The Oxford Handbook of the History of Tourism and Travel
Eric Zuelow (ed.), Kevin J. James (ed.)
https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190889555.001.0001
Published: 2022 **Online ISBN:** 9780190889586 **Print ISBN:** 9780190889555

CHAPTER

Poverty, Class, and Tourism: From Seeing Poverty to Modern Philanthropy, Social Policy, and Antipoverty Activism

Fabian Frenzel

https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190889555.013.20 Pages C20.P1–C20.N55
Published: 19 December 2022

Abstract

Tourism's relationship to poverty and class is multifaceted and has changed over time. Tourism is a social phenomenon in which class and poverty often become apparent and are sometimes negotiated. In this chapter, the author focuses on a certain aspect of the relationship between tourism and class, namely tourism's role in enabling and underpinning the politics of class and poverty. Using the context of Victorian slumming as an empirical backdrop, the chapter discusses three aspects of the politics of class in tourism: (1) the relationship of knowledge and class in tourism, with tourism producing but also obscuring knowledge; (2) the relationship of tourism and inequality, interrogating how tourism enables claims making in contexts of inequality; and (3) the role of free time for political action, investigating how the availability of free time and space has enabled the formation of class-based politics. The chapter contributes to better understanding the role of tourism in political and class-based action, a role not widely acknowledged in political history and social movement studies.

Keywords: class, poverty, slumming, Victorian slums, Friedrich Engels, inequality, nineteenth century, space and poverty, free time.

Subject: World History, History

Series: Oxford Handbooks

Tourism's relationship to poverty and class is multifaceted and has changed over time. Tourism is a social phenomenon in which class and poverty often become apparent and are sometimes negotiated. In this chapter I focus on a certain aspect of the relationship between tourism and class, namely tourism's role in enabling and underpinning the politics of class and poverty. I take the notion of the 'political' here with a wide view: not simply movements, unions, and parties, but also writing, witnessing, and making visible and audible, as Rancière has proposed, what is not-visible and what is not-audible.[1]

There are at least three major debates when considering class, poverty, and tourism. It is a truism, first, that travel and tourism open eyes, at least potentially, to things unknown and unseen. The original secular travel is often linked to a desire to discover the world, in the "age of discoveries," and contributed to an expansion of empirical knowledge, tested and confirmed, using travel as the method.[2] But such a positive view of tourism as linked to enlightenment and thus emancipation has long been questioned. Critical reflection on the history of Western colonial expansion has confirmed that the processes of these discoveries were not simply pursuits of knowledge in the abstract, but part and parcel of a drive for domination and appropriation of the "discovered" people, their resources and labor, their culture, and their knowledge.[3] Thus, the process of knowledge expansion by travel was combined with an active act of forgetting, of covering up and obscuring knowledge.[4] Poverty and class, by the same token, are in a constant process of being seen and obscured, of becoming subject of the gaze but also its distortions, in tourism. The main consideration, then, is if and how the knowledge of poverty and class is produced in and via tourism and what emancipatory potential this knowledge production may have.

Second, this speaks to an inherent inequality that often underpins tourism. Modern tourism as a practice initially exclusive to only the richest and most privileged has over time become more broadly available, including first European bourgeois and workers, and since the final decades of the twentieth century, the middle classes of the developing world.[5] But such increasing inclusivity has not removed the inherent inequality of tourism. In this context, being able to do tourism is a marker of relative wealth of those who can travel, but then also brings a geographical dimension of spatialized inequality, in which transport technologies underpin the matching of the relative wealth of "mobile" tourists with the relative poverty of "locals."[6] Tourism has long been seen, on this basis, as a potential conduit of economic growth and development, bringing investment to create employment and tax receipts as well as other multipliers. But as research into the "tourism poverty nexus"[7] has shown, tourism's record in poverty alleviation has been far from only positive, with investments often leaking back to tourist-sending regions and tourism extending rather than narrowing inequalities.[8] Researchers have argued for some time that successful antipoverty tourism requires stringent tourism planning and regulation and cannot be expected to happen automatically.[9] This chapter interrogates not so much if and how the movement of people between spaces that are unequal may contribute to more equality between them in direct economic terms, but rather explores the role of tourism in making any collective claim for equality more powerful.[10]

Third, tourism and class also relate to the role of free time and space for social and political action, but also underpinning the identity work of class consciousness. The critique of bourgeois ideas of liberalism and democracy in the nineteenth century rested to no small measure on the insight that people who spent most of the day working have no time to engage in politics.[11] Free time itself enables the observation of political issues and participation in political action. Without free time, political action can hardly be pursued. Indeed, class consciousness, as the fundamental enabler of claims making, can arguably only be developed in free time. Collective spaces to come together and share experiences are equally central.[12]

Tourists often seek out philanthropic and activists' engagements, including involvement in political causes in the widest sense, but also specifically those aiming to advance working-class emancipation, liberation and struggle, and the struggle against poverty.[13] As this chapter argues, tourism has been an important enabler of political action on issues of class, and of cross-class encounters which underpin such action. This often involves the creation of infrastructures, meeting places, study centers, and social spaces, a role of tourism that is rarely acknowledged in the histories of social movements and political action.

This becomes apparent in the ways in which nineteenth-century explorers "discovered" new urban poverty spatialized in distinct neighborhoods in British cities, which had formed following large scale rural-to-urban migration. Tourism at this point was a well-established bourgeois practice, underpinning, at least within Europe, increasing connectivity in information and mobility. But the modern urban form had only just started to develop. New low-income and often informal neighborhoods, such as London's East End, moved into the focus of a new class-conscious tourist gaze. Addressing the three guiding questions in turn, the following sections review the touristic practices of early reporters of urban poverty, with a focus on Engels whose *Condition of The Working Class in England* is an early example of writing about urban poverty. This follows with a historical recap of the development of a wider taste for exploring urban slums in the second half of the nineteenth century. Then, returning to the way poverty becomes perceivable, I explore two more distinct developments. Initially I return to Engels and his 1870s writings on the housing question to show how the abstraction from empirical observation opens new insights into the structural logics that underlie the formation of capitalist cities, and their poor neighborhoods. In the final section I investigate the formation of modern antipoverty action resulting from slumming practice. I conclude by drawing the story together.

Discovering Urban Poverty

Being a tourist in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century meant, for the most part, being a member of the nobility or of the higher bourgeoisie and seeking, in the long tradition of the Grand Tour of the previous century, a close encounter with what was perceived as the "European" Classical past of ancient Roman and Greece (see Verhoeven, this volume).[14] But horizons had also broadened beyond European travels—however, only for rather few who were voluntary travelers. While global travels had become regular in the eighteenth century, most of these were movements of migration, transportation, and slavery, largely invisible and often ignored by an emergent bourgeois public. This new public, however, eagerly consumed the reports of explorative journeys into the Americas, Africa, and Asia, launched frequently with great public fanfare and often co-funded by wealthy participants, eager to take part in scientific discoveries. Reports of the explorer Georg Forster of his travels with James Cook were bestsellers, widely read by European audiences in the 1780s.[15] In the aftermath of the American and French revolutions, travel writers no longer only focused on scientific reporting of new worlds. Reports on other places became somewhat more political, interrogated questions of freedom and democracy, and triggered reflections on the state of politics at home. Tocqueville's journalistic accounts of US democracy and civil society or Lord Byron's travel reports were rendering travel writing socially and politically conscious. Most bourgeois travelers did not have the funds Byron commanded, but many were equally agile and mobile. At times, such mobility was linked to increasingly international bourgeois business pursuits. It was in this context that an already radicalized twenty-four-year-old Friedrich Engels came to Manchester in the 1840s for a twelve-month visit. He was sent by his father, a small-town German industrialist, who co-owned a factory in Manchester. The point of the mission was partly to stymie young Engels' revolutionary ideas. Engels had experienced the transformation of the small medieval towns in his native western Germany into new centers of emergent German textile industry and had developed an astute sense for questions of social justice. Aligning himself with the early communist movement, he had formed what was to become a lifelong friendship with Karl Marx. Both supported attempts to establish a communist party in Germany and in Europe. Once in Manchester, Engels' interest in the social question intensified, triggered by the experience of the significantly advanced industrial capitalism of England and its social consequences.[16]

Horrified by what he saw, he penned his 1848 *Condition of the Working Class in England*.[17] The book was written in German for a German audience and an English translation did not appear until 1890s. As such it did not influence Victorian slum writing by British authors emerging around the same time.[18] In turn, Engels' book was massively influenced by this growing body of work in which Victorian writers reflected on the social transformations caused by industrialization and emerged new urban forms, including slums.[19] Engels relied on several sources, including statistics and parliamentary reports—materials that would later also inform Marx's *Capital*. But he was also a travel writer, drawing on his own sojourns and direct observations of Manchester's working-class neighborhoods.

The book is emblematic of bourgeois travel writing and slum reporting in the nineteenth century in several ways. There is the concern with the working class, with actual living conditions of workers and slum housing. Like other slum writing of the time, Engels' work produced visibility and contributed to the construction of a new matter of concern. The use of data, observational and experiential on the one hand, and statistical and scientific on the other, mirrored the early attempts at creating a science of the social. Statistical knowledge featured broadly, often taken from Kay's *The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Class* and from government reports.[20] For most parts, Engels' account also differed from the predominant sensationalist newspaper and press reports of slums which tended to link poverty with notions of crime and moral deprivation of those in the slum.[21] Engels instead worked toward a structural analysis, in which conditions were blamed on the capitalist order rather than on the poor. In the book, Engels considered the wider political situation, wage levels and organization efforts of the working class, among other elements.

While Engels made the working class and their dismal living conditions visible, he still produced a very specific visibility. In his account, foremost, members of the working class never spoke. This is not just a reflection of the time. In the works of Henry Mayhew, produced around the same time, voices of slum residents were already established as both narrative elements and convincing ethnographic data.[22] But Engels not only ignored the voices of those he encountered in the slum, he also specifically silenced his own research partner and lover, Mary Burns. Burns enabled Engels' insight and access the slum, she was his tour guide and broker. Throughout the book there is no recognition of her role. Most importantly, Engels combined a valorization of the English working class with a scathing and racist description of the Irish. Taking on prevalent prejudices at the time, Engels failed to extend his structural analysis of capitalism to immigrants and committed the silencing of the contribution of Mary Burns, who was herself of Irish descent, a second time. Speaking to a German audience still largely unfamiliar with the effects of industrialization on human habitats, his work reflected several emergent German stereotypes about the British. Appreciation of an advanced developmental stage of capitalism was mixed with simplistic accounts of British politics and culture.

Overall, Engels's voice in the book is resonant with what Jens Wietschorke[23] has argued about many Victorian slum writers, who claim a universal vantage point from which to observe, report, and map the slum as "Other" in an orientalist discourse.[24] Engels scandalized the observed difference because of structural conditions, and there is little blame attributed to those Othered. But in constructing the slum as an Other place, fully incorporating many of the tropes of slum reporting at the time, he effectively marked those living in the slum as Other, with little agency on their own. Thus, despite and beyond its early appearance, the *Condition of the Working Class in England* is a key example of "seeing the slum" in the emergent Victorian slum literature, a limited and distorted visibility for the poor, who are put in their place.[25] Finally, perhaps most importantly for the Orientalist trope, Engels also produced himself as the bourgeois subject: autonomous, independent, and knowledgeable. Thus, the slum becomes an imaginary that serves the creation of a white middle class, political astute, and caring subject. While the works of Engels and his early Victorian contemporaries were often based on experiences of travel into the slums, the wider audiences they served did not corporeally travel into the slum. They read the reports and books from their armchairs. However increasingly corporeal visits followed the literary travel.

Slumming as a Tourist Practice

As slums emerged as a matter of concern in Victorian writing, with its skewed visibility and its Orientalist tones, it also triggered a new practice of leisured visitation of slums.[26] "Slumming" occurred as a private or hidden practice concerning mostly the pursuits of leisure in slum areas, such as gambling, illicit substance consumption, and prostitution. But in the 1870s a more public form of slumming developed. While triggered by the new slum literature, this tourism phenomenon was also caused by the emergence of new large working-class neighborhoods that were increasingly impossible to ignore as a feature of the city. Initially better-off Londoners went to visit poor neighborhoods of their city, but soon international visitors, in early forms of urban tourism, also joined.[27] The phenomenon occurred not just in London but across Europe and North America.[28] Pictorial displays of slum visitation, sometimes satirical and critical in tone, showed slum visitors protected by police, and indicated how the practice was questioned early on as problematic.[29] The leisurely slum stroll did little to undermine the dominant Othering of literary slum representations. Slums were considered Other worlds, distant in culture and habit, and this made part of their attraction. Slumming often consolidated and confirmed the assumed difference: people living in slums, whether or not they actually were ethnically and culturally different, were often constructed as such, and any existing differences were emphasized in the tours. Just as in the writing, such Othering came with a strong dose of moral concern. The living conditions in slums, so was assumed, made people living there morally more dubious.

Responding to the questioning of slumming as a social practice, organizers of tours started to develop a discourse of social responsibility and pointed to the necessity to address the "slum issue." Moral concerns thus formed a justification of intervention, a *mission civilisatrice*, in which education and reforming slums became a "white men's burden" at home. The early "missions" movement, of which I will talk more below, is an example: its motivation was explicitly linked to Christian morals and framed charitable work as an ethical obligation.

There were parallels between slumming in the East of London and the colonization of the countries further away (see Butler, this volume and Jennings, this volume).[30] In the discovery work of slumming and in the linguistic comparison to the colonies of the Empire, poor neighborhoods of the city thus paradoxically moved into greater distance from the rest of the city. But this distancing of inner-city neighborhoods within the bourgeois imagination was also a process of making them visible: of seeing anew poverty in its urban form as spatialized Other. The slum as an actual social space was toured in fascination over difference, different lives, different ethnicities. As in writing, such travel practices confirmed the bourgeois subjectivity at the time. It makes sense to read public slumming exactly as such: not so much as ways of getting to know the city but positioning the city in relation to the bourgeois subjectivity that claimed its center. The stronger ethnic component of this type of tourism is visible wherever ethnic difference is a feature of class difference. It applied in Victorian London, where rural-to-urban migrants did not stem merely from rural England, but increasingly from Ireland, from across the channel and from the colonies further afield. It was even more the case in late nineteenth-century North America, where the regular touring of African American neighborhoods became part and parcel of the developing race consciousness in the North of the United States: an appreciation of African Americans not quite as fellow citizens, but as contributors to the wider cultural offer of the US city.[31]

But such clear-cut separation of slum and nonslum, of rich and poor, of a white, mostly male[32] subject and the world he observed, as evident in slum writing, was much harder to sustain in travel practice: slumming as a tourist endeavor prompted pollution and violation of the boundaries: the urban *flaneurs* of nineteenth-century London, Paris, or Vienna risked (often quite voluntarily) emergence into the grit of the city. Encounters in real life were harder to control and spill-overs occurred. Literal slumming prompted cross-class encounters. Most importantly, slum dwellers visited rather than written and read about, could speak back, and did so in several ways. Before we turn to the spaces in which those encounters occurred and were managed, we need to consider how the distance that is both the condition of slumming, but also often its result, comes about. How does the modern city develop distinct poor and rich neighborhoods?

The Spatial Organization of Poverty

The visibility of poverty is connected to its occurrence in physical space, its prevalence and presence as a tangible social fact. The formation of slums in modern cities in the nineteenth century constituted a very specific spatial organization of urban poverty. In the premodern and early modern cities, poverty occurred more ubiquitous, neighborhoods were less segregated and inequality, while significant, did not normally occur in specific, segregated spaces.[33] But with rural-to-urban migration, triggered by increasing demand for industrial labor and enabled by modern transportation, modern cities grew and new neighborhoods formed as specific locations for the poor.[34] With respect to contemporary examples, Saunders has spoken of “arrival cities,” neighborhoods where new urbanites settle first.[35] The initial reactions of urban policy to such developments in nineteenth-century cities were aiming at making slums less visible. The clearing and regeneration of major thoroughfares in modern cities was a key urban policy tool, developed in the UK but professed in the works of Haussmann in Paris.[36] “Haussmann’s method” also prompted Engels to revisit the question of living conditions, housing, and urban political economy. This time, he relied much less on empirical information and direct access. Instead, now equipped with a developed theoretical apparatus of political-economic thinking, he analyzed the formation of slums abstractly. Engels’s critique of Haussmann was written in 1872 and provided a unique and novel theoretical explanation for the development of the phenomenon he observed.

Engels’s specific contribution lies in providing an understanding of the city as a spatial expression of the capitalist political economy. Engels argued that the spatial development of modern city was an expression of the antagonistic nature of class struggle. He had already pointed out, in his *Condition of the Working Class in England* with the example of Manchester, how rich and poor were separated into distinct neighborhoods in such a way that the better-off urbanites did not have to see the poor and their living conditions: “The town is peculiarly built, so that a person may live in it for years, and go in and out daily without coming into contact with a working-people’s quarter or even with workers … the working people’s quarters are sharply separated from the sections of the city reserved for the working classes.”[37]

The resulting invisibility of the working class represented a spatial fix to a political problem, namely, how to deal with social inequality produced by capitalist development. Rancière’s notion of the division of the sensible applied: the intention was to erase the poor and to create a situation of “police”: “Move on, there is nothing to see here.”[38] Such policing of the sensible also meant that working-class people were not recognized and had no voice in urban politics. The invisibility of working-class neighborhoods aimed at preventing the ability of their residents to make political-economic claims or to form coalitions with middle classes to challenge the existing political-economic order. Underlying this policing were material conditions of urban development and their spatial dimension. Engels highlighted the relevance of urban real estate and its value as a secondary domain of capitalist accumulation:

> The growth of the big modern cities gives the land in certain areas, particularly in those which are centrally situated, an artificial and often colossally increasing value; the buildings erected on these areas depress this value, instead of increasing it, because they no longer correspond to the changed circumstances. They are pulled down and replaced by others. This takes place above all with workers' houses which are situated centrally and whose rents, even with the greatest overcrowding, can never, or only very slowly, increase above a certain maximum. They are pulled down and in their stead shops, warehouses and public buildings are erected. Through its Haussmann in Paris, Bonapartism exploited this tendency tremendously for swindling and private enrichment.[39]

Engels' analyses of the urban condition are an early theory of urban gentrification, increasingly used in contemporary urban studies.[40] According to David Harvey, privately owned real estate in the city constitutes a monopoly power, an ability to extract surplus value in terms of proximity of locations in relation to places of work or consumption.[41] The spatial organization of poor neighborhoods on the outskirts of cities, and their regular clearance or "regeneration" as cities grew, resulted from this specific political economy of urban development, which Engels described as the "Haussmann Method."[42]

But this logic also enabled the formation of slums as distinct "spaces of the poor."[43] In these spaces new urban social movements started to form other than the factory floor—around neighborhoods, for instance, and focused on questions of social reproduction: a formation of a class consciousness beyond work.[44] The spatial organization of poverty in slum neighborhoods also underpinned the growth of slumming as a social practice. Paradoxically, the attempt to render poverty invisible opened urban poverty for a new visibility in distant and separate spaces.

A Political Gaze on Urban Poverty

Thirty years after his original piece of slum reporting, Engels provided a theoretical clue to the formation not just of slum neighborhoods: a theoretically informed analysis of the political-economic conditions underlying the capitalist production of space. This theoretical analysis, among others, formed the basis for a new gaze on urban poverty that can be distinguished from Engels' gaze when writing about Manchester slums thirty years earlier. This more abstract, political gaze now also started to influence slumming practices: The discovery of poverty as a matter of concern, expressed initially in Orientalist slumming practices based on Othering were increasingly recast as attempts to bridge the new class-based geography of the city. Here a new politics of slumming emerged which can be described as "Same-ing" in difference to the Othering described earlier.[45] Slumming here can be rethought as a practice that remakes the slum into a place of proximity, not distance, a politics that corrects the distribution of the sensible that obscures the connections of the political-economic order. While the emergent bourgeois experience of the slum was not a guarantee to overcome the limits of Othering, Engels' theoretical analysis (and the many that followed in his vein) provide an understanding of how to overcome it, and thus helps to form a new gaze to travel the slum with. In the next section I want to show how the formation of slum neighborhoods and the travel practices into them, underpinned by a new gaze, enabled new cross-class encounters and activism, even the development of social democratic politics. Tourist practices became part and parcel of transformational social movements. This can be linked to the formation of infrastructures that offered hospitality and anchor points to outsiders aiming to engage with the slum.

Slumming Infrastructures

If initial slumming consisted of private endeavors in pursuit of illicit consumption, later Victorian slumming emphasized social responsibility and moral pursuit, and was thus often in need of public display. As Seth Koven has shown, the formation of slumming was intimately linked to the formation of new charitable enterprises, often in the domain of childcare. The charity Barnados grew, propelled by a pioneering use of photography, into a project to support street children in their development.[46] The formation of such institutions required resources and infrastructures: investments made in the formation of charitable institutions, the purchasing of houses, and the building of schools. These new institutions needed to be staffed, too, and thus required a constant flow of income. Part of such income was provided via practices of slumming, either by direct visits, volunteering sojourns or indirectly via the use of photography which was then used to mobilize donations. Likewise, new institutions in poorer neighborhoods provided points of references and attractions to be visited on slum tours, and as such consolidated and legitimized the slumming practice itself. Most importantly they provided infrastructures and places to visit and stay. This was also the case with emergent missions and settlements.

Initially driven by a perceived lack of churches in newly formed slum areas, the second half of the nineteenth century saw the increasing development of settlement projects in London’s slums, and these became the most important enablers of slumming practices and of cross-class encounters in their time. The first settlements were missions, proselyting in purpose, and attempting to bring moral and religious instruction for the religiously diverse new urbanites of London’s slums.[47] The settlement model expanded when Oxford colleges got involved. Oxford House Settlement was established in 1884 in Bethnal Green, providing educational as well as recreational activities.[48] The purpose of the settlements was to allow students to stay in the slum areas to study its residents and their living conditions. At the same time, they volunteered in education, culture, sport, and general support of residents. Such work was often premised on the patronizing notion of moral superiority of the better-off “settlers,” of which the slum residents could learn.

Toynbee Hall in Whitechapel was to become perhaps the most influential of the new settlements in London’s East End.[49] Initially reserved for male explorers, settlement projects became increasingly open to women.[50] The model also spread from Victorian London to other cities, with early visitors to Toynbee Hall establishing similar institutions in the US and beyond. In continental Europe and North America, the settlement movement thrived long after it had peaked in London.[51] Arguably the settlements were places in which cross-class encounters enabled a practical implementation of the theoretical insights that political-economic reflections had provided. Engels’ critique of the political economy of the capitalist city was experienced and addressed, a gaze formed in combining abstract knowledge with first-hand encounters. However, the class differences and practices of Othering did not necessarily give way to Same-ing in the newly enabled cross-class encounters. While settlements provided spaces for the working classes to speak back, or appropriate the discourses of power and knowledge, settlements remained premised on a very specific notion of downward mobility and colonizing zeal. However, some transformation of the gaze caused by the settlements can be inferred from the development of individuals who took part in the Settlement program. Toynbee House, for example, was used as a base for the empirical studies of slum conditions by businessman Charles Booth, who pioneered empirical reach and methods of urban studies. Among the supporters of the project, working in data collection in East London, was Beatrix Potter. Learning the basic craft of social research, Beatrix Potter would become a leading researcher in the Fabian society, in which she became a driving force. With her husband Sidney Webb, the couple encapsulate the spirit and outlook of twentieth century social democracy in the UK. Their work in the slum settlements informed their developing politics.[52] One of the many interesting developments is the education of key twentieth century social democratic figures: Clement Attlee as well as several other key members of the Labour party had gone through the experience of “slumming” in the settlement movement.

It is interesting in this regard to consider the ideology of the Fabian society as a concrete example of the limits of politics emerging from the new slumming gaze. Most of the founding members of the Fabian society were from better-off backgrounds, drawing on lifetime endowments or family wealth to pursue their socialist activities. Fabians were central to the developing social democratic compromise with the capitalist order underpinning social democratic politics in the UK. When Fabians visited the settlements in slums, they aimed at bettering slum conditions. Later in the twentieth century, when those same activists had become politicians building the welfare state, they arguably succeeded in overcoming of slum conditions. Whether the policies here pursued managed to overcome class division and the associated Othering, in social-spatial terms, of the poor toward a politics of Same-ing, is less certain. Indeed, as Hannah Arendt observed in her reflection on working-class politics and the formation of the "social question" as a political concern, "the poor" entered politics through their own deeds, but not in their own words.[53] Unable to overcome the Othering gaze that marked the middle-class recognition of poverty as a political concern, those Othered as poor began to self-identify as a separate social class.

As can be seen, a new political gaze underpinning slumming in late Victorian London has helped forming a political movement. As this activism ascended to political power in the twentieth century, slumming gazes started to underpin the politics of the welfare state. Rather than allowing to fundamentally challenge the division of the sensible, to create a politics of Same-ing, a class compromise developed in Victorian slumming that went on to dominate social policy in the twentieth century: the provision of social housing in estates which replaced slum housing but confirmed the spatial Othering of the earlier periods. Working-class consciousness, at least in the UK, grew accustomed to demand a compromise from the political-economic order out of which it was created, rather than pursuing its overthrow.

The Politics of Slumming

One of the many aspects of the relationship between tourism and class, slumming is a form of tourism that developed in response to the early development of slum areas in modern cities. Slumming was prefigured in the recognition and experience of urban poverty in the developing cities by bourgeois writers, pioneers of urban exploration and practices of Othering that should remain the dominant representational mode of the genre. Friedrich Engels' 1848 *Condition of the Working Class in England* provides an example of such slum writing. While astutely aware of the structural conditions and causes of the formation of these neighborhoods while expressing passion as well as love of detail, data, and evidence in his writing, Engels failed to overcome the typical pitfalls of the genre: the silencing of voices of those he described and even of those like Mary Burns who made it possible for him to have insights in the first place; the stereotyping of Irish immigrants among the slum residents along the lines of ethnic and racial prejudice prevalent at the time; and the limited reflection on the author's positionality.

It is against the backdrop of Engels and many other writings in this genre, that better-off urbanites started their own explorations of slum neighborhoods. Cities grew to unprecedented dimensions in the nineteenth century and the buzz of the urban sphere, its diversity, its cacophonies, and the large differences in wealth are both, sources of curiosity and an imperative to discovery. Those "slumming it" among the urban poor largely followed the practices of Othering that were prefigured in slum writing.

But actual journeys into the unknown territories of the city questioned the clear boundaries that Othering practices constructed where encounters between classes challenged the division of the sensible because they allowed those Othered to speak back. A key potential of tourism emerged: it can overcome the distancing on which, at least conceptually, it is predicated. This potential of tourism, one may argue, extends beyond the case study presented here and has implications for contemporary questions of travel and class between the Global North and South, for example.[54]

The Orientalist gaze that underpinned early Victorian slumming changed. This was expressed in writing as well as in practices. Engels' analysis of the political economy of the urban form explained why slum neighborhoods develop as distant urban spaces, providing the framework of a new political gaze on slum neighborhoods. Practices of slumming transformed, too, along side its growth and differentiation as a form of urban tourism. Leisurely sojourns into the poor parts of the city for diverse forms of illicit consumption were complemented by charitable engagement and volunteering. A new industry of charitable organizations, attempting to address the issue of poverty, developed. In the settlement movement, a new moral-political approach to slum tourism developed that increased the potential for cross-class encounters and politics. New institutions provided infrastructures and conceptual frames for the practice of visiting slum neighborhoods.

In the UK, this development can be shown to directly have led to a new political approach to seeking class compromise: no other movement encapsulated the social democratic approach to the social question as well as the Fabian society, founded practically in the context of the settlement of Toynbee House. For most of the later part of the twentieth century, their politics of gradual change, working-class emancipation, and the development of policies that culminated in the welfare state, dominated both the UK and other capitalist states. Despite its achievements, it reified the working class, extended a division of the sensible and helped maintaining the capitalist political economy. While this study focused on the UK in the nineteenth century, it would be insightful to explore the role of travel and slumming practices in wider contexts.[55] There is still a significant gap and potential to uncover the role of slumming in the formation of social democratic politics, in both UK and further afield. More radical movements also form in cross-class encounters enabled by tourism, as more recent examples from the Americas or from Africa can show.

This notwithstanding, there is a relevance of tourism for the question of a politics of class, and its dialectics between the formation of knowledge/power and its gazes and the actual touristic encounters that result. If class difference becomes an attraction in tourism, then this attraction historically entails Othering, both as a condition of the attraction and its confirmation.

This was presented against the backdrop of three debates: First, in terms of the knowledge production of poverty and class in tourism, we could see emancipatory transformations of knowledge, a deeper understanding of poverty and class, which we could link to travel practices. We could also identify, second, that the main thrust of tourism bringing more equality in the case study was not a result of direct interventions, the poverty relief in situ and the charitable activities enabled by it. Rather this was caused, in a longer timeframe, by the change in political agency and knowledge, and the formation of political movements, enabled by the touristic practice of slumming. Third, there is an important difference that tourism makes to other practices in which poverty and class are rendered visible, namely its production of spaces of encounter. Slumming practices became politically meaningful in the establishing places such as the settlements and missions. And while the emerged political movements did not overcome a politics of Othering, there was marked progress in transforming gazes, and in addressing the actual concern of urban poverty which can be attributed, at least in part, to slumming.

Further Reading

Dowling, Robert M. *Slumming in New York: From the Waterfront to Mythic Harlem*. Reprint. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2009.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Engels, Frederich. *The Housing Question*. Seattle, WA: CreateSpace, 2016.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Engels, Friedrich. *The Condition of the Working Class in England*. Edited by David McLellan. Reissue edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Frenzel, Fabian. "Beyond 'Othering': The Political Roots of Slum Tourism." In *Slum Tourism Poverty, Power and Ethics*, edited by Fabian Frenzel, Ko Koens, and Malte Steinbrink, 49–65. London: Routledge, 2012.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Frenzel, Fabian. *Slumming It: The Tourist Valorization of Urban Poverty*. London: Zed Books, 2016.

Harvey, David. *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Heap, C. *Slumming: Sexual and Racial Encounters in American Nightlife, 1885–1940*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2009.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Hunt, Tristram. *Marx's General: The Revolutionary Life of Friedrich Engels*. New York, NY: Henry Holt and Company, 2010.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Kay, Sir James. *The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes Employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester*. London: J. Ridgway, 1832.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Koven, Seth. *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Mayne, Alan. *Slums: The History of a Global Injustice*. London: Reaktion Books, 2017.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Mayne, Alan. *The Imagined Slum: Newspaper Representation in Three Cities, 1870–1914*. Leicester University Press, 1993.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Ranciere, Jacques. *The Philosopher and His Poor*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Ross, Ellen. *Slum Travelers: Ladies and London Poverty, 1860–1920*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Wietschorke, Jens. "'Go down into the East End'. Zur Symbolischen Topographie des urbanen Ostens um 1900." In *Das Prinzip "Osten": Geschichte und Gegenwart eines symbolischen Raums*, edited by Gunther Gebhard, Oliver Geisler, and Steffen Schröter, 77–102. Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2014.
Google Scholar Google Preview WorldCat COPAC

Notes

1 Jacques Rancière, "Ten Theses on Politics," *Theory & Event* 5, no. 3 (January 1, 2001), doi:10.1353/tae.2001.0028.

2 Justin Stagl, *A History of Curiosity: The Theory of Travel, 1550–1800* (London: Routledge, 2004).

3 Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Taylor & Francis, 2008).

4 Edward Said, *Orientalism: Western Conceptions of the Orient*, 5th ed. (London: Penguin, 2001).

5 Scott McCabe, "'Who Is a Tourist?' A Critical Review," *Tourist Studies* 5, no. 1 (January 4, 2005): 85–106,

doi:10.1177/1468797605062716; John Urry, *The Tourist Gaze*, 2nd ed. (London: Sage Publications, 2002).

6 Dfid, *Sustainable Tourism and Poverty Elimination Study a Report to the Department for International Development* (London: Deloitte & Touche, 1999); Colin Hall, *Pro-Poor Tourism: Who Benefits?: Perspectives on Tourism and Poverty Reduction* (Buffalo, NY: Channel View Publications, 2007).

7 Regina Scheyvens, “Exploring the Tourism-Poverty Nexus,” *Current Issues in Tourism* 10, no. 2 (2007): 231, doi:10.2167/cit318.0.

8 Regina Scheyvens, *Tourism and Poverty* (New York: Routledge, 2010).

9 Anna Spenceley and Dorothea Meyer, “Tourism and Poverty Reduction: Theory and Practice in Less Economically Developed Countries,” *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 20, no. 3 (April 1, 2012): 297–317, doi:10.1080/09669582.2012.668909; Christian M. Rogerson, “Urban Tourism, Economic Regeneration and Inclusion: Evidence from South Africa,” *Local Economy* 28, no. 2 (March 1, 2013): 188–202, doi:10.1177/0269094212463789.

10 Fabian Frenzel, “Slum Tourism in the Context of the Tourism and Poverty (Relief) Debate,” *DIE ERDE: Journal of the Geographical Society of Berlin* 144, no. 2 (November 19, 2013): 117–128, http://www.die-erde.org/index.php/die-erde/article/view/58.

11 Chris Rojek, *The Labour of Leisure: The Culture of Free Time* (London: SAGE Publications, 2010).

12 Anna Feigenbaum, Fabian Frenzel, and Patrick McCurdy, *Protest Camps* (London: Zed Books, 2013).

13 Fabian Frenzel, *Slumming It: The Tourist Valorization of Urban Poverty* (London: Zed Books, 2016).

14 James Buzard, *The Beaten Track: European Tourism, Literature, and the Ways to Culture, 1800–1918* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

15 Georg Forster, *A Voyage Round the World*, ed. Nicholas Thomas and Oliver Berghof (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999).

16 Tristram Hunt, *Marx’s General: The Revolutionary Life of Friedrich Engels* (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 2010).

17 Friedrich Engels, *The Condition of the Working Class in England*, ed. David McLellan, Reissue edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009).

18 Alan Mayne and Tim Murray, eds., *The Archaeology of Urban Landscapes: Explorations in Slumland* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001).

19 Hunt, *Marx’s General*.

20 Sir James Kay, *The Moral and Physical Condition of the Working Classes Employed in the Cotton Manufacture in Manchester* (London: J. Ridgway, 1832).

21 Tony Seaton, “Wanting to Sleep with Common People,” in *Slum Tourism Poverty, Power and Ethics*., ed. Fabian Frenzel, Ko Koens, and Malte Steinbrink (London: Routledge, 2012); Alan Mayne, *The Imagined Slum: Newspaper Representation in Three Cities, 1870–1914* (Leicester: Leicester University Press, 1993).

22 Ellen Ross, *Slum Travelers: Ladies and London Poverty, 1860–1920* (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2007).

23 Jens Wietschorke, “‘Go down into the East End’. Zur Symbolischen Topographie des urbanen Ostens um 1900,” in *Das Prinzip “Osten”: Geschichte und Gegenwart eines symbolischen Raums*, ed. Gunther Gebhard, Oliver Geisler, and Steffen Schröter (Bielefeld: transcript Verlag, 2014), 77–102.

24 Said, *Orientalism*.

25 Jacques Ranciere, *The Philosopher and His Poor* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004).

26 Seth Koven, *Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004); Ruth Clayton Windscheffel and Seth Koven, “Slumming: Sexual and Social Politics in Victorian London,” *The English Historical Review* 122, no. 495 (2007): 272–274.

27 Koven, *Slumming*.

28 Robert M. Dowling, *Slumming in New York: From the Waterfront to Mythic Harlem*, Reprint (Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press, 2009); C. Heap, *Slumming: Sexual and Racial Encounters in American Nightlife, 1885–1940* (Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2009).

29 Koven, *Slumming*.

30 Wietschorke, “‘Go down into the East End’: Zur Symbolischen Topographie des urbanen Ostens um 1900.”

31 Dowling, *Slumming in New York*; Heap, *Slumming*.

32 Ross, *Slum Travelers*.

33 Alan Mayne, *Slums: The History of a Global Injustice* (London: Reaktion Books, 2017).

34 Hans-Christian Petersen, ed., *Spaces of the Poor: Perspectives of Cultural Sciences on Urban Slum Areas and Their Inhabitants* (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2013).

35 Doug Saunders, *Arrival City* (London: Windmill, 2011).

36 David Harvey, *Spaces of Capital: Towards a Critical Geography* (New York: Routledge, 2001).

37 Frederich Engels, *The Housing Question* (London: CreateSpace, 2016), 56.

38 Rancière, “Ten Theses on Politics.”

39 Engels, *The Housing Question*, 25.

40 David Harvey, *Rebel Cities: From the Right to the City to the Urban Revolution* (New York: Verso, 2012).

41 Ibid.

42 Engels, *The Housing Question*.

43 Petersen, *Spaces of the Poor*.

44 Ibid.

45 Fabian Frenzel, “Beyond ‘Othering’: The Political Roots of Slum Tourism,” in *Slum Tourism Poverty, Power and Ethics*., ed. Fabian Frenzel, Ko Koens, and Malte Steinbrink (London: Routledge, 2012), 49–65.

46 Koven, *Slumming*.

47 Nigel Scotland, *Squires in the Slums: Settlements and Missions in Late Victorian Britain* (London: I.B. Tauris, 2007).

48 Ross, *Slum Travelers*; Mayne and Murray, *The Archaeology of Urban Landscapes*.

49 Koven, *Slumming*.

50 Ross, *Slum Travelers*.

51 Mayne, *Slums*.

52 Koven, *Slumming*.

53 Hannah Arendt, *On Revolution* (New York: Penguin Books, 1990).

54 Frenzel, *Slumming It*.

55 Ibid.