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An American visitor to London in the early 19th century was struck by what appeared to be “a growing refinement and humanity in the manners of people”. He went on

Formerly, every young gentlemen was obliged to learn boxing to defend himself against the insults of the mob, which he was sure to receive in walking the streets; but now, there is universal decorum and civility in the manners of the people of lower ranks (quoted in Langford, 2000, pp. 224–225).

This visitor was not alone in observing a significant shift in the street behaviour of Londoners at this time. Others, too, remarked on how ‘expecting incivility’, they were surprised to find ‘politeness and refinement’. What might account for this change in manners? The social historian, Paul Langford, identifies a variety of possible explanations. London’s built environment had become increasingly ‘urbane’ in the latter part of the 18th century, it was “more orderly, spacious, and hygienic than the clutter and squalor traditionally associated with a great city” (Langford, 2000, p. 225). Other factors include a ‘softening of manners’ due to an increasingly market-oriented middle class and the way in which, in the wake of the French Revolution, “the genteel classes were more ready to join in a common street culture of civility that made mutual respect rather than social distance the key note” (Langford, 2000, p. 225). Significantly Langford also observes, that “compulsion cannot have had much to do with this process” (Langford, 2000, p. 225) given that London was thought by contemporaries to be underpoliced compared with other European capitals.

These historical observations provide an interesting backdrop to contemporary concerns with civility and incivility in the city. They rightly remind us that concerns with civility are nothing new and that speculation about potential influences on street behaviour can range from a crude environmental determinism (where a city’s built form is thought to play a crucial role) to sweeping linkages between social interaction at street level and much broader geopolitical developments. An historical sensitivity is also a useful reminder that there has long been debate as to whether the city holds a positive or negative outcome upon civility. On the one had, there is a tradition of viewing urban life as necessary for the development of civility, stretching back to ancient Greece when the ability to manage the affairs of the city was what “distinguished the civilised Greek denizen of the city-state from barbarians” (Boyd, this issue, pp. 868–869). Others who have celebrated the civility of the city range from 18th-century moral philosophers, like David Hume, to the radical socialists of the 19th
century, like Marx and Engels for whom the city had the potential “to rescue the population from the idiocy of rural life” (Marx and Engels, 1968, p. 39). And the urban historian Lewis Mumford appears unequivocal in his belief in the ‘civilising’ role of the city. He declares that

The chief function of the city is to convert power into form, energy into culture, dead matter into the living symbols of art, biological reproduction into social creativity (Mumford, 1961, p. 650).

Yet, on the other hand, celebrations of civility and the city have existed alongside deep anxieties about the incivility of urban life. Despite Engels’ dismissive comments about the “idiocy of rural life”, he also had significant concerns about the incivilities of urban living, as this passage from the Condition of the Working Class in England in 1844 clearly shows:

The very turmoil of the streets has something repulsive…The brutal indifference, the unfeeling isolation of each in his private interest becomes the more repellent and offensive, the more...individuals are crowded together, within a limited space…The dissolution of mankind into monads…the world of atoms, is here carried out to its utmost extremes (Engels, 1934, p. 24).

Similarly, Mumford who seems so confident about the linkage between civility and the city also had concerns that the emergence of “Megalopolis” leads to “anonymity” and “impersonality” which act as a “positive encouragement to asocial or anti-social actions” (Mumford, 1938, p. 266).

These concerns around civility and the city have become particularly acute over recent decades, with the incivility, rather than the civility, of urban life coming to dominate policy and research agendas. Increasingly, the difference and diversity of urban life are viewed as threatening rather than enriching. As Lees observes, the

politics of fear is driving the growth of private police forces, gated communities, and public surveillance antithetical to the old civic virtues of civility, security, tact and trust inculcated by mingling with strangers in the city (Lees, 2004, p. 11).

Exemplifying these concerns about urban incivilities, are these observations by William Bratton in his account of arriving in New York City in 1990 as the new Chief of Police of the City’s transit Police Department:

I remember driving from LaGuardia Airport down the highway into Manhattan. Graffiti burned out cars and trash seemed to be everywhere. It looked like something out of a futuristic movie. Then as you entered Manhattan, you met the unofficial greeter for the City of New York, the Squeegee pest. Welcome to New York City. . . . Proceeding down Fifth Avenue . . . unlicensed street peddlers and beggars were everywhere. The down into the subway . . . Beggars were on every train. Every platform seemed to have a cardboard city where the homeless had taken up residence. This was a city that had stopped caring about itself (Bratton, 1997, pp. 33–34).

Importantly, however, Bratton believed it was possible to tackle these perceived problems and restore a sense of civility to the city. Following his appointment in 1994 as Commissioner of the New York Police Department (NYPD), Bratton targeted the beggars, drunks and the vandals with what became known as zero-tolerance policing, a strategy that would help to “reclaim the streets for respectable law-abiding people and help overcome the ‘culture of fear’ . . . characteristic of late modern urban environments” (Hughes, 1998, p. 112). Although controversy surrounds the introduction of zero-tolerance policing, its significance here is that it exemplifies “the paradox of imposing civility through coercion or at least the threat of it” (Crawford, this issue, p. 957). Increasingly, it seems, civility is to be achieved through the exclusion of incivilities; the public realm is to be secured for the respectable through the exclusion of the unrespectable; and the city becomes increasingly hostile to difference.
Against this background, three broad aims have informed this project of bringing together a multidisciplinary collection of essays around the theme of (in)civility and the city. The first is to throw some light on the varied definitions and meanings of civility and incivility that inform contemporary political and research agendas. One of the striking features of much of the current debate about civility and incivility, and related notions of respect and anti-social behaviour, is how little attention has been directed towards defining the meaning of these terms. The second broad aim is to bring together substantive pieces of research that provide (some preliminary) insights into the nature and experience of civility and incivility in particular urban settings. The third aim has been to examine some of the key interventions by governments both to promote civility and to tackle the problems of incivility within the city. In this introduction, we consider each of these broad aims in a little more detail, highlighting how the contributors have addressed these issues of definition, experiences and interventions.

Definitions and Meanings

A key task of this Review Issue is to begin to engage with the multiple and complex meanings of civility and incivility. Beginning with civility, it is possible to unpack this term in a variety of different ways. One distinction is that between ‘proximate’ and ‘diffuse’ civility. The former is most commonly understood as ‘politeness’ or the absence of ‘rudeness’ in our interactions with others. Hence, civility would cover verbal and non-verbal communication—our words and gestures aimed at others or used in the presence of others. One difficulty here, however, is that civility often assumes a common language. Yet this may not always be the case, even within a single country. As society changes and becomes more diverse, there are sub-cultural groups and ethnic minority communities with their own languages, as well as distinct forms of physical interaction and presentation, and this should be acknowledged. The latter become increasingly important in cities where the dominant mode of interaction is visual as opposed to verbal. The term diffuse civility recognises that this broader spectrum of behaviours can impact on others. To be civil in this sense is to have regard for the effects of our actions on others and to care for the space(s) we share with others, whether or not we are present in those spaces at the same time as others. Thus diffuse civility places responsibility on us without the necessity of co-presence and in this way it is a tougher challenge since we may not understand the impact that our behaviours may hold on others (if we do not verbally interact with one another) and our behaviours are less easily regulated by the approbation or sanction of others.

Boyd offers variations on this distinction between proximate and diffuse civility in the first paper in this collection. He highlights two distinct meanings of civility, one emphasising its formal connotations (in terms of manners, courtesies and the formalities of face-to-face interactions in everyday life) and the other its substantive connotations, whereby civility denotes membership of a political community (as evident in debates around ‘civil rights’ or ‘civil disobedience’). For Boyd, however, the meaning and value of civility go beyond these two dimensions and he points to the need to grasp civility as “an active and affirmative moral relationship between persons” (p. 875). Thus, in contrast, to those who would view civility as little more than a conservative desire to keep the peace in which we are enjoined simply to leave other people alone, for Boyd civility has a deeper significance. Boyd observes that

The growth of civility is coterminous with positive virtues like charity, magnanimity, and humanity that are desirable for their own sake. To see civility only in narrowly functionalist terms is to overlook its moral significance (Boyd, this issue, p. 875).

Interestingly, there is a close relationship between Boyd’s understanding of civility and that articulated by Amin in his
contribution to this collection. For Amin, civility is examined from the perspective of solidarity or the ‘politics of living together’ and his reflections on creating the ‘good city’ place particular emphasis on how a ‘culture of care and regard’ needs to become central to interpersonal relations, corporate behaviour and public engagement. Yet in the contemporary city, Amin (this issue, p. 1013) observes, social interaction appears more and more driven by “urban disregard, intolerance and self-interest”.

Notions of urban disregard and intolerance have become central to definitions of urban incivility and provide the focus of the paper by Phillips and Smith (this issue). As these authors acknowledge, incivility is a term that largely came to prominence in the US in the 1970s and 1980s as referring to “a cocktail of social unpleasantness and environmental mess found in decaying neighbourhoods” (Burney, 2005, p. 2). It was the publication of Wilson and Kelling’s widely cited ‘broken windows’ thesis in 1982, however, that really sparked major interest in incivility as a research topic in its own right. Two particular aspects of this thesis captured the attention of the research and policy community. First, it claims that the presence of signs of disorder can initiate a ‘feedback cycle’ in which fear is engendered among the ‘law-abiding’ members of a community who then retreat from public interaction. As Wilson and Kelling observed

Vandalism can occur anywhere once communal barriers—the sense of mutual regard and the obligations of civility—are lowered by actions that seem to signal that no-one cares (quoted in Burney, 2005, p. 24).

Secondly, the thesis argues that the presence of social and environmental incivilities is the cause of a growth in more serious forms of crime, something which later provided justification for the zero-tolerance policing strategies introduced in cities like New York by William Bratton (see above). For Phillips and Smith, however, the strong linkage between incivility research and the broken windows thesis is increasingly problematic. As they observe

Incivility research has become a sub-field of applied criminology oriented towards a ‘social problem’ that has disconnected itself from the wider sociological tradition and the intellectual opportunities this brings (Philips and Smith, this issue, p. 882).

In moving the research agenda forward in this area, Philips and Smith cogently argue for the need to explore “the full range of incivilities”, embracing encounters with those fleeting strangers met en passant [in the] time–space choreography of daily routine, the press of bodies and the rhythm of the streets (Philips and Smith, this issue, p. 880).

In the UK, the term ‘incivilities’ has, since the mid 1990s, largely been displaced by that of ‘anti-social behaviour’ and now occupies a prominent position within law and order policy discourses. Although anti-social behaviour covers most of the things we think of as incivilities, as Burney (2005) notes, the two terms have rather different connotations. While incivilities can be understood as something “applied collectively to communities”, anti-social behaviour is something done by individuals who are thereby singled out and blamed for the harm they inflict upon communities. One is about outcomes; the other about inputs (Burney, 2005, p. 2).

These concerns about the meaning of anti-social behaviour are taken up in Flint and Nixon’s paper in this issue. Reviewing policy developments in the UK related to anti-social behaviour, Flint and Nixon demonstrate that, through not developing a precise legal definition of the term anti-social behaviour, government has been afforded the scope to use such policies to engage with a wide range of behaviours.
Experiences and Settings

A second broad aim of this Review Issue is to use a range of case studies to provide conceptual and empirical insights into the experiences and settings of civility and incivility. The contribution by Phillips and Smith is a very useful starting-point in this regard. From their Australian survey data, they are able to capture an extraordinarily detailed picture of the properties of low-level incivilities experienced in daily life stemming from interpersonal encounters with ‘rude strangers’. For Phillips and Smith, the overall picture of the experience of incivility is one of far greater complexity and variety than we might imagine after a tour through the criminological literature of blighted neighbourhoods replete with graffiti, vacant lots, burnt-out cars and home boys who produce only the flight of those fearful respectable citizens. Our image is of movement. It is of people bumping into each other on a station concourse, pushing into queues at the ATM, using bad language on the train and sometimes demanding an apology (Philips and Smith, this issue, p. 898).

Phillips and Smith’s paper (see too Phillips and Smith, 2003) clearly demonstrates that the narrow geographical focus of most incivility research has overlooked the fact that incivilities are experienced in a wide range of urban environments. Indeed, rather than residential space, it is in what they term the ‘utilitarian’ spaces of retail venues, thoroughfares and transport hubs (railway stations, bus stops, car parks) that people are most at risk of experiencing incivilities.

Two further papers in this issue provide further examination of these utilitarian spaces. Lee investigates the interactions between African American, Jewish and Korean merchants and their Black customers in five predominantly Black neighbourhoods in New York City and Philadelphia. Located within the tradition of social interactionist research, Lee focuses on how civility is negotiated and maintained through the everyday encounters between merchants and customers. Her research shows that, although civility is the norm, it is a precarious and fragile construction given the socioeconomic and racial context within which such interactions are located. As Lee notes

While merchants work to preserve civility, Jewish and Korean storeowners realise that regardless of their efforts, their non-Black status in poor, Black neighbourhoods can easily make them visible targets for angry customers, residents and political entrepreneurs. Because merchant–customer interactions are embedded in a context in which inequality is extreme, non-Black merchants recognise that their efforts to maintain civility do not preclude the emergence of protest motivations (Lee, this issue, p. 916).

In contrast, Staeheli and Mitchell explore the issue of civility in a different retail setting: the shopping mall. The maintenance of civility within the mall, however, is not left to merchant–customer interactions. Rather, the mall’s institutions, functions and users are tightly regulated. Civility in this context is about the privileging of community (with all that implies in terms of the exclusion of difference) by mall owners over the public (with its implications of randomness and confrontation with difference). As Staeheli and Mitchell state

Malls stand for civility and community, rather than publicity, tightly holding to private property rights as a basis for regulating the institutions, actions and people allowed in the mall (Staeheli and Mitchell, this issue, p. 989).

Neighbourhood spaces remain, of course, important locales in which incivilities are experienced and regulated. The papers by Flint and Nixon and by Crawford, provide insights into these settings. Flint and Nixon highlight the central role held by public housing agencies in the UK within strategies aimed at tackling anti-social behaviour and promoting civility. Exploring the use of Anti-social Behaviour Orders, Acceptable
Behaviour Contracts and tenancy agreements, they argue that the increased regulation of conduct by public housing agencies is representative of a realignment of the roles of various actors in the governance of civility in residential areas. Also focusing on the UK, Crawford examines the role of neighbourhood wardens and their contribution to fostering social order in deprived neighbourhoods. Launched by the government in 2000, wardens are expected to perform a wide variety of roles, from basic patrol functions and maintaining a visible presence, to tasks related to environmental management and improvement and stimulating community engagement. As Crawford notes, political expectations that wardens can make a significant difference to neighbourhood life are extremely high. The aim is no less than the rebuilding of layers of intermediary actors within civil society, capable of commanding sufficient authority to act as agents of social control and promote civility (Crawford, this issue, p. 965).

Interventions

Crawford’s observations link to the third main theme of this Review Issue: the interventions, in the form of a plethora of policy innovations, that have as their target the reduction of incivility and the promotion of civility within the city. Such interventions focus on two overlapping levels: civil society and individual behaviour. The papers by Bannister et al., Flint and Nixon, Crawford, and Brannan et al. all illustrate how the UK government’s concerns with civility (as shown by the ‘respect agenda’ in general and policies such as anti-social behaviour orders in particular) are bound up with a wider, neo-communitarian-inspired political project concerned with reinvigorating and renewing civil society and promoting a sense of active and responsible citizenship (Fyfe, 2005). Indeed, as the paper by Brannan et al. shows, government interest in promoting civic-ness encompasses a wide spectrum of policy areas, including crime, health, education, employment and democracy. However, their paper also draws attention to the way that people’s motivations to act civically may be driven by their moral outlook (or ‘normative commitments’), but might also be based on a more actuarial attitude where people weigh up the costs and benefits to them as individuals in relation to acting civically. This brings into focus interventions that are increasingly concerned with the ‘politics of behaviour’ (Field, 2003) or what Rose (1999, 2001) has termed ethopower and ethopolitics. With roots in Foucauldian ideas about the self-regulating subject, ethopower and ethopolitics focus attention on the ways in which governments are increasingly preoccupied with constructing particular moral values and ethical beliefs around required conduct of individuals. For Flint and Nixon, ethopower and ethopolitics are exemplified in New Labour’s twin concerns with ‘governance through community’ and ‘governance through contract’. The former stems from the communitarian underpinnings of much of New Labour’s social policy, with communities expected to set standards of behaviour and to take responsibility for tackling incivility by using the new powers and structures of neighbourhood governance made available by government (such as ASBOs and the neighbourhood wardens discussed by Crawford). ‘Governance through contract’ focuses attention on initiatives such as Acceptable Behaviour Contracts, Parenting Orders and Tenancy Agreements all of which point to a contract-based citizenship in which rights and entitlements are conditional on particular duties and obligations.

Such policy interventions, however, are the source of a wide range of concerns that are articulated by many of the contributors to this Review Issue. For Bannister et al., for example, there are issues around the imprecision and ambiguity with which terms like ‘anti-social behaviour’ and ‘respect’ are deployed in policy discourse and the ways in which UK government policy risks creating less, rather than more, respectful cities. Similarly, Crawford expresses concerns that neighbourhood wardens may increasingly be drawn into security and law enforcement activity in
ways which undermine their potential to contribute to community development work and tackling the social problems that often underpin anti-social behaviour and incivility. Over and above these specific concerns, however, there are also much broader issues around government attempts to domesticate civil society and promote civility. As Boyd’s paper reminds us, the connections between civility and civil society are far more complex than UK Prime Minister Blair’s Third Way politics allow for. Not only can civility exist without formal groups but also not all voluntary associations necessarily contribute to civility. The residents’ associations of the gated communities found in exclusive neighbourhoods or the street gangs that roam poorer parts of the urban fabric are both examples of voluntary associations which “at minimum contribute little or nothing to a society’s stock of civility and at maximum are bearers of incivility” (Boyd, this issue, p. 875). Indeed, Boyd goes further and questions “how civility can be legislated or enforced without destroying the sentiments that originally lent it moral force” (p. 876). Is there a danger, he speculates, that efforts to recreate civility “may succeed only in hastening its departure” (p. 876). Similar concerns have been expressed by Richard Sennett who worries about the unintended consequences of the UK government’s approach to dealing with respect. Sennett observes that

With adolescent males, there is a tipping point between good behaviour and anti-social behaviour in which if you say ‘I’m going to get you, I’m going to whip you into shape’, that’s a red rag to a bull (The Guardian, 2006, p. 21).

Indeed, Sennett underlines this point in his ‘inquest on respect’ where he argues that treating people with respect cannot occur simply by commanding it should happen. Mutual recognition has to be negotiated; this negotiation engages the complexities of personal character as much as social structure (Sennett, 2003, p. 260).

One simple example of the importance of such mutual recognition that Sennett uses to exemplify his argument is that of police officers patrolling the housing estate in Chicago where he grew up.

What impressed me about the cops in the squad car was that they indeed seemed to have learned from the homeless kids. Though they were hardly credulous or sentimental students, these two men thought they could only deal with these kids by giving them some mental credit. Back at police headquarters… the staff made use of the information provided by the kids, but seldom of the interpretations they offered of how best to survive on the streets (Sennett, 2003, p. 177)

The anxieties shared by many of the contributors about current forms of policy intervention in relation to civility and incivility clearly suggest the need for much more innovative and radical thinking in this area. Amin’s paper begins to do this by exploring how we can move towards what he terms ‘the good city’ characterised by the ‘habit of solidarity’ in which there is ‘a culture of care and regard’ and where people learn to ‘live with, perhaps even value difference’. To do this, Amin contends, we need to attend to ‘the politics of living together’. This means focusing attention on ‘repair’ (the infrastructure of cables and software, post-codes and transport systems that make possible urban life but which often escape democratic scrutiny), ‘relatedness’ (in terms of strong obligations to those on the margins), ‘rights’ (so that those viewed as a threat to civility are not simply excluded from urban space) and ‘re-enchantment’ (by promoting the gathering of strangers and practices of cultural heterogeneity). And there is an urgency of reconfiguring interventions in the urban arena to reflect this agenda, for as Amin makes clear

Far too much contemporary urbanism is driven by the need to crush social vitality and raise alarm against non-conformity. The result is the city of fear and circumspection, not the city confident with difference and multiplicity (Amin, this issue, p. 1019).
Future Research Agendas

In what ways do the various contributions to this Review Issue help us to identify fruitful areas for research? Three issues flow directly from the concerns expressed herein. First, there is a clear need to engage further in the conceptual consideration of the relationship(s) between (in)civility and the city. What is the precise nature of civility that we wish to create? Does the form of urbanity fostered by government impact upon the nature of civility and/or incivility engendered at the societal level? The Review Issue demonstrates the dangers inherent in adopting broad definitions, relying upon commonsense understandings (where they do not necessarily exist) of civility and respect, of incivility and anti-social behaviour and/or criminality. Blurred definitions can impede the public liberties of those who have done little wrong and dull the impact of interventions that require targeting at specific causes. Such conceptual work is important—not least because so much policy in this area is predicated on the assumptions that civility is declining, incivility is on the increase and all incivilities are damaging.

But where is the evidence? The second issue that demands further research is the experience of incivility and civility in the city. The various papers in this Review Issue demand that we seek to explore the manifestation of civility and incivility across the entirety of the public realm; we need to situate civility within all forms of social interaction. The papers also highlight the value of multidisciplinary and cross-cultural investigation. There is a need to look beyond the contemporary moral panic surrounding civility and the belief that incivility is a consequence of the behaviour of certain social groups and certain communities. The baseline review undertaken by Phillips and Smith in Australia is valuable in this respect, linking incivility to the entirety of the urban experience and as a condition impacting upon us all. There is a clear need to establish comparable baseline data sources and engage in longitudinal assessments of the changing nature and extent of incivility in the city.

Allied to this, we require to explore the impact of incivility upon well-being, to distinguish where appropriate between the positive and negative consequences of encountering difference: to determine when anxiety emerges out of a lack of familiarity or from communication barriers; and, to determine when anxiety emerges as a consequence of intentioned rudeness, aggression and so forth. In so doing, we need to move beyond institutional and organisational discourses around (in)civility to a much closer engagement with the experiences of those viewed as perpetrators and victims of incivility.

Thirdly, we need to consider not only the intended but also the unintended consequences of policies that strive to engender or enforce civility. We need to look beyond the short-term success or failure of interventions designed to eradicate the manifestation and experience of incivility to the longer-term impact of such initiatives on the nature of civility and the quality of social relations. For example, whilst disorder may feed withdrawal from the public realm, policies that merely focus on the eradication (zero tolerance) of disorder may do little to promote engagement in the public realm and thus little to promote civility (or rather they address only a narrow aspect of civility). There is a necessity to consider more experimental research, designed to explore the relation between different notions and experiences of urbanity and civility. The on-going research reported by Brannan et al. is of key relevance here.

Research that explores the foundations of respect and its link to tolerance is also required. Boyd reminds us that civility should be considered in more than its formal and substantive connotations; rather, it concerns moral relations between the citizenry. The ‘good city’ (drawing on Amin) is one in which civility rests not only upon the tolerance of difference, but also on the promotion of social solidarity based upon a care and regard for otherness. The importance of work in this field should not be
underestimated. Returning to the work of Sennett, he observes that

A city isn’t just a place to live, to shop, and to go out and have kids play. It’s a place that implicates how one derives one’s ethics, how one develops a sense of justice, how one learns to talk with and learn from people who are unlike oneself, which is how a human being becomes human (Sennett, 1989, p. 83).
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