehouses and factories (and this industrial heritage does feature in tourism marketing of Manchester—see Bramwell and Rawding, 1996).

Fourthly, the layout and design specification of the apartments define the 'correct' style for the 'loft living image' (see Table 1). The predominant imagery of apartment design seeks to convey a sense of spacious urban living enhanced by minimalist design styles and geometric shapes creating a sense of harmonious control and order, thus reflecting a more widespread turn to modernistic and minimalist design aesthetics for home-spaces. Style is emphasised in these representations of living spaces through a process of spatial purification involving the excising of objects or clutter that suggest mundane aspects of life. Apartments are marketed specifically as "low maintenance homes" as the cosmopolites apparently believe that "chores around the house and garden are no longer seen as being necessary" (*PaD*, September, 2004, p. 36). Indeed, some apartments even come complete with access

to a "lifestyle manager" to help cosmopolites "realign their work/life balance" and "organise all aspects of their personal life—from sourcing unusual gifts and organising holidays, to managing property portfolios and finding the nearest Kabbalah guru!" (*Square*^{foot}, September/October 2004, p. 51). In this vision, city-centre 'cosmopolitan living' is not 'mundane' but involves the performance of specific consumption and lifestyle choices by 'people of taste' whose lives are almost art forms in themselves. The new Issa Quay development, for example, is marketed as modern contemporary design providing "an opportunity to purchase *a piece of the finest modern art*" (Issa Quay marketing material; emphasis added).

The ordering and the purification of such spaces by the deployment of a particular design aesthetic and the materiality of the household objects represented imply that the space has to be of the 'right' style in the same way that the ability to perform the 'right' style is required of the potential buyers, thus erasing practices which could threaten the marketed 'cosmopolitan' lifestyle. Indeed, the imagery is partly constructed by its erasure of 'other' forms of difference as a necessary part of constructing a notion of 'cosmopolitan' difference. The 'modern as minimalist' design aesthetic prioritised here becomes a normative disciplining aesthetic which structures the vision and practice of urban living but also performs social differentiation. The identification of a desirable aesthetic framework simultaneously devalues other aesthetic formations in the process of marking social distinction and, for those unable or unwilling to perform such minimalism, the status of 'contemporary' or 'modern' is understood to be beyond reach. This distinction is further emphasised and spatialised by the marketing of security features—secure parking, 24-hour security services and gated communities—to create a sense of protection and separateness from the surrounding 'dangerous', 'uncivilised', non-cosmopolitan city, particularly with the 'rolling out' of the city-centre style of development into the wider city, into such areas as Wythenshawe, Ordsall and Blackley.

This reading of the texts of place marketing suggests the encoding of a narrowly defined, class-based vision of cosmopolitanism into the imagery produced. The exclusion of 'other' forms of difference is highlighted here by its absence from this attempt to produce a uniform identity for city-centre living. It could be argued that the image produced is nothing more than clever marketing which works well to encourage demand among its target market. However, through their mundane actions in marketing the 'cosmopolitan city', estate agents, developers, marketers and property investment managers go further in that they actively create *a* geography of difference, in which 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' differences are spatialised in their visions of the city. This is not to say that this process alone is responsible for the social inequalities present in Manchester which result from uneven development and investment and a variety of social processes. However, it is the intention of this analysis to highlight the role of the actions of these key place marketing agents in producing particular geographies of value in the city which in turn feed into other material and symbolic uneven geographies of the city. In producing *a* (rather than *the*) geography of difference, these actors are actively pathologising certain forms of difference, particularly by identifying 'cosmopolitan' and 'non-cosmopolitan' identities for spaces in the city, and this in turn can feed into other geographies of exclusion in complex ways.

In this process, certain areas of the city are encoded as 'cosmopolitan' and as property investment 'hotspots'. However, the production of these cosmopolitan spaces invokes 'other' spaces which are deemed non-cosmopolitan, backward and undesirable. One example is that of Blackely, described in the marketing as "not one of Manchester's more recherché areas". Five former public-sector tower blocks are to be redeveloped on Blackley New Road (four miles from the city centre) and marketed as 'Lakeside'. One block will be demolished allowing the construction of 30 new 'contemporary town houses' while the 4 remaining blocks

(described as "gruesome old council blocks") will be renovated to provide "'city-style' apartments, some of which will be duplexes and penthouses". Blackley is urban, but it needs a particular *style* of development to make it part of the modernising, 'cosmopolitan' city—i.e. the style of the city centre. Crucially

> Lakeside will be approached through electronic gates and a graceful tree-lined driveway ... residents will benefit from a purpose-built 21st Century gymnasium including a sauna, Jacuzzi and steam room. Additional protection and luxury comes courtesy of a 24-hour security and concierge service.

'Lakeside' is thus constructed as everything Blackley is not—a gated, secure, separate, modern/21st century, sophisticated leisure zone which is closer in style to the city centre than its surroundings. Although the development involves retro-fitting high-rise blocks, there is also a clear line drawn between the past and 'unacceptable' forms of living (i.e. 'failed tower blocks') and the present and acceptable forms of difference (i.e. 'city-style' apartments and penthouses (not 'flats')). As the marketing states

> From the three show apartments ... you have no sense of the building's history (advertising features in *PaD*, June 2004, pp. 66–67; September, 2004, p. 46; *Square*^{foot}, September/October 2004, pp. 24–25).

Another example is provided by Wythenshawe, located on the southern outskirts of the city. In an article recommending it as a potential property hotspot, it is suggested that although the shopping centre is "vile" it "will be improved and one day, people won't even recall it was a council estate". Although the article suggests it is a good spot for investment, it notes "don't expect to find Japanese beer and feta-stuffed peppers in the local corner store for a while". (*Square*^{foot}, September/October 2004, p. 10). Again, there is a clear fixing of difference in space in which Wythenshawe cannot be 'cosmopolitan' because it is a council estate and lacks the kind of consumption activities that 'cosmopolites' apparently require to distinguish themselves. This also reproduces the artificial distinction between people who live in council estates as 'local' and therefore 'non-cosmopolitan', and those who can engage in transnational consumption practices and are therefore 'cosmopolitan'. Another article suggests that future property hotspots can be found in "*horrible places* which are going to go up" (*Square*^{foot}, September/October 2004, p. 66; emphasis added), while other locations, such as Longsight, Gorton and Moston, are designated places to "be wary of" (*Square*^{foot}, September/October 2004, p. 10). Clearly, to be acceptable or desirable, places have to 'modernise' in a fashion which matches the 'right' form of development. There would seem to be a class basis, based on housing tenure and consumption practices, to the way in which these distinctions are created. The actions of the marketers of such developments create a geography of value (both economic and cultural) and difference in which 'proper' places are those that are deemed to fit the 'right' vision of urban development. The production of these 'cosmopolitan' spaces simultaneously requires the definition of 'non-cosmopolitan' spaces.

Some estate agents recognised that their marketing practices contributed to a narrow definition of acceptable difference in the city. As one producer of marketing imagery stated

> I never thought about [social exclusion]. I feel absolutely ashamed of myself, because one thing about the city centre is that it is so cosmopolitan. Especially this area, there are a large number of Chinese, Greeks, foreign students and the gay community, but I see they are not represented here [in the marketing imagery] despite a lot of our buyers and investors being Asian. Manchester itself is multicultural, it's the most cosmopolitan place I've worked, and the whole place benefits from that (estate agent interview no. 3).

This view may support the conclusions of recent literature that it is possible to find new forms of tolerance and interaction with difference in some gentrified areas. However, even here it is only certain well established groups and areas in the city centre that are considered acceptable, especially those that are 'foreign' or 'exotic'. These are types of difference which are (largely) accepted in Manchester and which have been commodified and marketed for many years. These include the 'Chinese community', in the form of 'China Town' and its restaurants, and the 'gay community' and Manchester's Gay Village area which is promoted as a night-time venue and an international venue for the 'Mardi Gras' and 'Europride' festivals (and internationalised through media products such as the 'Queer as Folk' television series). This point was also made in the resident interviews. As one respondent stated

> I guess those two are built into the city now they've been there that long ... They've been here for a long time and make a good contribution to the city and its culture like Chinatown with its food and festivals and the Gay Village has its nightlife and Mardi Gras (resident interview no. 32).

Another example is the annual 'Irish Festival'. However, other forms of difference with significant presences in Manchester, notably White working-class culture and areas such as Blackley or Miles Platting are not deemed commodifiable or acceptable. Indeed, media representations of this culture do little to include it in the 'acceptable' face of contemporary Manchester. Popular television dramas such as 'Shameless', set on a Manchester council estate, tend to reify working-class culture in an unpleasant way, while news reporting focuses on crime in such areas, more recently particularly on the high level of Anti-social Behaviour Orders (ASBOs) handed out in the city, making it the media's 'Asbo capital of the UK'. Similar conclusions could be drawn about Manchester's Afro-Caribbean cultural groups, notwithstanding the annual 'Mosside Carnival', and others have suggested that certain 'less acceptable' aspects of gay lifestyles are rendered invisible and excluded from the Gay Village (Binnie and Skeggs, 2004; Bell and Binnie, 2004). Although it could be argued that at least these forms of difference are now visible within the city centre in a way that they were not before, these limitations signal that the production of the cosmopolitan city is shot through with tensions along the axes of class, sexuality, race, ethnicity and nationality.

The 'Cosmopolitan City', Mundane Gentrification and the Fixing of Difference in Space

As Mills (1993) notes, in addition to marketing practices, new images of the inner city also arise out of the banal practices of gentrifiers which may reproduce and conceal hidden oppressions. The new practices of governance rely on promoting and inculcating ethical (entrepreneurial) values within target populations which regulate individual conduct and maintain order by binding individuals into shared norms and values around, for example, city-centre lifestyles, but which also pathologise undeserving 'others' (MacLeod and Ward, 2002; Rose, 2000). The analysis presented thus far suggests that the marketing of the city centre as 'cosmopolitan' implies that the prospective residents will possess the required cultural capital to allow them to perform that cosmopolitan identity, but that this process relies on the construction of an undesirable 'other' who is excluded from these spaces. On the other hand, as we have argued, it is necessary to explore what actually happens in these spaces in the city as they could also be sites of the contestation of marketed images and more openness to difference. The complexities of these processes are explored in this section through an analysis of city-centre resident interviews.

Reinforcing Geographies of Difference

Many residents reproduced the exclusive marketed narrow form of cosmopolitanism

through a series of complex discourses and the performance of the city-centre lifestyle. This can be seen in several residents' understanding of the 'cosmopolitan city', as illustrated by this response

> Well, [cosmopolitanism] is made up of a lot of attributes. There are all the new really classy bars that you can go to. Then there is the fantastic range of restaurants. I mean you can eat French, Italian, Chinese, Thai and Spanish whatever—there is so much variation. Then I think the whole city-centre living with the contemporary stylish open plan apartments and the lifestyle that accompanies it. Mixed in with the really good shops and sort of cultural facilities and events that the city centre has (resident interview no. 14).

While this acknowledges that the city centre now has a broader range of potential encounters with some forms of difference, particularly compared with what was there before, the notion of cosmopolitanism expressed here reproduces the marketed lifestyle through a narrow range of consumption practices.

Further to this, a number of discourses expressed how the reproduction of this notion of cosmopolitanism fed into processes of cultural exclusion. A common discourse was the fear of various 'others' which could be encountered in the city centre. These 'others' included a range of forms of unacceptable difference, but commonly referred to the homeless and *Big Issue* sellers,[1] 'beggars', 'immigrants', certain ethnic groups including 'Blacks', 'Eastern Europeans' and 'Asian men', some youth cultures such as skateboarders and 'Mosher kids', and White working-class difference. Thus a frequent response in the resident interviews was a desire to avoid contact with, and to purify city-centre space of, those that do not fit the 'cosmopolitan' urban script. Rather than an openness to difference, there is a desire to avoid perceived unpleasant encounters with certain other differences.

For example, one resident recounted a particular story about the treatment of difference when discussing the marketing imagery

> I remember once ... in the hall in the entrance of my building a resident who had just moved in was very annoyed about the *Big Issue* sellers and beggars outside on the street and complained that something should be done about it, like the caretakers should just remove them (resident interview no. 23).

Hence there is a willingness to reproduce the narrow marketed cosmopolitan lifestyle and exclude others. As MacLeod (2002, p. 602) suggests, in the renaissance of the entrepreneurial city it is important that "the enhancement of the city's image is not compromised by the visible presence of ... marginalized groups". Flusty (2001, p. 660) suggests that "in spaces targeted towards the affluent ... users demand the reassuringly visible presence of protection from unpredictable and potentially unpleasant encounters with otherness", while Smith, N. (1996, p. 227) further emphasises that the 'revanchist' city is materially divided but more "It is a divided city where the victors are increasingly defensive of their privilege". The remaking of Manchester in the 1990s was reliant on

> a business–leisure agenda in which the cosmetic presentation of the city centre was crucial. In this the poorer people of Manchester ... have no role. To the investors they represent what a city should not be—untidy, shabby, without money, liable to crime. This [is a] reclamation of the city centre for a lifestyle whose motifs are boats, bars and bistros, supplemented by boutiques and balls (Mellor, 2002, p. 216).

Thus here we see how the figure of the cosmopolitan produces an 'other' who is defined by their not possessing the 'correct' attitude or type of difference. There is a pathologisation and spatialisation of difference in the values and practices of residents. This was also frequently expressed in ethnic and racial terms as the following interview makes clear

> *Q*: Do you think living in the city centre allows more encounters with difference?
>
> Sometimes. You see a lot of beggars and *Big Issue* sellers that can be quite annoying. Sometimes there are a lot of people from other ethnic groups hanging around and a lot of foreign speaking Black men. This can be quite intimidating.
>
> *Q*: What impact does this have on you as a person?
>
> Not a very good one really, because I find them quite threatening so I shy away from anyone who is dissimilar and that is wrong because they might be OK but the rest of them aren't.
>
> *Q*: Are there particular areas in the city where certain groups locate themselves?
>
> I didn't think so until I went out to The Printworks one night. There are loads of like ethnic minorities there. Lots of sort of eastern Europeans and then Black people all hanging around. And also I went to Urbis one day to meet a friend and there were lots of like Mosher kids around. I never realised all this.
>
> *Q*: Why have you never noticed before?
>
> I guess because I've never been to these places. I stay in the same places I guess because that's what I know and where everyone I feel safe with is (resident interview no. 27)

Again, residents actively fix these forms of acceptable and unacceptable difference in particular spaces of the city. Some of these discourses are complex, with alternative and critical readings also present, but residents clearly articulate a geography of difference in the city. Take this example of the legitimation of the marketed cosmopolitan image by one resident

> Where I live it's half a mile away from Miles Platting. [The imagery's] not going to show that. You won't see *Big Issue* sellers or guys fighting outside a bar, how else can they sell the flats? It's understandable the way they are marketing them, they are appealing to people's aspiration, it's the lifestyle you can have. And with all the rejuvenating [*sic*] going on, I do believe we are all going to benefit from it, or a lot of us are going to benefit, but there will be a gap where people cannot afford it, and they have nowhere else to go. But as the city-centre boundary extends ... people will benefit. Unfortunately, I think they have got to the limit where if they go any further they will be impinging on people who don't own a home ... It's doing more good than harm ... I think that city living is for all people in Manchester, as I'm a capitalist ... It creates wealth and tourism and brings everyone into the city centre. It creates jobs for everyone, but how the benefits will trickle down emotionally, like "I can't afford to live this", well, who knows? Harvey Nichols or Selfridges is open so they can work there for £5 an hour, but they are not going to be able to afford a city-centre apartment. I don't think it's doing them any harm, as I do believe that life is what you make of it, you have to get out there and improve yourself and if you work hard enough then there's nothing stopping you (resident interview no. 7).

This is more than simply stating that marketing brochures will not acknowledge the proximity of deprived areas to the luxury flats they are trying to sell. This resident goes further as they accept the exclusion of certain social groups and are active in defining what those other forms of unacceptable difference are—namely, the homeless (non-consumers) or the (imagined) culture of nearby (predominantly White) working-class communities (Miles Platting is on the north-east edge of the city centre, dominated by public-sector housing and is one of the most deprived areas in the UK; see ward deprivation scores at http://www.odpm.gov.uk/indices.) As Binnie *et al.* (2006a) suggest, the ability to be a cosmopolitan relies on the construction of a working-class other that does not

possess the cultural capital or the 'correct' attitude to difference and here this distinction is associated with particular spaces in the city. As Flusty notes, interdictory spaces function

> to systematically exclude those adjudged unsuitable and even threatening, people whose class and cultural positions diverge from the builders and their target markets (Flusty, 2001, p. 659).

However, while accepting that such social groups are excluded from the reimaging of the city—how else will city-centre properties be sold?—this respondent had difficulties extending his position to agreeing with the social costs of this regeneration. As MacLeod (2002, p. 605) suggests "the new urban glamour zones conceal a brutalizing demarcation of winners and losers, excluded and included". For this particular individual, this is then legitimated by an appeal to a particular vision of urban development. MacLeod (2002) and Flusty (2001) suggest that urban regeneration of this kind raises questions over social justice in the city, "particularly as these relate to the life chances of those displaced by the unforgiving social Darwinism inculcated through disciplinary neo-liberalisation" (MacLeod, 2002, p. 608). Harvey (1989b) suggests that such urban development links to 'possessive individualism' which is attached

> to certain distinctive modes of consumption, imbued with a political view that focuses on civic and political liberties, and instilled with the notion that economic advancement is solely a matter of individual ability, dedication and personal ambition (Harvey, 1989b, p. 239).

For this city-centre resident, the 'cosmopolitan city' is not exclusionary because anyone can 'make it' if they try. This adds a deeper layer of meaning to the forms of difference which are excluded from the marketed cosmopolitan lifestyle, one which links to broader discourses of urban improvement and the development of society as a whole in the UK. Here the city centre, loft living residents, through their performance of their cosmopolitan cultural capital, produce an 'abject other'—namely, the White working class, seen as *Big Issue* sellers, shop workers and 'guys who fight outside bars' (and see the earlier discussion about the 'non-cosmopolitan' Blackley and Wythenshawe). As Haylett argues, in the UK

> a representative middle class is positioned at the vanguard of 'the modern' which becomes a moral category referring to liberal, cosmopolitan, work and consumption based lifestyles and values, and the 'unmodern' on which this category depends is the white working class 'other', emblematically a throwback to other times and places. This middle class dependency on working class 'backwardness' for its own claim to modern multicultural citizenship is an unspoken interest within the discourse of illegitimacy around the white working class poor (Haylett, 2001, p. 365).

What the discourse represented by the words of this resident implies, then, is that other forms of difference have chosen to exclude themselves from what is accepted as the 'correct' form of urban development. By placing themselves outside the formation of 'acceptable' difference, they have also placed themselves outside the benefits of urban and societal development. Thus the cultural politics of class work to exclude certain forms of unvalued difference in the 'cosmopolitan city'.

This is further expressed through the mundane practices of residents which reproduce the marketed image and 'cosmopolitan' lifestyle. This is frequently expressed through their use of space within the city and consumption practices. Many of the respondents focused their social lives on a narrow range of spaces in the city, particularly the bars, clubs and restaurants of the 'cosmopolitan' city centre, which they saw very strongly as 'their' space. This reproduction of the marketed cosmopolitan identity through mundane practices was also seen in residents' practice in and design of domestic

spaces. As one resident stated when relating their lifestyle to the marketed image

> I have got this kind of furniture in my flat, same as in the brochure, because I fell for this marketing as well, it suited well with my style. It was a new apartment and a great apartment. So I thought I'd treat myself, so I did splash out far too much . . . I hate being told what to do or how to live, but I find it subliminal. You have an image built in and you can adapt the image to your own personality. The marketing has created what we have now, it was an ideal which has become a reality, because people copied the marketing. And I am as guilty of it as anyone else and I am ashamed of it (resident interview no. 39).

This performance of the marketed image links to the production of acceptable difference through the mobilisation of a particular aesthetic in lifestyle and consumption. Flusty's (2001, p. 659) account of interdictory spaces suggests that they have "become subtler and more systematically pervasive". He suggests that *codes of conduct* have become a primary form of the 'disciplining' of urban space through a process of 'naturalised interdiction', linking to the notion of the performance and narration of entrepreneurialism defining 'appropriate' forms of citizenship. Binnie and Holloway (2003, p. 10) suggest that the production of the cosmopolitan city requires the active engagement of certain groups in the promotion of their own cosmopolitan otherness, with the corollary that other groups who do not make their difference count, or whose difference does not fit the overall 'cosmopolitan' vision of development, may be excluded as they "do not fit easily into the dominant vision of the heterogeneous cosmopolis". Thus the reimaging of certain spaces in the city based on notions of 'acceptable' forms of difference, and the mundane performance of an accepted form of difference by residents, may both serve in complex ways to reproduce and reinforce discourses which exclude certain others in the cosmopolitan city.

The exclusionary nature of the imagery is also registered in the attitude towards the marketing material expressed by those who labour to reproduce this 'cosmopolitan' city-centre lifestyle but who cannot afford to participate in it. In the words of one Afro-Caribbean resident of Ancoats (in east Manchester) who cleans city-centre apartment blocks

> What they are trying to do is treat us like we don't exist . . . Even if I could afford to live here I think these photographs are trying to tell me that they don't want us to buy their flat . . . There is nothing in here for us to make us feel accepted to live here. The people who make these brochures don't even know the meaning of the word cosmopolitan (Afro-Caribbean female from Ancoats, east Manchester, interview).

What is significant here is that the feeling of exclusion is not just related to economic capital. There is a clear recognition that the marketing imagery goes beyond that to appeal to people who feel that they can deploy the necessary cultural capital, the ability and desire to 'buy into' cosmopolitan living, and that it acts to exclude those whose class, ethnic and cultural positions are divergent from that imagery. There is also explicit recognition of the narrowness of the marketed notion of cosmopolitanism from a person who probably has more of a day-to-day contact with difference than those who inhabit the homogenising spaces of the exclusive city-centre developments. As Atkinson (2003, p. 1832) suggests, new urban spaces may not always have a policy of exclusion but are imbued with values or subtle codes which may exclude the disadvantaged simply through their feeling uncomfortable in such places and these "more subtle modes of exclusion are woven into much deeper class and cultural interpretations of whom a place is 'for'".

Spaces of Tolerance in the Cosmopolitan City?

The analysis above demonstrates that discourses of cultural exclusion are strongly

produced and reproduced in the mundane activities and attitudes of the new city-centre residents. However, this is not to suggest that this is the only discourse that can be found in these new spaces in the city. Other more varied discourses indicate that these new cosmopolitan spaces in the city can also be sites in which difference is more tolerated and even welcomed and sought out. A variety of contesting discourses are produced and reproduced in the new city centre about the understanding of cosmopolitan and what it means to live in the 'cosmopolitan city'.

Not all residents feel included in or reproduce the narrow, marketed cosmopolitanism, or link it to cultural exclusion, and some residents may see city-centre living as a strategic rather than a lifestyle choice (Mills, 1993). As one resident stated in response to the marketing material

> These photos are bad . . . That is rubbish . . . That's just the most pretentious thing you will ever see . . . It's just so tacky. They might as well just name it something like 'Apartments for snobs only'. I want to live in the city to be close to work, not to be sold some phoney lifestyle (resident interview no. 41).

However, whether they buy into this new image or not, many residents consider that the city centre has in some ways become more diverse and cosmopolitan than it was before its gentrification and the attraction of a new inner-city population

> [The cosmopolitan city is . . .] Well, the bars and nightlife, the cafés on the sidewalks, the city-centre residents. These things all make it cosmopolitan as well as the business that is now attracted to the city centre (resident interview no. 17).

Importantly, there is also a strong discourse among residents which reproduces the notion of cosmopolitanism as an attitude and openness towards difference, as these residents suggest

> You're meant to welcome people in and all that . . . cosmopolitanism and whatever . . . you're meant to mix all different groups together so you appreciate them and their ways (resident interview no. 16).

> You might as well live in the suburbs if you're not going to experience every other cultures' idea of a night out. I mean some of the places might not be everyone's cup of tea but if you're given the opportunity you might as well take it. Cosmopolitanism . . . is all this that we've been talking about. Cities nowadays welcome all different cultures and that is what it's all about. Living in the city centre should make you more cosmopolitan due to all of this. I think it has made me be more cosmopolitan. I think most people just think about sitting outside bars and cafés drinking your wine or your coffee and they think that makes you cosmopolitan. I think that's a glorified take on it. I think it extends much further than that. I think if you truly are cosmopolitan you should be in acceptance of and try out all different cultures (resident interview no. 21).

This second resident understands cosmopolitanism as the possession of a specific attitude and set of skills which permit the understanding and negotiation of cultural diversity. However, what is interesting is that in promoting this image of the cosmopolitan subject they engage in a process of 'othering' in which they fix difference in space—the construction of the cosmopolitan city centre relies on the devaluing of the suburbs as sites of humdrum mundaneity and homogeneity which echoes research findings in other contexts (for example, Ley, 2004; Rofe, 2003).

However, this picture of the new city-centre spaces as sites of openness to difference is further contested by these residents who express this attitude to diversity. Several of the respondents who felt themselves to be cosmopolitan in this sense did not believe that the city centre in general shared this characteristic

> Well, [cosmopolitanism] is meant to be when you experience all sorts of different cultures. Manchester is cosmopolitan but

> its city centre residents aren't (resident interview no. 31).
>
> *Q*: Do you think all city-centre residents think like you?
>
> I'm not sure. I would like to think so. I think some of them are very naïve and don't really allow themselves to be involved with those who are different (resident interview no. 42).

Some of the discourses of residents who expressed this view of the regenerated city centre went further in their critique of these spaces

> I think [the city centre] is not suited to a lot of groups on purpose. I think other ethnicities are not really allowed to live here, as it is a predominantly white thing as well as the few accepted Black men. It is aimed at the single, wealthy Whites that have no ties ... people get very stuck in their ways and very possessive towards the city centre because they live here. They think that because they spend a fortune on the apartments and in local things, they have the right to look down on those who perhaps haven't got the money or image. I think there is a very nasty class thing going on. It all comes down to money and image. They make prices so high for apartments and to drink and eat in certain places that they leave out the ordinary people. It's good that I guess we have our own bars or whatever, but it is the city centre and it should be available to everyone ... certain people are not allowed in certain places (resident interview no. 12).

Residents were thus able to articulate divisions within the inner-city population based on indicators of race, class and subtle differences in lifestyle and image, and to link specifically these to the exclusion of certain forms of difference.

Conclusion

This paper has focused on the treatment of difference in the 'cosmopolitan city' by presenting a case study of Manchester (UK). It has contributed to the literature on urban studies by responding to and synthesising recent calls for research to pursue three approaches to understanding this issue: the need to interrogate notions of cosmopolitanism through a grounded urban case study; the need to link the textual analysis of urban imagery produced by the private sector to the political economy of the city; and the need to investigate what actually happens in these new cosmopolitan city spaces.

Thus the focus of the paper has been on the production and consumption of the reimaging of Manchester as a 'cosmopolitan city'. Following recent research (for example, Gotham, 2002; Gibson, 2005), linking the production and consumption of imagery to the political economy of the gentrifying city has helped to show how and why particular meanings about the city are encoded into urban reimaging processes and how these interlink in complex ways with how difference is treated in the city. The involvement of the private sector in entrepreneurial forms of urban governance is now widely recognised, but few studies have considered their role in the treatment of difference in the city. In this example, private-sector place marketing and the actors involved (estate agents, marketers and property developers) play a significant role in shaping particular class-based aesthetics as wants and desires among the new city-centre residents which in turn link to processes of cultural exclusion in the gentrifying city. Given the relative economic power of the private sector in gentrifying processes (i.e. compared with the resources available to the public sector for developing property and place marketing), their role in linking globalisation, the form of urban regeneration, urban reimaging and the treatment of difference in the city deserves more consideration.

The conceptualisation of cosmopolitanism adopted in this paper—a particular stance towards difference which involves an openness to, and tolerance of, diversity—has helped the exploration of the impacts of the deployment of notions of cosmopolitanism in the entrepreneurial city. In Manchester,

there are certainly strong discourses which reproduce the narrow marketed notion of cosmopolitanism and which contribute to cultural exclusion. This narrow marketed cosmopolitanism is reproduced by many of the new city-centre residents through their performance of the city-centre lifestyle. The 'cosmopolitan city' image thus attracts residents, who are not cultural dupes in the sense that they simply accept the marketed image, but do through their mundane gentrifying actions and attitudes reproduce this narrow notion of cosmopolitanism. Although the 'cosmopolitan city' implies a form of living which displays a willingness to engage with difference, those producing and reproducing this narrow image propagate a narrow class-based aesthetic which reinforces class distinctions by defining particular 'class cultures' which are deemed 'acceptable' or 'unacceptable' in the cosmopolitan city. This process is further complexly contested on the basis of race, ethnicity and sexuality. Thus the existence of tensions destabilises attempts to produce cosmopolitan cities in the wider sense of the term used here. This may also be true of other cities, as studies of Amsterdam (The Netherlands; see Bodaar, 2006) and Houston (Texas, US; see Haylett, 2006) suggest, but this requires more consideration in the literature.

On the other hand, in combination with exploring what actually happens in these new 'cosmopolitan' consumption spaces, this approach has revealed a more complex view of how difference is treated in the city which goes beyond some of the literature which is rather reductionist in its reading of the city. Thus there are also complex and contested discourses of understandings of what the 'cosmopolitan city' should or could be, some of which match the understanding of the term adopted in this paper. Thus this paper has begun to address the issue of whether these new cosmopolitan city spaces might actually open up spaces in which openness to and tolerance of difference can be generated. This has also been suggested about cities as diverse as London, Hong Kong, Auckland and Montréal (see Brown, 2006; Law, 2002; Latham, 2003; Germain and Radice, 2006). However, perhaps there are still limits to what can be expected of such new city spaces. They still experience limits to the forms of difference which are acceptable, but perhaps they are spaces in which those boundaries are being contested and extended. Importantly, what is also revealed in both these discourses is that the notion of cosmopolitanism as operationalised in the city is paradoxical in that its construction relies on the definition and devaluing (or even exclusion) of an 'other' of non-cosmopolitan people and spaces (and see Binnie *et al.*, 2006b). This case study suggests that cosmopolitan forms of regeneration rely on the production of 'acceptable' and 'unacceptable' forms of difference which are also spatialised within the city. Thus the approach of grounding cosmopolitanism in the urban helps to reveal more of the complexities of the treatment of difference in the contemporary city.

Note

1. The *Big Issue* is a charity which helps homeless people find their way back into housing and employment. The first part of the process involves homeless people agreeing to become street vendors of the *Big Issue* magazine which allows them to keep a proportion of the sales price whilst demonstrating a long-term commitment to the project and themselves.

References

ASHWORTH, G. J. and VOOGD, H. (1990) *Selling the City*. London: Belhaven Press.

ATKINSON, R. (2003) Domestication by cappuccino or a revenge on urban space? Control and empowerment in the management of public spaces, *Urban Studies*, 40, pp. 1829–1843.

BECK, U. (1999) Democracy beyond the nation-state: a cosmopolitan manifesto, *Dissent* (Winter), pp. 53–55.

BECK, U. (2002) The cosmopolitan society and its enemies, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19, pp. 17–44.

BELINA, B. and HELMS, G. (2003) Zero tolerance for the industrial past and other threats: policing and urban entrepreneurialism in Britain and Germany, *Urban Studies*, 40, pp. 1845–1867.

BELL, D. and BINNIE, J. (2004) Authenticating queer space: citizenship, urbanism and governance, *Urban Studies*, 41, pp. 1807–1820.

BINNIE, J. and HOLLOWAY, J. J. (2003) *Who produces? Who counts? Who is excluded? Understanding the spatialities of cosmopolitanism*. Paper presented at the *Association of American Geographers Annual Conference*, New Orleans.

BINNIE, J. and SKEGGS, B. (2004) Cosmopolitan knowledge and the production and consumption of sexualised space: Manchester's gay village, *The Sociological Review*, 52, pp. 41–61.

BINNIE, J., HOLLOWAY, J. J., MILLINGTON, S. and YOUNG, C. (2006a) Introduction: grounding cosmopolitan urbanism. Approaches, practices and policies, in: J. BINNIE, J. J. HOLLOWAY, S. MILLINGTON and C. YOUNG (Eds) *Cosmopolitan Urbanism*, pp. 1–34. London: Routledge.

BINNIE, J., HOLLOWAY, J. J., MILLINGTON, S. and YOUNG, C. (Eds) (2006b) *Cosmopolitan Urbanism*. London: Routledge.

BODAAR, A. (2006) Multicultural urban space and the cosmopolitan 'Other': the contested revitalisation of Amsterdam's Bijlmermeer, in: J. BINNIE, J. J. HOLLOWAY, S. MILLINGTON and C. YOUNG (Eds) *Cosmopolitan Urbanism*, pp. 171–186. London: Routledge.

BOURDIEU, P. (1984) *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge.

BOYLE, M. and HUGHES, G. (1991) The politics of the representation of 'the real': discourses from the Left on Glasgow's role as European City of Culture, 1990, *Area*, 23, pp. 217–228.

BRAMWELL, B. and RAWDING, L. (1996) Tourism marketing images of industrial cities, *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23, pp. 201–221.

BRENNER, N. and THEODORE, N. (2002) Preface: from the 'new localism' to the spaces of neoliberalism, *Antipode*, 34, pp. 341–347.

BRIDGE, G. (2001) Estate agents as interpreters of economic and cultural capital: the gentrification premium in the Sydney housing market, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25, pp. 87–101.

BROWN, G. (2006) Cosmopolitan camouflage: (post-)gay space in Spitalfields, East London, in: J. BINNIE, J. J. HOLLOWAY, S. MILLINGTON and C. YOUNG (Eds) *Cosmopolitan Urbanism*, pp. 130–145. London: Routledge.

BURGESS, J. A. and WOOD, P. (1988) Decoding Docklands: place advertising and the decision-making strategies of small firms, in: J. EYLES and D. M. SMITH (Eds) *Qualitative Methods in Human Geography*, pp. 94–117. Cambridge: Polity Press.

BUTLER, T. (2003) Living in the bubble: gentrification and its 'Others' in north London, *Urban Studies*, 40, pp. 2469–2486.

CHEAH, P. and ROBBINS, K. (Eds) (1998) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

CLARK, E. D. B. and BRADFORD, M. G. (1998) Public and private consumption and the city, *Urban Studies*, 35(5/6), pp. 865–888.

COCHRANE, A., PECK, J. and TICKELL, A. (2002) Olympic dreams: visions of partnership, in: J. PECK and K. WARD (Eds) *City of Revolution. Restructuring Manchester*, pp. 95–115. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

EVANS, G. (2003) Hard-branding the cultural city: from Prado to Prada, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27, pp. 417–440.

EYLES, J. (1987) Housing advertisements as signs: locality creation and meaning-systems, *Geografiska Annaler*, 69B, pp. 93–105.

FAINSTEIN, S. S. (2001) Competitiveness, cohesion, and governance: their implications for social justice, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25, pp. 884–888.

FEATHERSTONE, M. (2002) Cosmopolis: an introduction, *Theory, Culture and Society*, pp. 1–16.

FLUSTY, S. (2001) The banality of interdiction: surveillance, control and the displacement of diversity, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25, pp. 658–664.

GERMAIN, A. and RADICE, M. (2006) Cosmopolitanism by default: public sociability in Montréal, in: J. BINNIE, J. J. HOLLOWAY, S. MILLINGTON and C. YOUNG (Eds) *Cosmopolitan Urbanism*, pp. 112–139. London: Routledge.

GIBSON, T. A. (2005) Selling city living: urban branding campaigns, class power and the civic good, *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 8, pp. 259–280.

GIDDENS, A. (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

GOLD, J. R. and GOLD, M. M. (1994) 'Home at last!': building societies, home ownership and the imagery of English suburban promotion in the interwar years, in: J. R. GOLD and S. V. WARD (Eds) *Place Promotion: The Use of Publicity and Marketing to Sell Towns and Regions*, pp. 75–92. Chichester: Wiley.

GOLD, J. R. and WARD, S. V. (1994) (Eds) *Place Promotion, The Use of Publicity and Marketing to Sell Towns and Regions*. Chichester: Wiley.

GOSPODINI, A. (2002) European cities in competition and the new 'uses' of urban design, *Journal of Urban Design*, 7, pp. 59–73.

GOTHAM, K. F. (2002) Marketing Mardi Gras: commodification, spectacle and the political economy of tourism in New Orleans, *Urban Studies*, 39, pp. 1735–1756.

GRIFFITHS, R. (1998) Making sameness: place marketing and the new urban entrepreneurialism, in: N. OATLEY (Ed.) *Cities, Economic*

Competition and Urban Policy, pp. 41–57. London: Paul Chapman.

HANNERZ, U. (1996) *Transnational Connections: Culture, People, Places*. London: Routledge.

HANNIGAN, J. (2003) Symposium on branding, the entertainment economy and urban place building: introduction, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 27, pp. 352–360.

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

HARVEY, D. (1989b) *The Urban Experience*. Oxford: Blackwell.

HAYLETT, C. (2001) Illegitimate subjects? Abject whites, neoliberal modernisation, and middle-class multiculturalism, *Environment and Planning D*, 19, pp. 351–370.

HAYLETT, C. (2006) Working-class subjects in the cosmopolitan city, in: J. BINNIE, J. J. HOLLOWAY, S. MILLINGTON and C. YOUNG (Eds) *Cosmopolitan Urbanism*, pp. 187–203. London: Routledge.

HERD, D. and PATTERSON, T. (2002) Poor Manchester: old problems and new deals, in: J. PECK and K. WARD (Eds) *City of Revolution: Restructuring Manchester*, pp. 190–213. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

HOLCOMB, B. (1993) Revisioning place: de- and re-constructing the image of the industrial city, in: G. KEARNS and C. PHILO (Eds) *Selling Places: The City as Cultural Capital, Past and Present*, pp. 133–144. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

HOLCOMB, B. (1994) City make-overs: marketing the post-industrial city, in: J. R. GOLD and S. V. WARD (Eds) *Place Promotion: The Use of Publicity and Marketing to Sell Towns and Regions*, pp. 115–132. Chichester: Wiley.

HOLCOMB, B. (1999) Marketing cities for tourism, in: D. R. JUDD and S. S. FAINSTEIN (Eds) *The Tourist City*, pp. 54–70. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

HOLDEN, A. (2002) Bomb sites: the politics of opportunity, in: J. PECK and K. WARD (Eds) *City of Revolution: Restructuring Manchester*, pp. 133–154. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

HUBBARD, P. (1996) Re-imaging the city: the transformation of Birmingham's urban landscape, *Geography*, 81, pp. 26–36.

JONAS, A. E. G. and WILSON, D. (1999) The city as growth machine: critical reflections two decades later, in: A. E. G. JONAS and D. WILSON (Eds) *The Urban Growth Machine: Critical Perspectives Two Decades Later*, pp. 3–20. Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

KEARNS, G. and PHILO, C. (Eds) (1993) *Selling Places: The City As Cultural Capital, Past and Present*. Oxford: Pergamon Press.

KEOHANE, K. (2002) The revitalization of the city and the demise of Joyce's utopian modern subject, *Theory, Culture and Society*, 19, pp. 29–49.

LATHAM, A. (2003) Urbanity, lifestyle and making sense of the new urban cultural economy: notes from Auckland, New Zealand, *Urban Studies*, 40, pp. 1699–1724.

LAW, L. (2002) Defying disappearance: cosmopolitan public spaces in Hong Kong, *Urban Studies*, 39, pp. 1625–1645.

LEY, D. (2004) Transnational spaces and everyday lives, *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, NS*, 29, pp. 151–164.

MACLEOD, G. (2002) From urban entrepreneurialism to a 'revanchist city'? On the spatial injustices of Glasgow's renaissance, *Antipode*, 34, pp. 602–624.

MACLEOD, G. and WARD, K. (2002) Spaces of utopia and dystopia: landscaping the contemporary city, *Geografiska Annaler*, 84B, pp. 31–48.

MADSEN, H. (1992) Place marketing in Liverpool: a review, *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 16, pp. 633–640.

MARVELL, A. (2004) Making of the Meads: suburban development and identity, *Geography*, 89, pp. 50–57.

MELLOR, R. (2002) Hypocritical city: cycles of urban exclusion, in: J. PECK and K. WARD (Eds) *City of Revolution: Restructuring Manchester*, pp. 214–235. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

MILES, S. (1998) The consuming paradox: a new research agenda for urban consumption, *Urban Studies*, 35(5/6), pp. 1001–1008.

MILLINGTON, S. D. and YOUNG, C. (2003) *Producing the cosmopolitan city? Cosmopolitanism and urban regeneration in Dublin*. Paper presented at the *Association of American Geographers Annual Conference*, New Orleans.

MILLS, C. (1993) Myths and meanings of gentrification, in: J. DUNCAN and D. LEY (Eds) *Place/Culture/Representation*, pp. 149–172. London: Routledge.

MITCHELL, D. (1995) The end of public space? People's Park, definitions of the public, and democracy, *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 85, pp. 108–133.

ODPM (OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER) (2004) *The English indices of deprivation 2004*. London: HMSO.

PADDISON, R. (1993) City marketing, image reconstruction and urban regeneration, *Urban Studies*, 30, pp. 339–350.

PECK, J. and WARD, K. (2002a) Placing Manchester, in: J. PECK and K. WARD (Eds) *City of Revolution: Restructuring Manchester*, pp. 1–17. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

PECK, J. and WARD, K. (Eds) (2002b) *City of Revolution: Restructuring Manchester*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

PÉCOUD, A. (2004) Entrepreneurship and identity: cosmopolitanism and cultural competencies among German-Turkish businesspeople in Berlin, *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 30, pp. 3–20.

QUILLEY, S. (2002) Entrepreneurial turns: municipal socialism and after, in: J. PECK and K. WARD (Eds) *City of Revolution: Restructuring Manchester*, pp. 76–94. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

RACO, M. (2003) Remaking place and securitising space: urban regeneration and the strategies, tactics and policies of policing in the UK, *Urban Studies*, 40, pp. 1869–1887.

ROBBINS, B. (1998) Introduction part 1: actually existing cosmopolitanism, in: P. CHEAH and B. ROBBINS (Eds) *Cosmopolitics: Thinking and Feeling beyond the Nation*, pp. 1–19. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

ROBSON, B. (2002) Mancunian ways: the politics of regeneration, in: J. PECK and K. WARD (Eds) *City of Revolution: Restructuring Manchester*, pp. 34–49. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

ROFE, M. W. (2003) 'I want to be global': theorising the gentrifying class as an emergent élite global community, *Urban Studies*, 40, pp. 2511–2526.

ROSE, N. (2000) Governing cities, governing citizens, in: E. ISIN (Ed.) *Democracy, Citizenship and the Global City*, pp. 95–109. London: Routledge.

SANDERCOCK, L. (2003) *Cosmopolis II. Mongrel Cities of the 21st Century*. London: Continuum.

SCHEIN, L. (1999) Of cargo and satellites: imagined cosmopolitanism, *Postcolonial Studies*, 2, pp. 345–375.

SIBLEY, D. (1995) *Geographies of Exclusion*. London: Routledge.

SMITH, M. P. (2001) *Transnational Urbanism: Locating Globalisation*. Oxford: Blackwell.

SMITH, N. (1996) *The New Urban Frontier: Gentrification and the Revanchist City*. London: Routledge.

SMITH, N. (2002) New globalism, new urbanism: gentrification as global urban strategy, *Antipode*, 34, pp. 427–450.

SMITH, S. (2001) *Social Geographies: Space and Society*. Harlow: Pearson.

SZERSZYNSKI, B. and URRY, J. (2002) Cultures of consumption, *Sociological Review*, 50, pp. 461–481.

TAN, S. and YEOH, B. S. A. (2006) Negotiating cosmopolitanism in Singapore's fictional landscape, in: J. BINNIE, J. J. HOLLOWAY, S. MILLINGTON and C. YOUNG (Eds) *Cosmopolitan Urbanism*, pp. 146–168. London: Routledge.

VERTOVEC, S. and COHEN, R. (Eds) (2002) *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

WAITT, G. (1999) Playing games with Sydney: marketing Sydney for the 2000 Olympics, *Urban Studies*, 36, pp. 1055–1077.

WARD, K. (2000) From rentiers to rantiers: 'active entrepreneurs', 'structural speculators' and the politics of marketing the city, *Urban Studies*, 37, 1093–1107.

WARD, K. (2003) Entrepreneurial urbanism, state restructuring and civilizing 'New' East Manchester, *Area*, 35, pp. 116–127.

WILLIAMS, G. (2003) *The Enterprising City Centre: Manchester's Development Challenge*. London: Spon.

WYNNE, D., O'CONNOR, J. and PHILLIPS, D. (1998) Consumption and the post-modern city, *Urban Studies*, 35, pp. 841–864.

YEOH, B. (2004) Cosmopolitanism and its exclusions in Singapore, *Urban Studies*, 41, pp. 2431–2445.

YOUNG, C. and LEVER, J. (1997) Place promotion, economic location and the consumption of city image, *Tijdschrift voor Economische en Sociale Geografie*, 88, pp. 332–341.

ZUKIN, S. (1988) *Loft Living: Culture and Capital in Urban Change*. London: Radius.

ZUKIN, S. (1995) *The Culture of Cities*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.