

distortion and loss of authenticity. Accordingly, Chapter 13 is **Jan Sircus's** short paper, 'Invented places', which was published in *Prospect* in 2001. Sircus (2001: 31) likens sense-of-place to a brand that connotes certain expectations of quality, consistency and reliability. The influence of theme parks and invented places is widespread and pervasive and, as Sircus suggests, Disneyland is the quintessential invented place. The (supposedly) artificial creation or manufacture of 'places' and place values in ways that draw upon the techniques of theme parks – usually to further the purposes of consumption – occurs in a variety of settings, including shopping malls, historic districts, urban entertainment districts, central city redevelopments and tourist destinations (see Relph, 1976; Zukin, 1991; Hannigan, 1998). Providing a good discussion of the phenomena, Sircus's paper is additionally valuable because its author worked as an architect and as a senior Disney 'Imagineer'. By presenting a difference perspective, the paper highlights the apparent disjuncture between the 'elitist' concerns of critics and the more populist desires, made manifest by the popularity of such places. As Sircus argues, place is neither good nor bad simply because it is 'real' rather than surrogate or 'authentic' rather than pastiche – people enjoy both; they are not inevitably fooled by the invention and 'fakery' and, furthermore, it may not matter to their experience.

This leads on to Chapter 14, **Sharon Zukin's** 'Learning from Disney World' – a chapter from her

1995 book, *The Cultures of Cities* (Blackwell, Oxford). A valuably critical article about what urban design might have to learn from Disney World and from theme parks generally, the paper has two themes. The first relates to the making places vis-à-vis theme parks (i.e. inventing/reinventing places). The second relates to control and management strategies, which, in turn, moves the discussion onto the social dimension of urban design. The lesson here – and from the previous selection – is that all design involves a process of imagining changed outcomes, either by changing existing places or by creating places anew. The theme park might be at one end of a continuum of authenticity, while incremental alterations to existing urban environments might be at the other, but this immediately raises debates about precisely what is meant by authenticity: is authenticity resident, for example, in the environment or is it constructed in the mind of the beholder? An answer – but certainly not the end of the debate – is that authenticity is in the experience rather than in the object (Ashworth, 1997). Moreover, the original design of places is only one contribution to the perception of them, because the way places are managed and controlled over time also impacts on sense-of-place. Again, Disney World may be one extreme, but much of the so-called 'privatised' public realm (see Section Four) exhibits similar characteristics.

Matthew Carmona and Steve Tiesdell