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The aim of the paper is
debate on what it means today to be an inhabitant of a place.
try to build a framework to recognize residents and transient populations
(tourists, first of all) like different ways of being inhabitants of a place.
Nick Barley\(^1\) writes of London:

“The 100 million airborne arrivals who descend on London each year are equal to almost twice the population of Britain. Travel on this scale now makes it impossible to characterise cities as stable entities. They’re no longer simply geographical locations but urban contexts adapting themselves to constant flux. As much as it is a collection of buildings, a city is a shifting set of conceptual possibilities, robust enough to expand and contract on demand without losing its essential identity”.

“London looks like it does, and is organised in the way that it is, precisely because people have always moved around it

It may be the landmark buildings which characterise individual cities in our minds, but while Big Ben and Nelson’s Column let us know we are in London, the way we move around these immobile has been especially important in the delineation of the city.

London is London for this reason.”

1. Barley N.(2000), Breathing Cities: the architecture of movement, Basel ; Boston : Birkhäuser,
The structure of a city and a territory and its transformations (physical and immaterial) arise from the movement that is generated around them, a movement of populations, people that work, sleep, buy, or "simply" pass.

*The Cities take its meanings from the system of relationships between places and people*.¹

These meanings are not fixed and invariable, but are constantly being negotiated, being changed, being recoded.

Govern a place requires an understanding of the diversity and richness of these different meanings.

---

¹ Amin A., Thrift N. (2001), *Cities. Reimagining the urban*, Blackwell Publishers,
The sentence (and a lot of literature in this sense) lead us to say that a city is the image of its inhabitants.

They co-evolve, every time that the city changes, change something in its inhabitants, and every time we have inhabitants changes (in composition, number, tradition, uses, culture etc) there are changes in the city, both in physical and immaterial forms.

But in the past (in general, not everywhere and not always) it was clear whom were the inhabitants of the city. They were the ones that lived, slept, worked, and passed the majority of their time in the city, in one word the community of the city.

In this sense describe the city or its inhabitants it was very similar, the two things were strictly connected.
Nowadays we recognize an individual, mobile and plural life that is not easy to describe.

So the populations of a city are very different and they are so much, so plural, that it is not immediate to understand who they are, describing the city, but (may be) we can better understand the city if we study its inhabitants.
The tourist population today is one (or more than one) of the most important transient population

Tourism policies are usually characterized by a sectorial, economic approach, they are not seen as territorial policies.

But tourism means new places, houses, infrastructures, pipelines, power lines and so on. At the same time, tourism brings different people together, new residents arrive from other countries, the culture is influenced, places are viewed in different ways and new meanings are given to them.

Policies that affects the population composition of a territory, its urban, physical and environmental structure should not be sectorial; we do think that the tourism policies are territorial policies.

Investigate how many population are on a place, and who they are appears necessary in order to understand the transformation of a place and device suitable policies to govern it.
It is a rethinking of the paradigms of government: if before it was clear that the government was done for the citizens, and these were identified with residents, today we are facing new forms of citizenship, more elusive and rarefied but with important territorial implications.
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but “Who is a Tourist?”
Tourist: some definitions

The World Tourism Organization defines tourists as:

people who "travel to and stay in places outside their usual environment for more than twenty-four (24) hours and not more than one consecutive year for leisure, business and other purposes not related to the exercise of an activity remunerated from within the place visited".

For Cohen (1974) – A tourist is a temporary traveller, travelling in the expectation of pleasure from the novelty and change experienced on a relatively long and non-recurrent round trip
Cohen (1974) illustrates that the tourism component can be represented in a fuzzy way.

"In the modern theory of sets, a fuzzy variable" is defined as the type of imprecision that is associated with fuzzy sets such that within classes there is not a sharp transition between members and non“

“There exist many traveller roles which possess a “touristic component” of varying strength prominent examples are the Italian or Irish immigrant who pays a visit to the “old country”, the young professional engaging in “touristry”, who is in search for jobs which will give him an opportunity to see the world while working (Pape 1965), the pilgrim who combine devotion with some “religious tourism” or the persons who “takes the waters” to a spa, ostensibly to improve his health but actually to enjoy himself (Lowenthal 1962).”

There is not therefore a dichotomy or a strong gradient between the travellers who are tourists and the ones who are not.
Today the ways to do tourism and the types of tourists have exponentially increased their number.

In the literature we can found a variety of reasons and different ways of dealing with places and populations; we have to pass from the concepts of tourism and tourist in singlar form to the plural one: we have to speak of tourisms and tourists.
The post-modern tourism goes ahead this concept.

Uriely recognize three fundamental characteristics:

• Lack of differentiation between the everyday life and touristic experience;
• Multiplication of different experiences within the same touristic moment;
• The role of subjectivity in the construction of the tourist experience.

The consequence is that the touristic component it isn’t present just in the traveller, but is present in every population of a place, also in the resident one.
The various definitions of tourist show the effort required to "cut off" a lot of transient populations that aren't tourists, but neither inhabitants in the traditional sense.

This effort can hide the idea that after that a tourist knows, lives and attends a place he can become another thing.

The activities that the tourist does, the time spent in a place and the involvement processes within places and their social structure, lead (or may lead) the tourist to become, gradually, more close to be like an inhabitant.

In this sense tourists should not be considered different from the inhabitants, but as different shades of the same population.
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Then Who is a inhabitant?

The above leads us to wonder about who is the contemporary inhabitant of a place and especially about what being inhabitant means.

Where once there was essentially an identification between the resident community and the place, now the link is very different and variable among individuals.

New populations have appeared interpreting new lifestyles.
To try to investigate further what the distinctive elements of inhabit a place are we try to build a conceptual framework of reference. We took into account three assumptions:

1. Whoever can knows whatever place and becomes inhabitant of it. “To estimate the type of relationship that links an individual to a place - in terms of perception and attribution of meaning to places we should start from a general point, namely that any place in any city can be, by a any person, known or unknown.” To become inhabitants of a place it is not strictly necessary to have past ties, inherit knowledge or otherwise.

2. The knowledge and the experience of a place are incremental If knowledge of a place is incrementally, each person can became “more inhabitant” with experience.

3. There are many ways to inhabit a territory, each and all contribute to its environmental, cultural and social transformation.
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Four dimensions seem to be relevant for defining the inhabitant of a place:

I. The time he/she passes over the territory;

II. the type of performed activities;

III. the social involvement;

IV. the attitudes of places.

Each one defines the quality of the inhabitant, and only good scores in all identifies the traditional (good) inhabitant; different scores correspond to different inhabitants.
We can assert that being inhabitants of a place is a fuzzy variable.

For each dimension of inhabit listed above, we can identify a set of indicators helpful to define a measure. We can report each value on a scale from 0 to 100, and build an overall score, in the same scale, that summarizes the previous one.

The “measure” of being inhabitants of a place can be defined like "INHABITANTNESS".
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The minimum value, the zero, represent those who are not inhabitants of our territory. They aren’t inhabitants today but they can become inhabitants in the future.

The maximum value, 100% represents the individuals who have been living in the city for a long time, work, consume and spend in it their free time and, also, “take care of” it and are an integral part of local society: in short, the traditional inhabitants.

In the between are all the other populations.
We can consider inhabitantness as an indicator of the goodness of a person: greater is the inhabitantness, more a person is better for the territory.

Actions that improve the presence of populations with high inhabitantness or policies that increase this title are certainly interventions that improve the local system, with spin-offs on its anthropogenic (social and cultural) and environmental components.

Looking at contemporary life is clear that no one is inhabitant of a place at 100%.

Lifestyles are so many that today everyone is inhabitant of several places in different ways.
The same score doesn’t represent the same population, inhabitantness must be assessed in its single scores in the different dimensions, and over time, in its evolution.

Two inhabitants at 50% for example, can be very different from each other: the first might be a person been born and grew up in that place and after emigrated, and the other a person been born elsewhere but who now frequents the place assiduously and that now works there. It is clear that speak about inhabitantness at 50% it is not sufficient to identify the populations, we need to have other indications.

So beyond providing a static frame of inhabitantness, it is also important to have a dynamic one.
The theoretical framework was aimed at trying to understand, differentiate and improve (in number or quality) the "good populations" of a tourist destination, but with general considerations.

Nowadays there is not a clear difference among those who moves in an area: all are inhabitants, albeit in different ways and measures.

If tourism is a view that must be overcome and necessarily we have to speak of tourisms, also the time has come to stop talking of inhabitant and put the emphasis on inhabitants.
Describe a city or a territory through its inhabitants could be helpful for understanding the dynamics at work and for a more aware plan for the future.

It doesn’t mean forget our traditional analysis but add a new point of view.

Take into account these population obviously doesn’t mean that we have to satisfy each need that they have. In a lot of cases they compete and we have to choose which population is the one that is better for that place at that moment, to achieve a vision, a strategy.

But take into account inhabitantness, in all its dimensions and its evolution during the time, means that I know what is happening to the populations of a place and I can decide in a more aware way those who benefit of my policies, programs and plans, in brief what kind of inhabitants we need.
The city inevitably becomes the mirror of its inhabitants, whether stable or transient. The inhabitants make the city, and they evolve together to the city, influencing one each other.

The project of the city absolutely must be accompanied by a project, an idea, a path that think to the inhabitants, in the large sense that we describe.

Planning the future of a place, means, inevitably, planning its inhabitants.
Thank you for the attention